Social and Personality Psychology Compass 10/7 (2016), 377–389, 10.1111/spc3.12259

Ethical Requirements and Responsibilities in Video Methodologies: Considering Confidentiality and Representation in Social Justice Research

Steph M. Anderson[1]* and Carolina Muñoz Proto[2]
[1]*The Graduate Center, City University of New York*
[2]*Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso*

Abstract

In recent years, psychologists have begun to use video more frequently in qualitative research, in particular, within research on social justice. The non-confidential nature inherent in video, however, raises new ethical challenges for the field of psychology to address. Building upon a growing literature on video-based research, in this article, we use an illustrative case study to examine how researchers' sense of *ethical responsibility* can find guidance from, clash against, or fill gaps left by extant federal and disciplinary *ethical requirements*. We focus specifically on issues of confidentiality and representation, highlighting the challenges and possibilities that video creates in relation to participants' power, dignity, and participation and arguing that psychologists must systematically engage questions about ethical responsibilities throughout the design and implementation phases of a research project. In doing so, psychologists, their community partners, and students will be better able to articulate and problematize their assumptions and intentions regarding video work.

In recent years, psychologists have begun to use video more frequently in qualitative research (Hadfield & Haw, 2012; Sparrman, 2005), particularly within research on social justice (Bhavnani, 2008; Cahill et al., 2008; Luttrell, Dorsey, Hayden, & Shalaby, 2011; Sandercock & Attili, 2014). As a source of knowledge and/or method within the research process, video provides an opportunity to explore questions otherwise unanswerable, helping researchers develop insights that other methods may overshadow (Marquez-Zenkov, 2007; Milne, Mitchell, & de Lange, 2012; Stanczyk, 2007). For example, previous research has used video as an object of analysis (Forsyth, Carroll, & Reitano, 2009; Holliday, 2007; Lomax, 2011; Rich, Lamola, Gordon, & Chalfen, 2000) and as a means for data elicitation (Aronson & Bania, 2011; Smith, Smees, & Pellegrini, 2004; Sparrman, 2006; Watts, Griffith, & Abdul-Adil, 1999). Across these studies, researchers have incorporated diverse subgenres of video: video diaries (Barnes, Taylor-Brown, & Wiener, 1997; Bates, 2013; Gibson, 2008; Pini & Walkerdine, 2011), video interviews (Kasangaki, Macnab, & Cannon, 2012; Muñoz Proto, 2012), ethnography or vérité (K. Yang, 2015; Liebenberg, Ungar, & Theron, 2014), and video testimonies (Muñoz Proto, Devoto Lyon, Villar Castillo, & Battistella, 2013).

As a means to communicate research findings, video is also proving to be a powerful research product related to issues of social justice, as it can enable alternative forms of representation, authorship, and participation (Downing & Tenney, 2008; Fine et al., 2004; Gubrium, Harper, & Vannini, 2015; Milne et al., 2012). Due to its dual audio and visual layers, video provides an opportunity to "show" and not just "tell" a person, a situation, a context, or a psychological phenomenon. As a result, audiovisual representations can work to humanize participants, buffering against fragmented analyses that reduce participants to demographic characteristics

or behavioral variables (Billig, 1994). Video may also create a sense of immediacy for audiences, potentially personalizing the issue being addressed (Foster, 2009; Marshall, 2003). Video documentaries created within participatory action research projects (PAR), for instance, reflect grassroots questions, analyses, and policy recommendations (Gubrium et al., 2015; Milne et al., 2012; Muñoz Proto, 2012; Sandercock & Attili, 2010; Tilleczek & Loebach, 2015). Taken together, this body of literature points to video's ascendancy in psychological inquiry and foregrounds video's potential contribution to the study of injustice, the production of alternative representations of/by marginalized communities, and the disruption of normalized forms of injustice and disempowerment (Cahill & Bradley, 2011; Frith, Riley, Archer, & Gleeson, 2005; Hadfield & Haw, 2012; Luttrell, 2010; Sandercock & Attili, 2014).

In order for the potential of video to be realized, however, researchers must reflect on the unique ethical challenges that incorporating video poses. While sociologists, anthropologists, and geographers have addressed this challenge (e.g., Banks & Zeitlyn, 2015; Cahill, 2007; Cahill, Sultana, & Pain, 2007; Jacobs, 2013; Luttrell & Chalfen, 2010; Luttrell, Restler, & Fontaine, 2012; Pauwels, 2002; Pink, 2004; Ruby, 2005; Sparrman & Lindgren, 2010), psychologists have been less vocal (see Lynn & Lea, 2005; Turan & Chapin, 2008 as exceptions). In what follows, we first differentiate between *ethical requirements* – the federal and disciplinary codes of conduct – and *ethical responsibilities* – sense of ethical obligation based upon psychologists' epistemological, political, and personal perspectives – as a framework to identify and discuss the ethical issues that emerge with the incorporation of video in research. Our aim is not to be exhaustive of all ethical dilemmas, but to concentrate on two particular ethical issues: confidentiality and representation. Both are demonstrative of the how a researcher's sense of ethical responsibility may find guidance from, clash against, or fill gaps left by extant federal and disciplinary ethical requirements in the United States. Drawing from the critical perspectives from North America (Fine, 2012; Fox & Fine, 2012; Teo, 2010) and Latin America (Montero, 2006; Wiesenfeld, 2014), we contend that due to the novel ethical questions, video poses researchers must develop and articulate a heightened sense of their ethical responsibilities. Toward that end, we offer illustrative examples from our own work of a video-based PAR project carried out by Carolina and colleagues (Muñoz Proto et al., 2013), identifying key questions that guided the resolution of ethical dilemmas and foregrounding the importance of articulating ethical responsibilities. The article concludes with recommendations for on how to pursue deeper disciplinary reflection on the ethical responsibilities in video work.

Video through the Lens of Ethical Requirements and Responsibilities

In all scientific inquiries with human participants, psychologists in the United States are guided by two prominent ethical guidelines: *The Belmont Report* (National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research, 1992) and the *Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct (APA Ethics Code)* of the American Psychological Association (American Psychological Association, 2002). These codes specify a number of *ethical requirements* that psychologists must fulfill in order to meet their ethical obligations, i.e., the non-negotiable legal and institutional boundaries of social inquiry. *The Belmont Report* (1992) identifies basic ethical principles of biomedical and behavioral research involving human participants and general applications of those principles; the intent of the *APA Ethics Code* (APA, 2002) is to establish integrity of the psychological profession, provide education and professional socialization for psychologists, create public trust, and demonstrate the discipline's ability to self-monitor (Fisher, 2009). Considered side-by-side the ethical principles and codes are simultaneously broad and particular in discussing ethical matters. As stated in *The Belmont Report* (1992):

> The codes consist of rules, some general, others specific that guide the investigators or the reviewers of research in their work. Such rules often are inadequate to cover complex situations; at times they come into conflict, and they are frequently difficult to interpret or apply. Broader ethical principles will provide a basis on which specific rules may be formulated, criticized and interpreted (p. 1).

As a strength, this flexibility of ethical guidelines allows researchers to interpret the codes in relation to various circumstances and situation-specific ethical dilemmas. As a weakness, the generality of the guidelines may not provide an adequate level of specificity for the resolution of novel ethical quandaries, such as those posed by new methodologies or technologies. For example, the *APA Ethics Code* (APA, 2002) states that researchers need to obtain informed consent for the video recording of a participant's likelihood (Standard 8.03: Informed Consent for Recording Voices and Images in Research, APA, 2002), but is silent on how these recordings should or can be used and/or disseminated. As specified within both documents, inattention to particular issues or conduct within a code does not deem an action ethical or unethical; psychologists must use the codes as conceptual *tools* to guide their research. Stated differently, it is the responsibility of psychologists to determine appropriate ethical choice based upon relevant considerations of their research. As such, ethical principles and codes can identify "what is ethically desirable and what is clearly unacceptable" (Smith, 2010, p. 3). When applied to actual research, what constitutes acceptable is not always as clear and may carry different meanings across research contexts.

In confronting ethical issues, psychologists also turn to their personal values for the interpretation and implementation of these guidelines. The notion of *ethical responsibilities* describes a sense of ethical obligation(s) based upon epistemological orientations of the researcher. This includes a sense of ethical obligation to psychologists' communities, to their discipline, and to the overall purpose and objective of conducting psychological research. Critical, participatory, and social justice-oriented frameworks, for instance, share a concern for participant voice, self-determination, and self-representation, while focusing on the denaturalization of violence, oppression, and injustice (Fine, 2012; Fox & Fine, 2012; Teo, 2010; Montero, 2006; Wiesenfeld, 2014). Because these frameworks value local perspectives and collective ownership of scientific knowledge, researchers strive to *work with* communities and individuals rather than *working on* individuals and communities (Cahill, 2007; Fine, 2012; Fine & Torre, 2006; Fox & Fine, 2012). These epistemological commitments are not necessarily encompassed by disciplinary codes of conduct but are nonetheless the basis for approaching ethical dilemmas.

Arguably, in confronting ethical issues, all psychologists draw from their understanding of institutional and legal ethical requirements as well as their own epistemologies. This is not unique to video work but also pertains to other forms of social inquiry (e.g., Fine, Weis, & Wong, 2000; Haverkamp, 2005; McIntyre & Lykes, 2004). The role of ethical responsibilities, however, is heightened when working with new methods and technologies, such as digital video. Psychologists are likely to face at least two types of ethical quandaries in video-based research. First, when extant codes do not provide guidance, researchers' sense of ethical responsibility becomes the primary guide for addressing ethical issues. Second, when federal and disciplinary guidelines do exist (i.e., ethical requirements are well-defined), researchers' sense of ethical responsibility may not necessarily align with disciplinary requirements that were written with other methods and research processes in mind (i.e., experiments, observation, and survey). In what follows, we consider confidentiality and representation as unique sites for the articulation of the dynamic relationship between ethical requirements and responsibilities.

Confidentiality and Representation in Video Methodologies

Confidentiality

Respect for privacy and confidentiality are staples of ethical research with human subjects. Privacy identifies a participants' right to determine the information they share and the extent to which they disclose it (Folkman, 2010). Respect for privacy recognizes participant autonomy and right to self-determination and helps ensure that participants experience minimal harm in their participation. The primary purpose of confidentiality is to protect privacy. Confidentiality establishes an agreement between the researcher and participants regarding the treatment of their data, the information they choose to disclose (Folkman, 2010). Inherent in its nature, the visual component of video renders it extremely difficult – if not impossible – to preserve confidentiality, thus violating one of the central standards of social scientific research. Although psychologists have an obligation to maintain confidentiality as a part of their ethical requirements, video is inherently non-confidential. A deep-seated question immediately arises: Does the inability to maintain confidentiality in using video negate its implementation? Stated differently, does the risk connected to non-confidentiality outweigh potential benefits that may come from research? Using a strict interpretation of the *APA Ethics Code* (APA, 2002), psychologists should use video for analysis purposes only and should distort participant voices and images in order to protect confidentiality if published (Fisher, 2009).

Yet, the relationship between confidentiality and risk in relation to video may look different from various epistemological standpoints. Acceptable or appropriate limits of confidentiality are designed to help protect against disclosure of participants' identities. The underlying assumptions are that participants (1) *want* their identities kept confidential and that (2) it is within their best interest to do so (Giordano, O'Reilly, Taylor, & Dogra, 2007). For populations that have been historically silenced within psychological research and the culture at large (e.g., LGBTQ individuals), the avoidance of future stigma may justify the negation of their participation in non-confidential research. In the name of protection, however, concealment may also serve to keep their experiences and voices "in the closet" (Cahill et al., 2008). From this perspective, the ability to name or to keep confidential can be seen as an act of power that is often taken away from those most disenfranchised. As such, confidentiality is not only an ethical consideration but is also a political one (Guenther, 2009).

Just as precautions must be raised in regard to foreseeable and unforeseeable risk participants may experience, so too must precautions against acts of paternalism. Within research, unequal power dynamics already characterize researcher–participant interactions (Fine, 1998; Wilkinson, 1999). Psychologists must take care to not reinstate these dynamics in their research. Researchers may find themselves torn between IRB requirements to preserve confidentiality in order to fulfill ethical requirements (by blurring faces and distorting voices, for instance), and the request of activists, advocates, or other research participants to appear on camera to show their realities and share their experiences. Understood this way, the use to *non*-confidentiality within research may, under certain conditions, better serve researchers' objective to work toward social justice (e.g., Cahill, 2007). How researchers resolve this dilemma with their IRBs exemplifies the necessity to articulate and consider their ethical responsibilities.

Representation

When confidentiality and anonymity are nearly impossible, *how* participants are represented within video becomes a central ethical question. Although not explicitly mentioned within *The Belmont Report* (1992) or the *APA Ethics Code* (2002), the ways in which psychologists portray participants has ethical and political dimensions (Cahill, 2007; Fine et al., 2000;

Giordano et al., 2007). Because issues of representation are unaddressed by ethical requirements, how psychologists represent participants in research is predominantly informed by their ethical responsibilities. As noted above, psychologists are required to obtain consent for the recording of images (Standard 8.03: Informed Consent for Recording Voices and Images in Research, APA, 2002). They do not, however, need to obtain consent for the manner in which they portray participants in data analysis or publication. Through agreement to have their images recorded, participants consequently consent to the ways in which they will be portrayed (Haverkamp, 2005). Stated differently, participants have little to no control over the ways in which their images are modified, used, or distributed by social researchers (Banks & Zeitlyn, 2015). Within traditional psychological research, this is generally the contract between research psychologists and participants. Behind such power, dynamics is an epistemology that delineates the psychologist the expert and authority in the interpretation of data and dissemination of knowledge (Fine, 1998; Fine & Torre, 2006; McIntyre & Lykes, 2004; Wilkinson, 1999).

It is precisely because of the non-confidential nature of video, though, that the ethics of representation deserve careful consideration in the absence of disciplinary guidelines. This need is heightened with video, as video footage can be easily shared, duplicated, and distributed (Yang, 2015). While the Internet and social media may serve to reach wider target audiences and facilitate community collaboration among psychologists (Derry et al., 2010), researchers may lose control over who has access to the video footage (Banks & Zeitlyn, 2015). Like in other forms of research, good intentions alone do not ensure accurate portrayals or that the message intended is the one actually communicated (Ruby, 2000).

The non-confidential nature of video and its effect on representation may, from a critical perspective, pose advantages as much as potential risks. Video, for example, can trouble traditional power dynamics between participant and researcher. Literally "looking back" at the world through video technologies, participants are invited to use research as a vehicle to speak for themselves and their communities (Foster, 2009; hooks, 2000; Muñoz Proto et al., 2013), to fashion their identities and those of their communities for the viewing public (Cahill et al., 2008; Luttrell et al., 2012; Pink, 2007). In addition, the knowledge that participants would be able to readily identify themselves within the research may also create higher levels of accountability, as researchers may have to personally address participants' reactions and concerns upon seeing their portrayals in research findings (e.g., Guenther, 2009). Finally, non-confidentiality can also have an educational and empowering impact. Research suggests that having control over the content that is released to the public can help individuals realize the variety of ways in which they can participate and speak back to public discourses (Anderson, 2013). In sum, while extant disciplinary guidelines require researchers to avoid non-confidential methods and forms of data because they are considered inherently dangerous, critical researchers who are using video may view non-confidentiality as an important means to achieve the psychological, political, and educational benefits of self-representation.

Considered together, issues of confidentiality and representation foreground the dynamic relationship between ethical requirements and ethical responsibilities. The use of video within research challenges researchers to articulate, resolve, and implement solutions to the ethical questions posed by non-confidential nature of video and to weigh larger aspirational principles, like justice, in their interpretations of specific enforceable standards and codes (*The Belmont Report*, 2002; *National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research,* 1992). How researchers resolve potential dilemmas and novel ethical questions regarding video-based research requires an acute articulation of their sense of ethical responsibility. In what follows, we discuss issues of confidentiality and representation using illustrative examples from a video-based PAR project carried out by Carolina and

colleagues (Muñoz Proto et al., 2013). In doing so, we seek to demonstrate the utility of a reflexive approach and articulation of ethical responsibilities in the resolution of ethical questions.

The Memoscopio Project as an Illustration of Ethical Responsibilities

Between 2009 and 2011, Carolina Muñoz Proto et al. (2013) carried out a video-based study of a transnational campaign, the World March for Peace and Nonviolence (the March). In an effort to promote disarmament, non-militarism, and nonviolence, the March engaged with local governments, community organizations, and individual participants through public events in 600 cities, use of social media, and a three-month march around the world. Carolina and colleagues were invited to carry out a study that would document and explore the experiences of March participants. Specifically, they sought to understand the psychosocial significance of participation in the March, focusing on the role of digital testimonies and online archives as tools for voice, participation, and advocacy. Methodologically, the project involved the creation of an online archive of short video testimonies, called the Memoscopio Archive. Testimonies in the archive were then analyzed through the creation of digital exhibits (Memoscopio, n.d.; Muñoz Proto, 2014).

This project design resulted from a continual process of reflection and decision-making on a number of ethical issues with video. The Memoscopio team struggled to balance the potential risks and benefits of non-confidentiality and the desire of participants and community activists to self-represent, as well as how to best address issues of representation, given the inherently political nature of the project. Like others, (e.g., Sandercock & Attili, 2010), while the issue of confidentiality foregrounded tensions between extant requirements and existing responsibilities, the Memoscopio team had to rely only on their ethical responsibilities regarding the topic of representation. In navigating the design and implementation of the project, the Memoscopio team drew upon the Frierian pedagogy of the question (Freire, 1986): as a collective, they articulated and defined a set of questions as a means to resolve ethical roadblocks. As discussed below, these questions were instrumental to their process and importantly helped surface the team's sense of ethical responsibility.

In the initial design and implementation of the project, the team wrestled with the decision *whether* to use video as a method, and if so, *how* to best protect participants from undue risk. On the one hand, Carolina felt that non-confidentiality inherent in video could threaten participants' safety and political freedom. Especially in countries least known to the research team, she worried that non-confidentiality could make participants potential political targets and thus proposed limiting data collection to audio-recorded interviews. On the other hand, non-academic members of the team and community gatekeepers advocated for the public use of video, as many of the activities of the March were visually rich and compelling. In addition, the non-confidential nature of audiovisual data heightened the researchers' sense of responsibility to represent participants as they wished to represent themselves: as agentic spokespeople and witnesses to peace building rather than as research subjects, victims of violence, or interview participants.

To determine if video should be used and if so which genre would allow the greatest participant autonomy over representation, the team and March organizers focused on the following questions: Which methods will produce the richest and most usable knowledge on the March with the fewest risks to participants? Which video genres (e.g., interview, vérité, testimony, diary, and documentary) are most familiar, most relevant, or best understood by March participants, as well as the intended audiences? What technical, aesthetic, and interpersonal conditions will allow them to represent themselves with autonomy and

as experts and authors of their own experience? Through three months of dialogue, fieldwork, and piloting, the team came to the conclusion that video data were not only relevant to the practices under study but also represented one of the most widely used media formats in the March. Video constituted a form of data that, in its raw form, for example, would be readily accessible and useful within advocacy work, thus fulfilling an important principle of participatory research. Piloting also showed that it was crucial to invite participants to address their audiences directly by looking at the camera and without any interruptions from the researchers. Thus, the Memoscopio team selected video genre of testimonies, a highly important genre of political speech in the Americas that is familiar to grassroots activists and their potential audiences. Testimonies would allow participants more representational control and, crucially, to share their experiences of the March in their role as activists and spokespeople. In contrast, classic interviews carried out by researchers would position them as research subjects whose experiences would be framed by the researchers' questions.

Technically and logistically, with the same emphasis on representational autonomy, participants could choose to share written, audio, and/or video testimonies and do so anonymously through the project's website or during a face-to-face interaction with the researchers. This level of control allowed the majority of the participants to share video testimonies publicly, while a small number were able participate without disclosing their identities, thus preventing the risks associated to a public stance against political actors in their local communities. Once recorded, participants had the ability to have their testimony re-recorded or deleted both immediately, as well as after the videos had been uploaded to the digital archive. This wide offering of formats and levels of disclosure allowed each participant to decide what kinds of disclosure were risky and how much risk they were able or willing to take on, thus avoiding a paternalistic stance. In this way, the team sought to obtain and maintain representational consent for how participants were portrayed (Sandercock & Attili, 2010).

Finally, during the data analysis and dissemination phase of the project, the team was careful not to undo the gains of the previous phase and focused on the extent to which they, as researchers, should make editorial decisions. Specifically, they asked themselves: What are the consequences and implications of clipping or editing participant testimonies? As described above, the power to edit, revise, and re-organize data is generally within the domain of the researcher. Because of the non-confidential nature of the testimonies, however, and the desire to preserve self-determined representations, the Memoscopio team decided not to edit participant testimonies and to display them unedited within the testimony archive. In addition, to avoid fragmented or over-analyzed representations of the testimonies, the researchers decided to accompany academic publications with an online digital exhibit, explicitly alerting readers that transcripts of testimonies in articles and book chapters do not truly do justice to the embodied and situated nature of the video testimonies (see memoscopio.org).

Overall, the Memoscopio team collected over four times as many video testimonies as written accounts, suggesting that video testimonies were a natural fit within the March context: participants were already viewing, producing, and sharing video testimonies as part of their peace advocacy (Muñoz Proto et al., 2013). While this example illustrates only some of the myriad of ethical challenges that researchers may face when using video in social justice research, the success of the Memoscopio team provides a cogent example of the necessity of articulating ethical responsibilities in the resolution of ethical dilemmas and of utility of mobilizing Frierian pedagogy of the question (Freire, 1986) within video-based research.

Moving Forward with a Focus on Responsibilities

Many qualitative researchers have long expressed frustration with the inapplicability of *The Belmont Report* (1992) and the *APA Ethics Code* (2002) to qualitative inquiries. Such inapplicability relates in part to the codes' positivist and biomedical-model roots (Haverkamp, 2005), which translate more readily into ethical requirements than responsibilities. This may explain the lack of attention to the ethical issues of video research within psychology more generally, as well as the greater emphasis that IRBs place on fulfilling ethical requirements compared to responsibilities in video work (see Bradley, 2007; Cahill, 2007). In response, some psychologists advocate for the establishment of a separate code of ethics for qualitative inquiries (Haverkamp, 2005). Yet, a divorce between quantitative and qualitative psychological ethics, between various quantitative and qualitative epistemologies, is unlikely.

While the improvement of extant ethical codes is crucial, we contend that there are important reasons why a greater focus in the articulation of ethical responsibilities will better address the ethical dimensions of video work. Practically, technologies to produce, store, and disseminate video change at a much faster pace than disciplinary codes, leaving researchers to address new and 'unregulated' ethical issues on their own (Yang, 2015). Moreover, it is impossible to regulate all decisions that arise with video methodologies due to the situation-specific nature of ethical challenges. As Carolina and her colleagues' work suggests, greater emphasis on ethical responsibilities will better attend to shifting and complex dynamics of video work that emerge across particular visual methods (e.g., photovoice), video genres (e.g., video diaries and video testimonies), research project designs (e.g., PAR), and communities (e.g., privileged, vulnerable, and underage).

For these reasons, the development of ethical responsibilities will better realize video's potential to study and promote social justice within critical and participatory frameworks. As recent work reviewed in this article suggests (Frith et al., 2005; Hadfield & Haw, 2012; Luttrell, 2010; Sandercock & Attili, 2014), psychologists using video as a tool for voice, participation, alternative representations, and dissemination of research to non-academic communities are often invested in turning video methodologies into a transformatory and ethical praxis. In this sense, psychologists are reaching beyond the non-negotiable requirements and principles of ethics codes. This work would be best advanced through fostering dialogue and reflection regarding ethical responsibilities both within research projects, as well as within published works.

As the case of Memoscopio demonstrates, the field has much to gain from engaging in a reflexive pedagogy of the question (see Freire, 1986), as a simple yet generative means to consider how to best navigate the uncharted territories on video-based research for social justice. A serious and systematic engagement with questions about ethical responsibilities throughout the design and implementation phases of a project may allow psychologists, their community partners, and their students to problematize their assumptions and intentions regarding the use of video. Drawing from the experience of the Memoscopio team and the critical frameworks that inform our approach to video, we propose the following additional questions as a starting point for researchers interested in video work:

Confidentiality

- Under what conditions will the use of video empower and be transformative for the community? Who can best help answer this question?
- How are our ethical responsibilities affected when working with a community we know well, or belong to, versus, a community of people who are strangers/others to us?

- What are the risks and benefits of maintaining confidentiality and of publicly identifying participants in this video project?
- If we choose non-confidentiality, how can we best ensure that participants are informed of potential risks?
- To what extent do we approach confidentiality and privacy differently when working with groups who have been historically privileged as opposed to disenfranchised?

Representation

- Is it our responsibility to disseminate or to keep private the video products of this project?
- Who should have control over producing, approving of, and/or distributing footage? With whom should we consult in making these decisions?
- Who should own and have access to the raw footage and final video products?
- Would the needs, rights, and goals of the participants be better served by copyright licensing, creative commons licensing, or other legal frameworks?
- Should we obtain representational consent in this project and, if so, how can we address it?

These questions are not meant to be exhaustive; rather they serve as a starting place for identifying researchers' sense of ethical responsibilities with the incorporation of video within psychological research.

Finally, what happens, if in answering these questions we come to realize that it is not possible to fully address our ethical responsibilities in video research? An ethical engagement with video methodologies requires researchers to be willing to put away the camera (Milne, 2012). When a given methodology becomes popular, we run the risk of overusing it or using it at the wrong times or for the wrong purposes (Nind, Wiles, Bengry-Howell, & Crow, 2012). Enthusiasm over a new research tool that appears to be empowering and transformative has the potential to blind us to the subtle differences that exist between one participant and another, between one context and another, and between one research topic and another. That over-enthusiasm can lead to a kind of methodological fixation with high ethical costs. Active reflection based on the pedagogy of the question (Freire, 1986), as we proposed here, may help the field of psychology avoid this trap as video methodologies become ever more popular.

Conclusion

As images and video continue to take more primacy in our culture and create new contexts and meanings for psychological understanding, researchers must acknowledge the empirical potentials of video, while confronting the ethical issues that arise within this uncharted territory. Disagreement between what is ideal and what is implementable, between ethical requirements and ethical responsibilities will continue to characterize ethical discourses. Where psychologists may fulfill certain principles or standards, they may dissatisfy others. In this article, we focused on confidentiality and representation as two central issues of the use of video in research oriented social justice. Moving forward, in contrast to the development of additional regulations within legal and disciplinary ethical codes, we advocate for a focus on ethical responsibilities as a guide for handling novel ethical dilemmas. Within psychology, ethical discourses must continue to grow to acknowledge the importance of identifying and integrating ethical responsibilities within the psychological literature. The opposite of proscriptive, we propose a Freirian attention to questions: The act of collectively posing and answering questions on confidentiality, representation, and other issues may help the discipline recognize, reflect on, and address regulated, unregulated, and emergent ethical issues within video methodologies. We believe this may be especially generative for the promotion of voice, participation, power, and dignity through video-based research on social justice issues.

Short Biographies

Steph M Anderson's work sits at the intersection of social personality psychology and gender studies. She has written about the positive outcomes of participation in documentary film production among disadvantaged youth (*Culturally relevant arts education for social justice: A way out of no way*). Steph has held many fellowships as a videographer and her short, "Purple Shoelaces" premiered at the HBO Theatre in May 2012. A portrait of the Women's Division of the New York City Gay Basketball League and explores experiences of gender, sexuality, and camaraderie on and off the court. The film has screened at conferences internationally. Steph's recent academic work examines relationship between cisgender and transgender LGBQ experiences of discrimination and the enactment of antigay prejudice by heterosexual individuals. Across her empirical and artistic projects, she prioritizes video and digital technologies as methodological tools and as vehicles to disseminate psychological science to larger public audiences. She is currently a visiting lecturer of Gender Studies at John Jay College of Criminal Justice. Steph holds a PhD in Psychology from the Graduate Center of the City University of New York.

Carolina Muñoz-Proto's work sits at the intersection of social personality, peace and conflict, and community psychology. She has written about video methodologies in participatory action research projects that examine the intergenerational effects of mass incarceration on families (*The Critical Qualitative Research Reader*), and the experiences of grassroots transnational peace activists (*Journal of Social Issues, Peace Psychology Book Series by Springer*). Recent work discusses the influence of Latin American feminism and humanism on her approach to research methodologies and ethics. With funding from the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, current research explores the narratives of political action of Chilean men and women who have participated of armed and nonviolent approaches to social change, conflict, and resistance. Her work on video testimonies and digital archiving in peacebuilding has been supported by the Mellon Doctoral Globalization Fellowship of the Committee on Globalization and Social Change, The Graduate Center, City University of New York. Since 2014, she serves in the editorial team of the journal *Psicoperspectivas: Individuo y Sociedad*. Carolina is an Assistant Professor in the Doctoral and Undergraduate Programs at Escuela de Psicología, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, in Chile. She holds a PhD in Psychology from the Graduate Center, City University of New York.

Note

* Correspondence: Critical Social Personality Psychology, The Graduate Center, CUNY 365 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10016. Email: sanderson1@gradcenter.cuny.edu

Works Cited

American Psychological Association. (2002). Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct. Retrieved October 15, 2015, from http://www.apa.org/ethics/code/index.aspx

Anderson, S. M. (2013). Editing lives: The justice of recognition through documentary film. In M. S. Hanley & G. L. Sheppard (Eds.), *Culturally Relevant Arts Education for Social Justice: A Way Out of No Way* (pp. 108–118). New York: Routledge.

Aronson, I. D., & Bania, T. C. (2011). Race and emotion in computer-based HIV prevention videos for emergency department patients. *AIDS Education and Prevention*, **23**(2), 91–104. DOI: 10.1521/aeap.2011.23.2.91

Banks, M., & Zeitlyn, D. (2015). *Visual Methods in Social Research* (2nd edn). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Barnes, D. B., Taylor-Brown, S., & Wiener, L. (1997). "I didn't leave y'all on purpose": HIV-infected mothers' video recorded legacies for their children. *Qualitative Sociology*, **20**(1), 7–32. DOI: 10.1023/A:1024760113945

Bates, C. (2013). Video diaries: Audio-visual research methods and the elusive body. *Visual Studies*, **28**(1), 29–37. DOI: 10.1080/1472586X.2013.765203

Bhavnani, K.-K. (2008). Shifting passions, changing genres. *Feminism & Psychology*, **18**(1), 21–34. DOI: 10.1177/0959353507084952

Billig, M. (1994). Repopulating the depopulated pages of social psychology. *Theory & Psychology*, **4**(3), 307–335. DOI: 10.1177/0959354394043001

Bradley, M. (2007). Silenced for their own protection: How the IRB marginalizes those it feigns to protect. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, **6**(3), 339–349. http://doi.org/http://ojs.unbc.ca/index.php/acme/article/view/782

Cahill, C. (2007). Repositioning ethical commitments: Participatory action research as a relational praxis of social change. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, **6**(3), 360–373. http://doi.org/http://ojs.unbc.ca/index.php/acme/article/view/784

Cahill, C., & Bradley, M. (2011) Documenting (in)justice: Community-based participatory research and video. In S. Sutton & S. Kemp (Eds.), *The Paradox of Urban Space: Inequity and Transformation in Marginalized Communities* (pp. 223–241). New York: Palgrave.

Cahill, C., Bradley, M., Castañeda, D., Esquivel, L., Mohamed, N., Organista, J., Sandberg, J., Valerio, M., & Winston, K. (2008). "Represent": Reframing risk through participatory video research. In M. J. Downing Jr. & L. J. Tenney (Eds.), *Video Vision: Changing the Culture of Social Science Research* (pp. 207–226). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Cahill, C., Sultana, F., & Pain, R. (2007) Participatory ethics: Policies, practices and institutions. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, **6**(3), 304-318.

Derry, S. J., Pea, R. D., Barron, B., Engle, R. A., Erickson, F., Goldman, R., Koschmann, T., Lemke, J. L., & Sherin, M. G. (2010). Conducting video research in the learning sciences: Guidance on selection, analysis, technology, and ethics. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*, **19**(1), 3–53. DOI: 10.1080/10508400903452884

Downing Jr., M. J., & Tenney, L. J. (Eds.). (2008). *Video Vision: Changing the Culture of Social Science Research*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Fine, M. (1998). Working the hyphens: Reinventing self and other in qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 70–82). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.

Fine, M. (2012). Resuscitating critical psychology for "revolting" times. *Journal of Social Issues*, **68**(2), 416–438. DOI: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.2012.01756.x

Fine, M., & Torre, M. E. (2006). Intimate details: Participatory action research in prison. *Action Research*, **4**(3), 253–269. DOI: 10.1177/1476750306066801

Fine, M., Torre, M., Boudin, K., Bowen, L., Clark, J., Hylton, D., … Upegui, D. (2004). Participatory action research: From within and beyond prison bars. In P. M. Camic, J. E. Rhodes, & L. Yardley (Eds.), *Qualitative Research in Psychology: Expanding Perspectives in Methodology and Design* (p. 315). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Fine, M., Weis, L., & Wong, L. (2000). For whom? Qualitative research representations and social responsibilities. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 107–132). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Fisher, C. B. (2009). *Decoding the ethics code: A practical guide for psychologists* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Folkman, S. (2010). Privacy and confidentiality. In B. D. Sales & S. Folkman (Eds.), *Ethics in Research with Human Participants*. (4th edn., pp. 49–58). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Forsyth, R., Carroll, K., & Reitano, P. (2009). Illuminating everyday realities: The significance of video methods for social science and health research. *International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches*, **3**(3), 214–217.

Foster, V. (2009). Authentic representation?: Using video as counter-hegemony in participatory research with working-class women. *International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches*, **3**(3), 233–245.

Fox, M., & Fine, M. (2012). Circulating critical research: Reflections on performance and moving inquiry into action. In G. Cannella & S. Steinberg (Eds.), *Critical Qualitative Research Reader* (pp. 153–165). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Freire, P. (1986). *Hacia una pedagogía de la pregunta. Conversaciones con Antonio Faundez*. Buenos Aires: Ediciones La Aurora.

Frith, H., Riley, S., Archer, L., & Gleeson, K. (2005). Imag(in)ing visual methodologies. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, **2**(3), 187–198. DOI: 10.1191/1478088705qp037ed

Gibson, B. E. (2008). Co-producing video diaries: The presence of the "absent" researcher. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, **4**(4), 34–43.

Giordano, J., O'Reilly, M., Taylor, H., & Dogra, N. (2007). Confidentiality and autonomy: The challenge (s) of offering research participants a choice of disclosing their identity. *Qualitative Health Research*, **17**(2), 264–275. DOI: 10.1177/1049732306297884

Gubrium, A. C., Harper, K., & Vannini, P. (Eds.). (2015). *Participatory Visual and Digital Research in Action*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Guenther, K. M. (2009). The politics of names: Rethinking the methodological and ethical significance of naming people, organizations, and places. *Qualitative Research*, **9**(4), 411–421. DOI: 10.1177/1468794109337872

Hadfield, M., & Haw, K. (2012). Video: Modalities and methodologies. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education*, **35**(3), 311–324. DOI: 10.1080/1743727X.2012.717434

Haverkamp, B. E. (2005). Ethical perspectives on qualitative research in applied psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, **52**(2), 146. DOI: 10.1037/0022-0167.52.2.146

Holliday, R. (2007). Performances, confessions and identities: Using video diaries to research sexualities. In G. C. Stanczyk (Ed.), *Visual Research Methods* (pp. 255–280). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Hooks, B. (2000). *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Jacobs, J. (2013). Listen with your eyes: Towards a filmic geography. *Geography Compass*, **7**(10), 714–728. DOI: 10.1111/gec3.12073

Kasangaki, A., Macnab, A., & Cannon, W. (2012). Videorecorded interviews as a medium to enhance cross-cultural programme evaluation. *Health Promotion International*, **27**(1), 74–81. DOI: 10.1093/heapro/dar098

Liebenberg, L., Ungar, M., & Theron, L. (2014). Using video observation and photo elicitation interviews to understand obscured processes in the lives of youth resilience. *Childhood: A Global Journal of Child Research*, **21**(4), 532–547. DOI: 10.1177/0907568213496652

Lomax, H. (2011). Visual identities: Choreographies of gaze, body movement and speech in video-based mother-midwife interaction. In P. Reavey & P. Reavey (Eds.), *Visual Methods in Psychology: Using and Interpreting Images in Qualitative Research*. (pp. 153–169). New York, NY, US: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

Luttrell, W. (2010). "A camera is a big responsibility": A lens for analysing children's visual voices. *Visual Studies*, **25**(3), 224–237. DOI: 10.1080/1472586X.2010.523274

Luttrell, W., & Chalfen, R. (2010). Lifting up voices of participatory visual research. *Visual Studies*, **25**(3), 197–200. DOI: 10.1080/1472586X.2010.523270

Luttrell, W., Dorsey, J., Hayden, J., & Shalaby, C. (2011). Transnational childhoods and youth media: Seeing with and learning from one immigrant child's visual narrative. In J. Fisherkeller (Ed.), *International Perspectives on Youth Media: Cultures of Production and Education* (pp. 192–208). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Luttrell, W., Restler, V., & Fontaine, C. (2012). Youth video-making: Selves and identities in dialogue. In Milne, E. J., Mitchell, C., & de Lange, N. (Eds.), *Participatory Video Handbook* (pp. 164–177). Latham, MD: AltaMira Press.

Lynn, N., & Lea, S. J. (2005). Through the looking glass: Considering the challenges visual methodologies raise for qualitative research. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, **2**(3), 213–225. DOI: 10.1191/1478088705qp039oa

Marquez-Zenkov, K. (2007). Through city students' eyes: Urban students' beliefs about school's purposes, supports and impediments. *Visual Studies*, **22**(2), 138–154. DOI: 10.1080/14725860701507099

Marshall, E. O. (2003). Making the most of a good story: Effective use of film as a teaching resource for ethics. *Teaching Theology & Religion*, **6**(2), 93–98. DOI: 10.1111/1467-9647.00159

McIntyre, A., & Lykes, M. B. (2004). Weaving words and pictures in/through feminist participatory action research. In M. Brydon-Miller, A. McIntyre, & M. B. Lykes (Eds.), *Traveling Companions: Feminism, Teaching, and Action Research* (pp. 57–78). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Memoscopio. (n.d). Retrieved from www.memoscopio.org

Milne, E. (2012). Saying "no" to participatory video: Unraveling the complexities of (non)participation. In E. Milne, C. Mitchell, & N. de Lange (Eds.), *Handbook of Participatory Video* (pp. 242–256). Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.

Milne, E.-J., Mitchell, C., & de Lange, N. (Eds.). (2012). *Handbook of Participatory Video*. Lanham: AltaMira Press.

Montero, M. (2006). *Hacer Para Transformar*. Buenos Asires: Ediciones Paidos Iberica.

Muñoz Proto, C. (2012). In search of critical knowledge: Tracing inheritance in the landscape of incarceration. In S. Steinberg & G. Cannella (Eds.), *Critical Qualitative Research Reader* (pp. 479–490). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Muñoz Proto, C. (2014). "When I heard about the March": Testimonies and participatory archiving in peacebuilding. (Unpublished dissertation, The Graduate Center of the City University of New York). Retrieved from http://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc_etds/79

Muñoz Proto, C., Devoto Lyon, A., Villar Castillo, C. V., & Battistella, M. (2013). Memoscopio: Producing usable and collectively owned knowledge about the World March for Peace and Nonviolence. *Journal of Social Issues*, **69**(4), 754–770. DOI: 10.1111/josi.12040

National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research. (1992). The Belmont Report. Retrieved October 15, 2015, from http://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/humansubjects/guidance/belmont.html

Nind, M., Wiles, R., Bengry-Howell, A., & Crow, G. (2012). Methodological innovation and research ethics : Forces in tension or forces in harmony? *Qualitative Research*. DOI: 10.1177/1468794112455042

Pauwels, L. (2002). The video-and multimedia-article as a mode of scholarly communication: Toward scientifically informed expression and aesthetics. *Visual Studies*, **17**(2), 150–159. DOI: 10.1080/1472586022000032224

Pini, M., & Walkerdine, V. (2011). Girls on film: Video diaries as "autoethnographies". In P. Reavey & P. Reavey (Eds.), *Visual Methods in Psychology: Using and Interpreting Images in Qualitative Research*. (pp. 139–152). New York, NY, US: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.

Pink, S. (2004). Performance, self-representation and narrative: Interviewing with video. *Seeing Is Believing? Approaches to Visual Research Studies in Qualitative Methodology*, **7**, 61–77. DOI: 10.1016/S1042-3192(04)07005-3

Pink, S. (2007). Walking with video. *Visual Studies*, **22**(3), 240–252. DOI: 10.1080/14725860701657142

Rich, M., Lamola, S., Gordon, J., & Chalfen, R. (2000). Video intervention/prevention assessment: A patient-centered methodology for understanding the adolescent illness experience 1. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, **27**(3), 155–165. DOI: 10.1016/S1054-139X(00)00114-2

Ruby, J. (2000). *Picturing Culture: Explorations of Film and Anthropology*. University of Chicago Press.

Ruby, J. (2005). The last 20 years of visual anthropology: A critical review. *Visual Studies*, **20**(2), 159–170. DOI: 10.1080/14725860500244027

Sandercock, L., & Attili, G. (2010). Digital ethnography as planning praxis: An experiment with film as social research, community engagement and policy dialogue. *Planning Theory & Practice*, **11**(1), 23–45. DOI: 10.1080/14649350903538012

Sandercock, L., & Attili, G. (2014). Changing the lens: Film as action research and therapeutic planning practice. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, **34**(1), 19–29. DOI: 10.1177/0739456X13516499

Smith, B. (2010). Moral foundations of research with human participants. In B. D. Sales & S. Folkman (Eds.), *Ethics in Research with Human Participants* (4th edn, pp. 3–10). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Smith, P. K., Smees, R., & Pellegrini, A. D. (2004). Play fighting and real fighting: Using video playback methodology with young children. *Aggressive Behavior*, **30**(2), 164–173. DOI: 10.1002/ab.20013

Sparrman, A. (2005). Video recording as interaction: Participant observation of children's everyday life. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, **2**, 241–255.

Sparrman, A. (2006). Film as a political and educational device: Talk about men, male sexuality and gender among Swedish youth. *Visual Studies*, **21**(2), 167–182. DOI: 10.1080/14725860600945010

Sparrman, A., & Lindgren, A.-L. (2010). Visual documentation as a normalizing practice : A new discourse of visibility in preschool. *Surveillance & Society*, **7**(3/4), 248–261.

Stanczyk, G. C. (2007). Images, methodologies and generating social knowledge. In G. C. Stanczyk (Ed.), *Visual Research Methods* (pp. 1–22). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Teo, T. (2010). What is epistemological violence in the empirical social sciences? *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, **4**(5), 295–303.

Tilleczek, K., & Loebach, J. (2015). Research goes to the cinema: The veracity of videography with, for and by youth. *Research in Comparative and International Education*. DOI: 10.1177/1745499915581084

Turan, Z., & Chapin, D. (2008). How we learned to love digital video editing. In M. J. Downing Jr. & L. J. Tenney (Eds.), *Video Vision: Changing the Culture of Social Science Research* (pp. 102–119). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Watts, R. J., Griffith, D. M., & Abdul-Adil, J. (1999). Sociopolitical development as an antidote for oppression: Theory and action. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, **27**(2), 255–271.

Wiesenfeld, E. (2014). La psicología social comunitaria en América Latina: ¿Consolidación o crisis? *Psicoperspectivas*, **13**(2), 6–18. DOI: 10.5027/psicoperspectivas-Vol13-Issue2-fulltext-357

Wilkinson, S. (1999). Focus groups a feminist method. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, **23**(2), 221–244. DOI: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.1999.tb00355.x

Yang, K. (2015). Participant reflexivity in community-based participatory research: Insights from reflexive interview, dialogical narrative analysis, and video ethnography. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*. DOI: 10.1002/casp.2227

Yang, K. (2015). Voice, authenticity and ethical challenges: The participatory dissemination of youth-generated visual data over social media. *Visual Studies*, **30**(3), 309–318. DOI: 10.1080/1472586X.2015.1017364