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Abstract

This study makes an original contribution to knowledge, by an examination of the relationship between ‘creative risk’ and ethical appraisal within media and visual arts pedagogy at a higher education level.

A central aim was to explore a new discipline-specific model for ethical appraisal for use by visual arts researchers and students. ‘The ethical dimension is an important aspect of research governance’ (De Wet, 2010:301), however, Hedgecoe, (2008:874) argues that ‘underpinning the sociological critique of ethics review is an alarming methodological lacuna’. The observation that ethical issues implicit in visual research are different than those derived from purely textual sources, (Wiles et al., 2008), together with the recognition that quality assurance may hinder creative approaches, (Hargreaves, 2008), necessitated the need to seek better solutions.

A second allied aim of the study considered the role of ‘creative risk’ and how this might affect the ethical decision-making of visual arts researchers and staff? Finally, by analysing data assembled during the study, the research explores the creative and ethical risks associated with the display of problematical images.

The study identified that within the visual arts an overwhelming majority of respondents considered creative risk-taking to be important yet exhibited a nuanced relationship to ethical regulation. Furthermore, whilst creative risk was greatly overlooked in the literature, a factor noted by Ellis and Meneely, (2015); creative risk may help us better understand the processes of teaching, research and making.

The study proposes a series of recommendations for improved systems of ethical appraisal including the need to differentiate between a research context and art practice operating outside of the academy. The findings also statistically assess the incidence of ethical issues highlighted by postgraduate visual arts researchers and advance a new definition for creative risk.

It is hoped the study’s original interpretation of creative risk and recommendations for improved systems of ethical appraisal will assist others in the field.
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1. Introduction

1.1 Aims of the investigation and approach

This study aims to make an original contribution to knowledge, by an examination of ‘creative risk’ and ethical appraisal within media and visual arts pedagogy at a higher education level. The study sets out to investigate if it is possible to develop a new pedagogical approach to ethical appraisal within the visual arts and to examine the nature of ‘creative risk’ via its relation to creative process and ethical scrutiny.

A first aim of the research is to explore a new discipline-specific model for ethical appraisal, within which a student or researcher might meaningfully and reflectively engage with ethical issues inherent in their creative work. ‘The ethical dimension is an important aspect of research governance’ (De Wet, 2010:301). However, Hedgecoe, (2008:874) argues that ‘underpinning the sociological critique of ethics review is an alarming methodological lacuna’. Wiles et al., (2008:8) assert ‘ethical issues raised by visual research are, arguably, distinct from those raised by purely textual data’ whilst Hargreaves, (2008:230) states it is difficult within the university environment to balance quality assurance at an institutional level with ‘the flexibility required for really creative approaches’. Miller et al., (2012:30) lament the current ‘tick-box mentality, such that gaining ethics approval becomes a curiously disconnected facet of a research project’s life’. The development of new systems cannot simply continue to ‘follow the procedures of the biomedical model’ (De Wet, 2010:313). There is a critical tension between the generic institutional approach to ethical regulation and the ‘complex landscape of research across the disciplines, which resists resolution into one homogeneous terrain’ (Lederman, 2007:317). There is a clear need for investigation. Would it be possible to devise a more appropriate system of ethical appraisal for the visual arts? What would be the consequences of such a system?

A second aim is to provide an original definition for the term ‘creative risk’ itself and examine how visual arts students, researchers and lecturers perceive ‘creative risk’. Ellis and Meneely, (2015) identify the paucity of research specific to ‘creative risk’ in this area. In noting the lack of research concerning risk in educational contexts Lindqvist and Nordänger, (2007) identify the immediate need for new empirical studies. It is hoped therefore this study will provide a better understanding of ‘creative risk’ in ways specifically relevant to media and visual arts pedagogy. In reference to ethical appraisal it will also be pertinent to ask; how does ‘creative risk’ effect the ethical decision making of visual arts researchers and staff?
Finally by analysing data assembled during the study, a ‘research through practice’ component aims to further explore ethical issues encountered by visual researchers. This strand has three objectives. The first objective is to ascertain the ethical issues inherent in a range of images amassed during the study, whilst at the same time considering the creative or ethical risks associated with their display. The second objective is the original design of a functional model to describe the process of ethical appraisal. Lastly it will be necessary to seek feedback on a visualisation of data connected to this study, which will be presented at a public exhibition.

It is hoped that the trifurcate approach outlined above will provide both the depth and context required to rigorously examine both creative risk and the development of a more appropriate process of ethical appraisal for visual researchers.

In order to achieve a coherent hypothesis, consideration will be given to broad ethical constraints, particularly in relation to pedagogy and the institutional environment as well as wider contextual themes such as the assessment of creative process and the theory/practice debate that characterise the field.

1.2 Scope of the investigation and approach

It is important first to define the area for this research investigation. Whilst the study is born from an experience of media practice, by necessity the research must also embrace the wider visual arts. This is important, as any nascent model of ethical appraisal must become relevant to a broad base of visual arts researchers to be successful. Indeed, it can be argued that media practice is so closely enmeshed within the visual arts and the nature of interdisciplinary working so prevalent that an inclusive approach is a necessity.

In locating the study within the field of the visual arts and acknowledging its inception within media, the review has accentuated on occasion the contested nature of media education. For example in relation to media practice, seldom heard are the proponents of practice whose roots lie largely in the tradition of art and design. The reasons for this are complex. Berger, (2013:151) asserts that media education moved away from practice ‘towards ‘high theory’ just at a time when students were becoming involved in creating their own media texts’. This has resulted in a ‘dangerous schism between theory and practice’ (Berger, 2013:151). It is only relatively recently that practitioners appear to have joined what has traditionally been a theorists’ discourse with its origins in cultural studies. Unlike the more established areas of the visual arts within media all too often pedagogic commentaries appear disengaged from any real involvement with practical media production or simply dismiss it, falling back on the preferred educational tenets of cultural demystification or empowerment. A theme identified within the literature review and exemplified
by Readman (2013) and (Man, 1990). There is a sense that the practice and theory debate has become highly political, ‘the primacy of the artist identity’ (Orr, 2011:7), versus the political purism of an exclusive focus on academic theory noted by Buckingham (2003). In relation to media practice for example, it is perhaps disappointing in 2016 that the notion of a divide between thinking and making – an anachronistic dichotomy between concepts of academia and vocation remains (Powell, 2011; Hoechsmann, 2011; Berger, 2013).

Throughout the study, specific examples will be drawn from media practice where they have a wider cross-disciplinary purpose and meet the research aims. However the study’s primary focus will concern the visual arts generally within the UK higher education sector. In this context the research has employed a three-part approach outlined in the aims section that is designed to identify a better process for ethical appraisal and thoroughly explore creative risk.

**Contextualising Risk**

Risk-taking within media and visual arts teaching exists in a variety of guises. Ellis and Meneely, (2015:18) offer a definition of risk as a ‘degree of uncertainty in the outcome of a decision that may result in an actual or perceived loss’. It may be present tacitly within the pedagogic approach employed by a teacher noted by Hargreaves, (2008), as well as there being an explicit physical danger within production activities themselves (Small, 2000). Risk may be seen as an either an objective feature or a social construction (Thompson, 2012). Significantly at times risk may also be symbiotically related to creativity itself. Biesta, (2005:61) asserts that ‘education only begins when the learner is willing to take a risk’. However ‘the role of risk taking in preparing young people for the future is often overlooked by educators and policy makers’ (Rolfe, 2010:3). Craft (2006), promotes the need for genuine risk-taking though concedes the difficulty in a teaching context. Smilan et al (2007:2), highlight risk-taking as one of the ‘pathways to prosperity’ whilst several authors advance the idea that creativity and the link to making should not be undervalued, (e.g. Sennett, 2008). The literature review reminds us however that creativity is not always positive (Wenger, 2009) and risk is not always negative (Gigerenzer, 2002). ‘Often risk seems to be confused with being a bit edgy, yet edginess is a proven winning formula for many organisations. A real risk, on the other hand, must surely be related to the possibility of commercial or artistic failure’ (Boswell, 2014). The lack of empirical studies around risk in an educational context is noted by Lindqvist and Nordanger (2007). As mentioned in the introduction the role of creative risk is largely absent from the pedagogical discourse surrounding media and visual arts practice. This is outlined in the literature review in chapter four and presents a significant opportunity for a distinct contribution to knowledge.
Contextualising Ethical appraisal

In the context of risk the need to consider coextending ethical constraints was also prominently borne out by the literature review and early research. ‘In relation to ethics It is striking how little attention is given to ethical theory in the literature of risk communication’ (Thompson, 2012:636). In terms of ethical appraisal the nature of the visual arts discourse can sometimes initially appear divergent from fields with a longer more established record of research. ‘Much of what is currently claimed to be research within Fine Art would not be recognised as such by other disciplines within an academic framework’ (Douglas et al., 2000:3). We are also reminded that the visual arts ‘have only recently begun to focus explicitly on the ethical implications of research’, which can be viewed as ‘the maturing of research in art, design and media’ (The Ethics Project, 2006:online). Commenting on Research Ethics Committees, De Wet, (2010:310) notes the dearth of practical guidelines and recommendations and calls for ‘revealing case studies’ to be provided to researchers. It is clear however, that ‘researchers and students now need to be able to demonstrate and assert the legitimacy of their actions and ethical decision-making to a broader, more public audience than they would have in the past’ (Whiteman, 2012:6). Miller et al., (2012:34) stress ‘the importance of ethical training for the researcher so that she/he is able to think and act ethically in unforeseen/unknowable circumstances’.

Contextualising the sphere of the research study

Whilst the aims of this research project remain focused on ethical appraisal and creative risk it is vital to consider the context within which judgments are formed. Within the temporal space of media and visual arts pedagogy, it therefore became apparent that in support of the main research aims, it would be conducive to explore five coextending themes: Risk, Ethical constraint, Craft or practice, Theory and Creativity. These themes are to be found within the literature review often individually but seldom explicitly amalgamated or linked in a single argument. Their inclusion in this study is an explicit attempt to address what Jackson (2006), describes as a complex conceptual and practice world. It is remarkable for example, in his highly cited and substantive (153357 word) reference work on creativity that Pope (2005), refers to the term ‘risk’ only eight times. ‘Ethics’ is referenced four times in the main text, whilst by comparison the word ‘flower’ is mentioned twelve times. Unsurprisingly the term ‘creative’ appears multiple times on its 182 pages. Likewise Ellis and Meneely’s, (2015) otherwise excellent paper on risk is limited by quantifying creative risk for students, solely in terms of social risk.

The five themes mentioned earlier are however inherent within the visual arts and it can be argued are critical to providing a comprehensive contextual understanding of creative risk and ethical appraisal.
The interesting point here in relation to this study, is the area where the themes overlap or intersect. This territory will provide an anchor for the study. The diagram below (fig.1) is an attempt to map the coextending themes in the visual arts field. In practice the scale of each of these areas in terms of their significance might vary.

![Diagram of field: Visual Media Arts within Higher Education with themes overlapping including Risk, Ethical Constraint, Creativity, Craft and Practice, Theory.](image)

Figure 1: Intersection of coextending themes in the field of media practice and the visual arts. Spencer, (2012).

### 1.3 Thesis organisation

The study encompasses:

- A background section. This narrates the early research journey, from an interest in ‘physical risk’, to a cognisance of ethical regulation and an appreciation for creative risk.

- A literature review. Here the intention is to critically frame the arguments and questions implicit in the research project.

- Three case-studies; an investigation by survey, examining the nature of ‘creative risk’ via its relation to creative process and ethical scrutiny; the development and testing of a new visual arts process for ethical appraisal and a ‘research through practice’ component exploring ethical issues encountered by visual researchers.

- A conclusion. In this chapter synthesis will be sought in answer to the three main research aims detailed in the introduction. Suggestions and guidance together with the advocacy for further research and policy implication will be included in the recommendations made at the end of this concluding chapter.
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Appendices, which include a range of evidence referenced to in the main body of text.
2. Motivation

2.1 Motivation behind the investigation

Where does this report begin? It is perhaps apposite to suggest that rather than my preliminary research, the origins of this study lie in the mid to late 1990s. The beginning of my Masters course in Communication Design had fortuitously coincided with the digital explosion that was to be prologue for today’s Internet. Having originally turned down a 0.5 appointment at a large further education college I now found myself riding on the wave of technological frenzy that accompanied the widespread introduction of computers within Art and Design education. This was a boom time for not only Macintosh and the artists and designers keen to explore the potential of its associated software but also the nasissance of a range of new courses concerned with media production. These courses were very different from traditional media studies. From early on, I was aware of a friction between these analogous yet different pathways. Each with its own doctrine and their differing articles of faith. A distinction Berger, (2013) concedes has greatly been damaged media education. For a period media communication and production might have actually been defined by ‘not being media studies’ rather than actually what it was. A common student question during course interviews at this time was ‘what is the balance of practical work and theory?’ Within the current debate around praxis, the answer 70/30 in favour of practice might now seem as absurd as it was then tangible. Conveniently some A level Media studies tutors reversed an approximation of these figures. In 1998, I was unaware of David Buckingham and his theorising over the war of the pedagogies.

In the ensuing years I was course leader for a bewildering number of media programs, as specifications changed and institutions grew to see the popularity and propitious nature of media production. This was particularly the case during the uncapped dash for student numbers within further education of the mid to late 1990s; a result of the ‘government’s policy of seeking to expand the sector by some 25 per cent’ over three years from 1993/4 (Robinson and Smithers, 2002:34). By introducing demand led funding, colleges were no longer ‘to be subject to the normal cash-limit control that applied to most government funding’ (Robinson and Smithers, 2002:34). In addition, New Labour’s victory in the 1997 general election heralded a ‘boom in creative and media related courses being offered by a reconfigured higher education sector’ (Berger, 2013:145). To some commentators this period also signalled a point from which ‘universities and colleges were no longer to be state-subsidized service providers but treated rather as economic organizations selling education and research services to the state and others who were willing to purchase them’ (Williams, 2014:61). The transition of further education colleges from being under local education authority control to becoming independent incorporated entities emphasised the point.
The storm clouds had yet to gather.

I taught in schools, colleges and at a university where I piloted a degree course in filmmaking through validation.

I grew to be familiar with a ‘disconnect’ between educational policy in relation to media and the actual experience of learners reflected within the literature review. Things in essence appeared simple. Students took media production courses because they wanted to develop their creative filmmaking abilities (or similarly an understanding of sound, print or digital media) and in most cases hoped eventually to get employment. Our role as tutors was to make this happen. Students it was presumed on the whole wanted to ‘make really good films’ a statement I now understand contains at least three contentious suppositions. It is also perhaps an assertion as naïve as it is true.

During this time I became aware of my own emerging sense of vulnerability. I was sometimes placed in a difficult position. Students would approach me with ambitious ideas for their projects that engendered in me a feeling of uncertainty. Often it would be the higher achieving student keen to enact work echoing that of professional producers or independent practitioners that engendered the keenest sense of concern. On one hand the ambition by a student to push the boundaries or strive for professional values was admirable. Their response often felt a highly ambitious mix of experimentation matching the higher grading criteria of an award. At times though this same student aspiration was accompanied by tutor concerns over competency, resource and the over arching responsibility that an institutional context imposed.

More extreme examples at this time included the Master’s level student developing a documentary to be shot on location in the French Alps, (described in chapter seven). The subsequent proposal to paraglide over a glacier might have held great production or creative merit but its realisation held certain risk. The sixth former whose carefully crafted idea for a pilot cooking programme, included the requirement to shoot and skin the game clearly demonstrated an understanding of his genre but could this be acceptable in a sixth form context? More mundane examples included the numerous film drama productions shot on location with their attendant risks. At first I saw these risks purely in terms of health and safety noted by Small, (2000). It would take me some time including the embarkation onto a course of PhD research and the execution of a pilot study for this myopic view to come into clearer focus.
3. Background.

3.1 The 2008 PhD Pilot Study: Media Practice and a Safe Curriculum

What initially seemed simple contradictions, for example between the diktat that students must always be in line of sight during class times and physical nature of filmmaking remained unresolved. This schism was emphasised by inspections and lesson observations. As Small, (2000) noted, the boundaries of an acceptable pedagogy for media practice felt blurred. Learning always entails risk although ‘not all learning entails a similar amount of risk’ (Biesta, 2005:61). Yet ‘teaching that is planned to be risk-free is in fact a very crude distortion of the fundamental concept of teaching’ (Lindqvist and Nordänger, 2007:22).

This dichotomy led to the pilot PhD investigation. The study conducted at Liverpool Hope University sought to determine how the management of physical risk relates to the nature of practical filmmaking activity. The study is included here as its findings were to have pivotal significance to the later development of a new model for ethical assessment.

3.1.1 Need for a pilot investigation

By 2007 there was a clear sense of increased concern and new emerging procedures connected to risk management within professional moving image practice. The development of an appropriate pedagogical response presented a unique challenge to media education. At higher education level the range and scale of possible student film projects was immense. From a pedagogical perspective these might include working in a studio or individual student productions involving location filming in both the UK and occasionally further a field. Activities might embrace a filmmaking residential, necessitate individual or group working and cover a range of genres including: documentary, film drama, animation and experimental filmmaking. For those teaching media production the absence of adequate subject specific, educational guidance, relating to risk management was problematic. Concurrently, propelled by the sense that technology attracted student enrolment, many universities had engaged in a form of ‘arms race’ to acquire the latest equipment (Berger, 2013:154), in turn contributing to even more ambitious working.

Fewer resources and younger students only served to magnify these potential problems, in the school context. In these circumstances ‘the realities of classroom practice are inevitably much more 'messy' and contradictory than the well-ordered universe of educational theory’ (Buckingham, 2003:153). On its own the assertion by Nixon (2003:127), that ‘the need for direct supervision has to be assessed by reference to the risks involved and the activity undertaken’, provided little comfort for a teaching staff feeling vulnerable and unsure.
Against this background work, the pilot research conducted at Liverpool Hope sought to determine how the management of risk within education, related to the nature of practical filmmaking activity. As a first step, it was decided to survey enrolling students to assess their prior educational experience in this area, before moving on to develop new measures within the Department of Media, Communication and Film. During 2008/9 a survey of newly registered media and film undergraduates was conducted. The study attempted to investigate the nature of practical film making in schools to determine attitudes towards health and safety to better understand how enrolling students perceived risk in relation to filmmaking. As part of the preparation for this research the author attended the BBC Training and development’s course; Risk Management for Productions (Part 1 and 2) and completed The Pinewood Studios Health and Safety Awareness day.

The problem of risk had not gone unrecognised (Small, 2000:3), notes ‘tutors to the growing legion of media and film students are faced with increasing numbers of productions but with no specific guidance to remedy the potentially dangerous situation’. For teachers and lecturers alike, lack of clarity over questions of responsibility, legal obligations, structures and the role of staff in defining and monitoring risk, creates a climate of uncertainty. ‘Teaching staff have difficulty with terms like ‘risk education’ and ‘risk concepts’... feel vulnerable and often inhibited, fearing personal liability and litigation’ (HSE Risk education, 2016:online)

The eventual aim of the pilot project was to evaluate of the usefulness and impact of practical risk control measures connected to media student working.

3.1.2 Current approaches
Risk assessment procedures for use by media production students undertaking film projects appear to vary widely across the university sector. Whilst some HE institutions use paper-based systems others like Bournemouth University had developed integrated web-based solutions (CEMP, 2016), the situation however in schools was much harder to determine.

In a wider context it became clear that within sections of industry, health and safety was assuming a critical role. Legislation had reinforced the point. Large media organisations such as the BBC, Pinewood Studios and Channel 4 for example, provide a wealth of guidance for those involved in production.

At the time of the pilot, the QAA communication, media, film and cultural studies benchmark (2008:online) encouraged ‘a knowledge of the legal, ethical and regulatory frameworks that affect media and cultural production’ and ‘critically informed competency’. However it was perhaps a
missed opportunity that given the significance of this guidance, which ran to twenty pages, there was not a more explicit encouragement with regards to safe working practices, risk management or health and safety.

3.1.3 Legislation and guidance

Within the UK there is along list of legislation which impacts on this field. Small (2000), gives a comprehensive description of legislation as it impacts on film and television production safety, though it should be noted that there have been legislative updates since its publication. Nixon (2003:125) summarises the situation from an education perspective ‘there are three elements to the concept of a teacher’s duty of care: the common law aspect, the statutory consideration and the contractual obligation’. Each of these strands requires a slightly different approach.

The Corporate Manslaughter and Corporate Homicide Act (2007) is possibly the most significant recent development as in the institutional context it places increased pressures on those deemed to have a relevant duty of care to the victim. In school or college context these problems are complicated further by the responsibility of the institution or staff member discharging a ‘duty of care’ to those yet to reach adulthood. In reference to this loco parentis Nixon, (2002:124) asserts ‘today, a higher expectation of teachers is apparent; an expectation that they will do a better job than some notional parent/carer may do’. In his book ‘Health and Safety in Schools’, Brierley, (1991:1) reminds us that ‘reasonableness is the key word’ Yet in terms of creativity a ‘duty of care can become a straight jacket which challenges any strategy that deviates from a tried and tested methodology’ (Hargreaves, 2008:7).

One example of an attempt to provide advice in this equivocal area, is Guidance on Safety in Fieldwork, published by The University and Colleges Employers Association (2005, and revised 2011). However there is a shortage of literature providing relevant guidance. What does exist fails to address the combined issues around teaching and the specific risks associated with unsupervised media practice. Guidance on Safety in Fieldwork for example may feel perfectly adequate for an escorted geography fieldtrip but is less forthcoming concerning unsupervised student working.

At school level, the key guidance ‘Health and Safety: Responsibilities and Powers’, (Department for Education, 2001) and ‘Standards for LEAs in overseeing educational visits’ developed at the request of teachers seeking more specific guidance, have regularly been updated. However, they still fail to suitably or fully address issues such as off site student production pertinent to the media teacher. Against this background Bush, (2008) describes a range of formal models of educational leadership and management suggesting in his conclusion that the increased
complexity of the educational context may appear to lend support to the ambiguity model, where teachers work independently for much of the time. In this way it is easy to see why a media teacher feels both accountable and vulnerable.

3.1.4 The survey
In light of this context, the results from the pilot study are presented in brief here. The survey sought to examine experiences and perceptions of risk associated with filmmaking in schools and colleges. In this way it was hoped to better understand the underpinning knowledge base of enrolling first year media production undergraduates.

3.1.5 Aims
The primary aim of the survey was threefold: to examine the nature and extent of practical film making activity within UK schools and colleges; to determine attitudes towards health and safety within a production context and to discover how enrolling media and film students perceive risk in relation to production activity.

3.1.6 Methods
The survey took the form of a questionnaire, which comprised of 27 questions. The questionnaire was piloted on a small sample of undergraduates to test its reliability, then revised following feedback prior to distribution.

The survey was conducted at Liverpool Hope University during initial undergraduate induction in early October 2008 and involved questioning 74 first year students in the Department of Media, Communication and Film at the university. The students’ recent school, or college experience provided the logic for selection of this group. Between them the students in the survey had last attended 62 different educational establishments prior to enrolment at Liverpool Hope. This figure included two students from institutions outside of the UK (Germany and Ireland).

The questionnaire was distributed and completed before the students had the opportunity to undertake a health and safety induction within the film department at Liverpool Hope. Completion of the questionnaire was conducted within a controlled classroom environment to discourage collaboration.

The initial focus of the questionnaire related to the experience of the group within their previous place of study. The sample was questioned about the protocols of course related filmmaking. Did filming occur on or off school or college premises? Was filmmaking normally completed in lesson time or not and what level of supervision took place? The questionnaire also sought to determine
if control measures, such as risk assessment prior to filming were commonly used (see Appendix 12).

The second part of the survey set out to examine how the students understood the concept of risk. Students were asked to imagine they were part of a team who had been asked to film a band playing an outdoor concert in a local park and also asked to consider and identify potential hazards. In a separate question the more abstract scenario of an asteroid strike was posed, in the attempt to determine if students were cognisant of ways to evaluate the magnitude of risk. For the purposes of this study an exemplar definition of risk would include some reference to likelihood, chance or probability as well as acknowledging the significance of the potential level of impact, harm or injury. For comparison the HSE website (Risk management: ALARP at a glance, 2016:online) defines risk as ‘A risk is the likelihood that a hazard will actually cause its adverse effects, together with a measure of the effect’. A definition of a hazard would indicate that it was something that could cause adverse effects.

3.1.7 Findings
Out of the 74 students questioned, 50% or 37 confirmed that whilst at school or college they had taken part in the production of a student film as part of course work. A figure which broadly reflects the nature of level three media provision within both A level and National Diploma media syllabuses where the majority of courses have some element of practical work. However, only 20% of all respondents stated whilst at school or college they had taken part in activities where they had learnt about media specific health and safety issues. Furthermore, 40% of the overall sample identified that they had learnt about general health and safety issues whilst at school or college.

When the students were asked if they ever take part in filming during lesson time, a significant majority of these students (36) confirmed that they had.

Of these 36 students who answered the follow up question, inquiring if in lesson time this activity took place on school/college premises, 7 answered ‘always’ whilst 29 answered ‘sometimes’. This suggests that for the majority of students, film projects with have at times required offsite production.

Question fourteen on the survey queried whether in lesson time when filming on school or college premises, a tutor or other member of staff always present. This elicited a negative response from 30 of the 36 students who had taken part in filmmaking activities.
A further question broadened this subject to consider unsupervised off site production activities. Respondents were asked if within lesson time they had ever taken part in filming away from school or college without a parent or member of staff present. Out of the 36 students, 67% (24) confirmed that they had.

In an attempt to better understand what from a teaching and learning position might have significant ramifications, students were asked in question sixteen, the percentage of course related filming they were expected to complete outside of lessons, in their own time and away from school or college without a teacher or member of staff present. Of the respondents 64% indicated that approximately half or more of all filming was achieved in this way. Only 17% stated that no filming was achieved in this way.

When asked how often they were asked to complete a risk assessment form before filming over half of the students who took part in production activities, indicated that on no occasion were they asked to complete a risk assessment. Of those who did complete a risk assessment, less than half (41%) of these could state that these were always checked before filming commenced.

The second part of the survey examined how the students understood the concept of risk.

In relation to the groups understanding of risk, students were asked whether they could explain the difference between a risk and a hazard. A majority showed a reasonable understanding of ‘risk’ whilst there a slightly smaller group provided acceptable descriptions of the term ‘hazard’. It should be noted that a further sizable group of students provided partial definitions. Examples of common misunderstandings included ‘a hazard is there and you can’t avoid it’, and ‘a hazard is when there is (sic) warnings that something might happen’. In several instances students gave specific examples, such as a wet floor etc.

When asked to what extent they felt confident that they had a clear understanding of the terms. In regards to ‘risk’, 50% were either confident or very confident of their definition. In relation to the term ‘hazard’, 45% were either confident or very confident of their definition.

In the scenario question students were asked to imagine they were part of a team who had been asked to film a band playing an outdoor concert in a local park. They were then requested to list as many potential hazards associated this production as they could. Significantly 32% of the total respondents could only nominate one or two potential hazards whilst 41% of the respondents could describe 4 or more valid points.
When asked why do you think it might be important to manage risk when making a film 59% gave two or more valid reasons with only 12% of the respondents providing legal responsibility as an answer.

### 3.1.8 Reflection on findings from the pilot study

Traditionally within the school and college context, a regime of lesson observation, inspection and guidance has supported the principle that during lesson time pupils/students should be observed and supervised by the teacher or college lecturer. A rationale connected to both assessment and the general well being (health and safety) of the pupil/student support this. Whilst it is now becoming accepted that this might not always need to be the case e.g. Nixon (2003), an uncertainty in the minds of many teachers remains. In a school, even accompanied off site activity like a trip to a museum, might first require a letter home seeking permission for a pupil to participate.

*From the research findings we can draw a hypothesis that:*

In schools and colleges during lesson time, some students take part in unsupervised on site filming. Also in lesson time, some students take part in unsupervised filming away from the school or college premises.

A high proportion of school and college students undertaking film making activities feel that they are expected to complete at least some production work in their own time, away from the school or college. However a majority of school and college students in the survey, who had undertaken filmmaking activity, had not been asked to complete a risk assessment form before filming. Where risk assessment forms were requested there was a significant possibility they had not been checked by a member of staff before filming commenced, thus negating the potential value of the information. Moreover, students’ ‘un-viewed’ risk assessments may well be superficial or inadequate. Additionally, the findings tentatively suggest that the majority of students receive little in the way of heath and safety training, either specifically related to media production or generally whilst at school or college.

In many ways school or college film projects could feasibly contain the same exposure to hazards that a professional crew might experience. In this scenario the combination of an ill prepared or overly ambitious student production team with limited experience might however suggest increased risk. Consequently there is a clear duty for the educational institution to offer precise guidance on health and safety matters to these students. However, the survey suggests that for the majority of students this may not be the case.
A significant number of students presented with a filmmaking scenario, were less confident describing what might constitute a hazard, than when they were when presented with a more extreme asteroid example. In this second scenario however, there was some evidence of difficulty or confusion in relation to evaluating the perceived level of risk. These findings suggest that the students understanding of risk is limited. Additionally, the inability of a significant number of students, to list more than two potential hazards associated with making a short student film clearly supports the need for a subject specific undergraduate health and safety induction.

3.1.9 Pilot conclusion
The lack of evidence supporting the widespread and effective use of risk assessment in film projects is of concern. It is now an established industry practice and it can be argued should be included at course level. Whether its absence relates in the classroom to a lack of training, resources or the time to manage the administrative nature of student risk assessment activity remains unclear. Other contributory pressures might include concerns over what type of filming activities might be appropriate, whilst a teacher’s fear of vulnerability by signing off the risk forms may contribute.

However, ‘simply offering students the opportunity to engage and making them responsible for the outcome is not acceptable’ (Hargreaves, 2008:223).

3.1.10 Importance of induction, guidelines and risk assessment
In an educational situation, the health and safety concept of what is ‘reasonably practical’ might of course apply. However, few would argue with the view that there should be an aspiration, within a discipline attempting to echo professional practice, to provide a designated media health and safety induction, set out a clear set of production guidelines for students and foster the discipline of assessing risk prior to commencement of a project. As Berger, (2013:156) notes ‘there is probably no other subject that shadows its industry so closely’.

Findings from this study clearly support a minimum recommendation for a subject specific health and safety induction, clear production guidelines for students and the discipline of project risk assessment.

3.1.11 Impact of study on the curriculum at Liverpool Hope University
At Liverpool Hope a guideline protocol for student filmmaking was developed. The study encouraged the department to look afresh at procedures.
Students specialising in film and television production were provided with an introductory guide to the production area. The booklet included rules and regulations for use of the university production spaces and includes guidance for the main areas of student film activity. Within the first five weeks of the level C introductory semester, a specific safety induction lecture, for all BA (Hons) Film and Television Production students was introduced. Additionally, an online exercise was developed using virtual learning environment (VLE) software, where students were questioned on a series of artefacts relating to film health and safety and risk assessment. As part of the weighted assessment for the compulsory 60 credit first year production module, students were required to pass this Health and safety assessment test to progress on the course. The department also revised the risk assessment paperwork used by student film groups so it more accurately echoed industry best practice.

Whilst these things are immediately tangible, perhaps the biggest shift was in terms of thinking. The concept of a dynamic approach to risk management, where the subject is integrated within the approach to every day working, has perhaps been the major achievement.

3.1.12 The relevance to later research

The pilot study described above was critical as it introduced key themes that would later significantly influence the direction of the research.

Firstly the notion of student or researcher competence was significant. In the UK the Health and Safety Executive emphasise the need to people undertaking tasks to have a level of competency to do so, i.e. ‘necessary skills, experience and knowledge’(*HSE What is Competence?*, 2016:online). Therefore in the pilot study a recommendation had been for a mandatory training session before a student attempted risk assessment. This was seen as essential to validate the process. This same principle would later inform the development of the new MIRIAD (Manchester Institute for Research and Innovation in Art and Design) protocol for ethical appraisal described in chapter 6.

Secondarily, the pilot study had necessitated a familiarity with risk assessment. Unlike ethical checklists that were typically a tick-box format, health and safety risk assessments were often two-part documents that included the necessity for reflection on risks highlighted. This type of assessment demanded a reflective response from the person completing the document. A useful corollary of this arrangement is also the ability to determine the level of engagement, by the nature of these reflective comments. The development of this device would later be one of the critical improvements within the design of a new ethical appraisal protocol for visual arts researchers.
3.2 Risk photography
From early in the preparation for the research study, when confronted by student activity that felt problematic either in terms of content or supervision where possible an attempt was made to document it. Most often this would be in the form of photographic evidence. Later it would become clear that these images themselves would have a critical ethical dimension. These images are explored at length in chapter seven.

3.3 The journey from health and safety to creative risk
During 2010/11 it became increasingly apparent that a more complex relationship between risk and creative production was emerging. Initially this was seen in terms of physical risk as expressed within the pilot research described earlier. The ambitious student, who might bring in a smoke machine and set the fire alarm off necessitating the evacuation of the college or the palpable anxiety and uncertainty about how to approach student filmmaking away from the classroom or lecture theatre. ‘At times the tension also appears to lead to contradiction or even paradox: risk-taking is to be encouraged but it is also to be kept within easily controllable bounds’ (Banaji et al., 2006:64). The assertion by Hargreaves, (2008:8) that ‘creativity needs to be risk assessed and managed sufficiently to facilitate student success and safety’ sat uncomfortably with the emphasis on ‘treating risk taking as necessary to achieve reward’ (Rolfe, 2010:7) and led to the interest in what might constitute creative risk?. Concurrent with development of the PhD RD1 proposal it became clearer that physical risk was but one element within a more complex picture. It became apparent that risk-taking within media and visual arts practice exists in a variety of guises. It may be inherent within the pedagogic approach, as a physical peril or liability. Importantly at times risk may also be necessarily concomitant to the creative act itself, as exemplified within student work. However, ‘little is known about risk taking in the context of innovation in young people’ (Rolfe, 2010:10). Craft, (2005) notes the importance of providing opportunities for leaners to take risks. Within the field of media and visual arts pedagogy therefore a more complex yet interesting enquiry concerned this notion of ‘creative risk’.

3.4 The need for an ethical perspective
Whilst as early as February 2011, the research RD1 submission acknowledged that ‘consideration will also be given to broad ethical constraints such as student wellbeing, particularly in relation to pedagogy and the institutional environment’ in the weeks and months that followed a combination of factors would bring this element sharply to the fore. A new supposition which began to emerge questioned; was it always ethically acceptable for a tutor to set notions of exemplary attainment so high? Orr, (2011:41) identified that ‘fine art lecturers see a testing of boundaries as related to outstanding fine art practice’. What were the ethical implications of
managing expectation in this way? Was it right in all circumstances to equate challenging or professional standard student work with a higher assessment grade, particularly if this necessitated a possibly unreasonable inherent risk? Was it deterministic anyway to equate this work as being more creative?’ Hargreaves, (2008:230) posits ‘risks create ethical tensions at all levels’. Many of the undergraduate final year grade descriptors, referenced professional standards, yet how realistic was this given issues around student competency and resource?

At this point and in light of the earlier pilot study, the requirement to appraise the ethical nature of this research study using the Manchester Metropolitan University ‘ethics checklist’ raised a number of issues. Firstly, it appeared pertinent to contest the relationship of ethics to the pedagogy of media and the visual arts. The idea that the drive to encourage adventurous ‘risky’ student work in extremis could itself have an ethical dimension was further kindled during a postgraduate research seminar at MMU in early 2011. Therefore to consider the ethical aspects of creative risk appeared pertinent.

Secondarily, ethical regulation raised the issue of the role of ethical appraisal in relation to challenging or contentious work sometimes found within areas of the visual arts research. ‘Much that is valued as art remains shocking, disturbing and problematic’ (Cashell, 2009:1).

Thirdly, current procedures for ethical scrutiny felt ill matched against the reality of visual arts practice. Typically questions on institutional ‘ethics checklists’ were remote and appeared to be derived from the field of medicine rather than art, design or media. The process also lacked transparency engendering a sense of insecurity, ticking a box might for example jeopardise a project. These factors attributed to a sense that ‘pre-emptive barriers’ might ‘not only delay and discourage research, but also to distort its substance’ (Bledsoe et al., 2007:593). Finally it was clear that students were being asked to engage with ethical thinking, yet felt ill equipped for entry to the discourse.

The pilot study had shown the importance of competence and understanding, if a process was to be considered valid, but what little advice was available concerning research ethics was generic and often dissonant from a visual arts perspective.

‘The principled demand of bureaucratic regulation for a single manageable standard faces the recalcitrant heterogeneity and improvisational subtlety of genuinely ethical research practice’ (Lederman, 2007:323).
With supervisory help it was suggested that a next exploratory stage in the enquiry might be the development and delivery of a postgraduate introductory session on ethics for the MIRIAD researcher, training programme. The process of investigating a pedagogical response aimed at encouraging ethical thinking necessitated a better understanding creative risk. This enquiry is described in following chapters and marked the beginning of the next stage of the study.
4. Methodology

The research design adopts a mixed methods approach. ‘A central premise is that the use of quantitative and qualitative approaches together can provide a better understanding of a research problem’ (Banks, 2001:119). Rather than being solely an exercise in literary criticism the study hopes by exploiting cases studies and empirical work to gain a fresh perspective on the topic. In doing so the research project built on the empirical approaches to creative research articulated by (Jackson et al., 2006; Barron, 1969).

This mixed method approach encompasses:

- Literature review.

- A series of cross-sectional surveys that examine the nature of ‘creative risk’, via its relation to creative process and ethical scrutiny.

- The testing of pedagogical strategies and ethical appraisal prototypes.

- The evaluation of pedagogical strategies and ethical appraisal prototypes.

- Structured recorded interviews with teaching staff and researchers.

- A ‘research-through-practice’ component to explore examples of common ethical issues encountered by visual researchers.

- The exhibition of a visualisation of key findings, in order to seek feedback.
4.1 The Literature review

4.1.2 Introduction

*Beyond a war of the pedagogies: Critical attitudes towards creativity, ethics and risk within media and the visual arts.*

4.1.3 The need for a literature review

The stated central aims of this research study are to explore a new model of ethical appraisal, within which a visual arts researcher might meaningfully reflect on ethical issues inherent in their work, whilst at the same time better understanding the role of ‘creative risk’.

Embarking on this review it was evident that key texts would need to be examined across a range of areas. Firstly, examples of ‘creativity research’ studies connected to pedagogy within higher education would be useful. This would allow an examination of their findings and also an investigation of empirical methods employed. ‘The ethical dimension is an important aspect of research governance’ (De Wet, 2010:301) as such reference to critical commentaries here would be valuable. The nature of ‘difficult’ or ‘challenging’ creative work also needed to be explored, particularly from an ethical dimension. Furthermore, any current studies related to creative risk need careful contemplation to ensure no overlap, or unnecessary repetition of work. It was also thought pertinent to selectively consider key texts from the creative theory canon. The uncertainty concerning an adequate definition for creative risk, called for better understanding of the perception of risk itself. Finally, in entering the arena of the media and visual arts education debate it was essential to become familiar with the current field. This was important particularly in relation to the discourse around creativity, practice and pedagogy. To this end a selection of contributions from key commentators were sought. The texts analysed below range in publication date from 1969 to 2015. A thematic summary is provided towards the end of the review.

4.1.4 Understanding creativity

In any attempt by this study to define ‘creative risk’, we must first consider how others have sought to characterise creativity itself. There have been numerous attempts to define creativity. Pope, (2005:35) posits ‘time and time again, notions of creativity tend to develop in recursive but never in identically repeated ways’. Readman (2009:8), recognises that creativity is seen as an advantageous and sought after quality but speculates that ‘in the field of art, design and media there is considerable disagreement about what this ‘thing’ might be’. 
Whilst ‘creativity involves risk on a number of levels’ (Hargreaves, 2008:230), a precise definition of creativity can appear elusive. In his description ‘the ability to bring something new into existence’ Barron (1965:3), provides for many a concise starting point. However, even here Storr (1972), seeks to qualify the inclusion of the word new. Sternberg (2006), proposes an ‘Investment Theory of Creativity’. The fundamental premise being that creativity is in large part a decision that anyone can make but that few people actually do make because they find the costs to be too high. Gibson (2010:608), argues that ‘the issue of creativity is multi-faceted and open to disparate and often contradictory definitions’ whilst Kaufmann (2003:247), points to problems with a ‘lax definition of creativity’ citing problems involved in distinguishing the concepts of intelligence and creativity from each other. In his book ‘The Craftsman’ (2008:290) Richard Sennett attempts to avoid them term altogether, ‘because the word carries too much Romantic baggage’. A reference also stressed in the work of Buckingham et al (1995). In his alternate craft centred model, Sennett favours the concept of intuitive leaps, whist at the same time questioning the relationship of craft abilities and accepted notions of intelligence. The observation by Egan (2005:171), that ‘Well-designed research regarding the impact of teamwork on individual creativity has been minimal to date’ is also pertinent reminding us of the often, collaborative nature of media and visual arts practice.

Within the Arts Academy pursuit of creativity is championed. The word ‘creative’ was mentioned thirty two times in the QAA subject benchmark statements for Communication, media, film and cultural studies (2008), a rise from twenty-six in 2002. By comparison there is no mention of ethics or risk in the 2008 statement. Similarly in the 2008 QAA subject benchmark statement for Art and Design the term ‘creative’ appears thirty four times, the word ‘ethics’ once and ‘risk’ not at all. Yet how do we teach or even access creativity when there is such apparent difficulty with the term itself and so little acknowledgement of the role risk-taking plays? As has been noted risk-taking within media and visual arts practice exists in a variety of forms both tacitly and explicitly, often enmeshed with creativity itself. All this is however largely absent from the pedagogical discourse surrounding visual arts and media practice.

4.1.5 Seeking to define the term creativity
Possibly the most comprehensive recent guide to creativity is ‘Banaji, Burn and Buckingham’s influential literature review, ‘rhetorics of creativity’ (2006). Banaji et al. (2006) systematically examine the discursive positions on creativity adopted by a broad range of ‘academics, policy-makers and arts educators’. In doing this the authors begin by acknowledging an array of different theories, contexts, artistic traditions, academic or quasi-academic traditions and policy contexts. Rhetorics are defined as ‘a subset of discourse, characterised by specific properties’ (Banaji et al., 2006:11). Broadly speaking this equates to commonly understood frameworks or structures
connected to creativity employed by various theorists and stakeholders. Within their review the authors locate nine rhetoric strands: ‘Creative genius’, ‘Democratic and political creativity’, ‘Ubiquitous creativity’, ‘Creativity as a social good’, ‘Creativity as economic imperative’, ‘Play and creativity’, ‘Creativity and cognition’, ‘The creative affordances of technology’ and ‘The Creative Classroom’. These rhetoric categories are useful as a framework. They are not exhaustive in terms of the theorists attached to each heading but are a useful reference work for those engaged in the field. They are perhaps most useful in catagorising the various debates in the field. Though Readman (2009:10), cautions ‘some of these rhetorics are not merely different, but contradictory’. The paradoxical nature of these rubrics therefore does not present a grand solution to the problem of creativity rather it is a road map in terms of the theoretical discourse. As a map there are some gaps. A fact the authors themselves concede acknowledging that ‘these rhetorics can only be partially realised in a review of this kind’. Of equal interest to the categorisation of the various rhetorics is the report’s final section ‘Themes and questions’. Here a lengthy list of uncertain and problematic issues demanding further enquiry are listed. A relevant example being: ‘How might democratic accounts of creativity, which avoid the problem of elitism, nevertheless accommodate notions of exceptional talent?’ In terms of ethics and this study, the identified dilemma concerning ‘expressions of creativity that do not fit in with current social definitions of acceptable collective social endeavour’ is significant (Banaji et al., 2006:74). It is a factor that will be germane to the design of a new discipline specific appraisal process. In light of this study’s interest in creative risk it is notable that given the scope and breadth of ‘rhetorics of creativity’, risk is referenced only eight times and there is only one mention of ethics. This oversight substantiates the aims of the research study. In recognising this limitation it is clear there is scope for further work, particularly in relation to better defining ‘creative risk’.

In terms of appraising creativity Readman (2009:11), also helpfully reminds us that ‘In art, design and media we have a tendency to construct creativity around great works and great practitioners’. This is theme that finds resonance with Orr (2010) who advances the role of connoisseurship in creative assessment. It is a hypothesis that appears to be gaining traction. It is also evident in the work of Csikszentmihaly, (2013). The idea that there is growing agreement around ‘assessing creativity’, when the term ‘creativity’ itself presents such difficulty is important. Critically in terms of this study it suggests the possibility that around other symbiotic elements of creativity, such as creative risk we might too find accord.

Defining creativity itself however, remains elusive. Readman, (2009:11) asserts a number of different meanings for the term creativity but cautions that it is important ‘to be more explicit about our agenda and aware of the rhetoric when we invoke the c word’. It is significant that some authors go at lengths to avoid the ‘creative’ descriptor altogether. Buckingham et al., (1995)
express difficulty with the notion of creativity citing its Romantic baggage and others such as Pope, (2005) dedicate chapters to exploring alternative terms, yet creativity remains a ‘central source for meaning in our lives’ (Csikszentmihaly, 2013:1).

4.1.6Attempts to determine the nature of creative process
Barron, (1969) is generally considered to be one of the pioneers of research into creativity as such deserves inclusion here particularly in relation to his methods. These will be valuable particularly in connection with the development of surveys and questionnaires connected to this study.

Barron provides his early definition of creativity as the ability to bring something new into existence. Whilst tempering this by the suggestion that creation often ‘involves a reshaping of given materials, whether physical or mental’ (Barron 1969:10). Storr, (1972:xv) will later go on to clearly emphasise the problematic nature of the term ‘New’ and Barron will later refine his definition to the ‘ability to generate both novel and adaptive (useful) solutions to problems’(Feist and Barron, 2003:63).

Barron (1969), focuses on how creativity might be measured. In examining the links between creativity and intelligence, importantly Barron asserts there is little if any relationship ‘between certain purported measures of intelligence and measures or ratings of certain aspects of creativity’. It is a subject to which he will continue to return. ‘As defined, intelligence and creativity may be related but are not the same thing’ (Feist and Barron, 2003:63).

Usefully Barron (1969:15), provides many examples of the interview questions and methods used during his investigation of the way writers and others approach creation. Barron’s questions range from being analytically probing in a conventional sense, to what initially appear as bordering on the whimsical. For example ‘You have been shipwrecked on an desert island, and are able to know for certain that you can never get off it and will never again see another human being. Would it be possible for you to commit an evil act? What would it be?’ Here less obvious responses receive higher originality (creativity) scores. These insights into question design provide an interesting reference point for those developing similar interview based inquiries.

Barron’s Berkley study required a cohort of highly creative individuals prepared to undergo a range of assessments and tests. The selection of a sample of individuals considered unusually creative was achieved through a nomination process. These individuals were then recruited to take part in a series of blind assessments and personality tests. The results were then carefully analysed. Barron (1969:73), theorises that the findings seem to suggest not only increased levels of ego among the creative group but also raised incidence of psychopathology. This Barron
speculates supports a commonly held supposition that those considered to be creative, are often suspected of being ‘a bit dotty’. Eccentricity likewise Barron contends has long been prized within artistic and intellectual circles. Barron’s recommendations in relation to nurturing and encouraging creativity include the provision of social recognition and reward. Examples of practical techniques such as brainstorming and synectics, the search for similarity in problems, are considered. Acknowledging that mechanisms of this kind may initially appear to be a gimmick, Barron goes on to suggest that in fact they are useful in stimulating creative thinking.

Barron also considers creativity and young children. The author addresses the contended nature of the loss of natural childhood creativity though a system of schooling. The author contemplates what he terms the paradox of discipline and freedom. The suggestion is made that it is not schooling that is solely to blame for this loss of creative childhood innocence but rather the issue lies in part with the balancing of these the two dynamics.

In summary when considering Baron’s early work it is easy to see areas within the texts that now appear dated. However, the examples of empirical creative research; the attempt to investigate the link between creativity and intelligence and the search to better understand why some individuals appear more creative than others is valuable. These are central themes to which subsequent authors will return. Barron’s tentative decoupling of intelligence from creativity remains pertinent and will be echoed again by Kaufmann (2003). In its analysis of early creativity and education research the text also signals the beginnings of an inquiry into how creativity can be encouraged and increased particularly within the school or university environment. Crucially in terms of this study Barron’s work is useful in reminding us that it is possible to design and conduct empirical studies concerned with observation or experience rather than theory or pure logic.

4.1.7 Locating Creativity in Higher education
The methodology of this study requires a consideration of creativity within an institutional context. It is vital to comprehend the constraining factors both in terms of the development of a new system of ethical appraisal and to better understand creative risk in this context.

In his article entitled ‘Interfering with the interference’, Tosey (2006:29) summarises the institutional situation citing ‘features of HE, such as mechanisms for the maintenance of quality and standards, often appear to inhibit emergence and sit in tension with creativity’. Tosey goes on to distinguish creative notions, ‘such as imagination, originality, unorthodoxy and fantasy’ which the author suggests ‘appear in tension with important cultural values in HE about respectability and rigour in knowledge generation; and with needs for conformity, standardisation, accountability and risk aversion in our institutions’. Tosey draws on an inherent paradox already
advanced within the field of organisational behavior (Stacey et al., 2000:106), concerning the need to operate at the ‘edge of chaos’ in order to foster a fertile creative environment. Whilst notions of a chaotic even anarchic environment will be resonant to many within the visual arts, it also suggests that a better appreciation or at least understanding for risk within the arts academy would be beneficial. Here this study’s aim to better define ‘creative risk’ will be helpful.

Tosey then extends his treatise through examining the contrast suggested by Seel (2003) in Emergence in Organisations. Seel’s proposition separates what is termed the command and control paradigm from what is identified as the emergent paradigm. What is useful here is the grouping together of characteristics found within the operation of these two types of community. The culture within the command and control model is arresting: ‘keep people in silos’, ‘ensure everyone salutes the flag’ and ‘manage communication initiatives’. Inversely under the emergent paradigm there is the encouragement to build connectivity and encourage diversity. Whilst in practice no institution is probably as homogeneous so to conform completely to either model, what is pertinent is the way a culture can pervade through an organisation. This in turn contributes to the environment in which media and visual arts education is enacted. It also suggests that the proclivity for risk and nature of quality assurance procedures may also differ under competing organisational models.

Fryer, (2006) describes the results of a research study carried out on behalf of the National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts (Nesta) and the Higher Education Academy (HEA). Fryer’s study explores the views of National Teaching Fellows (NTFs) with regard to creativity, teaching and learning in HE. The finding that the majority of NTFs (92.2 per cent) believe that creativity can be developed contrast sharply with findings by Oliver et al. (2006), which surmised some students see creativity as innate with all the implications that this implies. Here the exploration of students’ experiences of creativity utilised a methodology that comprised semi-structured interviews and a focus group. The study helpfully provides three models of creativity; as innate or intuitive and not able to be developed; as nurtured therefore open to development and as potential i.e. individuals have a upper limit to their creative potential, which through work they may acquire. ‘If students see creativity as innate, it makes little sense to teach it; if they see it as potential, then they may excuse themselves (or others) for poor performance on the basis of biology rather than effort’ (Oliver et al 2006:45).

These findings conclude with the suggestion ‘that creativity is something that students are not used to discussing and quite possibly lack a shared common frame of reference to interpret’. (Oliver et al 2006:57).
Interestingly the study also revealed the students’ perceived frustration or conflict regarding being creative and being considered ‘academic’. It will be interesting therefore to explore student’s understanding of creativity in the survey chapter of this study.

Cowan’s (2006) original idiosyncratic contribution to the debate reflects the student frustration raised by Oliver et al. Cowan’s style belies his years of teaching experience. He states ‘creativity (understandably?) tends to be judged, within society, in terms of products that are seen to be creative and are rated as commendable for that reason. Yet often it is in the experiences of failure and frustration that the creative ability is honed and developed’ (Cowan 2006:158). He goes on to propose a scheme where learners would rather self-assess their own creative processes, thinking and outcomes, against stated criteria they had developed beforehand. This ‘creativity as process’ rather than ‘creativity as product argument’ is of note. Under Cowan’s system assessors would simply confirm whether or not the learner’s self-assessment was ‘objectively established by the information the learner has assembled for that purpose, and the way it has been used’ (Cowan 2006:161). To realise this new scheme Cowan goes on to introduce a six-step method. This process starts with the learner establishing, their own definition of creativity. Whilst the scheme appears initially cumbersome there is much merit in Cowan’s plan and it echoes other authors’ calls to promote a dialogue or questioning of creative assumptions. Cowan’s learner-led creative assessment model is notable and challenges traditional thinking in this area. It is an interesting contribution to the field.

Craft (2006:24) promotes the need within creativity for genuine or authentic risk-taking suggesting that ‘the catalyst and mentors for these processes are distinct from the roles and processes generally found in schools’. In her treatise on creativity in English schools the author describes the interest in creative policy and practice as occurring in three waves. They start with ‘first-wave thinking and developments’ initiated possibly in the 1960s and connected to the child-centred policy of the period. This is then suppressed in part by the advent in 1988 of the National curriculum. Craft then describes what she terms the second wave of the 1990s with its resurgent interest in creativity supported and championed by a range of major educational policy developments. The third wave Craft suggests is now emerging. Craft states ‘the third wave also problematises creativity and does not shy away from some of the tensions and dilemmas encapsulated in fostering it’ (Craft 2006:23). Helpfully Craft’s work also highlights the dichotomy of the terms ‘Creative teaching’ and ‘Teaching for creativity’. The former focuses on the teacher or lecturer feeling empowered via taking ownership whilst the latter concentrates on the learner and practices that encourage creative choices. Craft (2006:28) concludes by remarking that ‘In a marketised culture and a globalised world, where economic development is seen as unidirectional, the possibility of creativity being harnessed to social justice may be eclipsed by other
less altruistic goals’. With such limited emphasis placed within the discourse specifically on ethical considerations in relation to creativity, Craft’s remarks are a pertinent reminder of the connection.

Ethical concerns are also present in the research findings of Edwards et al, (2006). This time the study examined a relatively small sample comprising thirty-two academics from a diverse range of disciplines. This survey, found that ‘Some participants felt that certain creativity ought to be seen as good not just in some general, abstract way, but by being linked to morality. For example, ‘so-called creative accounting [could be] innovative . . . exciting for the practitioners and so on’, but was potentially destructive of companies and livelihoods in the longer term. Consequently, some participants felt that ‘it’s our job to indicate limits’ over acceptability’ (Edwards et al, 2006:61). This is interesting in terms of questioning the ethical perspective of staff and will be relevant to the development of questionnaires later in the study.

In relation to risk, several authors note a need for a space within which it is safe for students to take risks but (apart from Cowan’s assessment system) go little further to develop this idea. Jackson (2006:211) states ‘Learning cultures that are averse to risk-taking and penalise mistakes inhibit adventuring and therefore the potential for creativity’. In addition Jackson also cites Andriopoulos and Lowe, (2000) who used the term ‘adventuring’ in their paper on enhancing organisational creativity. The term describes the process through which it is possible to explore uncertainty via ‘scenario making’ in order to examine possible options or routes. They postulate it is then possible to test or experiment with these scenarios. As used by Andriopoulos and Lowe the term ‘adventuring’ also embraces ‘incremental risk-taking’ in order to limit a company’s exposure to huge or uncontrollable risk. Their process also acknowledges the presence of ‘mistake making’. However, in the full Andriopoulos and Lowe paper that was published in Management Decision Journal (2000:737) it is worth noting that this engagement with ‘mistake making’ and risk is clearly framed within an organisational and commercial context. As such its relevance particularly to creative risk taking within a pedagogical context needs further consideration. The concept of incremental risk-taking is perhaps best echoed in Sennet’s concept of intuitive leaps described in his book Craftsman (2008).

Several of the authors cited above contributed chapters to Developing Creativity in Higher Education (2006). The general attempt by these contributors to pursue their investigation utilising established research methodologies is a model for students engaged in this field and relevant to this study. The omission by these authors to fully appraise the more thorny ethical areas of creativity pertinent to pedagogy is perhaps again an oversight, highlighting the need for further work in this area.
4.1.8 Locating Creativity in Media Education

Discussing creativity Buckingham, (2003:127) notes the term creativity, ‘seems to serve very different purposes for different users, while acting as a kind of ‘magic ingredient' that is assumed to produce all sorts of transformative effects’. Emphasising creativity as ‘loosely defined’ and sometimes given a Romantic connotation Buckingham also acknowledges the social or collaborative nature of much media production and the need for technical skills. In order to promote exploration and genuine student insight the author calls for teachers to ‘consciously construct - a space for play and experimentation, in which there are genuinely no right and wrong answers’ (Buckingham, 2003:137). Buckingham describes the resulting pragmatic approach to assessment adopted by many within media education, where emphasis is placed on reflection and self-evaluation. Buckingham (2003:138) states ‘the product should not be seen as the end of the process, but as a stage within it - a starting point for reflection or a basis for redrafting, rather than a summation and a demonstration of what has been learned’. Textual critical analysis is not sufficient, creative production Buckingham (2003:122) argues can also be a route to ‘developing new and more profound critical insights’. In terms of pedagogy Buckingham places weight on self-evaluation by the student, and the move from 'situated practice' towards ‘critical framing'. Problems with this approach are discussed. The danger is noted of reflection becoming an exercise in self-justification where the ‘most successful students may be simply those who are best at presenting themselves’ (Buckingham, 2003:150). The risk is raised that student self-evaluation might also be viewed as an unrelated or unnecessary component. In placing this pedagogical emphasis on self-evaluation Buckingham advances a series of reflective questions a student might answer. These examine if the student’s intended communication was achieved and how an audience might interpret the finished piece. The questions provide an interesting correlation with Cashell, (2006) whose compromise regarding ethics is discussed later and takes in to account both the intended moral response intentioned by the producer and its subsequent appraisal by viewer. In practice however there is a danger that the adoption of this process (at least at National diploma/GNVQ level) has resulted in a formulaic process of ‘ring-binders’ and plastic pockets as students amass evidence against grade descriptors with creativity as a casualty. For higher education here Orr, (2011) usefully points to a more complex appraisal of assessment within higher education offering a series of lenses or filters through which artwork is apprehended and evaluated.

4.1.9 Understanding risk

After considering creativity we must next contemplate risk. As Craft (2006) notes there is a clear pedagogical need within areas of the creative disciplines to actively encourage students to take risks within their work. Several authors have commented on the link between creativity, risk-taking, arts education and the stimulation of economic growth. ‘As the global economy becomes
more entrenched in technological and innovative advancement, the idea that creative thinking, risk-taking and rediscovery are the pathways to prosperity is becoming self-evident’ (Smilan, and Torres de Eca 2007:2).

There is however, a range of factors that might influence the ability of teaching staff, to successfully support this goal. Institutional and cultural factors, teacher training and previous practitioner/academic experience may all contribute. ‘For lecturing staff, introducing creative activities arguably increases risk and requires more skill and courage than didactic teaching methods’ (Hargreaves, 2008:230). Alsafi (2006) also reminds us that there are pressures too on the learner. These may include the relationship between achievement, motivation and risk-taking and the construct of the risk of risk-taking. Here Ellis and Meneely, (2015) identify the need to consider the value of ‘safekeeping’ in relation to risk. In relation to creative production the risk might relate to physical harm, (Small, 2000). Finding a pedagogical response presents a challenge. Lindqvist and Nordänger (2007:23), assert ‘little is known about how people in education actually act, discuss and experience risk in their daily work’. Not all learning entails a similar amount of risk and some forms of learning may be quite predictable in their outcomes (Biesta, 2005). In defining risk, similarities are sometimes drawn with situational tasks such as gambling or skill games involving a significant element of chance. The definition of risk as a combination of likelihood or probability, together with a measure of the effect is enshrined within the health and safety legislation described in this study’s pilot research mentioned in chapter three. Adjunct to this premise at least for some, lies a dichotomy between the idea of creative risk as a challenge to the ego or notions of culture, versus ethical or actual physical risk. Risk within media and visual arts learning and teaching, is manifest in a variety of ways. Hargreaves, (2008) states that creativity involves risk on a number of levels for the student, staff as well as the institution. However Hargreaves’ tripartite approach problematically excludes impact on the world beyond the academy. Thompson, (2012:636) postulates that discussing risk inevitably involves ethical examination, because to debate ‘the risks of something implicitly names it as risky’.

It is both notable and surprising that within a visual arts context the concept of ‘creative risk’ has received such little attention, a factor identified by Ellis and Meneely, (2015). It is hoped to build on work by Hope and Oliver (2005:Preface), who emphasise that ‘risk is a dynamic process that can have positive outcomes in an educational context’.
4.1.10 Defining risk

In considering the factors at stake, Jackson et al., (1972) propose four main areas of risk: monetary risk, physical risk, ethical risk and social risk. Here it is the nature of assessing risk that is fundamental to its perception.

Gigerenzer’s (2002) highly cited argument concerning the assessment of risk, concerns the difficulty individuals have comprehending risk. Gigerenzer states ‘one of the goals of formal education that has been neglected in most western countries is to teach people to reckon with risk, that is to reason effectively in an uncertain world’ (Gigerenzer, 2002:240). Gigerenzer allies the word ‘risk’ with the concept of uncertainty. In doing so emphasis is also placed on the suggestion that risk does not always have a negative outcome. Gigerenzer (2002:26) states that uncertainty is a risk ‘when it can be expressed as a number such as a probability or frequency on the basis of empirical data’. Probability it is asserted can be defined in three ways as degrees of belief, propensity or frequency.

Degrees of belief is sometimes is also referred to as subjective probability. That is ‘the probability of an event is the subjective degree of belief a person has in that event’. Gigerenzer (2002:26).

Propensity relates to physical design. The simple example of the physical design of a six-sided dice is offered. The dice’s design influencing probable outcome.

Frequency it is asserted derives from empirical data within a specific reference class. Here for example Gigerenzer, (2002:28) cites the relative frequency of lung cancer in American males who have smoked cigarettes for at least 20 years.

Gigerenzer maintains that failure to understand or differentiate between these three methods of interpreting probability creates confusion in terms of quantifying risk. Gigerenzer’s preferred definition of probability that is subsequently deployed within the book is frequency.

It is suggested that other factors too create misperception. Single event probabilities given where no reference class is stated, obfuscate the interpretation of risk. For an example of probability related to a single event, Gigerenzer contemplates a 30 percent chance it will rain tomorrow. Whilst this statement cannot be proved to be wrong its meaning is also unclear. Does it mean that it will rain on ‘30 percent of days that are like tomorrow’ or that ‘there is a 30 percent chance it will rain tomorrow’ or even ‘it will rain for 30 percent of the time’ (Gigerenzer, 2002:29). Similarly expressing something in terms of ‘relative risk’ rather than ‘absolute risk’ can easily confound.
Mathematically relative risks are expressed in larger numbers than absolute risks, which can therefore imply greater benefits. Conditional probabilities (the probability event A occurs given event B) also provide the potential to confuse. For example the probability event A occurs given event B, is different from event B occurs given event A. Worryingly Gigerenzer suggests that at times these methods are also deliberately deployed by vested interests to distort information.

In summary Gigerenzer encourages individuals to challenge the certainty with which statistical information concerning risk is often presented. By reminding us that risk does not always imply a negative outcome we can perhaps reframe our demarcation of creative risk. The explanation of three different definitions for probability is welcome, particularly as it might help anchor a better characterisation and theory of creative risk. It also has immediate application in connection with defining ethical risk where those assessing projects may inadvertently be employing subjective probability. This is pertinent as ethical scrutiny is an area where Bledsoe et al., (2007:593) identifies the ‘intensifying efforts’ to develop techniques to preempt and control risk. Valuable also is the emphasis on qualifying frequency within a specific reference class, as many activities within the arts might easily assume the nature of single event probabilities.

Gigerenzer calls for a better system within education for the teaching of statistical thinking. Its relationship within art and design media to ethics, risk and creativity might at first seem novel. However, within visual arts and media practice, the appeal of a method to quantify and express risk has potential beyond adding rigor to physical risk assessment.

The notion in Gigerenzer’s premise ‘subjective probability’, i.e. the ‘belief a person has in that event’ is intriguing. The health and safety lobby counter this issue with the expression ‘reasonably practicable’, and an expectation that decisions be taken by competent qualified individuals. Never the less, one is left with the sense that subjective probability plays a bigger role than is acknowledged. This understanding will be important not only to a consideration of creative risk but also to evaluating ethical issues.

4.1.11 Ethics and the Institution
The study requires that we consider the application of applied ethics within an institutional setting. This will be important in light of the study’s aim to devise a new system of ethical scrutiny for visual arts research. ‘Ethics in research is extensive, complicated, and warrant deep and thoughtful discussion’ (De Wet, 2010:303). With regard to applied ethics Beauchamp, (2003:1) postulates ‘it is not obvious that applied ethics is the offspring of, or even dependent upon, general moral philosophy’. However, over the millennia philosophers have developed many
theoretical approaches to ethical conduct. In order to contextualise the subject of applied ethics it is useful here to briefly to consider this wider field.

Thompson, (2012:628-9) cites Utilitarian principles and Kantian or deontological ethical theories as ‘two patterns of thought that were especially influential throughout the 20th century’. This account however, omits the third major ethical tradition i.e. virtue ethics that holds ‘justice, charity, and generosity are dispositions to act in ways that benefit both the person possessing them and that person’s society’.1 Utilitarian theory is often summarised as that which produces the greatest good to the greatest number. Whilst ‘Kantian, Neo-Kantian, or deontological ethical theories ... define right action according to the categorical imperative: Act only according to that rule whereby you can, at the same time, will that it should become a universal law’ (Thompson, 2012:629). However, whilst these traditions ‘have rich literatures of philosophical development’ they are also ‘beset by numerous difficulties’, (Thompson, 2012:629) and concern is expressed over the danger of over-simplification (Saunders, 2010). This can be viewed as the ‘so-called gap between theory and practice’ (Beauchamp, 2003:2). In discussing applied ethics Beauchamp, (2003:2) argues that it is now ‘generally accepted that no straight forward movement to practical judgments is possible by appeal either to moral theories or to general moral principles’. ‘From the point of view of pragmatism, ethical theories do not represent an infallible static knowledge’(Monteverde, 2014:394). Applied ethics or professional ethics on the other hand may draw on ethical theory but is primarily an attempt to address practical dilemmas or problems through reference to established professional practice or external moral norms. However, it can be argued that in the case of the visual arts, this reliance on moral norms can at times be problematic. This is particularly the case with work which in extremis employs ‘uncompromising and sometimes extremist strategies’ (Cashell, 2009:1).

The challenge will be to develop a protocol for ethical appraisal that will not appear overly proscriptive and will encourage dialogue and reflection.

The problem with an over reliance on one ethical tradition is noted by Lawton (1998). In an institutional context Lawton (1998) targets those working within the public sector and notes in general terms the prevalence here of a utilitarian approach. Lawton, (1998:41) identifies inherent problematic utilitarian questions, such as how do we weigh good or happiness and ‘over what timescale do we calculate the costs and benefits?’ Using the utilitarian example, Lawton (1998) emphasises the problem that reliance on one theory creates with real world problems. This is a weakness also cited by Hargreaves, (2008) and discussed later in this chapter. Within the text

1 http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/ethics  (Accessed 12/06/2016)
Lawton (1998) advances the concept of moral pluralism, a similar compromise to that of ethical pluralism later promoted by Cashell (2009).

Helpfully, Lawton (1998) also narrates the background to and findings of the Nolan Committee (1995) including Nolan’s seven principles of public life: selflessness, integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty and leadership. These the author surmises are drawn from an array of ethical theories and feed into the development of applied ethical frameworks for those working within public bodies. Lawton’s assertion that codes regulating behavior are important but often fail because of issues regarding enforcement is salutary for those engaged with devising similar codes within higher education. ‘It is not easy but individuals have to live with the consequences of their actions; they have to be willing to expose their decisions to public scrutiny and be comfortable with the actions they have taken. It is here that theory is tested out’ (Lawton, 1998:153).

The development of a new ethical protocol for visual researchers will also require the preparation of an introductory taught session in ethical thinking. It will be essential therefore to convey the essence of these differing theoretical propositions and introduce applied ethics as it relates to research. Here, considering research generally, Panter and Sterba, (2011:4) lament the lack of ethical guidance concerning ‘day to day decision making on difficult methodological topics’.

The literature contains several studies that explore differing approaches to ethics education notably, in the area of medicine or law. Monteverde, (2014:386) states however, that ‘the results from these investigations are far from unanimous and highly dependent on the researchers’ conceptual frameworks’. Often cited is the ‘excessive complexity’ of ethical theories, which is sometimes presented as a reason for not teaching them at all (Monteverde, 2014; Lawlor, 2007). However, it can be argued that this approach has only served to further endorse a view of ethics as the sole preserve of esoteric philosophical debate. Saunders, (2010) usefully suggests the more pressing pedagogical question facing teachers is not whether to teach moral theories, but how best to do so. Saunders, (2010) emphasises in taught sessions that case studies or problematical ethical dilemmas should be seen as a starting point and suggests the need to initially decouple moral theories from applied ethics. Furthermore, Hammersley and Traianou, (2012) argue research ethics must be viewed as a pressing pedagogical question facing teachers i.e. as requiring an applied ethical approach.

This reflection is useful both in terms of clarifying key terms as well as acting as a reminder of the issues with which the investigation will need to contend.
4.1.12 Ethical appraisal

‘Creativity might be seen as evidence of quality enhancement and therefore welcomed. In addition, in a competitive market with fee-paying students creativity may be a necessary function of success. However, the penalty for negative publicity, if QAA audit reveals flaws in the systems, is high. Strategically, many HEIs may be guilty of attempting to balance these risks by combining rhetoric around quality enhancement with confining principles and frameworks that limit the flexibility for truly creative approaches’. (Hargreaves, 2008:6)

As discussed ethical appraisal for research is based around applied ethical principles derived from professional codes, responsibilities and practical concerns. Whilst linked to ethical theory the area of applied ethics is distinct. As such explicit references to moral or ethical pluralism defended by (Gaut, 1999) and favoured by (Cashell, 2009) are largely absent from the discourse in favour of more certain solutions. However, the ‘method and moral content of applied ethics remain a project in the making’ (Beauchamp, 2003:14).

‘Research Ethics Committees ... are rapidly becoming indispensable mechanisms in the overall workings of university institutions’ (De Wet, 2010:301). However, for some there is concern that this regulation has the potential to negatively impact on research (Bledsoe et al., 2007; Lederman, 2007; Hammersley and Traianou, 2012). Whilst ‘the ethical dimension is an important aspect of research governance processes present in institutions of higher learning’ (De Wet, 2010:301), it would be proper to investigate the the process of ethical scrutiny itself, from a visual arts perspective. At the time of writing no study has been located which attempts an investigation of this kind. Lederman, (2007:314) also hints that some researchers may only ‘simulate’ compliance with ethical regulation. This again will be explored in the survey chapter of this study.

Earlier, Lawton (1998) identified the prevalence of utilitarian approaches to ethical appraisal within the public sector. Hargreaves, (2008) exemplifies this theme in her employment of utilitarian ethical principles to examine if current models of quality assurance within higher education are risk-averse therefore limiting the scope of creative learning and teaching strategies. Whilst the Hargreaves study is primarily located within the health and social sciences it has general relevance. Hargreaves proposes a utilitarian decision tree process to determine the viability of an activity. This approach maybe useful in areas of operational educational management however, it is likely to be found wanting and overly prescriptive in relation to more complex areas of the arts. By its very nature the utilitarian model limits an examination of the proposed actions themselves. This single-track approach to ethics runs counter to a less prescriptive ethical pluralism which
authors such as Cashell (2006) have demonstrated to such effect in approaching challenging or difficult work.

Hargreaves (2008:233) also speculates on the notion of autonomy and risk within graduate education. In doing so it concludes that 'simply offering students the opportunity to engage and making them responsible for the outcome is not acceptable'. This is a key proposition and supports the both the notion of competence and the need for staff and researchers to be adequately introduced to ethical thinking. It is something that the MIRIAD protocol will address. The training of researchers to be able to feel comfortable and confident in making ethical decisions is a essential (Miller et al., 2012).

Hargreaves, (2008:231) assertion that codes of practice and implied health and safety restrictions ‘may stifle creativity and innovation’ whilst plausible, is not supported by clear evidence. Furthermore, Hargreaves, (2008:231) then argues that ‘creativity needs to be risk assessed and sufficiently managed to facilitate student success and safety’ in apparent contradiction to the earlier supposition. In relation to ethical scrutiny and creativity, this paradox will be investigated later in chapter five of the study.

Hargreaves research supports the need for further work, particularly in relation to finding a pedagogical perspective on ethics and risk within the area of visual arts education. At the same time it is clear that any new process must consider the quality assurance requirements in a wider university context. Likewise, Tosey (2006), reminds us of the difficulty of constraining creativity inside acceptable bounds within an institutional context. These factors will be critical in developing a new prototype for ethical appraisal within the visual arts.

In chapter six we will look in detail at the professional and regulatory ethical frameworks that inform applied ethical procedures in visual arts research.

4.1.13 Transgression and pluralistic ethics

When considering the role of ethical scrutiny there is a clear awareness that a distinguishing characteristic of the creative field relates to the notions of transgression to be found in areas of the visual arts canon. ‘More and more people in the art and ethics debate are turning to contextualist theories on which the aesthetic-ethical value relation is not invariant but complex’ (Thomson-Jones, 2012:291). Whilst both Lawton (1998) and Hargreaves (2008) observe widespread reference to utilitarian principles within public life by contrast, within art criticism there has been much debate about the ‘relation between aesthetic value and ethical value’(Thomson-Jones, 2012:275).
Cashell’s dense and highly referenced text *Aftershock: The Ethics of Contemporary Transgressive Art. (2006)* explores the interface between ethics and contemporary art. It takes as its main theme, what has become recognised as transgressive art, a term which suggests ‘that this art shocks only by virtue of its uncompromising mission to interrogate conservative views and subvert conventional moral beliefs’ (Cashell, 2006:1). Cashell defines aesthetic transgression as ‘any act of violation presented under the alibi of art’ (Cashell, 2006:1). The author cites the appeal of transgression as a reaction towards or challenge to ‘disinterestedness’ in contemporary art. In order to examine what can arguably be termed morally transgressive art, throughout the text a range of example works are critically analysed.

Cashell postulates that certain types of transgressive art practice appear to intentionally evoke a moral sensibility by inciting a negative ethical reaction. This suggestion is then developed by advancing the idea of ethical pluralism, offered as a partial solution to the subsequent likely moral disagreement. ‘Ethical pluralism is a model that attempts to address the fact that conflict between mutually opposed yet equally reasonable attitudes arises because moral values are neither exclusively oppositional nor commensurate with each other’ (Cashell, 2006:13).

With regards to artistic and ethical evaluation there is clearly a schism or at least tension been those who seek to appraise a work purely on its aesthetic merits versus those prepared to recognise a moral component, what Cashell (2006:29) refers to as the ‘intertwinement of value dimensions in certain art objects’. One of the major debates outlined by Cashell is the fundamental question as whether aesthetic value and moral value are distinct, the artistic or aesthetic worth remaining separate from any moral issues the work may generate. Within the field of art theory or philosophy this premise is traditionally located under the heading autonomism. ‘The radical autonomist holds that it makes no sense to evaluate works ethically, since works of art cannot possess ethical qualities, either ethical merits or flaws’ (Gaut, 2007:67). It is however clear that certain artifacts notably transgressive works deliberately and clearly set out to challenge established moral precepts. Cashell (2006:29) contests the autonomist assumption stating ‘the autonomist commitment to aesthetic value contradicts recent tendencies in art practice, especially those that, as we have seen, aggressively challenge exactly these arbitrary ideological divisions. To discuss contemporary art without reference to its causes of production, its historical context, its audience effects or its relation to the rest of the real world, reveals a serious misunderstanding of its aesthetic significance’.

Cashell quotes Daniel Jacobson currently Professor of Philosophy at the University of Michigan as contributing significantly to the debate with his proposition of Humean moralism. This hypothesis
seeks to diametrically challenge autonomism by directly linking the morality of a work to its aesthetic worth. However this in turn brings with it its own problems. Referring to Humean moralism Cashell remarks that it is in danger of creating its own absolutist thesis, namely that the morally defective work is unavoidably to be aesthetically flawed as a logical corollary of that approach. By referring to Jacobson’s original 1997 paper *In Praise of Immoral Art*, its clear that this was also a conclusion that Jacobson himself made. In the conclusion to his essay Jacobson muses that Humean moralism is doomed by the incorrigibility of the best immoral art.

Finally, Cashell settles on a compromise that takes in to account both the intended moral response intentioned by the producer and its subsequent appraisal by viewer. Therefore if the viewer identifies a serious moral violation this will ‘be found potentially to compromise the aesthetic value of the work’. (Cashell, 2009:31)

In summary, Cashell supports the idea that an ethical enquiry or assessment is both purposeful and relevant to the analysis of artistic endeavour. It is noticeable within the creative arts that ethical inquiry is emerging more in terms of a conversation rather than a process set on prescribing particular approaches. This is a factor that needs to be manifest in any new system of ethical appraisal.

Cashell’s adoption and promotion of ethical pluralism whilst not new is helpful. Thomson-Jones (2012:291), notes there is an emerging ‘tacit acceptance of critical pluralism’. In relation to the pedagogical processes supporting the development of creativity within student work worthy of further investigation. Whilst the topic of creative risk is not explicitly discussed at length by Cashell, many of the transgressive works cited contain an element of real risk-taking, sometimes this is a challenge to moral norms, occasionally these risks are also physical.

Cashell provides a percipient and timely appraisal of a contentious area. Cashell’s work supports the possibility that further investigation into relationship between risk and ethical appraisal might be an alternative prism through which to better comprehend transgressive arts more difficult paradoxes. Cashell’s stance particularly regarding the encouragement for discussion, will be useful in the development of pedagogical material to support the composition of a new prototype for ethical appraisal within visual arts research.
4.1.14 Practice and theory

‘When the more theory-led elements of the course are referred to, the comments suggest that students see the studio as essentially about learning and theory as essentially about being taught’. (Orr et al., 2014:38).

Any attempt at a pedagogical analysis of creativity or risk-taking in the field of media and visual arts teaching must also contend with a range of issues that characterise the practice arena. The prevalence of group working, aspects of professional practice and craft, new technologies, the theory/practice relationship and the positioning of media and visual arts practice within, or across the curriculum require careful consideration, whilst also affording great opportunity for new insight. ‘Craftwork establishes a realm of skill and knowledge perhaps beyond human verbal capacities to explain’ (Sennett, 2008:95).

In his 1996 seminal discourse on media and critical pedagogy ‘Critical pedagogy and media education: a theory in search of a practice’, Buckingham described a ‘war of the pedagogies’. Buckingham went on to cite a ‘major criticism, which has been made of the theoretical discourse of critical pedagogy, which concerns its unwillingness to address practice’. Buckingham also confronted the relationship between theory and practical work, an issue poignantly resonant for many engaged in learning and teaching within this field. Masterman, (1990:26) expresses concerns in regarding student imitation of professional products in what he refers to as the ‘technicist trap’ However, this argument is perhaps constrained by its ambition. Masterman, (1990) overlooks the possibility that rather than soullessly replicating professional products the real challenge might be to critically contest accepted media norms via the development of craft skills and be exemplified in the artifact itself. Buckingham, et al. (1995:129-130) postulate that ‘the establishment of media studies as a legitimate academic subject in schools has involved a troubled, almost schizophrenic stance towards practical production’. Tensions for example relating to the integration of media practice and theory noted by Buckingham remain. ‘We are creating a new fetish: creativity fetish with the absence of the creators in this process’ Wagner (2009:71). Whether this connects to the value of creative media practice in terms of its capital within academic institutions themselves is uncertain. However the external depiction has not helped. ‘Media programmes became the scapegoat for a perception that higher education was dumbing down’ (Berger, 2013:148-149).

Extending Buckingham’s war metaphor, it is perhaps too easy to view conflict around terms such as craft, critical vocationalism and technical skill as a continuation of this pedagogical internecine conflict. Whilst this research study concerns the visual arts in general, it is useful to consider
media, as pedagogically here the theory and practice dichotomy has been pronounced. Within the UK at school year twelve, learners might be offered one of two media routes. These choices comprise either a primarily theoretical study via A’level Media studies, albeit with a minor element of media practice (MEA, 2016) or a National Diploma route with a much larger element of practical work (Pearson, 2016). Within the UK this pattern was until recently largely replicated at degree level. Film studies as opposed to film production, being an example.

This is not to say that there is an absence of undergraduate provision that seeks to balance theory and practice. There are plenty of undergraduate courses that strive to integrate theory and practice. However, commentators have noted that in Art and design ‘this integrative view of theory and practice was not reflected in the students’ narratives. They either ignore the presence of theory or, if it is referred to, it is described as a peripheral and relatively unimportant component of their study’ (Orr et al., 2014:40).

What is apposite here is the perception that theory or written work can impede creativity in some way. ‘There is a widely held assumption in art teaching that theory gets in the way of creativity and spontaneity’ (McKenna, 1999:75). Hockey, (2007:165) notes the problems experienced by practice-based PhD students who contrasted the ‘codified language form required for a doctoral thesis’ with a previous experience of freedom of form in their creative making’. Sennett, (2008:95) identifies ‘the limits of language’ as an issue and suggests at times it apposite to substitute ‘the image for the word’. This is a discourse that provides a context for the study.

In the five themes outlined in the introduction of this thesis namely, risk, creativity, ethics, theory and practice we have therefore not merely hypothetical abstractions but interconnected elements, which might form part of what Buckingham, (1998:38) describes as the ‘complex and messy realities of classroom practice’. (For an expanded account concerning the work of Buckingham see: Appendix 10).

4.1.15 The Media Manifesto: Emerging themes in Media education

Buckingham also in turn contributes to The Manifesto for Media Education Website (2011). A project supported and led by The Centre for Excellence in Media Practice (CEMP) at Bournemouth University. The projects coordinators state that the endeavour was developed as ‘an attempt to develop a shared understanding, some shared reasons, for media education’ (A Manifesto for Media Education - Why a Manifesto?, 2016).

The manifesto project comprised a website which initially invited contributions, a London symposium held in June 2011 and a subsequent book, published in 2013. By March 2012 the
website attracted fifty-three written contributions from a variety of teachers, lecturers academics and students. These were originally grouped under a broad range of general headings such as literacy, practice, meaning, creativity, participation etc. At the symposium these headings were simplified to; Politics, Power and Meaning; Creativity; Literacy and Production, Practice and Professionalism. Following the June 2011 event, Mp3 sound recordings of the speakers’ presentations together with question and answer sessions were uploaded to the site.

The nature of the manifesto format has inevitably led to submissions of a more polemical nature. This said, a considerable range of approaches as well as levels of scholarly engagement are evident. Several of the contributions made to the manifesto project are pertinent in terms of this literature review and will be examined below.

Readman’s written contribution to the site, ‘Not philosophy of media education, but media education as philosophy’ includes an examination of the term creativity. Readman, (2012:online) argues ‘the simultaneous emptiness and plenitude of the word ‘creativity’, its presence as an assessment term in media specifications should elicit critical scrutiny and debate’. Readman suggests that assumed creativity merit should be examined and students themselves should be involved in this enquiry. A theme Readman expands within his presentation at the Manifesto symposium. It is here Readman attempts to unpick creativity’s constituent discursive nature. Readman postulates the role of human judgment in validating creativity and the characterisation of ‘creativity’ as both rich and empty at the same time. In reference to the term as empty he draws on the work of Gottfried Wagner. However in the text of Wagner’s paper to the Forum for Creative Europe in Prague (2009), Wagner tempers his early statement with the expression of interest in the notion of creativity being expressed either as ‘no state and total state’ suggesting neither is entirely accurate. Wagner goes on to suggest that creativity needs to deal with meaning. What is also interesting is Wagner’s clear frustration regarding the danger of ‘creating a new fetish: creativity fetish with the absence of the creators in this process’. Readman, (2012:online) also advances the notion of creativity as an area of conflict. Again this is present in Wagner’s Prague discourse where he mounted an assault both on the UK and its advocacy of creative industries in the New Labour model and Soviet-style five year plans on creativity. Readman’s main contribution is to encourage us to consider a philosophical approach to examining the normative meaning of creativity. Readman considers who gets called creative and why, later encouraging students to be involved in this process. There is also perhaps one further synergy between Wagner and Readman, relating to Wagner’s description that creativity needs to be linked to meaning. Readman draws on the practice-based research criteria – ‘Where is the knowledge object?’, theorising that this possibly offers a line of enquiry with regard to creativity.
Nik Powell is currently Director of the National Film and Television School, his contribution to the manifesto project is entitled ‘In theory there is no difference between theory and practice...in practice, there is’ (Powell, 2012:online). An interesting title given the theory versus practice debate already highlighted within this literature review. Powell states ‘that critical, analytic film studies classroom teaching should be kept separate from these practical courses. This way undergraduate students with a vocational rather than academic bent can acquire the education and skills required on the floor of the Creative industries’.

Powell (2012:online), advances ‘anyone wanting to make films or other moving image story telling perhaps should – like an English (or American, or French, or Russian) Literature student – be studying the great storytellers in Media and learn through studying them how great stories are told in the moving image’. Powell asserts ‘Like literature courses, these should be classroom based ... and NOT practical as much as individual teachers might prefer them to be so’.

Powell’s stance appears to challenge the contemporary view articulated at length by Buckingham et al. A stance embodied within higher education that combines both theory and critical practice on production based media courses. In some respects Powell’s ideas, whilst well meant, are a throw back to an earlier period. They reinforce the notion of a divide between thinking and making – an anachronistic dichotomy between concepts of academia and vocation. Never the less Powell provides evidence that Buckingham’s war of the pedagogies continues.

Alan Clarke from York St John University contributes a piece to the manifesto site titled ‘You can’t eat a BlackBerry’. Clarke (2012:online) advances the notion that ‘In the UK, however, the term media studies (or is it just the added studies?) is problematic’. By doing so he echoes other authors on the site who struggle not only with the theory/practice equilibrium, but also with the breadth of the subject and its constituent varied disciplines.

David Gauntlett, Professor of Media and Communications at the University of Westminster provides this thoughts on the site under the heading ‘Six principles for media education’ and later he also provides a keynote speech at the symposium. Gauntlett (2012:online) starts by questioning the nature of university media courses, commenting ‘media courses are often oriented towards getting a job in the media’. He speculates that some areas they may not be the best vehicles for this. Gauntlett goes on to state ‘Creativity has to be the most important element in every part of a media course or degree’. Helpfully he posits ‘Ruskin argued that human creativity should be unleashed, and must dare to risk failure and shame, so that the richness of humanity can be properly expressed’. Later suggesting it necessary to ‘push ourselves in the
direction of diverse and unusual experimentation, rather than the risk-averse version of *professionalism* which prefers bland competence’.

Within his ‘Six principles for media education’ Gauntlett also briefly refers to ethics, stating ‘If a media course is to ‘add value’ to the learning and experience of students, it must include a social and ethical dimension’.

Given his status Buckingham’s contribution to the manifesto is refreshing as he confesses that ‘I am probably one of the world’s worst manifesto writers. I have always felt that media education suffers from an excess of grandiose rhetoric. We have all heard far too many assertions about how media education can change the world, save democracy or empower the powerless. As a classroom teacher, I was always painfully aware of the gap between this sort of rhetoric and the messy realities of my own practice’ (Buckingham, 2012:online). Buckingham also reminds us ‘Most of the critics of media education do not have even the faintest idea of what it actually looks like in practice. Media education can be intellectually challenging; it can involve intense and rigorous forms of creativity; and it can engage learners in ways that many other school subjects do not’.

Daniel Ashton’s (Bath Spa University), submission to the manifesto site is entitled ‘Our Survey Said…’ Ashton (2012:online) begins by presenting a raft of evidence that supports the need to develop skills and employability within higher education provision. Ashton clearly and purposefully sets out his agenda to ‘focus specifically on how questions around employability connect closely with theory and practice debates that have been an ongoing part of discussions on media education’.

Emphasising the importance of work placements and internships Ashton states the need to ‘stress engagement with broader ethical questions of media work. For example, unstable working conditions.’ Ashton states that ‘Approaches emphasising employability should be embedded within the curriculum rather than as a bolt on, could perhaps be seen under this conceptualisation as less about the erosion of ‘subject-specific’ content and more as an opportunity to develop a programme of media employability education’. Given the ongoing theory versus practice debates Ashton’s observation is both constructive and timely.

‘Teaching in/and Media Education’ is Michael Hoechsmann’s proposal. Hoechsmann is Chair of Education Programs at Lakehead University, Orillia. Out of the project’s fifty-three submissions it is included here for two reasons: firstly because it acknowledges the depth and extent of ‘semiological guerrilla warfare’ and ‘ideological skirmishes’ which typify the media studies theoretical discourse. Unsurprisingly it deploys the familiar war metaphor again. Secondarily and
much more importantly Hoechsmann introduces the digital native perspective that derives from Mark Prensky’s article (2001). Hoechsmann reminds us of how the experience of those students brought up immersed within the new digital culture can differ from that of their teachers.

Worthy also of a mention here, particularly in relation to a refreshing look at pedagogy is the paper ‘Radical Alternatives to Education?’ (Wheeler, 2012). By at first presenting what initially appears a very risky pedagogy, Wheeler then shows us where these ideas have already been in practice. Rather than simply setting out to just to push the boundaries, Wheeler’s approach advances some interesting questions. Wheeler’s advancement of Summerhill and the humanist schools of the 1960s, of Montessori schools, distance education in the Australian outback remote, the Steiner school movement and anarchist philosopher Ivan Illich’s idea of ‘peer matching’ lie in sharp contrast to the more esoteric posturing of educational theorists elsewhere on the site.

Having examined all the contributions on the site there seems to be something of an imbalance. The voice of the makers appears muted. There are of course several reasons for this. Apart from a couple of contributors notably Readman, the discussion of creativity is also all but absent. Counter hegemonic strategies, meta-cognitive inquiry, civic participation, consumer activism, social movements, issue-based politics – yes, but what about practice? In his contribution to the manifesto Berger reminds us ‘the problem was that media education began to move away from the media and creative industries (and practice) towards ‘high theory’, just at a time when students were becoming more involved in creating their own media texts, and this has caused a dangerous schism’.

The general conclusions drawn from this discussion are examined in the summary below.

4.1.16 Summary
The literature review set out to examine the discourse around creative risk and ethical appraisal relevant to visual arts research. In doing so a number of themes emerge which are described below. Significantly, the review also reveals the paucity of research concerning creative risk and ethical appraisal in this research context.

The findings here have relevance as a guide to constructing a suitable process for ethical appraisal in the visual arts. They will also be particularly valuable in developing the accompanying taught ethical thinking session. Furthermore, they will assist in formulating surveys to explore a contextual understanding of creative process and ethical constraint, that will be essential in working towards a definition for creative risk.
Under thematic headings the findings from the review are appraised below:

4.1.16.1 Creativity

A concordant definition for creativity itself remains elusive (Sennett, 2008; Readman, 2012). Creative risk remains largely overlooked and poorly defined. Very few attempts have been made to explore the area to any depth, for example Hargreaves (2008), and Ellis and Meneely, (2015). There is very little research that engages with or examines creative risk, let alone from with from ethical perspective in terms of media and visual arts pedagogy.

Questions around creativity and a normative acceptance concerning how it is assessed remain. This is implicit within both pedagogy and the more challenging areas of practice (Cashell, 2006). However Orr, (2010) and Readman (2009), both allude to the role of connoisseurship or tacit knowledge in the assessment of creativity. This is an area of growing consensus and suggests the possibility that around other symbiotic elements of creativity, such as creative risk we might too find similar accord. This is significant in terms of the study. The Oliver et al. study provides three models of creativity; as innate or intuitive; as nurtured therefore open to development and as potential i.e. with an upper limit that through work they may acquire. The pilot survey will also allow us to explore this.

There is debate around assessing creativity as process and/or assessing creativity as demonstrated by product, (Cowan 2006). There is an emerging sense that it is may also be useful to encourage students to be involved in this process of examining why something is considered to be creative. In accessing creativity it may be helpful to ask where is the knowledge object? (Readman, 2011) or where is the meaning? (Wagner, 2009) This is also evident in Cashell, (2006).

We are reminded that creativity is not always positive (Wagner, 2009), and risk is not always negative. (Gigerenzer, 2002). It would be useful to investigate these themes by asking researchers and staff their opinions.

Several authors advance the idea that creativity and the link to making should not be undervalued, (e.g. Sennett, 2008). Wagner warns that by overlooking practice that ‘we are creating a new fetish: creativity fetish with the absence of the creators in this process’. (Wagner, 2009:71). The Banaji et al., (2006) literature review concerning creativity was helpful. In the attempt to illuminate discursive discourses around creativity, a useful series of rhetorics has been developed by the authors. Though these nine rhetoric categories overlap and sometimes conflict they are useful as a framework. A central message of the review is that we should not use the
idea of creativity superficially (Banaji et al., 2006). Experimental work conducted in the 1960s sought to objectively determine the nature of creativity in relation to the individual (Barron, 1969). This now appears largely overlooked, possibly due to notions concerning the democratisation of creativity. Given his stature it is also surprising that Barron is not included within in Banaji et al., (2006).

4.1.16.2 Risk

When considering what is at stake in terms of taking creative risks the proposal of four main areas of risk: monetary risk, physical risk, ethical risk and social risk is useful (Jackson et al., 1972). However, here it is the nature of assessing risk that is fundamental to its perception.

In terms of assessing risk a range of simple factors can obscure an individual’s ability to assess or comprehend risk (Gigerenzer, 2002). The use of ‘subjective probability’ in assessing risk is very different from the employment of the frequency method, which derives from the use of empirical data. Gigerenzer, (2002) provides us with the tools to better comprehend or possibly model the process of creative risk and decision-making.

The concept of ‘incremental risk-taking’ is advanced by a number of authors as being pertinent either to limit exposure to huge risk or as implicit in process of creative leaps. (Andriopoulos and Lowe, 2000; Sennett, 2008). We are also reminded of the importance of ‘safekeeping’ (Ellis and Meneely, 2015).

4.1.16.3 The pedagogy of media practice.

The word ‘studies’ as in media studies appears to be problematic (Clarke, 2012). Is there still a need for media ‘studies’ at school level? Whilst at Qualifications and Credit Framework level three (QCF 3) there is academic debate amongst media educationalists about secession into constituent areas there is reluctance, yet within higher education to a greater extent events have overtaken this debate.

Historically commentators writing on media education do so from a traditional media studies viewpoint. Sometimes, this appears disengaged from a real sense of involvement with; or understanding of practical media production.

There is the impression that for many years media pedagogy became so stuck in the politics of media deconstruction it tended to overlook the importance and veracity of craft. The possibility that rather than soullessly replicating professional products the real challenge might be to
critically contest accepted media norms via the development of craft skills and be exemplified in the artifact itself is widely overlooked.

The demarcation between different forms of practical production from practical work: as self-expression, as a method of learning, as a vocational training and as a deconstruction where codes and conventions are examined is helpful. (Buckingham et al., 1995)

Buckingham repeatedly reminds us to look in the classroom for answers.

Debates on media pedagogy often overlook truly radical approaches, including some methods that are currently in use. There is a tendency towards complex, aspirational and often politicised solutions far removed from the ‘chalk-face’. (Wheeler, 2011 et al.)

The topic of creativity is sometimes avoided as too thorny or contentious by media education commentators. This contrasts with others who place it central to the educational mandate of art and design media. (Readman, 2009)

In relation to media it is perhaps disappointing that in 2011 that the notion of a divide between thinking and making – an anachronistic dichotomy between concepts of academia and vocation remains. The media ‘theory and practice war metaphor’ unfortunately, continues to remain valid. (Powell, 2011; Hoechsmann, 2011)

4.1.16.4 Ethics

In an visual arts context Cashell (2006), provides helpful suggestions for ethical methods to assist in the evaluation of ‘difficult’ or transgressive creative works. Examining the dialogue between maker and audience is pertinent in exploring ethical and creative contexts. This is particularly the case in terms of evaluation of an artifact.

Cashell contests the autonomist assumption stating ‘the autonomist commitment to aesthetic value contradicts recent tendencies in art practice, especially those that, as we have seen, aggressively challenge exactly these arbitrary ideological divisions. Cashell settles on a compromise that takes in to account both the intended moral response intended by the producer and its subsequent appraisal by viewer. Therefore if the viewer identifies a serious moral violation this will ‘be found potentially to compromise the aesthetic value of the work’ (Cashell, 2009:31). Ethics perhaps needs to be approached from a pluralist perspective if it is to be useful within art and design media (Lawton, 1998; Cashell, 2006).

A weakness concerning the regulation of ethical principles is enforcement, (Lawton, 1998).
The Nolan Committee (1995) laid down seven principles of public life: selflessness, integrity, objectivity, accountability, openness, honesty and leadership. These are still considered central as being applied ethical guidelines for public office within the UK.

4.1.16.5 Ethical appraisal

Lederman, (2007) observes within traditional systems of appraisal ‘the poor fit between demarcations of research as a regulatory object and its different, ambiguous, or absent demarcations in the knowledge-making practices in various academic disciplines’.

The training of researchers to be able to feel comfortable and confident in making ethical decisions is a essential (Miller et al., 2012).

The locus of control has moved away from research communities to universities or other institutions these operating increasingly in a managerial rather than a collegial fashion (Hammersley and Traianou, 2012).

In terms of appraisal systems there is a palpable tension between what Lederman, (2007:311) terms a ‘reductive objectification in the interest of consistency’ where ‘ethical accountability is only imaginable in the form of managerial auditing’ and the ‘divergent practical realities of principled, upstanding research’.

There is some suggestion that researchers will simulate adherence to ethical regulation in order to get their research done. In light of the study’s general aims, this is a very interesting area to explore further.

4.1.16.6 Research methodologies

Several of the texts reviewed here provide us with a range of empirical approaches suitable for the topic (Jackson et al., 2006). In a survey of Art and Design postgraduates Hockey, (2007) notes the problems encountered by practice based PhD students in adhering to accepted norms of academic process particularly in relation to written work.

Barron (1969), reminds us of the rich history of practical experimentation and sophisticated cognitive testing which characterised the early exploration of creativity.

Several authors have attempted to visually or schematically express their theoretical ideas (e.g. Stacey et al., cited by Tosey. 2006). This approach will be explored within Chapter seven.
4.1.16.7 Higher education institutions

It is difficult within the university environment to balance quality assurance at an institutional level with the flexibility required for really creative approaches (Hargreaves, 2008). Drawing on the work of Stacey et al., Tosey (2006:34), contemplates that organisations need to the capacity to operate at the ‘edge of chaos’ to generate more space for ‘creative thinking and action’. Steel’s (2005), grouping together of characteristics found within the command and control paradigm i.e. ‘keep people in silos’, ‘ensure everyone salutes the flag’ and ‘manage communication initiatives’ contrast unfavourably with his emergent paradigm where there is the encouragement to build connectivity and encourage diversity. Hence managers might want to reflect on wider institutional ethos before for example; criticising a department as having a silo mentality.

4.1.17 Discussion

The research sets out to explore a new model of ethical appraisal and to examine the relationship between ‘creative risk’ and ethics within the visual arts. Any review of this kind is by its very nature limited, allowing the author space to briefly sketch the main arguments as they relate to the study. The scarcity of published research connected to creative risk or ethical appraisal within the visual arts is conspicuous.

The growing consensus around determining how creativity is assessed, whilst creativity itself remains equivocal, suggests the possibility of further analogous pathways that will contribute to better understanding creative process. It is possible that creative risk may be one such pathway.

The literature review clearly supports the notion that in certain areas, the ethical regulation of research within higher education is viewed as problematic (Lederman, 2007; Bledsoe et al., 2007; Hammersley and Traianou, 2012). Some authors go as far as to suggest there may be non-compliance by staff (Lederman, 2007; Bledsoe et al., 2007). However, there is little if any research in this area concerning ethical regulation from a visual arts research perspective.

Whilst ethical appraisal remains esoteric there are however some very recent indications that creative risk is emerging as a topic of interest. Examples of this include Ellis and Meneely, (2015:37) and their study of ‘safekeeping’ and risk-taking interior design students. Their findings perhaps unsurprisingly concluding that ‘that the general population of interior design students is skewed toward creative risk-taking’, but also emphasising a ‘safekeeping mind-set is also important to resolve the design’. A stance echoing Boswell, (2014) who states ‘a real risk then means that there is something at stake, that there is something to be gained or lost by making a
particular decision or taking a certain course of action’ but adds ‘this does not need to be left to chance’.

Other recent developments include the exhibition ‘Risk’ at the Turner Contemporary, Margate (Risk at the Turner Contemporary, 2016) and a 2016 one day conference at UAL London (What if... Why not...?: Creative Risk taking in Art, Design and Performance. UCL., 2016).

In light of this study’s ambition to better define creative risk it is notable that Ellis and Meneely’s lone examination of creative risk, concern’s itself only with creative risk-taking within a studio class room that ‘can be understood as a social risk that opens one up to external evaluation, scrutiny, and criticism’ (Ellis and Meneely, 2015:18).

Applied ethical appraisal in the visual arts can reasonably be seen as linked to creative risk, but concerning the visual arts lies largely latent within the literature. Surprisingly given its recent emergence as a prominent theme, in ‘strengthening research integrity’ (Universities UK, 2012).

This study is therefore timely.
5. Case study One: An examination of undergraduate, postgraduate and staff perspectives on ethics and creative risk

The stated central aims of this research study are to explore a new model of ethical appraisal, within which a visual arts’ researcher might meaningfully reflect on ethical issues inherent in their work, whilst at the same time better understanding the role of ‘creative risk’. Several interesting debates emerged from the review of literature notably around ethics, creativity and risk. Lindqvist and Nordänger, (2007:23-4) for example, state ‘we know very little about how people in education actually act, discuss and experience risk in their daily work. There is immediate need for descriptive studies where the focus is empirical’. Whilst in terms of ethical appraisal Lederman, (2007:306) identifies the ‘poor fit between demarcations of “research” as a regulatory object and its different, ambiguous, or absent demarcations in the knowledge-making practices in various academic disciplines’. In this chapter the intention was to dissect, test and explore these themes within the student context and later with staff. Furthermore it was envisaged that the findings as they emerged would inform the development of the new protocol for ethical appraisal as outlined in chapter six.

The methodological approach for this chapter’s investigation comprises a series of questionnaires, the first being a broad exploratory survey conducted at the University of Chester (R). This preliminary research would inform a second questionnaire to be conducted with separate undergraduate (UG), postgraduate (PG) and staff (S) groups at Manchester Metropolitan University. Finally with the aim of verifying results, a ‘convergent’ survey (C) would be devised and implemented with postgraduate researchers. In the following chapter each participant’s quotes are labeled (R, UG, PG, S or C, plus a unique number). The intension is to preserve anonymity whilst allowing a better analysis of respondents’ contributions.

5.1 The University of Chester undergraduate exploratory questionnaire

5.1.1 Development of a pilot student awareness questionnaire: Locating the study

In combining risk and ethics, the development of the Chester questionnaire was a logical next step from the ‘Media Practice and a Safe Curriculum’ research described in chapter three. The Chester survey also provided the opportunity to address issues raised in the literature review and in turn it was hoped this process would help further focus the study.

Whilst the central thrust of the exploratory questionnaire sought to investigate the student perspective on ethics, risk and creativity. In doing so it probed contentious areas such as the continuing discussion cited by Orr, (2010) concerning where the emphasis of assessment should
be placed; whether to assess creativity as process or product. Furthermore it sought to investigate student perceptions of the sometimes problematic relationship of practice to theory, (Powell, 2011; Hoechsmann, 2011; Hockey, 2007). In terms of participant research concerning creativity, this empirical approach can be seen as building on the work of Fryer, (2006) and Martin Oliver et al. (2006). The survey comprised of thirty-eight questions, nineteen of which explicitly focused on risk or creative risk. Additionally the inquiry included questions concerning ethical training and a respondent’s perception of ethically ambiguous or transgressive creative work. These would be themes that would be developed and refined in later surveys, in parallel with the development of the MIRIAD ethical protocol described in chapter six. A first draft of the questionnaire was reviewed and amendments made before its use. Significantly, given the nature of this ethical appraisal related topic, the absence of appropriate examples of consent forms at MMU, necessitated the development of a consent form template before the research could be undertaken. An analysis of the results from the pilot of the questionnaire is contained below. Copies of completed responses from the Chester survey can be found in Appendix 4.

5.1.2 Findings from the exploratory awareness questionnaire (undergraduate)

The awareness questionnaire was conducted at the University of Chester in April 2012. Eleven graphic design undergraduates were introduced to the research aims of the pilot study together with its voluntary nature, then asked to sign consent forms. One student chose not to be involved. The findings presented here need to be contextualised in terms of this initial sample and the fact that a central aim inherent within this exploratory questionnaire was the necessity to develop the survey itself.

The thirty-eight questions were broadly grouped into four themes: a definition of terms, the nature of risk, the nature of creativity and the nature of ethics. As mentioned earlier the survey also considered assessing creativity as process or product and the relationship of practice to
theory. These were areas considered as contextual to the central theme of ethics and creative risk.

Definition of terms: Ethics.
In general respondents in the Chester survey struggled to define what they thought the term ‘ethics’ meant in relation to their art, design or media practice. In describing ethics, comments on the returned forms ranged from: ‘Whether the piece is socially acceptable’ (R5), to ‘The right thing to do – like being a Jedi or part of the rebellion in star wars’ (R2), another student referenced an applied ethical definition by stating, ‘Ethics is professional conduct according to the law or industry regulations’ (R8). This early finding supports the need for greater awareness of ethical thinking, a proposition that resonates in the work of De Wet, (2010) and Miller et al., (2012). This emergent perception would also become an influential factor significant in the MIRIAD ethical appraisal protocol described in Chapter six.

Definition of terms: Creativity.
When questioned how they would describe or explain the term ‘creativity’, four students clearly referenced ‘The ability to create something new’ (R5), ‘Breaking the mold’ (R9), ‘Something for someone that is different’ (R4) and ‘Coming up with something new...’ (R2) echoing the concise definition favoured by Barron, (1965). One student did not respond to the question and the other answers were generally diffused, though with some suggestion that ‘creativity’ concerned ‘ideas’. Notably one student stated creativity was about ‘ideas, research and exploration’ (R7) an open perhaps democratising proposition, favoured in the work of Anna Craft and her notion of little ‘c’ creativity explained in the ‘The rhetorics of creativity’ (Banaji et al., 2006). Surprisingly perhaps given the cohort, four out of the ten students stated that they had never taken part in activities where they learnt about or considered the nature of ‘creativity’ or attempted to define it in connection to their work. Participants were also asked to list those who they considered influential in determining if something is considered ‘creative’ or not. Here the students’ responses strongly emphasised the artist themselves whilst also acknowledging tutors and the audience. Several respondents also mentioned the role played by critics. Significantly two students were more circumspect by suggesting subjectivity and rejecting the determination that the questioned suggested. When the sample were asked directly if they had ever sought to examine why something might be considered creative, the majority appeared to suggest they had never considered this.

In this institutional context, the apparent lack of a discourse here, around what constitutes creativity is interesting. Whilst creativity itself might be ‘a contentious and ill-defined concept’ (Onsman, 2016:211) there is a growing consensus relating to its assessment. Several authors note
the role of tacit knowledge, connoisseurship and post hoc consensual agreement in creative assessment (Csikszentmihaly, 1997; Orr, 2010; Onsman, 2016). However, Onsman (2016:212) also reminds us ‘history is littered with products which (sic) creative worth has risen and fallen apropos changing opinion and zeitgeist’. Whilst Blamires and Peterson, (2014:147-8) highlight the ‘high priority placed on creativity at a policy level,’ it is perhaps surprising that the student survey provides little evidence of academic discussion concerning creativity and creative process itself.

Definition of terms: Risk.

Asked how they would define the term ‘risk’ in the context of an art, design or media brief, the students’ two main responses were best summarised by the answers ‘When it can go wrong’(R2) and ‘Challenging myself or designing something that could create controversy’(R4). The frequency of the term ‘controversy’ being linked to risk, was surprising and a theme that isn’t accentuated in the literature. There is a possibility that students’ foreknowledge obtained from the consent form, i.e. ‘comprehend creativity in terms of risk and ethics’ had introduced a bias. This however also emphasised the importance of conducting the pilot and the nature of information released during the consent process. The consent material was revised accordingly. One student mentioned financial risk.

Definition of terms: Creative Risk.

When asked to explain what the term ‘creative risk’ meant to them personally, responses included ‘Designing something that could repel the viewer or cause upset or could harm the creator whilst designing it’(R4) and ‘Creating something in which you do not know how it will be publically received or how it will finish entirely (sic)’(R5). Another student described creative risk as “Doing something outside of the box”(R6). In many respects what is interesting here is the students’ willingness to define a term which itself is neglected in terms of interpretation within the major texts. Significantly for example the term ‘creative risk’ is absent from ‘The rhetorics of creativity’ (Banaji et al., 2006). Of concern though was the answer to the question; do you think some people are more likely to take ‘creative risks’ than others? Here unanimously participants confirmed their view that some people have a propensity towards creative risk. A problematic finding suggesting the possibility that creative risk might be innate as suggested by Martin Oliver et al. (2006). Almost all respondents also specified that this attitude to risk could be seen in other areas of creative risk-takers’ lives. Fortunately further enquiry in question 27, to examine these characteristics revealed that students felt the relationship people have to ‘creative risk’ could be developed, an idea favoured by Fryer, (2006). The group was split between those who thought it could be developed or nurtured but only up to a person’s predetermined or natural capacity for ‘creative risk’ and those who thought it could be developed or nurtured in an unlimited way. Important factors students identified as limiting their desire or scope to take ‘creative risks’ with
their work included: ‘Money’(R8) and ‘University rules’(R9) together with other responses that indicated personal self doubt may also be an issue. Important factors students specified that encouraged them to take ‘creative risks’ with their work included: ‘Higher marks’(R6), ‘Less specific projects’(R7) and the reflective ‘To push boundaries but ensure that morally the risk I have taken is backed up with logical and intelligent reasonings (sic)’(R3), (see Appendix 4).

The nature of creativity.

When asked if there were certain situations and circumstances in which they felt more inclined to be ‘creative’ all but one student said yes. In describing these conditions four students suggested that working on a project or brief was an amenable environment, two mentioned the need to feel inspired or strongly about something and two also referenced the need not to be ‘under pressure’(R2) or ‘judged by others’(R8). Here however, in relation to creating a suitable environment Banaji et al., (2006:64) identify ‘the tightrope that many educators have to walk between institutional constraints and the fragility of their constructed ‘creative’ environment’.

The nature of risk.

Question eleven enquired how often the students took ‘risks’ in response to a brief and options ranged from never to high. Here it was expected that the students’ answers would favour ‘high’, indicating they often took risks, however the majority (five) said that they took risks only sometimes. Three stated they often took risks and one said rarely. One student failed to answer. Most students confirmed that they sometimes minimised risks in response to a brief. This is described as safekeeping behavior and ‘seen as an equally vital part of the creative process to keep risk-taking in check’ (Ellis and Meneely, 2015:24). It is seen as ‘the balance between safety and identified development potential’ (Lindqvist and Nordängér, 2007:25). When providing reasons for their answers respondents cited ‘to gain better marks’(R7), ‘to get the best grade’(R9), ‘doing what I thought others wanted’(R6) or ‘to avoid upset’(R4). Others mentioned timescale and deadlines. Half the group thought that where they had taken risks on the whole the output was better as a result whilst the others were split viewing it as either the same or worse.

Most respondents thought that people, who took more risks in developing or producing their work, were in general accordingly viewed as more creative. Arrestingly the reasons for this pertained more to the publicity related nature of risk-taking than to the actual work. Comments included ‘Mostly because they get noticed’(R1), ‘Get noticed’(R7), ‘Sometimes attention seeking’(R6) and ‘When people don’t take risks they don’t get seen’(R9). Examples of designers, filmmakers or artists which students nominated as risk-takers included, Lady Gaga, David Carson, Damien Hirst, Marcus Harvey, Banksy, and the Chinese artist Ai Weiwei.
It is useful here to consider the institution perspective on this question where Banaji et al., (2006:64) argue that at times ‘the tension also appears to lead to contradiction or even paradox: risk-taking is to be encouraged but it is also to be kept within easily controllable bounds’. Lindqvist and Nordängér, (2007:22) remind us that ‘the word ‘risk’ comes from precisely this field of tension between the known and the unknown. The word stems from the Portuguese verb ‘to dare’, suggesting a state of tense anticipation’.

The nature of ethics.

In question thirty-six students were asked to consider the work Myra by Marcus Harvey (1995). A simple definition of ethics was provided as ‘the discipline dealing with what is good and bad and with moral duty and obligation’. The questionnaire then enquired; “Do you think that work that embodies or expresses poor ethical judgment is also therefore flawed in terms of its creative merit?” Only three of the ten respondents stated Marcus Harvey’s work flawed in terms of its creative merit. This question however needed further development, as it was clear that some students did not have enough knowledge of Harvey’s work to form an opinion and there was a concern that the phrasing of the question might have introduced an element of bias. In later surveys the use of an example was dropped in favour of a more open question.

Assessment.

Question thirty asked students how creativity was currently being assessed by their tutors. Three students either stated that they didn’t know or left no response. The other attempts at answers were perturbing. One student suggested that tutor’s ‘compare and contrast student work’(R7), another that the process was managed ‘by their own opinion and view of the work which is unfair’(R6). One student suggested that tutors had no say and were directed by ‘the Government body’(R9). In summary they had no real idea. This is a significant finding and of concern.

In terms of course work, only two students deferred from the position that the ‘creative process’, (the development of the work) and ‘creative output’ (the finished product or artifact) were on the whole assessed as equal by tutors. Only one student personally thought that the creative output or product was more important than the process in terms of assessment. These findings concerning process versus artifact, correlate with the idea that ‘lecturers are interested in assessing the students’ artistic engagement’ evidenced by ‘engaging fully in their emergent arts practice’. (Orr, 2010:2). Question thirty-five sought to probe the relationship of practice to theory by asking students to reflect on their entire art, design or media educational experience and consider whether theory or practice had appeared more highly valued by teachers, tutors or lecturers. Overall the respondents’ answers confirmed the view that their mentors’ value

2 http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ethics (April 2012)
judgments were balanced between theory and practice. However as this appeared to contest findings from the literature review in chapter four, (Orr, 2011; Hockey, 2007; Powell, 2011). It was therefore thought appropriate to revisit this question in a later survey to better explore this area in depth.

In summary, the pilot usefully indicated areas of the survey that required refinement. At the same time the process also revealed a range of interesting emergent issues pertinent to the study’s central theme of creative risk and ethical appraisal. However more work was required to be secure of these initial indications. As outlined at the start of the chapter the next stage of the study was to use a revised survey with different sample cohorts. These groups would be comprised of undergraduate, postgraduate and staff respondents.

The Chester survey also reinforced the need for recorded structured in-depth interviews with visual arts lecturers. Reflections on these discussions can be found in chapter six.

5.2 Rationale for development of the undergraduate, postgraduate and staff questionnaires

These new questionnaires would differ from the earlier Chester undergraduate exploratory questionnaire in a number of ways. Whilst the Chester study had been beneficial in probing participants’ attitudes to risk and creativity, the focus of the second survey would concern ethical appraisal. Therefore, building on the exploratory survey, the development of the new questionnaire greatly expanded the examination of respondents’ ethical awareness and perception of regulation. These are central themes of the study. For example 13% of Chester survey questions had explored ethical understanding, against 65% in the new surveys. Likewise the new survey sought to better understand creative risk and its importance to participants.

This increased focus also linked to concomitant developments in the MIRIAD ethical protocol outlined in chapter six. The possibility was emerging that the new appraisal protocol could be used by staff and possibly undergraduates and required a better understanding of these groups.

The new questionnaire would be shorter and intentionally designed for implementation across the three different samples. It was also envisaged that by comparing the three contrasting groups differing opinions could be mapped.
5.3 The undergraduate research ethics questionnaire

The undergraduate ethics workshop and evaluation session took place in May 2015 and comprised 19 students. This cross-disciplinary visual arts group were working on Unit ‘X’, the title given to a student design activity that takes place annually within Manchester School of Art at MMU. In meetings with departmental staff it was considered that this diverse group would provide a good test both for the new ethical appraisal system under development, and the survey described here. The occasion provided the opportunity to question the undergraduates on their attitudes towards ethics and creative risk. It was hoped to more fully understand how participants perceived ethical appraisal in relation to their work. This in turn would correlate with the development of a new process for ethical appraisal in the visual arts described in chapter six.

Below under question headings is a conspectus of responses gathered from the undergraduate survey. Examples of the completed forms can be found in Appendix 7.

1a. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?

In answer 63% of the undergraduate responses stated creative activity need not be ethically justifiable, whilst only 16% thought that it should be accountable. Whilst this finding chimes with the argument that ‘If researchers are to get their work done in the world as it, … they will often have to engage in actions that fall short of the highest possible standards’ (Hammersley, 2012:139), it also risks over simplification. This is exemplified by the detailed explanations offered by respondents below.

Illustrative comments given by those rejecting ethical liability included:

UG11) ‘While the majority of work should be ethical sometimes controversial work is required, especially if the intent of the work is to inspire change, confront problematic viewpoints and spark deep discussion’.

UG2) ‘Morality is fluid and changes’.

UG4) ‘I enjoy creative work that strikes (sic) opinion’.

UG5) ‘I am interested in work that pushes boundaries and makes people feel uncomfortable’.

An example of a practical dilemma was offered by one respondent who explained; ‘if you make a simple fabric that’s not sustainable, it may not be ethically correct to one audience but another (audience) could love it’ (UG14). A statement reminiscent of the promotion by Cashell, (2009) of ethical pluralism in the literature review. Another student who chose not to answer either yes or no but instead posited ‘to an extent art shouldn’t go out of its way to offend others on purpose, however art is made to question the norms and to evolve a certain reaction’ (UG16).
The main arguments made by those supporting the precept that all creative activity should be ethically justifiable were somewhat limited in scope and encompassed the concern that individuals should not be overly alarmed or harmed by any creative activity.

In brief the significant majority of feedback to question 1a refuted the suggestion that all creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable. In terms of ethical regulation there is a parallel to be drawn here between the visual arts and anthropology where Lederman, (2007:306) opines there is an ‘extremely poor fit, between the regulatory definition of research and anthropological evocations of fieldwork’.

1b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?
Consistent with the responses to question 1a the majority of undergraduates (63%) rejected the idea that good contemporary art needs to be ethically good. The remainder were split between supporting the belief good art should be by necessity be ethically good and indicating that they were unsure.

Reasons proffered by the majority supporting the proposition that art need not necessarily be ethical included:

UG4) ‘I liked to be shocked and shown something new, I like to be made to think about something’.

UG2) ‘Good art is challenging therefore it can be unethical’.

UG18) ‘Artists should be able to create what they wish, contemporary art is contemporary and future thinking’.

UG7) ‘People should be able to express themselves’.

It was left to a very small number of respondents to articulate an alternative position. These included those who were simply unsure or who had stated they thought good art was linked with being ethically good. Feedback ranged from the contemplative ‘I think it depends on what context the art is created in’ (UG17) to the more opportunistic ‘in order for your work to be liked and to get good criticism’ (UG3). It was again clear that the majority of undergraduates saw little or no compulsion for contemporary art to adhere to moral or ethical codes particularly if it would inhibit the room for personal creative expression or ability to challenge established norms.

Discussing visual research Hockey, (2007) recognises the importance placed by students on freedom of form in creative making and notes the dissonance evident between regulation and this cherished autonomy.
2. Do you think that research ethics is relevant to researchers in Art, Design and Media?

In question two approximately half the sample stated that they saw research ethics as being relevant whilst only 10% disagreed. More interestingly perhaps was the high proportion of those either undecided or offering a more nuanced view (37%). Contributions from this segment of the sample illustrated some uncertainty of the research ethics process itself, and included comments such as ‘never even been guided in this direction so don’t even really fully know what it is’ (UG14) and ‘sometimes when making art you don’t think of the potential ethical problems until someone points them out and you research into them’ (UG16).

Interestingly the views on the topic from those who affirmed the importance of research ethics appeared considered and included matters concerning consent, safety and privacy. The high number concurring with the notion of research ethics being relevant is not necessarily inconsistent with the respondents’ earlier replies however. Rather it might suggest a more sophisticated acknowledgement of the usefulness of ethical understanding whilst not ruling out the options for future rule breaking or risk taking. One undergraduate offered ‘It is important to know when you are breaking ethical values so that you can decide that is what you want your work to do’ (UG7) whilst a couple of students also mentioned ethics would help them to understand their work in context. These findings were insightful as they supported the need for the ethical taught session developed in conjunction with the MIRIAD ethical protocol described at length in chapter six.

3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your creativity or strengthen your creative work?

The majority of participants saw ethical approval as a combination of restraining and strengthening their work (58%), with just over a quarter of the sample viewing it having a creatively restraining effect.

One response summed up the feelings of those fearing of the potential restricting or suppressing influence ethical approval might introduce, suggesting; ‘giving students/artists boundaries will restrain a natural flow of ideas and will subtly introduce uniformity which is not what art is about’ (UG17). The comment is redolent of Bledsoe et al., (2007) who argue ethical regulation can be damaging to research, contending ‘in many cases faculty do not actively try to deter students from research. Instead, students deter themselves. Students may come to their advisors with ideas already formed’ (Bledsoe et al., 2007:593) about the ethical boundaries of what they can and cannot do. The distribution of replies to question three however challenged this assertion and saw the process of ethical approval in broader terms. Most remarks more eveny balanced
the possible creative strengths versus creative restraints an approval process would engender.

Explanations here included;

UG16) ‘Restrains creativity because you can’t create exactly anything you want, Strengthens your work as you think about your overall concept in more detail’.

UG5) ‘It would encourage further thought about what was being done, but could be restricting as I think creative work is (or should be) a free expression’.

UG13) ‘I would think of it as a challenge if I believe in a piece enough I will fight for it, but it can also act as a guide. As artists we should be constantly questioning ourselves’.

4. Where would you draw the line? Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden?

Most respondents in the undergraduate sample attempted to provide examples of unacceptable activity. Broadly the illustrations fell into two categories. The first included reference to work that might be viewed as sexist, racist, homophobic, or have negative impact on minority groups. Religion was also at times mentioned alongside these issues. The second area where there appeared to be consensus amongst the sample was a concern over emotional or physical harm.

To summarise, it was evident that the majority of the sample saw clear boundaries of acceptable practice within a university context.

5. Focus of your current project or research study

58% of undergraduates in the sample saw their projects as being practice led and 42% indicated that their current work was evenly split between theory and practice.

6. Have you ever received training in general research ethics?

Only two out of the nineteen students (10.5%) in the sample stated they had received any training in general research ethics.

7. Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?

Question seven sought to determine whether the participants had previously received an introduction to research ethics within their discipline. However none of the undergraduate sample when questioned signaled that they had received any training in research ethics specific to Art, Design or Media. It is not surprising perhaps in the institutional setting when visual arts students particularly at undergraduate level, should indicate a lack of ethics training. Even at a
staff level De Wet, (2010:309) identified the ‘lack of knowledge around ethics’ exhibited by social science lecturers and identified the need for better training.

8. How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline?
In this question undergraduates could select from five sentences to describe their knowledge or alternatively indicate they did not know. Most students (47%) chose to describe themselves as having some basic understanding of ethics in relation to the visual arts with a further 32% stating they had very little comprehension of the topic. Additionally two students (10%) from the sample stated that their awareness of research ethics was good, whilst a similar number disclosed that they had very little grasp of the subject. No respondent chose to describe their understanding as ‘excellent’.

9. Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?
Only two (10%) of the sample had previously assessed a university code of ethics, university ethics website or an ethical checklist. Such a small figure contrasts with the importance placed centrally within the institution on policies and procedures and efforts made to communicate this information. However this needs to be set in context as to date the institutional ethics focus has been on research rather than undergraduate study.

10. How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?
It was significant that most (57%) of the sample declared that they had never felt anxious about ethical aspects of their work in the past, with 37% asserting that they were sometimes concerned by ethical aspects of their work. However in the context of having received little in the way of ethical training it is perhaps not surprising that for the majority of respondents ethics was not a pressing concern. Whilst emphasising the need for better ethical awareness De Wet, (2010) opines that this lack of ethics teaching may be widespread. The range of examples offered by those who had experienced ethical concern included; photographing homeless people, the public dissemination of individuals’ personal confessions, the ethical use of materials, the environmental impact of a project and health and safety concerns.

11. How would you best define the term ‘creative risk’?
The sample in question eleven were asked how best they could describe the nature, scope, or meaning of the term creative risk. Responses included:
UG1) ‘Pushing self (sic) out of comfort zone or doing something against the norm’.
‘Being unsure of the outcome, pushing yourself to try something new even if you don’t know if it will pay off’.

‘Pushing the boat/boundaries to see how far you can take your work’.

‘Working outside the box’.

‘Risk taking to create art work, not enough risk to harm or damage people, equipment ...’

‘Work that might challenge or even offend the viewer’.

‘Taking chances’.

The illustrations above appear to associate creative risk with a number of common themes:

- A drive or persistence despite resistance from perceived constraints.
- An element of jeopardy or chance in the process.
- Thinking differently, unconventionally, or from a new perspective.

It is interesting that response ‘UG4’ seeks to impose limits on the adverse consequences that unrestrained risk-taking might imply whilst response ‘UG19’ contemplates the possibility of a negative audience reaction. It is useful to contextualise these varied responses by considering that the ‘response of students to their handling of risk appears to depend on what had been gained through prior experience’ of taking risks (Davies, 1999:105).

12. How often do you take creative risks in your OWN work?

Question twelve sought to determine the prevalence of creative risk taking in student work. When asked 74% of the sample replied that they sometimes or quite often took what they perceived to be creative risks in their work. From this it can be deduced that creative risk-taking is a common component within student work. Question thirteen below would attempt to determine its significance to the sample.

13. How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in your work?

Significantly 74% the sample considered creative risk-taking to be quite or sometimes important. Figures consistent with the previous response in question twelve that concerned the prevalence of creative risk taking. Building on the hypothesis developed in question twelve, we can now postulate that creative risk taking is both prevalent and regularly considered by the undergraduate sample to be an important factor in the creative process.

14. Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?

When asked whether it was ever justifiable to work unethically when taking creative risks 68% of the sample stated that it was at least sometimes acceptable to do so.
The data here is consistent with the responses offered in question 1a *(Do you think all creative activity should be ethically justifiable?)* where 63% of the undergraduate responses stated creative activity need not be ethically justifiable.

Examples of explanations offered by undergraduates in question fourteen include:

UG5) ‘If it is for a greater purpose – benefit outweighs the damage’.
UG16) ‘If they can back up their reasoning, rather than doing it just for the hell of it’.
UG19) ‘Creative minds should not be restricted’.
UG13) ‘Sometimes these boundaries need to be broken in order to gain a new perspective’.

Significantly Hammersley, (2012:136-141) suggests that an approach which departs from the ‘highest ethical standards’ may be acceptable in research terms if it can be ‘justified by appeal to the benefits produced’. Other commentators such as De Wet, (2010:303) strongly disagree arguing this method could ‘ultimately be to the detriment of research as it might compromise the welfare of participants, and may undermine the validity of the research study’. However, in relation to this study it was pertinent to consider the central role of the appraisal process. To what extent would an improved ‘subject specific’ ethical appraisal negate these theoretical arguments?

**15. Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit your ability to take creative risks in your work?**

Perhaps unsurprisingly given the low awareness of ethical appraisal revealed earlier in the questionnaire, there was discernable uncertainty evident in responses to question fifteen. In total 32% of the sample clearly stated that ethical appraisal could inhibit their ability to take creative risks whilst 42% stated that they didn’t know. The remainder of respondents either stated appraisal would have no impact (10.5%) or that sometimes it might (15.5%). Explanatory comments provided by the sample that give a sense of the feedback include:

UG13) ‘(Ethical appraisal)...would act as a guideline ...but you could still ignore it’.
UG16) ‘Would make you think more about the decisions you are making before going ahead with that idea’.
UG9) ‘Could stop further development of an idea’.
UG19) ‘Having a set of rules to abide by will restrict what I can create’.

If we extend the emergent hypnosis, introduced in the discussion on question twelve we can begin to conceive a behavioural model. This proposition would reflect the findings that creative risk taking is both widely prevalent and regularly considered as an important factor in the production of artifacts by the undergraduate sample. Furthermore it is at least sometimes seen as
justifiable to work unethically when taking creative risks. In the eyes of the majority of the undergraduate sample all creative activity need not be ethically justifiable nor is ethical evaluation necessarily relevant to the appraisal of contemporary artwork.

16. Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?
This final open question was envisaged as an attempt to capture a broad range of opinions pertinent to creative risk that might otherwise be missed. Rather than elicit its historical interpretation by citing the avant-garde the question referenced the notion advanced by Cottington, (2013:122) of an avant-garde representing the ‘research and development arm’ not only of the culture industry but consumerism in general’. ‘The idea of ‘avant-garde’ depends on the notion of progress: to be ahead of the rest, even in opposition to it, requires a belief in forward movement’ (Cottington, 2013:122). The question therefore sought to explore factors that in an institutional setting might limit new innovative or experimental ideas.

Illustrations of restricting influences contributed by undergraduates here include:

UG10) ‘Views of your peers’.

UG13) ‘People may be afraid to try something new, however in the past when faced with difficulties people still formed an underground movement and created avant-garde work.’

UG1) ‘Preconception about what art should be’.

UG14) ‘Not enough resources for the amount of students they pile into the university’.

UG17) ‘Health and safety’.

UG19) ‘The majority of people do not appreciate avant-garde work for what it is’.

The findings from the questionnaires are discussed further at the end of this chapter and in chapter eight’s conclusion.
5.4. The postgraduate research ethics questionnaire

The second sample group to participate in the survey were eight visual arts researchers in the early stages of their postgraduate studies. The questionnaire was conducted on 3rd June 2015. All the survey was executed prior to the group taking part in the taught MIRIAD introductory ethics session that introduced participants to ethical thinking. The taught session is described at length in chapter six. A copy of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix 5.

To aid analysis the form data was entered into Microsoft Excel. This allowed a comparative review to be made of the answers. Below is a summary of answers from the survey.

1a. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?

Four responses stated that all creative activity should be ethically justifiable, whilst one researcher stated that it shouldn’t and one didn’t know. Participants three and six indicated ‘other’. Looking at their subsequent comments, researcher three provided the explanation that ethics were not relevant when ‘sometimes you create for yourself’, but were important ‘when you involve other people’. Researcher six stated it was ‘Dependent on practical considerations’. Other interesting feedback to this question included one person who had indicated ‘yes’ remarking ‘I think it important that all creative endeavor at least considers the wider ethical considerations of the research from the perspective of the maker/artist – methodology and of course the subject’ (PG2). One researcher questioned the definition of ethics and another posited ‘rules for creative practice should not be different from any other area of life’ (PG5). In summary feedback to this question was generally supportive of the notion that creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable at least in qualified terms. This differed from the undergraduate response to this question, where the majority of students asserted that creative activity, need not be ethically accountable.

1b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?

In light of their responses to question 1a, it might have been initially expected that a higher number of participants would have gone on to affirm the principle that good contemporary art should be ethically good. However the overall majority (5/8) refuted this proposition, a finding more in line with the responses from the undergraduate sample. Reasons supporting this stance included ‘Sometimes art might need to transgress standard moral boundaries in order to query what we think about a subject’ (PG8) and art ‘can be used as a vehicle to open up the debate around certain issues in society’ (PG4). In addition two researchers questioned the term ‘ethically good’, as the term ‘good’ was viewed as problematic. One respondent suggested instead that the term ‘ethically sound’ might be more appropriate. In devising the questionnaire the term ‘ethics’
had been employed in its broadest context as it was thought most likely participants would have limited theoretical knowledge in this area. By questioning the term ‘good’ it is possible participants may have unknowingly alluded to need for a pluralistic approach to ethics favoured by Cashell, (2009). For example there are ‘situations in which commonly accepted [ethical] norms either conflict or do not adequately specify the conduct that is demanded of people who wish to act in an ethical manner’ (Thompson, 2012:620).

In the taught session on ethical thinking (see chapter six), a way was sought to address this hypothesis. After consideration it was decided to incorporate into the ethical thinking introduction the ‘Trolly Car Problem’ (Thomson, 1985) a premise derived from Foot, (1967). The ‘Trolly car problem’ probes a utilitarian view of ethical behaviour and is commonly used to explore whether decisions are about simply outcomes or about the manner in which you achieve them.

The use of the comparative analysis spreadsheet was also helpful here. It in fact showed only two researchers actually appear to contradict themselves, by offering apparently inconsistent responses to question 1 and 1a. This point aside, it is clear that an emerging theme in the survey responses is the nuanced relationship between creative practice, ethical norms and regulation.

![Figure 3. Detail from Excel comparative analysis spreadsheet](image)

2. *Do you think that research ethics is relevant to researchers in Art, Design and Media?*

All those who answered this question (7/8, as there was one abstention) were unanimous in the view that research ethics was relevant to academic investigation within the creative arts. One respondent contributed ‘Bad art is art that injures people’ (PG3) another added ‘ethics should be an explicit aspect regarding every element of research’(PG4). Researcher five speculated that ‘no research is entirely confined to the single researcher it will always contact with/impact on others’, whilst researcher six saw benefit in the ethical process provoking reflection. It appears therefore evident at least in terms of their research, that the post-graduate sample support the principle that research ethics is appropriate for the creative arts. The views here are in line the assertion that ‘ethics is becoming increasingly involved in another subset of sound research practices which are collectively referred to as “integrity in research”'(De Wet, 2010:303).
3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your creativity or strengthen your creative work?

There was a clear focus of feedback from the question of whether ethical approval was positive or negative in terms of creativity. Most participants saw it as a combination of restraining and strengthening the work 4/8 or simply strengthening the work 2/8. Even the researcher who in question 1a had disagreed that creative work needed be ethically justifiable saw the process as offering a combination of restraining and enhancing influences. Written researcher comments that exemplify this duality included the cogent statement ‘By restraining my practice it can strengthen both justification for decisions and future choices. However this can lead to difficulties in the initial stages of creative work since it narrows possibilities’ (PG6). Another participant offered ‘Ethical consideration could of course constrain creativity as progression in the creative fields has always depended on the margins/envelope being pushed and current orthodoxies being challenged’ (PG2). Only one response asserted that the process of ethical approval would solely restrain creativity, citing it ‘restricts freedom to work instinctively’ (PG7).

The results here are best read in conjunction with the responses to question two. This would suggest an accepted ethical process viewed perhaps if not entirely benign, rather providing a necessary stimulus to ethical reflection with the resultant binary effect of supporting or restricting the creative process. It is clear however, that is overstating the case to assert that by a process of regulation, creativity is left ‘flattened and drained, ... reduced to increments of knowledge by tiny, measured steps (Bledsoe et al., 2007:640).

4. Where would you draw the line? Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden?

When reflecting on the researchers’ feedback to question 4, there is a sense that the sample found it difficult to hypothesise whether any activity should be proscribed. Researcher five went so far as to write ‘very tricky one’ below their answer. Two participants left the section blank and others returned one or two sentence answers. In many ways this response should not be entirely unexpected as the reluctance to proscribe particular approaches is well established in the creative discourse. It is also a position articulated in the findings from the Arts and Humanities Research Council funded investigation of ethics in art design and media. (The Ethics Project, 2006). Examples where researchers did attempt to answer, included the narrow ‘anything that infringes laws around sex discrimination or race discrimination’ (PG5), to a broader ‘circumstances which would harm others’ (PG8). One student did attempt a fuller answer by offering as unacceptable; the scenario in which a student wanting to explore the public’s perception of terrorism, dresses as a terrorist and gets on a bus with an imitation AK47 rifle. Overall in the comments there was a
sense respondents were struggling to provide fuller examples. The inference from responses to question 4 supports the premise that a premeditated list proscribing certain visual arts activities might be viewed as being both anachronistic and overly coercive.

5. Focus of your current project or research study
Five researchers in the sample saw their projects as being evenly split between theory and practice. Two stated that they were focused a theoretical research project whilst one confirmed that they were working mainly in practice.

Looking at the group’s responses to questions through the lens of the Excel comparative analysis spreadsheet there was no significant difference or pronounced pattern that distinguished the participants by type of study. It was observed that the two theory focused researchers rated themselves slightly more highly in terms of quantifying their understanding of research ethics and also appeared confident that good contemporary art need not be ethically good. However, given a small sample size it would be imprudent to suggest this as overly significant. The practice-based researcher was clearest at decoupling ethics from evaluating creative activity but again this cannot be read as significant, rather a pointer to further work. A much larger empirical study would be needed to draw any conclusions with confidence.

6. Have you ever received training in general research ethics?
All but one participant stated they had not received any training in general research ethics. Given that this sample were embarking on higher level research, this may not be surprising but also points to a dearth of training at preceding academic levels.

7. Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?
Only one researcher out of the eight indicated that they had received specific training in research ethics in relation to Art, Design or Media. This was the same participant who had affirmed they had received training in general research ethics. The finding here again supports the notion that recourse and training is inadequate (De Wet, 2010). In chapter six, the development of subject specific training for visual arts researchers is discussed as part of the MIRIAD ethical appraisal protocol.

8. How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline?
In this question postgraduates were provided with possible replies ranging from ‘excellent understanding’ to ‘no understanding’. No respondent indicated ‘excellent’ but as already described the two researchers with theoretical studies both stated their understanding was good.
In addition the participant who confirmed in question six and seven they had received ethics training, also expressed a good understanding of research ethics in relation to the discipline. From the data we can see that all the postgraduates expressed at least some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to the visuals arts. The results unsurprisingly given the level, are better here than with the undergraduate sample.

9. Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?

From the eight respondents only two, researcher 3 and researcher 4 signaled a familiarity with academic ethical policy. What is interesting here is a confirmation that despite the importance placed on ethical compliance in central university policy statements there is an evident disconnection between institutional aspiration and practice. For example within MMU’s academic guidelines on good research practice it states ‘The University expects researchers to be aware of, and adhere to all relevant policies and guidance’ (Manchester Metropolitan University, 2014). It might be argued expectations here should be tempered, as the six researchers in this study unfamiliar with ethical policy, were in the early stages of their research. However, whilst it is heartening that in question eight most researchers expressed some basic ethical understanding, answers to questions six, seven and nine would also support the need for ethics to be more firmly embedded within visual arts pedagogy.

10. How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?

Question ten was an intentionally broad enquiry, intended to allow researchers to reflect on previous occasions when they had experienced an anxiety or tension affiliated to ethical decisions. Three participants expressed that they had often encountered ethical concerns, whilst four stated that this occurred sometimes and only one stated they had never experienced any ethical doubt connected to their work. This was a significantly higher figure than that expressed by undergraduates.

Examples of areas where individual researchers had encountered concerns included intellectual property rights and the use of imagery, ethics and the use of images of war, and a project concerning individuals with a learning disability. One respondent referenced interviewing holocaust survivors and the ensuant ethical considerations around interpreting this material. The scale and complexity of material offered here illustrates the need for any system of ethical appraisal within the visual arts to be both comprehensive and enlightened in approach.
11. How would you best define the term ‘creative risk’?

From the outset, concomitant with this research study’s exploration of visual arts ethics and investigations around ethical appraisal, has been the associated discourse concerning creative risk. In question eleven, the subjects were asked how best they could describe of the nature, scope, or meaning of the term creative risk.

Responses from researchers included:

PG2) ‘A challenge to current orthodoxy’.

PG5) ‘Experimentation needed for originality to flourish’.

PG6) ‘Working in a manner, which could fail’.

PG4) ‘Open to ideas’.

PG3) ‘Without creative risk you are not being creative, I think of it in practical and theoretical sense (sic)’.

PG8) ‘The process of investigating factors in a project such that the goals of the project are met without disabling the project’.

PG7) ‘Creating something that is likely to be misunderstood’.

It is noticeably that PG8’s response appears to negate the notion that higher risk with its attendant possibility of failure could be viewed as positive, whilst PG7 suggests most projects appertaining to creative risk are likely to be misunderstood. The description provided by researcher 2 ‘a challenge to current orthodoxy’ is interesting in terms of its enveloping scope and prescient relation to ethical transgression. Answer ‘PG6’ and ‘PG4’ both explicitly allude to some form of actual risk implicit or necessary within the definition.

12. How often do you take creative risks in your OWN work?

Four students indicated that they took creative risks in their work very or quite often, two stated sometimes whilst two confirmed they seldom or never took creative risks. Perplexingly Researcher 5 who stated they had never taken creative risks had previously defined creative risk as ‘experimentation needed for originality to flourish’. In summary here it is clear that the majority of the participants saw themselves as regularly engaging with what they considered to be ‘creative risk’.

13. How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in your work?

Given the high incidence of engagement with creative risk noted in responses to question twelve, question thirteen provided the opportunity to compare this with the importance placed on creative risk by the subjects themselves. Accordingly it was found that half the sample thought creative risk taking was very important whilst three more saw it as sometimes or quite often important.
In comparing the data from question ten and twelve with question thirteen we can see that those subjects who were most often concerned by ethical aspects of their work also thought it was quite or very important to take creative risks. Equally and not unsurprisingly those who took more creative risks valued creative risk taking more highly.

14. Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?

Question fourteen sought to probe further the link between creative risk taking and ethical behavior by exploring whether visual arts researchers ever saw it as justifiable to work unethically when taking a creative risk.

The data here was surprising, with an almost unanimous 7/8 respondents indicating that they thought it could sometimes be justifiable to work unethically when taking a creative risk. This appears to contradict the findings from the opening question 1a (Do you think all creative activity should be ethically justifiable?), where half the sample had supported the need for work to be ethically justifiable. A hypothesis for this paradox however, might be found by reflecting on the percentage of researchers who also acknowledged in question three the ambiguity an ethical approach might imply in terms of restraining or supporting creativity.

We could therefore posit that whilst aspiring to work ethically, visual arts researchers also concede the possibility that ethical constraint might limit creative possibility and indeed that what constitutes ethical or moral codes is not fixed in a structuralist sense. Therefore they are willing to consider subsuming ethical constraint within creative risk-taking in the desire for creative output. This position finds some resonance in the suggestion that researchers in certain circumstances might claim a certain a ‘moral license if they are to pursue their task effectively’ (Traianou, 2014:71).

Examples of explanations in question fourteen which appear to support this theory include:

PG1) ‘Moral or ethical codes aren’t necessarily absolute or relevant – they change over time’.

PG2) ‘Moral codes are essentially individually ascribed although consensus is clearly important in order for there to be agreement and some form of legislation. It is the imposition that concerns me, or not having the opportunity to challenge’.

PG7) ‘Ethics and morality are both subjective’.

PG4) ‘We have to test the bounds of our world’.
15. Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit your ability to take creative risks in your work?

Question fourteen constitutes both an enquiry, seeking to explore evidence of ethical appraisal inhibiting creative risk whilst also acting as means of validation for earlier responses. The response to this question was very clear 7/8 participants thought that ethical appraisal could inhibit their ability to take creative risks. This is a much clearer statement of concern than expressed by the undergraduate sample. Unlike the undergraduate group this finding is more redolent of the notion that creativity might be undermined in a regulatory environment (Bledsoe et al., 2007).

Some clarification of this situation was expounded in researchers’ comments:

PG2) ‘(Ethical appraisal)...might preclude risk-taking’.
PG3) ‘Depends on who and how appraisal is done’.
PG5) ‘If inhibition is justified then it’s justified’.

If we factored this into the hypothesis developed under the analysis of question fourteen we might surmise that:

Visual arts researchers consider ethical appraisal might sometimes limit creative working and at other times support creativity. Researchers recognise however that what constitutes ethical or moral codes is not fixed. They view creative risk-taking as being important. Whilst they are willing to actively consider breaking ethical codes in the pursuit of creative risk-taking they are also mindful of the inhibiting influence of an ethical appraisal system.

16. Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?

Again the final question put postgraduate researchers uses the term avant-garde in its experimental rather than art history sense to open up the topic further. Postgraduate reflections on institutional factors that might limit new innovative or experimental ideas here include:

PG2) ‘Institutional boundaries are counter productive but clearly necessary: Balance is the key. Art school should always challenge orthodoxy’.
PG6) ‘Existing academic work might not ‘back up’ a potential new practice. Existing moral and ethical framework might be held back by moral inertia’.
PG3) ‘Funding, the sensible, the government, ideology, fear of being sued, insecurity, the desire/need to quantify, measure, measure up’.
PG1) ‘Corporate image, social concerns’.
PG7) ‘Public perception’.
PG5) ‘It probably flourishes here more than anywhere else. If there are any factors then its probably people like me with quite practical and decided views’.

These themes would later find an implicit reflection in the attempt to model ethical process (see Figure 31, Chapter seven).

Findings from the questionnaires are also examined in the discussion section at the end of this chapter and in chapter eight’s conclusion.

Figure 4. The Postgraduate introduction to research ethics in art and design media session (3rd June 2015).
5.5. The staff research ethics questionnaire

The staff ethics questionnaire was designed to run concurrently with postgraduate survey. The questionnaire sought to discover the views of teaching staff. It was envisaged that responses could be compared with those derived from the postgraduate and undergraduate survey. Participants were approached both within the School of Art and Design at Manchester Metropolitan University and also through personal contacts at the University of Chester and Staffordshire University.

The questionnaire was similar in format to the undergraduate and postgraduate surveys containing sixteen main questions plus a second follow-up to the first question 1b. Minor adjustments were made to several of the seventeen questions to reflect the teaching responsibilities of the sample. For example question three asks if the process of ethical approval could restrain creativity in student projects rather than in the personal work of an individual lecturer. A copy of the questionnaire responses can be found in the Appendix 6. For examination the form data was entered into Microsoft Excel to allow a comparative analysis to be made of the answers. Below is a summary of answers from the survey.

1a. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?

Two responses stated that all creative activity should be ethically justifiable, whilst four lecturers stated that this should not always be the case. Those supportive of work being ethically justifiable gave reasons such as ‘all our actions are based on systems of value, and values carry ethical and moral attachments that need to be creatively considered’ (S5) and ‘I understand ethics is about what is right and wrong. So I don’t want anything wrong to happen’ (S6). Conversely those who thought it permissible that some activity need not be ethically justifiable gave explanations such as:

‘I think it would depend on the purpose of the creative activity and the ethical boundaries that the work may be challenging. If the work were to be published then there should be a consideration of all ethical aspects, but depending on what the work was trying to communicate and who it was aimed at, then there may be valid reasons for crossing ethical lines’ (S3).

‘In the early stages of learning creativity; ethical thinking might hinder spontaneous actions’ (S2).

‘Creative thinking that happens in my head, or to be provocative in my night time dreams or daytime revénès (sic) cannot be accountable without creating big brother society’ (S4).
'Creativity is not always ethically justifiable or accountable to the rules and regulations laid down by the institution’ (S1).

It is interesting that feedback to this question by staff in broad terms was antithetical to the responses provided by postgraduates who generally stated creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable at least in qualified terms. In fact the response was more similar to the undergraduate sample.

1b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?

In question 1b, the answers from the staff sample reflected those by provided by the postgraduate group. However the justifications then provided by staff respondents on the form appeared to be less certain or at least more nuanced than reasons advanced by the postgraduates.

Postgraduate explanations had appeared to some extent altruistic i.e. ‘Sometimes art might need to transgress standard moral boundaries in order to query what we think about a subject’ (PG8) and art ‘can be used as a vehicle to open up the debate around certain issues in society’ (PG4).

On the contrary staff responses seemed more restrained for example ‘whilst do (sic) need to be able to raise different questions – never the less it should be possible to do this without hurting people etc’ (S4). Another explanation surmised ‘Tastes, ideas, truths and opinions about what is ethically good changes over time. Good art or design may be challenging and it is not necessarily a bad thing to question what is ethical and if an artwork can encourage this questioning then this may be worth it’ (S3). Two participants questioned the term ethically good with one contributor stating they were ‘not sure about the term ethically good, as good and bad are dualistic values I no longer consider to be relevant’ (S5). This debate over the validity or accuracy of the term ‘ethically good’ is consistent with the postgraduate survey where similarly two researchers questioned the term ‘ethically good’ with one (PG2) suggesting instead the term ‘ethically sound’. There are two suppositions that can be made here. Firstly as discussed earlier, it maybe respondents were challenging the concept of ethical certainty by alluding to a more complex possibly pluralistic interpretation of ethics. Alternatively the concern may simply be etymological in that ‘good’ implies a morally right decision, where as ‘sound’ suggests it was based on valid reason.

By referring to the comparative analysis spreadsheet we can see that staff answers to this question were both consistent with their postgraduate counterparts and also with their own responses to question 1a, where unlike the postgraduate group the staff sample generally rebutted the concept that all creative activity need be ethically justifiable.
2. Do you think that research ethics is relevant to students or researchers in Art, Design and Media?

Reflecting the postgraduate survey the respondents here were unanimous in the view that research ethics was relevant to academic investigation within the creative arts.

One respondent’s explanation here conveniently summarised the reflections of the sample stating, ‘Students need to be aware that their research actions have the potential to have a positive or negative impact on themselves and others and they should be aware of how to both conduct ethical research and to report and use the results of their findings responsibly’ (S3).

3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your students’ creativity or strengthen your students’ creative work?

It was noticeable in responses to question three, that the process itself was held to have significant bearing on a positive or negative outcome. A factor that was not evident in postgraduate replies. This process was discussed by staff who theorised that ‘It is not a question of ethical approval that may affect students creative work, but the process of approval that needs to be considered’ (S5), and ‘if badly handled or misunderstood (the process) could restrain if well handled could strengthen’ (S4).

This explicit focus on the process itself by staff, particularly with regard to determining outcomes was interesting and perhaps a more pragmatic procedural response borne out of intuitional experience rather than reflections evidenced in earlier postgraduate comments. It is clear that this finding is significant in light of the attempts outlined in chapter six, to develop a more appropriate system of appraisal for visual arts researchers.

4. Where would you draw the line? Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden?

In the postgraduate survey the researchers had found it difficult to hypothesise whether any activity should be proscribed. Views evidenced in the staff sample however appear clearer and more certain. Examples provided by the group include:

S6) ‘Anything which cause harm to others or demeans others’.
S3) ‘...a project that had the potential to endanger or harm [physically or emotionally], or that might be seen as harassment or malicious misrepresentation of a person or group of people’.
S4) ‘Racist art, Misogynist art, Fascist art etc.'
S2) ‘Where creative work might intimidate a person or persons or where a creative work might contribute or insight hatred towards a group of people. Art ought not embarrass or expose the vulnerable’.

S5) ‘Some problematic issues may include anything where the will of one is imposed on another; or where harm is inflicted on another human or non-human being’.

The responses here are certainly more confident than the postgraduate sample. However, this should be read conditionally as it might be expected that the staff group would be familiar implicitly or explicitly with institutional constraints and also have experience managing ethical issues in the course of their teaching or supervision on a daily basis. It was also possible that teaching staff try to reduce their own professional risk, by diverting their work, choosing topics or populations selectively, or adapting methods that will entail a less demanding ethical review (Bledsoe et al., 2007).

5. Focus of your current teaching or research activity

The areas of teaching or research activity indicated by staff where broadly divided in a similar manner to the postgraduate survey with a three-way split between theory, practice and the combined theory/practice option.

Examination of the comparative analysis spreadsheet did not reveal any obvious patterns in the data related to the area of teaching or research activity indicated by the staff member. With reference to the categories, one respondent wrote underneath question five ‘Hopefully there is no distinction’ (S5) which felt salient particularly in the light of the literature review.

6. Have you ever received training in general research ethics?

Only one member of staff said that they had previously received training in general research ethics. Given the scale of activity around academic ethics and the string of recent initiatives it was unsettling that this appears not to have percolated down in the form of staff training. The evidence here also resonates with comments from the ‘abstainer interviews’ described in the second case study. This questioned whether their supervisors had enough knowledge of ethics to be able to give guidance and suggested that this lack of knowledge might represent ‘a break in the process’.

7. Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?

Unsurprisingly perhaps given the response to question six, only one staff member indicated that they had received specific training in research ethics in relation to Art, Design or Media. This was the same participant who had affirmed they had received training in general research ethics.
8. How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline?

The answers to question eight mirrored those from the postgraduate group. No respondent stated that they had an ‘excellent understanding’, rather the sample was evenly split between those who indicated they had a ‘good understanding’ and those expressing ‘some understanding’ of research ethics related to their discipline.

9. Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?

From the six respondents four indicated they had at some point examined academic ethical policy. The Excel comparative analysis spreadsheet shows that those who stated that they were familiar with academic ethical policy were more likely to have described their understanding of research ethics in question eight as ‘good’.

10. How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your students’ work?

Question ten sought to enquire how frequently staff experienced anxiety regarding of ethical issues present in student work. One respondent expressed that they had often encountered ethical concerns, whilst four stated that this occurred sometimes and one stated they had never experienced any ethical doubt connected to their student’s work.

Comments by the sample, illustrate the range of ethical concerns that staff had encountered. The problems included:
S5) ‘Where a student’s research jeopardised their own safety within a particular community context. Where a student’s disability rights compromised the learning and teaching of other students’.

S4) ‘Lack of awareness about how much research activity involves ethical issues’.

S1) ‘Students lighting a fire in a wood for a film with use of petrol (sic) – no permission from landowner nor consideration to their own and others safety’.

S3) ‘This is a difficult one to pin down to any one example. I have my own personal ethical boundaries and often feel uncomfortable with the very nature of the industry I am involved in promoting to my students. Visual communication is about conveying messages and sometimes I am uncomfortable with the messages that are being conveyed through the students work. When students work on competition briefs or self generated briefs or open briefs where they can determine the outcome I am often concerned and uncomfortable about the messages being
conveyed, the stereotypies that are reinforced and the ethics of the clients/brands they are designing for’.

S2) ‘I once felt that a student had revealed some gender prejudice issues in their work and I had to engage in a discussion about the words used in the work’.

It was interesting that a number of notions were immanent within the remarks above. Firstly it was evident that whilst physical safety and risk assessment (or the lack of it) was a dominant theme, more subtle concerns, such as representational issues were suggested in the feedback. This perception was evident in the postgraduate survey too, for example with anxiety expressed around the use of images of war. It was clear that the nature of research ethics within the visual arts conflates a number of different issues, with some more elusive than others. Therefore any system for ethical appraisal within the visual arts needs to take sensitive account of this range.

11. How would you best define the term ‘creative risk’?
Responses from the staff respondents describing of the nature, scope, or meaning of the term creative risk included:

S2) ‘Stepping out of the comfort zone, engaging in work that is new territory to the artist’.
S5) ‘Every action has its own consequences beyond our control. Within the context of art design and media research, creative risk is firstly accepting this fact and then learning from it’.
S4) ‘Challenging to own skills and capabilities, challenging society and asking difficult questions’.
S6) ‘Doing something where you are not sure what the outcome will be’.
S3) ‘We are often asking students to take risks when developing work and probably don’t fully explain what we mean by risk and I expect that each individual tutor might think about risk differently… What is risky may be determined by the individual … or may be determined by the wider community, whether that be in terms of the community of practice (the lecturers, practitioners and industry specific communities) or the wider community (the intended audience and the unintended audience)’.

To some extent these comments reflect those offered by the postgraduate group, inferring an element of ‘contrarian attitude’, jeopardy, and experimentation is required for creative risk to flourish. When we compare this identified ‘contrarian attitude’ with the literature on creativity it connects with descriptors identified as being associated with creative personalities such as ‘norm doubting’, ‘autonomous’, ‘hostility’ and ‘confidence’ (Feist and Barron, 2003:66). Response ‘S3’ however was interesting in that it extended the discourse to consider those who may determine or validate creative risk. This is similar hypothesis to that which exists around the verification or
affirmation of creativity itself. Response ‘S3’ also intimates the possible difficulty in reaching a common measure for creative risk, due to an individual’s personal predilection for risk. ‘Risk thresholds are personal’ (Davies, 1999:102). However it could similarly be argued that as within safety risk assessment, likewise it may be possible to explore common ground in terms of assessing creative risk. An idea that has several parallels in the growing theoretical consensus around the assessment of creativity itself (Csikszentmihaly, 1997; Orr 2010).

12. How often do you take creative risks in your OWN work?
The majority of the staff sample stated that they took creative risks in their work either frequently or at least sometimes.

13. How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in your work?
The majority of the staff sample confirmed that they saw taking creative risks in their work as important.

14. Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
Whilst in the postgraduate survey 7/8 respondents indicating that they thought it could sometimes be justifiable to work unethically when taking a creative risk the staff cohort was less sure. No member of staff here positively ticked the ‘yes’ box and four indicated, ‘sometimes’, ‘don’t know’, or ‘other’. The two respondents who had clearly stated that all creative activity should be ethically justifiable in opening question 1a, were consistent in question 14 by refuting that it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically.

Comments by staff here generally followed a common line and included:
S5) ‘Creative people are not above or beyond commonly held moral codes. However it is their duty to question and challenge all commonly held beliefs’.
S3) ‘Sometimes it is necessary to challenge the status quo to put to the test our belief systems to promote debate and discussion around what is ethically and moral right and in order to do this it may be necessary to break these codes to provoke a reaction’.
S1) ‘Justifiable – if they can justify it!! Why does the moral code need to be broken’.

In relation to the postgraduate survey, there appears above, to be a more muted questioning of the validity of ethical or moral codes themselves. For example comments from the postgraduate sample, raised issues concerning ethical codes changing over time, or the subjectivity of moral behavior. The reluctance of staff to indicate a positive affirmation that it is acceptable (even
sometimes) to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk runs counter to their overwhelming rebuttal in question 1a, that all creative activity need be ethically justifiable. This may be explained in part by the institutional context and the awareness of university ethical process, confirmed by the sample in question nine. It is clear however that this data suggests the staff group do appear more cautious in relation to transgressing boundaries than the postgraduate sample. It can also be deduced from the data, that whilst the majority of the sample view taking creative risks as ‘quite’ or ‘very important’, they are far more circumspect of creative risk connected to ethical transgression.

15. Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit the ability for your students to take creative risks in their work?
The staff response here was uncertain and there was a fairly even spread answers unlike the postgraduate sample 7/8 participants thought that ethical appraisal could inhibit their ability to take creative risks.

The theme in comments centered on the system of ethical appraisal itself. Explanations included:

S3) ‘Putting together a proposal to put forward to an ethical committee is time consuming and requires careful consideration ...This will inevitably restrict the possibility for quick fire, chance and intuitive responses and leave the judgement (sic) about the appropriateness of the work to a group of individuals who have their own ethical and moral compass and may be risk averse in relation to how the university might be effected by the results of the project’.

S5) ‘It is again a question of how appraisal is conducted that needs to be considered. Is the student a genuine participant in the process of ethical appraisal or are they merely compliant with the dominant power of the day’.

In summarising the responses of participants in a similar way to the postgraduate sample a number of themes emerge. Visual arts staff are likely to have received little in the way of formal general or subject specific ethical training, however it was likely they will be familiar with the ethical process in their institution. They are likely at some point to have experienced anxiety over ethical issues encountered in their students work. They sometimes take creative risks and generally view this as being important. Whilst acknowledging it was not always possible to ethically justify creative work they are reluctant themselves to actively consider breaking ethical codes in the pursuit of creative risk-taking. Staff, have reasonably clear personal views about what should not be permitted in terms of unacceptable student working.
Feedback in the staff survey also introduced questions concerning who is responsible for determining or validating creative risk and identified the significance of ethical regulation on positive or negative research outcomes.

16. **Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?**

In the final question it was hoped to elicit staff views on factors that might limit new innovative or experimental ideas. Staff reflections on limiting factors that here include:

S1) ‘Rules and regulations’.

S4) ‘Time’.

S6) ‘Fear, lack of imagination, convention’.

S3) ‘The university as an institution with its own values, mission and target market may not wish to challenge their own status quo or "risk" offending their stake holders, those that hold the financial future of the institution in their hands and therefore may be risk averse’.

S5) ‘Avant-gardism is just a matter of modernist fashion. The ethical and moral question is how may we (the university) promote and support new and diverse ways of thinking and practice’.

---

**Figure 5. Comparing the undergraduate, postgraduate and staff responses in the surveys.**

Further reflection on the questionnaires is provided at the end of this chapter and in chapter eight’s conclusion.
5.6. The convergence questionnaire

Following the Chester questionnaire and the postgraduate, undergraduate and staff surveys described in detail above, the need for a further inquiry to verify the emerging hypothesis was proposed. This final investigation would tackle areas in earlier questionnaires, where either the findings had been inconclusive or it was thought that by the rephrasing of a question greater understanding could be accomplished.

Therefore a revised questionnaire was developed which sought to further scrutinise issues central to the study. Several questions revisited areas already broached in the earlier surveys. These included inquiries around the perceived academic status afforded to theory and written work, versus that given to craft and practice; the discernable qualities that allow individuals to take more creative risk; the assessment of creativity and an opportunity for an expanded definition of the term ‘creative risk’ itself.

The survey comprised sixteen questions and was conducted on the 9th December 2015 with twelve first year postgraduate researchers from the School of Art and Design at Manchester Metropolitan University.

As in earlier surveys the sample where asked to indicate whether they saw themselves in research terms to be either practice led, mainly theory focused or evenly split between practice and theory. It was notable that the group comprised a reasonably balanced sample with five practice led researchers, four who saw themselves as theory focused and three who viewed their research activity as split between theory and practice.

The respondents where then asked to reflect on their experience of the assessment criteria in arts education and whether they considered that written theoretical work and practice/craft are held in similar esteem. Unlike the earlier Chester survey on this topic, this new question clearly anchored the subject to assessment criteria for better definition. It should also be noted that the sample here comprised postgraduate researchers rather than the undergraduates of the Chester survey and as such they might be expected to have had greater exposure to visual arts assessment practices. It is also important to acknowledge that the field of arts education is broad one. Assessment differs across institutions and courses. Hargreaves, (2006) describes this as operating on a continuum between professionally focused and academic provision whilst simultaneously exerting either a contemporary or traditional approach to assessment. This said it was hoped that given the range of assessment experience amassed within the postgraduate sample a summative impression could be reached.
Out of the twelve responses, six stated they thought theory and written work to be more highly valued during assessment, three were unsure, two considered practice and theory equally valued, whilst only one submitted that they found practice had been more highly valued.

The hypothesis here is that, a significant percentage of researchers consider that written work and theory is held in higher esteem or attributed more value during their experience of assessment practices within visual arts education.

Illustrations of these views are found in comments from the participants in the survey. These include explanations such as:

C1) ‘The higher standing of publishing over doing’.
C2) ‘We have a greater respect for the written word in the UK than other forms of expression – this is a cultural difference’.
C7) ‘Because (written work) is perceived to be more easily defined, quantified and therefore assessed.’
C5) ‘I think this is due to the shift in post structuralism - the critic/theorist needing to deconstruct the work. The power of the reader’.
C10) ‘I think there is still a hangover from years of belief that written work is more valuable, but that is changing, but not overly quickly’.

Those who considered that practice and theory had equal weight in assessment terms, generally emphasised the interconnected nature of both areas. Whist one respondent emphasised that in academia theory was more valued as opposed to industry where craft and practice held more esteem.

Hockey, (2007:165) notes the difficulty experienced by Art and Design practice based PhD students observing ‘the particular codified language form required for a doctoral thesis appeared to them to be obscure, difficult to master, and rigid in terms of its form. They contrasted this with their previous experience of freedom of form in their creative making’.

Also interesting but not surprising, is the fact that only one researcher considered practice to be more highly valued in assessment terms, a situation redolent of Nik Powell’s comments in his 2012 manifesto article ‘In theory there is no difference between theory and practice...in practice, there is’.
The participants were next asked a variation on a previous question concerning contemporary art and ethics. Respondents in earlier questionnaires had questioned the use of the term ‘good’ in respect of its applied moral implications (i.e. does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?). This time the question was rephrased with the term ‘good’ removed. Researchers were instead simply asked in their opinion if they felt contemporary art needed to be ethically justifiable. The results would be compared with earlier findings for verification.

Four responses here stated that contemporary art needed to be ethically justifiable whilst three rebutted the notion that contemporary art need be ethically justifiable, additionally five researchers opted to provide more nuanced explanations. These included:

C1) ‘(contemporary art...) needs to be ethically aware but can challenge perceived ethics’.
C5) ‘Art should create tension or sometimes be politically activist – cause disturbance. However it is problematic when it comes to exploitation (not shock)’.
C2) ‘Only if the ethical framework employed is suitable for the condition and contexts in which it will be applied (within contemporary art)’.

In terms of verification we can consider these responses alongside the earlier UG/PG and staff surveys. The chart below indicates the percentage of respondents across the range of answers to the question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group/sample</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convergence</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Perceptions of contemporary art and ethics.

From the chart above we can hypothesise that:

a) In all groups one third or less of respondents state that contemporary art needs to be (by nature) ethically good or ethically justifiable. This is an interesting finding and may account for the initial reluctance witnessed in chapter six where at the beginning of the introduction to ethical appraisal sessions participants appeared uncertain that the process was altogether necessary.

b) In the earlier undergraduate and postgraduate surveys there was a predilection for rejecting the notion that good art need also be ethically good (63% and 62%). However the revised
emphasis on the term ‘justifiable’ in the convergence survey sample, may have directed respondents to more nuanced answers (other 41%).

Creative Risk Revisited

The convergence survey next addressed a central theme of the study with ten questions on the topic of creative risk. The Chester questionnaire had explored this area at length whilst later the MMU surveys had favoured a comparative analysis of more limited inquiry here. The rationale to revisit creative risk concerned the desire to both verify responses from the Chester undergraduate sample and contrast them with those from a higher-level postgraduate cohort. The UG PG and Staff surveys would also usefully provide control data helpful to verify the evidence.

The ensuing responses saw an overwhelming majority (75%), of the convergence sample supportive of the notion that taking creative risk was very important to their work. If this criteria is expanded to include those who thought taking creative risks was ‘quite important’ the figure jumps to 92%. These figures initially appear higher than those from the 3rd June 2015 postgraduate survey (50% and 72.5%). However if we expand the criteria again to include those who ‘sometimes’ thought creative risks important the statistics across both cohorts become 92% versus 87.5% and there is a satisfactory correlation. That those in the visual arts have a propensity to creative risk taking appears to be evidenced by the data from this study.

Within the earlier Chester and MMU studies, participants had provided a number of definitions of the term creative risk, the convergence survey provided a final opportunity to add to this explication. Below the use of colour coding identifies common themes found within the responses to individual questions. Illustrations provided by the sample included:

C9) A bit like betting on outsiders. The odds are against you but potential rewards are greater.
C12) Producing work outside the norm – accepted status quo of society (the ‘system’).
C2) Extending /confounding perceived or actual boundaries or constraints.
C8) Risk at the expense of losing something, credibility perhaps.
C1) New approaches or interpretations of the defined area of practice.
C4) Taking a chance through your practice to enable you to push boundaries or progress.
C6) Pushing the boundaries of your practice.
C10) Creative risk means that it pushes ethical boundaries or completely crosses them.
C7) Risk/chance in making.
If we consider the responses here we can see two clear themes emerging in these definitions, a speculative situation involving exposure to peril (red highlight) and an affinity to crossing the limits of the field or subject area (green highlight). Orr, (2011:10) notes that student artwork that is viewed as excellent, sometimes explores the boundaries of the discipline itself, posing difficulties for assessors. In her 2011 article Orr provides an example and recounts discussing a student’s summer show with a fine art tutor. Reflecting on the student artwork, the fine art tutor comments ‘If it wasn’t going to be a first it would have to be a fail.’ A remark that appears to support both the importance for work graded as exceptional to challenge boundaries, and the difficulty for lecturers in identifying where these boundaries actually lie. The student who is awarded a first is positioned within the territory of the arts arena (Orr, 2011). It is interesting therefore that student responses in the survey also appear reflect this implicit necessity to test the frontiers of the subject area.

Several commentators including Orr, (2010) have remarked on the importance of tacit knowledge informing assessment practices within art and design. What is important here is that the survey reveals that this tacit understanding may extend at postgraduate level, to students themselves. Thus characterising the term creative risk for the student group, are antithetical notions of personal risk and vulnerability and the reward innovative or unconventional work may bring.

The convergence survey participants were next asked if they thought some people were more likely to take creative risks than others. The last time this question was asked in the Chester survey there had been a unanimous affirmative response. The convergence survey sought to verify this result. This was confirmed again with an overwhelming response from the sample corroborating the belief that some individuals had a greater propensity for taking creative risks.

In a similar manner to the Chester survey the subsequent key follow-up question sought to determine if an attitude to creative risk could be developed or nurtured. Interestingly like the Chester group, respondents here were again split with 66% suggesting an individual’s attitude towards creative risk might be developed or nurtured but only up to a person’s predetermined or natural capacity for ‘creative risk’. The remainder of the sample (34%), were more optimistic in signaling that they thought a proclivity to creative risk could be developed or nurtured in an unlimited way. It was notable from a pedagogical viewpoint that no participants stated that they thought a person’s relationship with creative risk was either fixed or could not be developed.

When asked what qualities these people had that enabled them to be more likely to take ‘creative risks’ the survey elicited a range of responses, for example:
C8) ‘Lack of empathy, tacit understating of future’.
C9) ‘Extroverts, outsiders, less bound by constraints and expectation of others’.
C12) ‘They are willing to stand out from the crowd – challenge the ‘norm’.
C3) ‘Confidence, money, knowledge, experience, sometimes less emphasis on consequence’.
C4) ‘More adventurous, questioning, engaged’.
C10) ‘Non conformist, challenging’.
C5) ‘I think there is a difference between calculated risk and spontaneous risk taking – one is concerned and judged the other with less known results’.

If we consider the highlighted ‘personality traits’ above, we can see a theme of separateness or divergence from the norm, i.e. the confident contrarian. These illustrations echo descriptions found in the Chester survey where participant suggested characteristics such as ‘No conscience’, ‘Bravery’, ‘They don’t care what people think’, and ‘Lack of concern for other peoples opinion of them’. However care needs to exercised in interpreting these findings particularly with regard to the extent that these opinions might unknowingly reflect popular stereotypes. What is clear however is that within both sample groups there is a clear image of the perceived qualities required by creative risk takers.

The Chester survey had asked students to state the most important factors that limited their desire to take creative risks in their work. The resulting answers had appeared slightly diffuse. It was therefore decided to rephrase this question and anchor it more firmly to the educational context. The participants were asked ‘From your experience of education what techniques or circumstances enable students/researchers to be more likely to take ‘creative risks’?

When questioned in this manner about their experience of education a range of issues was advanced by the convergence sample. The factors seen as being supportive for stimulating creative risk-taking in an educational context included:

C2) ‘…likely circumstances to include opportunity, encouragement, external conditions’.
C10) ‘The most likely circumstance would be where a teacher or lecturer would encourage creative risks’.
C4) ‘Case studies – examples of successes and failures. More freedom, less red tape. Doing a project which isn’t assessed’.
C9) ‘A culture of risk taking within institution/staff and amongst peers’.
C1) ‘When they see the benefit of risk taking in other practitioners work’.
C3) ‘Less emphasis on grades, supportive staff, good peer dynamic’.
‘Working in a more experimental, nomadic way. Encourage open space, democratic techniques. Show examples of similar practices.

‘Open ended learning experiences’.

‘...not be afraid to make mistakes...relaxing structured teaching methods’.

The factors raised by the group contain a number of themes. Firstly the comments suggest a need for encouragement to take creative risks or at least a supportive culture (*blue highlight*). Secondarily there is a discourse around assessment (*red highlight*) where respondents appear to be seeking more space for experimentation. In the literature around creativity this is sometimes enmeshed with the concept of play. ‘There is a series of parallels and connections between rhetorics of play and rhetorics of creativity’ (Banaji et al., 2006:47). Finally there is the suggestion that the use of examples would be beneficial (*green highlight*). The use of examples is also echoed in the QAA subject benchmark for Art and Design which states ‘how an individual’s practice relates to that of others ... is the cornerstone of originality and personal expression. Without such knowledge, an individual would not have any sense of the nature of their own creativity or the culture in which it is set’ (Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education, 2008).

**The nature of creativity revisited**

In the Chester study undergraduate students were asked how they believed creativity to be assessed by their tutors. As the earlier account of the Chester survey describes, in summary they had no real or clear idea. In the convergence survey a rephrased question on this topic was again asked. The question this time asked ‘Do you understand by what measure your supervisors or tutors judge or assess creativity in your work?’ It was hoped given that the postgraduate level of the new sample with their previous experience of arts education this would afford the best opportunity to evaluate understanding in this area.

The responses here by participants who were unsure of how creativity was being assessed included:

C9) Not really, I think this is likely to be subjective to the supervisor.

C8) Probably not.

C12) I am not completely sure.

C3) No.

C5) Not really. Certainly a guide would be whether it is similar or not to work that they are familiar with.

C4) No as far as I am aware my creativity isn’t being assessed.

C11) Every person’s judgment derives from their ethic (sic) position or the institution they work in.
The responses by participants who believed they understood how creativity was accessed included:

C7) Degree/extent of originality.
C6) Challenge of processes involved in the field. If the work fills a gap in the field.
C1) Yes - original thought leading to original work.
C2) Strength of knowledge/insight underpinning theory or rationale.
C10) My supervisors assess creativity in my work through my writing and interpretation, as my work is theory based.

Whilst in terms of assessment awareness these results are an improvement on the Chester undergraduate study they are equally apposite in questioning why such a high proportion of postgraduates appear to express little understanding of how creative merit might be appraised.

Whilst earlier questions in the study suggest there may be some tacit understanding particularly at postgraduate level. These results suggest a high percentage of learners may have progressed through a system of arts education to postgraduate level with little explicit comprehension of how creativity might be assessed. It could be argued that there is in fact no necessity for students in art and design to understand how creativity is assessed. However it seems sensible that there should be some clarity around how these decisions are made. Furthermore it is difficult to see a reason why the process of assessing creativity should not made transparent to students and researchers in this field. In a similar way that The Ethics Project, (2006) reported that a new focus on research ethics signified a maturing of the visual arts research, it might be argued that a clearer communication of the principles of creative assessment might equally be beneficial.

The assessment of creativity in art and design education is a relatively new topic for investigation. Academics such as Susan Orr have observed the general process of assessment in art and design and commented on how it operates in a layered manner one where knowledge of the student and dialogue are important but acknowledges not enough is known about the process of appraising work. Orr (2010:1) notes that within ‘art and design lecturers often work together’ to assess work and posits that ‘for art and design lecturers, moderation conversations are a key site for judgement making’. Orr (2011:15) suggests that a ‘Lecturers’ own sense of their aesthetic informs how they classify students’ artwork and how, in doing so, they classify themselves’. Orr (2011:15) states that her key argument is ‘that within fine art values, artistic practices, assessment practices and identities are enmeshed’.

In light of this complex arts arena where creativity is venerated it is perhaps surprising at postgraduate level that when questioned, none of the students in the sample had ever
considered asking their tutors or supervisors to explain what was meant by term creativity or creative risk.

When the participants were asked if they thought people who took more risks in developing or producing their work were in general viewed as more creative or not, 84% stated that risk-takers were considered to be more creative. Explanations included:

C11) ‘I don’t think that this should be the case but it is and it is the way we explain creativity after the 70’s’.
C4) ‘Because you are willing to completely lose a piece of work in the chance that it could become something greater’.
C9) ‘Progress/advance come about gradually or in giant leaps. The giant leaps are associated more with risk-taking’.
C5) ‘Shock culture of the art world, avant-garde as ‘moving forward’ – soldier, violent, risk-taking’.
C3) ‘Risk-taking is fundamental to creativity’.

These responses would appear to correlate with earlier findings. Working at the boundaries of the subject area can sometimes result in work being assessed as outstanding. However, being in the vanguard itself presents risks, for example if the work is judged not to fall within the limits of acceptable practice or the field itself.

5.7. Discussion
The surveys have clearly identified that creative risk-taking, is both prevalent and considered by respondents to be an important part of the creative process.

In all groups one third or less of respondents state that contemporary art needs to be (by nature) ethically good or ethically justifiable. It would appear therefore that many visual arts respondents are adopting the pluralistic ethical approach advanced by Cashell, (2009). This contrasts with the utilitarian ethical model generally favoured by public institutions such as universities (Lawton, 1998; Hargreaves, 2008). As such this pluralistic approach has the potential to be problematic particularly if an ethical appraisal process becomes committed to ‘rigid notions of compliance’ (Bledsoe et al., 2007:640). However, there is also the need to distinguish between the role of researcher and the artist operating outside the academy.

Furthermore sometimes it is seen as justifiable to work ‘unethically’ or contrary to ethical norms when taking creative risks. For example the majority of the undergraduate sample stated that creative activity need not always be ethically justifiable nor was ethical evaluation necessarily
relevant to the appraisal of contemporary artwork. In many ways this is not surprising perhaps given the characteristics of creative personality which include norm-doubting and non-conforming (Feist, 1998; Feist and Barron, 2003).

Post-graduate researchers consider ethical appraisal might sometimes limit creative working and at other times support creativity. Whilst this echoes concerns expressed by a number of authors e.g. Bledsoe et al., (2007) over ethical regulation the visual arts position appears more nuanced than the literature implies. Post-graduate visual arts researchers appear to recognise that what constitutes ethical or moral codes is not fixed. They view creative risk-taking as being important. Whilst they are willing to actively consider breaking ethical codes in the pursuit of creative risk-taking they are also mindful of the duality of an ethical appraisal system. Sometimes it is an inhibiting influence whilst at other times it can be constructive for the work.

The surveys suggest that visual arts staff were likely to have received little in the way of explicit or formal ethical training, either generally or subject specifically. This finding accords with De Wet, (2010). However, it was likely they are familiar with the ethical process in their institution. Most at some point had experienced anxiety over ethical issues encountered in their students work. They sometimes took creative risks and generally viewed this as being important. Whilst acknowledging it was not always possible to ethically justify creative work, significantly it was clear they are reluctant themselves to actively consider breaking ethical codes in the pursuit of creative risk-taking. Staff, held reasonably clear personal views about what should not be permitted in terms of unacceptable student working. Additionally, the staff survey introduced thorny questions concerning who is responsible for determining levels of acceptable creative risk or validating creative risk and identified the significance of ethical regulation on positive or negative research outcomes.

The common ground identified in definitions of creative risk between the samples is interesting. Earlier in the literature review, the growing theoretical consensus around assessing creativity was identified. However, the literature review also highlighted the lasting difficulty defining creativity itself (Buckingham et al., 1995; Sennett, 2008; Readman, 2009). The tentative finding in the Chester survey that suggests students maybe unsure of the metric for its assessment is also pertinent. Could it be that this common perception of creative risk might provide a pathway to a better understanding of creativity and creative process? This would accompany the emergent consensus around assessment.

Set in the field of ethical appraisal the model below explores this hypothesis (see Fig. 7).
The learner is unsure of creativity or its assessment, however both tutor and learner share common definitions of creative risk which itself is enmeshed with creativity and creative process.

Figure 7. Creative risk as a pathway to contextualise creativity
6. Case Study Two
Developing an diagnostic ethical model for visual arts research

6.1 The need for investigation

‘Ethical issues raised by visual research are, arguably, distinct from those raised by purely textual data’ (Rosie Wiles et al., 2008:8)

‘Compared with other, more established subject areas, art, design and media are relatively new research disciplines, and have only recently begun to focus explicitly on the ethical implications of research’ ...‘Ethical judgments are highly context-sensitive and there are rarely simple right or wrong answers to the dilemmas faced by researchers’ (The Ethics Project, 2006)

One of the stated objectives of this research study is to explore a model for an ethical process within which a student might meaningfully and reflectively engage with ethical issues inherent in their creative work. The necessity for this work emerged following the 2008 pilot study described in the introductory chapter and the identification that centralised or generic systems of ethical appraisal were not the optimal solution for ethical appraisal within visual arts research. The failure to promote ethical understanding or competence; the absence of discipline relevant ethical criteria and the lack of encouragement for a reflective response by researchers were identified as areas of concern. The unfortunate reality was that established generic systems of ethical appraisal described by Bledsoe et al., (2007:593) as ‘generalised from the medical world’ were often of superficial relevance to visual arts research.

6.2 Research ethics in the Arts: An institutional context

From 2010 onwards, the period of this research study has coincided with an accelerated interest in research ethics. This preoccupation has not been discipline specific. The reason for this increased focus may be seen to derive from a variety of influences such as legislative processes, international initiatives, increased funding accountability, the promotion of collaborative work and publicised cases of misconduct. Many professional disciplines have simultaneously over this period attempted to refine their own codes of practice or frameworks for applied ethical principles. Long overdue legal developments such as changes to copyright legislation that affect both research as well as teaching and learning in higher education, have also influenced ethical thinking during this period.

In terms of research, ethical regulation within Higher education can be seen as being influenced by:

2. Government e.g.

3. Legal statute.

4. Professional guidelines.

5. Funding bodies e.g.
   a. *The UK Research Councils.*
   b. *European Commission.*

6. Collaborations.

7. International statements e.g.
   a. *Singapore Statement for Research Integrity 2010.*

A more expansive model on the pressures in a system of ethical appraisal for visual arts research, within higher education may be found in chapter three; *Chart one. Spencer (2016) with reference: Maletzke (1963) and Nowak and Wärneryd (1985).*

6.3 Ethical frameworks

The Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) is one of the seven Research Councils in the UK. It is charged with distributing research funding within the social sciences (RCUK, 2016). The organisation introduced its Framework for Research Ethics in 2006. Since then it has only funded research in research organisations where consideration has been given to ethical implications. Researchers in Art, Design and Media often reference the ESRC ethical framework, as it appears to offer a fuller series of recommendations over more general guidance cited by the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC). The ESRC approach which links research funding to ethical appraisal in organisations where appropriate arrangements are in place, exemplifies current practice.

Rosie Wiles et al., (2008:10) summarises ‘Ethics committees vary widely in the ways in which they assess applications for review and the conclusions they come to, even in highly regulated and established systems ... However, the general principles they assess are fairly uniform and are likely to comprise those outlined in the ESRC Research Ethics Framework’.

Some commentators on visual research methods such as Prosser and Loxley, (2008) have expressed strong concern that this increased focus on ethical compliance via frameworks such as those promoted by ESRC risks restricting the contribution to knowledge that might be made by visual researchers. Concern is raised that in some areas, such as work with vulnerable populations or connected to sensitive issues, visual research activity may come under pressure. The peril of
compliance leading to an emergence of low risk/no risk projects is raised by the authors. Interestingly Prosser and Loxley, (2008) reflect Cashell, (2009) and Lawton, (1998) in favouring ethical pluralism over a more rigid approach. However, this pluralistic approach is problematic in itself as universities are ‘uncertain what level of ethical violations will trigger institutional liability’, it leads them ‘to take an aggressively pre-emptive approach to compliance’ (Bledsoe et al., 2007:593).

6.4 The creative arts and a centralised university ethics system

Generally it can be observed that the guidance frameworks described above are incorporated into academic policy by higher education institutions and form the basis for internal ethical regulation. These policies are often deployed as a single unified cross-university system. Commonly this comprises a tiered approach to ethical appraisal with only the most serious ethical concerns being referred to a central ethical committee for deliberation. Most often these systems of ethical appraisal show little acknowledgement for the diverse spectrum of disciplines, instead deploying a generic ‘one size fits all’ ethical appraisal model. However, Lederman, (2007:317) postulates that the ‘complex landscape of research across the disciplines resists resolution into one homogeneous terrain’ in this way. This can lead to omissions within the process around ethical issues pertinent to visual researchers such as cultural copyright or exhibition and the inclusion of factors extraneous to this field such as questions concerning NHS or medical procedures. In turn this approach is generally coupled to a pervasive ‘managerial auditing’ approach (Lederman, 2007:314) which can lead to the impression that appraisal serves a only superficial or perfunctory function. This can result in ‘the potential for this anticipatory approach to foster a tick-box mentality, such that gaining ethics approval becomes a curiously disconnected facet of a research project's life’, (Miller et al., 2012:30).

Of additional concern are the findings from chapter five, which indicate only a small minority of undergraduate and postgraduate students have previously received any form of formal training in research ethics. De Wet, (2010) notes calls by staff for better ethical training within academic faculties, whilst Miller et al., (2012:34) confirm ‘the need for ethical training and thinking has become heightened’. Often when reviewing appraisal procedures it may also appear that ethics concerns proscribing activities, rather than being an active encouragement for fostering ethical thinking. The opportunity for communicating the positive benefits of ethical appraisal in terms of a research project is therefore sometimes lost. It should be noted that at the time of writing whilst the majority of ethical appraisal systems are paper based or a hybrid form/email system, more recently some institutions have begun to develop online versions that in theory allow clearer quality assurance evaluation. A comparative examination of an online system can be found later in this chapter.
6.4.1 The provision of cross-university ethical induction sessions for researchers

In some institutions such as Manchester Metropolitan University, attempts are made centrally to provide new postgraduate researchers with optional generic ethical training sessions\(^3\). Whilst all attempts to foster greater ethical awareness may be viewed as well meaning, this generic approach by its nature does not adequately allow for discussion of discipline specific issues. For example, themes particular to visual researchers include transgression within the arts or the complexity of copyright for visual researchers (explored in chapter three). Additionally, with reference to the findings from the 2008 pilot study it can be reasoned that to substantiate a system of competence based ethical appraisal, training should be mandatory rather than optional.

With this background in mind it was clear that there was a need to explore the development of a new ethical diagnostic model for visual arts researchers.

6.5 How far can you go? HEA and The University of Derby workshop 2012

From early in the study it was clear that the nature of visual arts practice contains an element of ethical ambiguity. Cashell, (2009) reminds us of the tension been appraising a work purely on its aesthetic merits versus recognising a moral component. Therefore in the development of any new model for ethical appraisal it was thought useful to seek the views of researchers whose work focused on the most prominent expression of this ambiguity, notably the transgressive area of visual arts research.

On 26\(^{th}\) June 2012 the University of Derby hosted an Ethics, Transgression and Independent Study Workshop. The event was promoted as an opportunity to learn from other experts in the field, share practice and explore what activities academics felt uncomfortable supervising. It aimed to scrutinise where the boundaries for acceptable student research lay. The programme included speakers whose academic interest and published research centred on the transgressive area of the visual arts. In a pre-conference announcement, Dr Steve Jones a speaker set out his position stating ‘Although transgressive texts are largely perceived as problematic because of their disruptive or controversial content, many of the ethical problems students encounter in conducting research into transgressive materials stem from formal institutional contexts rather than the materials themselves’.

What was notable at the event itself was the reluctance or caution expressed by many of the academics present to supervise transgressive visual arts research. This was despite the fact that they themselves were active in the field. The reasons for this reluctance appeared multi faceted.

\(^3\) A new mandatory system is to be introduced from September 2016
Firstly there was the sense that they were wary of being seen to encourage any postgraduate activity that might be viewed as illegal. There seemed to be differentiation between their personal research which they might academically justify and that of a student researcher. Furthermore given the nature of the event, there was little sense that institutional ethical appraisal, might be a useful method to determine whether research deemed as having a transgressive component might be acceptable. It was unclear if this was because the lecturers viewed their institutions as being reluctant in general to sanction transgressive work. However from later conversations this would appear to be the likely case. It was noticeable that the debate was led largely by academics from the field of film studies. There was an absence of contributions from those engaged with practice.

A final theme of the conference was a general acknowledgement that research ethics in the visual arts could not be done on the cheap. The highly context sensitive nature of visual arts research particularly in concern to areas of visual media arts or at its transgressive fringes was viewed as a demanding dialogue requiring carefully considered evaluation.

6.6 Differentiating external practice from Postgraduate research

The Derby workshop prompted the notion that perspectives on ethical behaviour might have a ‘situationist’ perspective where behaviour is determined by surrounding circumstances. For example it might be legitimate for an artist to attempt a creative work outside the academy that would be unacceptable in terms of academic research within its confines. In many ways this is an awkward dichotomy and a constraint on the overwhelming affinity for creative risk expressed by researchers in chapter one. Throughout this study there has been a predilection for avoiding an atmosphere encapsulated by the motif ‘welcome to the school of art – you can’t do that’, in other words to refrain from being overly prescriptive.

One of the challenges of visual arts research in relation to ethics at postgraduate level is the need to differentiate between professional arts endeavor that takes place outside of the academy and research activity operating under the auspices of an institution context. The challenge however is to do this without extinguishing the opportunity for risk-taking on which so much creative activity depends. Creativity by its nature involves risk (Hargreaves, 2008).

6.7 Researching a new model of ethical appraisal

6.7.1 The development of a discipline specific ethical introduction for visual arts students

As the main focus of this research study emerged, the central role of ethical appraisal became apparent. During 2011/12 the significance of the ethical scrutiny to pedagogy and creative risk
within art and design became increasingly evident. It was emphasised by inadequacies in the ethical review system both at Manchester Metropolitan University and generally across the sector.

With reference to the pilot PhD research ‘Media Practice and a Safe Curriculum’, it was clear it was inadequate simply to provide a student with a process or paperwork without an adequate induction, a proposition that within health and safety legislation would possibly invalidate the entire exercise. For an appraisal of safety, or for that matter ethics it can be argued that a participant needs to have a level competency within the field before exercising judgment.
The need therefore to develop an introductory session for researchers on ethical thinking was seen as a priority.

As part of this research study the ethical thinking or ‘Research Ethics in Art, Design and Media’ session, as it became better known, was developed at MIRIAD (Manchester Institute for Research and Innovation in Art and Design). The first sessions took place in early 2011. Whilst the sessions drew on some elements of an earlier ARHC study (The Ethics Project, 2006) they required the development of new materials particularly aimed at introducing basic ethical theory and concepts. This sought to link these concepts to a range of examples in order to both encourage discussion but also to clearly confront some of the areas of art and design media perceived as being more problematic from an ethical perspective. Over time these sessions were to be continually refined.

Cederblom and Spohn, (1991:202) argue the importance of not engaging in a form of ‘ethical indoctrination’. Rather they suggest the process of ‘teaching ethics’ should involve reasoning, dialogue and participation. It was decided therefore, to adopt a theoretical introduction interwoven with relevant examples, followed by selected case studies that researchers could explore in small groups. A key feature of the model was the opportunity for debate that the group work encouraged. For there to be a chance of making people act more ethically you have ‘to engage them in serious dialogue’ (Cederblom and Spohn, 1991:208).

The process of developing the session became extremely beneficial, as it required a clearer understanding of ethics and the complex rhetorics, which surround them (see Fig. 8). In this manner Monteverde, (2014:397) suggests ethical theories may be seen as ‘playgrounds by departing from students’ experience, to foster moral imagination’ by exploring ‘their situational adequacy and reasonableness’. The sessions began with discussion around illustrations of ethical dilemmas drawn from visual arts research and teaching. Saunders, (2010) argues that it is best to start with concrete examples and build to abstract ethical theories rather than the other way
about. Next an attempt was made to confront the inherent complexity of ethical theory that it has been noted as pedagogically problematic (Lawlor, 2007). Monteverde, (2014) suggests this excessive complexity may have become for some an argument against teaching ethics at all. Here the attempt is not to promote the use these theories within applied ethical case studies, rather it is the attempt to demystify the field. The session then moves on to applied research ethics and an examination of the ethical characteristics that are a feature of ethical debates within visual arts research. Subsequently to further encourage discussion, there are group activities using case studies and finally the opportunity to examine the MIRIAD appraisal checklist itself.

The resultant lecture draws on case studies provided by the Research ethics project, led by Birmingham City University and funded as part of the Arts and Humanities Research Council Collaborative Research Training Scheme. The Birmingham led project disseminated material, which was developed from research that took place between September 2005 and July 2006, involving a consortium of British universities. Helpfully one of the project’s major outcomes was to ‘provide material that is directly useful to research supervisors and their students as part of research training courses’.

The newly devised session ‘Research Ethics in Art, Design and Media’ was first delivered on 18th May 2011 and on 9th November 2011 at Manchester Metropolitan University as a standalone session (without a prototype ethics checklist) and at the University of Chester on 25th January 2012 (with the MIRIAD prototype ethics checklist 6.5 v2).

During the sessions debate was encouraged around the necessity of ethics in relation to art, design and media particularly in terms of research and the development of practice. Looking back on notes from these sessions there were some common themes. A system (i.e. checklist etc.) to encourage ethical appraisal was normally initially viewed as a purely bureaucratic procedure by participants. To ‘burden researchers with additional goals’ (Hammersley and Traianou, 2012:43). At the start of the encounter issues such as ‘aversion to forms’ or ‘danger of overthinking’ were occasionally raised within the groups. However in general, during the course of the session participants gradually began to see the value of ethical reflection as being more positive. Further complex analysis would emerge where the ‘function of the artist’ and an occasional desire to work ‘against prevailing moral code’ were highlighted. The possibility of engaging with ethics was occasionally seen as ‘a great opportunity’ in terms of legitimising an approach taken within the creation of an artifact. Three overarching themes emerged. Firstly that approaching ethics in the context of being an art, design or media research student, differs subtly from that of a

---

4 http://www.biad.bcu.ac.uk/research/rti/ethics/guidance.html (Accessed April 2011)
practitioner working outside the parameters of the academy. Secondarily, the nature of ethical appraisal needs to avoid being overly prescriptive and perhaps needs to resemble something closer to a dialogue. Finally and importantly, participants in the sessions appeared previously to have given only limited consideration to ethics and as such were unfamiliar with a range of implications and fundamental considerations.

---

**Figure 8:** ‘Seeking Gestalt: Ethics and Rhetoric. Spencer, (2011). In Appendix 3 there is a larger scale version.

---

### 6.7.2 Audit of existing ethical materials: MMU Ethics protocol 2010-2012

Towards the end of 2011 and beginning of 2012 concurrent with the *Research Ethics in Art, Design and Media* sessions it was becoming ever more evident that beyond the introductory session for art, design and media postgraduate students that an investigation or audit of student materials in this area was required. A range of materials and guidance connected to ethics was contained on the Manchester Metropolitan University, Research Enterprise and Corporate Development (RED) website[^5], taking the form of downloadable MS word or PDF documents. All relevant forms were downloaded and examined. Several findings were made in this area. Examples of inconsistencies observed include:

- The ethics checklist form refers to an assessment of risk yet provides no indication of a method for its appraisal.
- The ethics checklist form borrows heavily from the lexicon of medical ethics, only partially addresses issue of consent and overlooks the area of dissemination.

[^5]: [http://www.red.mmu.ac.uk/?page_id=110&pageparent=4](http://www.red.mmu.ac.uk/?page_id=110&pageparent=4) (Accessed 2011 and April 2012)
• Apparent absence of risk assessment paperwork.
• The two examples of consent forms provided on the RED site (on a separate disparate staff page\(^6\)), are again of medical origin and provide only partial guidance.
• Whist acknowledging the staff page’s claim to be ‘still being assembled’, the inclusion of twenty documents listed under ‘ethics forms’ is discursive.
• The question needs to be asked why is the staff page available at all externally?
• The photographic release form appears to be an internal MMU document yet is linked to the student page. No consideration or guidance is given regarding permission for video or film work, in terms of participants and location.

Finally, in a wider analysis that included management and governance documentation there was some inconsistency between documents, relating to the issue of consent. For example, the Faculty of Art and Design’s student guidelines on ethical issues (MMU Faculty Ethics Committee, 2004:2) stated that research questionnaires were not subject to ethical approval or review unless they targeted vulnerable groups or raised concern by a tutor. In addition, there was a requirement that participants completing questionnaires should not be identified. However elsewhere, corporate university guidance made no mention of the requirement for anonymised responses. Furthermore, this central policy advice exceeded the faculty requirement, by emphasising the need that prospective respondents must receive full study information prior to completing any questionnaire (MMU Informed Consent Policy, 2016:4). Clarification in this area could not be found in the university’s central ethical framework document. Instead researchers and staff were instructed ‘to make specific decisions on the basis of careful consideration of all contributing factors’ (MMU Ethical Framework policy 2011:1). To further confuse things on the MMU ethics website a prominent one page guidance PDF download made no mention of vulnerable groups, anonymity or research information but simply stated formal consent is unnecessary ‘when consent is implied - for example by the returning of a questionnaire’ (MMU Unnecessary consent, 2016).

6.7.3 The example of a project with an unforeseen ethical dimension: The tearoom installation

The illustration of a student project with ethical issues, is described below to provide an example of the complex and disparate nature of visual arts activities that require an ethical response. The example given here was also later used as a case study within the ‘Research Ethics in Art, Design and Media’ sessions.

\(^6\) http://www.red.mmu.ac.uk/?pageparent=3&page_id=56 (Accessed April 2012)
In early 2012 concurrent with the development of new introductory sessions aimed at encouraging ethical thinking and audit of ethical materials described above, an approach was made for ethical advice on a student project. It was thought that it would be useful to consider this small case study as it coincided with the development of the new MIRIAD process. A description of the activity is included here as a reference to the reality of dealing with everyday ethical issues faced within visual arts institutions. The project in question was described a ‘two-week intervention’ to take place in the Holden Art Gallery and consisted of the proposal to open a café business. In reality though the project read more as a hybrid art installation/ not for profit fundraising enterprise. Overall the critical pathway for delivery of this idea was unclear from proposal. There was also insufficient clarity concerning details of the food offer. It was equally unclear from plan if this was to be a student led project or staff led project. The main reason why it was originally singled out it for special attention however was the use of live birds in the installation. Interestingly in light of the requirement to determine which projects constitute research and therefore should be appraised, the project also represents an example of a visual arts activity that is a miscellany of research, taught and potential commercial elements. The ERSC definition of research as being defined as ‘any form of disciplined inquiry that aims to contribute to a body of knowledge or theory’ is helpful up to a point but it is sometimes difficult to quantify in visual arts terms particularly at undergraduate level. An ethical appraisal of the tearoom project raised a number of issues that are summarised here:

1) Use of the birds.

There are many different moral positions people can take regarding animal ethics, from totally human-centred to full animal rights. If we were discussing scientific research ethics, which of course we are not – then 3Rs – Replacement, Reduction and Refinement would be pertinent (RVC, 2016). It is legitimate however to question whether the effect of live birds might be achieved though replacement by other means and how the inclusion of live birds reflects the expectations of the broader MMU community. Whilst the proposal paid particular attention to the wellbeing of the birds and the involvement of a bird expert, people’s safety appeared less prominent within the plan. It needed to be considered how access to the area was to be regulated, particularly when the café was not in use. From the drawing provided by the students, the birds appeared to be positioned in a busy area (circulation space). How would the possibility of inappropriate behavior towards birds from café users be managed (feeding them cake, fingers through bars). The bird cage was at the height of small children which had the potential for lots of issues. As mentioned the distancing of the cage from the food preparation area was important as were the location of hand wash facilities. How could an adequate protocol to ensure the bird handlers wash their hands prior to any kitchen activities be evidenced?
2) Health and safety.
This is a dynamic process rather than static one and ongoing assessment was necessary particularly following the café build. Preferably evidence of student food handling/hygiene awareness would be required. It was unclear who would be responsible for signing off the risk assessment.

3) Food offer.
It was unclear where the cakes and other food came from and who was making them, an important consideration with regards food hygiene. How do you ensure preparation of cakes is completed in accordance with food safety regulations? There was a potential issue with regard to student supervision. There may also be an issue over allergy/contamination. Furthermore possible secondary ethical issues regarding welfare standards (organic or free range eggs etc.) needed to be considered in relation to the food that was to be sold.

4) Business plan/Use of student staffing.
The university has a duty of care to students and this will include the provision of adequate training. How is this evidenced? Within the plan ethically the owners of this project needed to be clearer how they might make money particularly given the nature of the enterprise. There was very little detail about costs in the plan or assumed sales and forecast for profit.

5) General.
To avoid anxiety to permanently employed MMU catering staff, it was apposite to ensure adequate communication of this temporary enterprise.

It is clear from the above example that any new appraisal system that is designed needs to be both flexible and comprehensive in order to respond to the spectrum of scenarios that the visual arts can conjure.

6.7.4 Interviews with creative arts lecturers
As part of the research for the new ethical process a small number of university lecturers were interviewed and questioned on their attitudes to ethics and creative risk. What emerges from the recordings of these interviews is a sense of ambivalence with regard to the role of ethics within the visual arts. This reflects the debates outlined around the fundamental question as whether aesthetic value and moral value are distinct (Cashell, 2009).

‘Ethics is erm ... we need to put question marks in peoples’ heads ... we need to ruffle a few feathers..we need to aggravate people ... prompt them, poke them ... but we need to be careful how we do this’. Senior lecturer in Art and Design
Interviewer: ‘Do you feel that work that expresses poor ethical judgement is also flawed in terms of creative merit?’ Programme leader: ‘No’ (quietly).

One lecturer remarked that it was the sense of risk that made the role enjoyable.

‘I do like to feel vulnerable so I think I may have crossed a line where the vulnerability of taking a risk is what I thrive on in the lecture … yeh…. For me its the thrill of my job’ Senior lecturer in Art and Design

The findings here reflect those from the surveys discussed in chapter five where the concept of ethical adherence was defined by mixed feelings or contradictory ideas. In an ethical appraisal process it would be reasonable to argue that there is little chance of confronting this underlying attitude unless the ethical process itself is explicitly discipline focused.

6.8 The concept of a diagnostic model

From the early ‘Research Ethics in Art, Design and Media’ sessions in November 2011 and January 2012, it was clear that ethical judgments in art and design media could be exceptionally complex. As such to succeed, ethical appraisal needed to balance a diagnostic checklist approach with the need to preserve a space for dialogue with project supervisors or for the researcher to seek guidance when required.

It was therefore decided to develop and test a new three-part scheme for appraising ‘project ethics’ (See Fig.9). The process incorporated the newly devised ‘Research Ethics in Art, Design and Media’ session as its necessary introduction.

This plan required not only a new protocol or framework for identifying ethical issues but clear guidelines that a student could refer to for advice. In this study’s audit of ethical approval forms already described, the tendency for institutions to foreground medical ethics on their forms had been observed. An issue noted by Prosser and Loxley, (2008) who expressed concern with the frequent use of the medical model of ethics particularly with reference visual research. Most forms sampled in the current study were also simple tick box affairs and often included a limited range of ethical issues that failed to reflect the nature of the art, design and media discipline.

During research for the development of the pilot ‘Research Ethics in Art, Design and Media’ sessions however, it had been noted that material developed in 2005/6 by the consortium of universities led by Birmingham City University, might provide a starting point. This material was
discipline specific and had the distinction and eminence of been borne out of a significant earlier Arts and Humanities Research Council funded research study.

6.8.1 The development of a new ethical appraisal form

For the first pilot it was decided to use the discipline specific ethical criteria, adopted in Birmingham City University’s research ethics project (2006), but importantly and uniquely to merge this with the two-part appraisal process commonly found in risk assessment. The reasons for this approach were primarily pedagogical and a direct response to the perceived inadequacy of the ‘tick box approach’ found within many institutions’ forms, an issue highlighted in the literature review. The ‘tick-box mentality’ (Miller et al., 2012:30). The problem with a purely tick box system was its inability to allow a more expansive or reflective response by the researcher. The Birmingham led research project had noted that ‘Ethical decisions are highly context sensitive and there are rarely simple right or wrong answers faced by researchers’. It therefore felt appropriate to allow participants in the new MIRIAD scheme the opportunity for a more developed response.

The aim was to encourage researchers to consider and reflect on ethical issues they had highlighted on the form. By linking these ethical issues to an individual element of their research methodology it was hoped they would reflect and space was provided for them to respond to the ethical issues that they had identified in their work. In turn the form provided scope for a considered response rather than being simply complete a tick box exercise. Pedagogically this approach required an active learning response from the researcher in order to complete.

The ethical criteria therefore comprised forty-three individual ethical issues divided into six categories of classification (see Appendix 1). These were derived from the Birmingham study and comprised the a) communal or general good, b) academic c) integrity and responsibility to the discipline, d) safeguarding the wellbeing of participants, research participants and informed consent, e) the management of data and f) dissemination.

The new MIRIAD process was originally to aimed at post-graduate researchers within the School of Art and Design. It marked a significant departure from the MMU institutional process in use at the time.

The new prototype checklist also included a synopsis of ethical guidelines that were an attempt at simplifying and disambiguating Manchester Metropolitan University’s current policy in this area. Their inclusion with hindsight was also useful in gaining the support centrally, within the institution for use of the new ethical appraisal form. It was clearly evident from the outset that
very few researchers were familiar with MMU policy documentation contrary to what might be presented as a notional university requirement. It was envisaged that the new document could then provide structure and basis for a dialogue with a supervisor or tutor.

The resultant document or MIRIAD Research Prototype number 1, was entitled “Ethics and your research proposal” (See Appendix 1). It should be emphasised that it was envisaged that the prototype would form one part of a three-stage ethical process or protocol (see fig.9). It should also be noted that later versions of the form would highlight the availability in stage two, of extra guidance sessions, as the benefit of encouraging participants to seek dialogue or guidance over ethical aspects of their work became apparent.

![The Ethics Approval Process comprises three main stages](image)


6.9 Stage 1. Testing the new ethical appraisal protocol. April 2012.

6.9.1 The University of Chester pilot session: Early testing of the new ethics diagnostic model.

The first full pilot of the new ethical process was conducted at the University of Chester in April 2012 using MIRIAD Prototype 6.5 v2 a revised version of MIRIAD Prototype 1 (see Appendix 1), allowing longer reflective comments by the participants. As the process was self-contained it was thought acceptable to hold this first test at the University of Chester rather than Manchester Metropolitan University. In this manner it would be less likely to be confused with any current procedural systems.

Prior to the test session students were issued with a short evaluation questionnaire. Delivery of the introductory session took approximately one and a half hours to complete and it was anticipated that the subsequent completion of the ethics diagnostic checklist would take approximately half an hour. Students were talked through though how to fill in the two-part
diagnostic checklist paperwork and any questions were answered. During the checklist session assistance was provided as it was requested. A reflection on the pilot is to be found below.

6.9.2 Analysis of completed University of Chester forms
Nine forms were completed and returned by participants in the University of Chester April 2012 trial. All the participants had attempted to complete the forms. It was noticeable that the requirement for individuals to provide a written reflection on their highlighted ethical issues provided the reviewer with immediate feedback concerning the engagement and comprehension of the participant.

The most common errors were the failure by participants to tick the ethical categories in Part A on page four and only transcribe the issues they presumably though relevant, directly to part B on page five. A second common error was to indicate several ethical issues but only address some of these in their response box. The range and quality of reflective responses varied as might have been envisaged. It was clear from the analysis that the instructions on page four and five of MIRIAD prototype, should to be improved. More emphasis was needed on providing participants with clear written instructions, immediately above or adjacent to the space for their response on the form.

6.9.3 Student feedback questionnaire on pilot ethical form
Most students said they found the process of completing the form ‘fairly easy’ or ‘very easy’. From the students who found the forms ‘quite difficult’ the major criticisms were, “Complicated and unnecessary language”, “Not enough explanation,” and a request to add definitions. When asked “do you think the process as described is a useful workable method for considering ethical issues?” the vast majority said yes, with a very small number ‘undecided’ and nobody stating ‘no’. Overall there was a call for more illustrations particularly for exemplar responses to common ethical issues and definitions for some of the technical terms such as ‘gatekeepers’ or ‘active consent. From analysis of the students’ own reflection provided by completion of their checklists it was clear that the column on page five; ‘response to ethic issues raised’ needed to be further highlighted within the design. For example within health and safety checklists of a similar format, colour is often used in this area.

6.10 Stage 2

6.10.1 The launch of the new ethical process within the School of Art and Design at MMU
Building on the Chester pilot in July 2013 it was proposed that the new ethical protocol be introduced from September 2013 for all new postgraduate MIRIAD researchers.
This would mean continuing the Research Ethics in Art, Design and Media sessions already established, but from September 2013 making attendance mandatory. In tandem with the taught session it was planned to introduce the new ethics checklist from the beginning of the autumn semester for future RD1 submissions. The first tranche of these RD1 submissions that would include the new ethical appraisal would be submitted by a deadline of 16\textsuperscript{th} January 2013.

In order to support the launch of the new system within the School of Art and Design a number of additional measures were implemented. Firstly, it was decided to offer a bookable, 'one to one', diagnostic sessions on the first Wednesday of every month. This would be aimed at individually helping researchers ethically appraise their projects and if necessary assist in completion of the new paperwork. It was also decided to run a research ethics event for staff on Wednesday 28th November 2013.

In planning this new initiative, careful consideration was given to whether the MIRIAD launch would have any consequential impact on the university’s centralised system of ethical appraisal. This centralised system had in fact itself been revised in October 2012. These modifications can be seen as a response to the increased sector wide focus on research ethics, documented earlier in this chapter. However the issues identified previously in the centralised system such as generic ethical criteria, no attempt to encourage a reflective response and a lack of research ethics training remained. In an attempt to align the more comprehensive MIRIAD protocol with the current institutional arrangement it was therefore decided to consider at what stage referral to the centralised system was required. It was determined that only projects identified under the MIRIAD protocol as requiring consideration by the central ethical committee of the university would be referred. On the 5\textsuperscript{th} December 2012 a Research Ethics in Art, Design and Media session was held for all postgraduates who where attempting a January 2013 RD1 submission.

6.11 Stage 3. The First Review

6.11.1 The Academic team review of launch of new model

On the 4\textsuperscript{th} February 2013 a meeting was held at the Righton building to review the first submissions made my postgraduate researchers using the new MIRIAD Ethical appraisal prototype (see examples of completed forms Appendix 2). Present at the meeting were Dr Myna Trustram, Professor Jim Aulich, Mathew Scarborough (the research degrees administrator) and Dr Amanda Ravetz. The meeting was convened to reflect on the introduction on the new system. Copies of all the submitted forms were circulated.
Initial analysis concerned the ability of this new appraisal process to demonstrate researcher engagement. It was readily apparent from the forms, which participants had fully engaged. The prototype document also provided a measure of the extent of ethical reflection by researchers. This was viewed a significant improvement over the traditional tick box system of appraisal where little in terms of comprehension or engagement could be discerned. The incorporation within the document of the forty-three ethical descriptors or prompts was also generally viewed as a substantial enhancement that more accurately reflected visual arts research.

Focus then moved on to the choice of ethical descriptors on page four of the form, specifically within the communal or general good section. There was some concern expressed that topics, like ‘the value of knowledge’ or ‘anticipated or unanticipated consequences’ were too complex concepts for the process. Conversely it was argued that this section’s categories often acted as a ‘thought promoting catch all’ or prompt for ethical discussion, that might otherwise be missed. This it was argued was particularly relevant as ethical appraisal in the visual arts by its nature could often be highly ‘context sensitive’ (The Ethics Project, 2006). In terms of researcher understanding it was also explained that participants would have attended the introductory taught session and additionally had access to one to one follow-up meetings if required. It was agreed however that page four would be improved if a clearer instruction to participants could be added at the top of the page.

The ethical appraisals submitted by the eleven researchers were then discussed. The academic team commended the exemplar submissions from three researchers. Particular focus was then given to three researchers who indicated that they had ethical issues but did not follow these up. Similarly, discussion also centred on two researchers who indicated that they had no ethical issues whatsoever. The committee recommended that a follow up meeting be arranged with these students to better understand these responses. The intention was to offer assistance if required to these researchers in completion of their ethical appraisals, whilst at the same time allowing the opportunity for further structured evaluation of the new process. Consideration was also given to researchers who might be unable to attend the mandatory introduction session. The case of overseas students was mentioned in connection with this. It was agreed to look at ways of providing additional support for these researchers. Following the meeting it was agreed to seek permission to use copies of the exemplar ethical appraisals that had been recognised by the academic team, in future introductory sessions.

Where it was not possible for a researcher to attend a taught session as in the case of an overseas student it was determined to offer Skype sessions to support completion of the MIRIAD prototype form.
Figure 10 below shows the breakdown of completed forms from the first cohort, discussed in the academic meeting on the 04/02/13. The grey portion of the chart indicates areas of successful completion. The ‘immediate referral’ column on the chart shows research that due to its nature had triggered mandatory referral to the Head of Ethics. In the MIRIAD prototype form, such activities are high-lighted by a ‘green box’. The researcher here for example had indicated three ‘green box’, or mandatory referral activities.

Analysis of the first ‘live’ forms to be completed by researchers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Completion of Ethical Categories</th>
<th>Ethical response attempted</th>
<th>H&amp;S form Submitted</th>
<th>H&amp;S Signed</th>
<th>Immediate referral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Researcher 1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher 2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes x 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher 3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher 4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher 5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher 6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher 7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No Despite flagging issues</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher 8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Stated form unavailable</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher 9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No Despite flagging issues</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher 10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher 11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No Despite flagging issues</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10. Initial overview of completed forms – Ethics and H&S procedure 2013
6.12 Stage 4. The ‘ethical abstainers’

Interviews with researchers who indicated no ethical issues present

Following recommendations from the 4th February 2013 academic review meeting, interviews were arranged for late February 2013 with a small number of researchers. These included three researchers who had provided incomplete forms and the two who indicated that their research study contained no ethical issues.

As these meetings took place under the auspices of the ethical research study, care was taken to seek appropriate consent from participants and the meetings were audio recorded to facilitate better subsequent analysis. Whilst these individual meetings were designed around a structured interview, care was taken to allow time to provide support and guidance to the participant in order that they would feel confident in completing the form to the best of their ability.

The main areas of questioning where:

1. When reflecting on your engagement with the new MMU ethical approval process – can you describe your overall thoughts?
2. What reflections do you have on the taught RIP session ethics session?
3. Were you aware of the ‘one to one’ help sessions that ran last term?
4. Looking at the reflection exercise booklet in its entirety were there any areas that you found confusing?
5. Before attempting to complete the paper work did you read the appendix: Researcher guidelines on ethical issues.
6. Looking at part A of the form, were there any terms that you found confusing or hard to understand?
7. Did you discuss the ethics process with your academic supervisor – was this helpful?
8. Do you have any suggestions on how the ethics process might be improved?

Meeting with Researcher ‘10’

This was a slightly unusual study where the researcher didn’t appear to be working with participants. The researcher initially expressed confidence in response to the structured questions above. Originally on their form the researcher had indicated that there were no ethical issues within their project. This was determined however not to be the case when the research project was discussed in detail. It became clear that an understanding of ethical terms was an issue. Several areas of ethical involvement were identified by the end of the one to one session.
Meeting with Researcher ‘11’
Researcher ‘11’ initially didn’t think ethics was necessary, but had also failed their RD1 submission with a poor methodology (i.e. No wider engagement with arts community etc.). The submitted form had raised some ethical issues but no attempt had been made by the researcher to respond to these. The researcher raised a valid concern the over the topic heading ‘cultural copyright’ and sought further understanding. Researcher ‘11’ was provided examples of exemplar consent forms. By end of session the researcher appeared satisfied on process and a number of potential ethical areas were highlighted and responses considered. This meeting prompted the idea that in next introductory session it might be beneficial to allow ‘hands on’ time for researchers to begin completing their ethical appraisals. Researcher ‘11’ also offered to trial a new interactive version of form (MIRIAD Prototype 7.9bv) that was in development for overseas researchers following the 4th February 2013 academic review meeting. Researcher ‘11’ was subsequently the first respondent to submit electronically.

Meeting with Researcher ‘8’
Originally on their form the researcher had indicated that there were no ethical issues within their project. Researcher ‘8’ stated they were originally dissuaded from completing the form as they thought that a text based or written theoretical project didn’t need much ethical consideration. This is a theme strongly reminiscent of De Wet, (2010). Researcher ‘8’ seemed to understand the ethical categories well and was the most confident of all candidates interviewed in terms of comprehension of the ethical criteria. Following a discussion about the researcher’s project, by the end of the session three areas for ethical consideration had been identified in this candidate’s study.

Meeting with Researcher ‘9’
The form submitted by Researcher ‘9’ raised some ethical issues but no attempt had been made by the researcher to respond to these. There was a sense here that the supervisory team may have been unfamiliar with the ethical appraisal process. Indeed, a general need for better ethical training for academic staff is identified by De Wet, (2010). This is important to counter what Bledsoe et al., (2007:594) cite as sometimes ‘resentful compliance’ or ‘fearful avoidance’ of ethical procedures. Researcher ‘9’ demonstrated some lack of understanding over terms. The researcher acknowledged that she didn’t take up one to one help sessions that had been offered to this first group of researchers. Researcher ‘9’ was initially wary over overtly ‘political or bureaucratic processes’ and thought perhaps that as she was a theory-based student the ethical categories on the form didn’t apply. The reference to bureaucracy here is redolent of Bledsoe et al., (2007). However, after the meeting the researcher stated she appreciated that with hindsight
the process is benign and aimed to help. Researcher ‘9’ also posited the idea that academics should be doing these basic things already.

Meeting with Researcher ‘7’
This participant had indicated ethical issues on the form but no attempt had been made to respond to them. Researcher ‘7’ stated that the taught introductory session had ‘opened up my eyes’ to ethics. The researcher commented that the visual examples of ethical issues used in the taught session, brought relevance to what might have been a dry subject. The researcher also questioned whether their supervisors had enough knowledge of ethics to be able to give guidance in the area. He suggested that this lack of knowledge might represent ‘a break in the process’. When pressed on their understanding of the ethical descriptors within the form the researcher conceded that descriptors under the section ‘the communal or general good’ were probably the most difficult. However this was again linked to the need to be able to discuss project ethics with the supervisory team and connected again to issue of staff awareness of the ethical process. Researcher ‘7’ also suggested that whilst they found the ethical guidelines section overlong ‘I probably skimmed through it’, the glossary at the back was useful.

Overall the sessions with this ‘ethical abstainer’ group proved very useful.
The four main reflections on these meetings were:

• The need for staff training to adequately support the new system.
• To investigate what further support could be developed to promote a better understanding of some of the ethical descriptors identified as being more ‘difficult’.
• To examine how the relevance of the process could be promoted to researchers who considered themselves primary engaged with written or theoretical research.
• To explore what technologies could be deployed to embed guidance within the prototype itself.

Exploring interactivity and an electronic version of the checklist
As early as February 2013 following the sessions with the five researchers who had submitted incomplete forms it was starting to become clear that more needed to be done within the prototype document to aid better ethical understanding. This was particularly evident with reference to some of the ethical descriptors on page four. Around this time there had already been some experimentation with a PDF version of the MIRIAD Prototype 7.9av4a, which allowed text to be input. This was originally devised in order that overseas students would be able to electronically submit their ethical assessments.
The potential capabilities of interactive layered PDF files made using Acrobat software were already well known. There was an awareness that considerable care would have to be taken to avoid compatibility issues and that little work had been done to evaluate more sophisticated applications of this technology. It was also noted that there appeared to be few examples of more complex interactive PDFs in general use.

6.13.1 Potential benefits of an electronic version
The main benefits of exploring an electronic version further included the hope that extra depth could be added to prototype document possibly in the form of additional guidance or examples specific to the visual arts. It was envisaged that by employing mouse clicks and roll overs to aid comprehension the prototype could become richer without necessary becoming tediously overlong. A number of research studies had explored the potential of interactive PDFs notably in the field of medical research publishing (Barnes et al., 2013; Kumar et al., 2010).

Within this study there were a number of reasons when considering interactivity that a PDF route was chosen over an online web-based solution by the author: 1) the PDF route would allow a shorter response time to revise content during the research project; 2) it was thought beneficial to preserve the option of a paper-based document for class based teaching; 3) the PDF solution would not require a complex back end data base; 4) it was thought expedient to be able to operate independently away from the institution’s current IT infrastructure, particularly during the pilot research; 5) it would be intriguing in terms of communication design to see how far the possibilities afforded by a relatively inconspicuous yet ubiquitous software format could be refined.

6.13.2 Piloting an interactive version of the form
A small number of researchers had begun to trial an early version of an electronic document (MIRIAD Prototype 7.9bv) from February 2013. This prototype was a fairly basic revision of the standard document and simply allowed the user to type directly into the form or check boxes to indicate selections. No technical difficulties had been encountered and the returned forms were generally inline with expectation. Work therefore began on a more complex prototype. The aim was to create a document that would provide interactive guidance when required. If for example, a user rolled over an ethical descriptor on page four of the document, a paragraph of explanatory text would be revealed. Other features like hyperlinks from the document to online resources and rollovers to enlarge examples of consent forms were also to be included. These modifications would be targeted in response to on-going feedback from users and were envisaged as improving the resources available to those completing to form.
This development work resulted in MIRIAD Prototype 8 (see Appendix 1). These new forms were coded orange in colour to immediately distinguish them from earlier versions. It should be noted that at this point it was considered prudent to retain the researcher guidelines appendix, from earlier versions of the document. The rationale was that it would be sensible to seek feedback on how the interactive elements performed before removing the guidance entirely. During the evolution of this new PDF prototype several technical issues were encountered. For example the prototype employed the device of turning the visibility of layers in the document, on and off. However the results for some remote users were not optimal. Reports of ‘show through’ from background layers were received.

Whilst these users had correctly employed Acrobat reader or Acrobat pro to view the document it was discovered that a default setting on some versions of the software was creating a conflict. The only way round this problem was to provide guidance to users to turn off ‘show border hover colour’. This had the immediate effect of remedying the issue. A second issue, which was to be more much more problematic was the propensity for users to click on the prototype file and open it directly into Apple Preview software. It is perplexing given the usual sophistication of Apple products, but Apple Preview software does not support a ‘layers function’ in PDF documents. Initially this was to create some significant problems, but over a period of time a range of solutions were developed to limit this problem. These included guidance on using the document in the taught session, setting the default of the prototype to seek Acrobat, so it would always initially search for Acrobat first, and clear technical instructions to the user on the first page of the document itself. Later a more sophisticated embedded device would be incorporated to show a large red warning box, if there was the attempt to open the prototype in software other than Acrobat. Barnes et al., (2013) discuss experiencing similar technical compatibility issues when incorporating interactive 3D images within PDF files.

A final technical hurdle was surmounted after it was discovered that the MMU was running a very old version of Acrobat Reader on its network. This required a final adjustment to MIRIAD Prototype 8 (fig.11).

From early May 2014 the new form entered use. In June 2014 the prototype was placed on the university website for download by visual arts researchers. This was the first time that a MIRIAD Prototype had been distributed in this way.
6.14 Stage 6. Interim Findings

6.14.1 The January 2015 review of submitted appraisal forms

In the second half of 2014 it had become evident that a second major review of submitted forms was essential. One of the characteristics of a study of this nature is that to some extent it is dependent on the timescale of the research degrees process. Furthermore whilst new prototypes can be developed the opportunity to appraise these forms in situ, is concomitant with research committee submission deadlines and departmental processes.

By January 2015 however a significant number of ethical appraisals forms had been obtained as to warrant a reflective evaluation of the process to far (fig.12). The majority of these forms had been submitted between December 2013 and September 2014 and therefore related to MIRIAD Prototype 7.9v4.

It was gratifying to see the large number of examples that contained evidence of a thorough reflective response to the ethical issues indicated. Eight of the seventeen appraisals were assessed as either good or exemplar in this respect, with a further three being evaluated as reasonable attempts at a reflective response. Of concern however were the five submissions where no ethical issues had been identified. More pertinent still was the fact that three of these appraisals had been signed off by a supervisor. During 2013/2014 it was becoming increasing clear that the majority of visual arts activity at post-graduate level contained some ethical perspective. The hypothesis therefore, might have been to expect one or two submissions from the sample to indicate no ethical issues. Five was at the higher end of expectation. Concern was expressed whether there were echoes here from the February 2013 interviews with the ‘ethical abstainer’ group of researchers, where findings had suggested that lack of staff knowledge might represent a ‘break in the process’. An attempt at staff training on the new MIRIAD ethics process had been made as early as November 2012, but uptake at these sessions remained regrettably low. For the most part when visual arts staff did become involved with the new system they were
supportive and appreciated that the aim to encourage a greater awareness of ethical thinking, was a positive one. The reasons for low take up are unclear. However, in relation to staff ‘it is clear that ethical clearance procedures in research are sometimes at least initially, deemed unnecessary, excessive and hypercritical’ (De Wet, 2010:303), or viewed a ‘imposing unnecessary hindrances to academic teaching and research’(Bledsoe et al., 2007:618). However there was obviously more scope for staff development particularly with those staff supervising post-graduate study.

The overall evaluation drawn from the January 2015 review was that the high level (47%) of good or exemplar reflective responses was reassuring. In the meantime results were awaited from the first batch of interactive Prototype 8 forms.

**Analysis of the January 2015 review of appraisals.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Completion of Ethical Categories</th>
<th>Ethical response attempted</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Prototype version</th>
<th>Immediate referral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Researcher 12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Good evidence of reflection</td>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 7.9v4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher 13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>States no ethical issues Signed off by supervisor</td>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 7.9v4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher 14</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Exemplar evidence of reflection</td>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 7.9v4</td>
<td>Yes -3, Vulnerable populations, Gatekeepers &amp; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher 15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>States no ethical issues Signed off by supervisor</td>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 7.9v4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher 16</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Thorough evidence of reflection</td>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 7.9v4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher 17</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Limited response given issues raised</td>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 7.9v4</td>
<td>Yes -2, Consumption of food stuff &amp; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher 18</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Reasonable response also referenced on H&amp;S form</td>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 7.9v4</td>
<td>Yes -2, Working outside the UK &amp; Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher 19</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>States no ethical issues</td>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 7.9v4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher 20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Thorough evidence of reflection</td>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 7.9v4</td>
<td>Yes -1, Working outside the UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher 21</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Exemplar evidence of reflection</td>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 7.9v4</td>
<td>Yes -3, Gatekeepers, Conflicts of interest and Reputation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.15 Stage 7: The March 2015 review of interactive submissions

The first fully interactive prototype 8 forms emerged from the research degrees process for evaluation in March 2015. These mainly derived from the January 2015 deadline for RD1 submissions. A total of eight forms were received, one of which was submitted on the older MIRIAD Prototype 7.9v4. An analysis of these forms is presented in Figure 14.

It was immediately clear that some researchers had experienced technical difficulties with the interactive prototype. Four of the seven prototype 8 appraisal forms, exhibited technical issues. It should be noted however, that removed from these very clear technical problems evidence of researcher reflection was in line with the expectation derived from the January review of forms.

6.15.1 Technical issues present in the first ‘live’ interactive forms returned.

There was a range of technical problems evident in the submitted forms. A common feature was the presence of digital artefacts, unwanted or unintentional alteration to the data (Fig.13). This indicated that at some point the document might have been saved outside of Adobe Acrobat software. It was known issue that saving a layered PDF in software such as Apple Preview, had the effect of flattening these layers. This in turn would result in transparent layers appearing as undesired digital artefacts in the new document.

What was puzzling was the fact that so many of the submissions indicated technical issues, particularly in light of the extensive testing before release of the prototype. There were a number of hypotheses why this might be the case.
1) The possibility that one researcher had downloaded the prototype, saved it outside of Acrobat and then forwarded it to other researchers.

2) A corruption had occurred with the original file.

3) The guidance on use of the prototype had not been clear enough and researchers had simply opened the document straight into Apple Preview software.

It was thought that option three was the most likely. Fortuitously this was reinforced in late March 2015 when two researchers separately sought Skype help interviews complaining that they could not make the PDF work correctly. In one instance it was clear that the researcher had indeed unknowingly saved the original file in Apple Preview in the other instance it was thought highly likely. It was therefore agreed that more work needed to be done to avoid a reoccurrence of this issue.

Figure 13. Display of artefacts on completed form

### Analysis of the March 2015 review of interactive submissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Completion of Ethical Categories</th>
<th>Ethical response attempted</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Prototype version</th>
<th>Immediate referral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Good evidence of reflection</td>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 7.9v4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Completion of Ethical Categories</th>
<th>Ethical response attempted</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Prototype version</th>
<th>Immediate referral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Good evidence of reflection <strong>No technical issues</strong></td>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 8</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Completion of Ethical Categories</th>
<th>Ethical response attempted</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Prototype version</th>
<th>Immediate referral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Reasonable evidence of reflection <strong>No technical issues</strong></td>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 8</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Completion of Ethical Categories</th>
<th>Ethical response attempted</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Prototype version</th>
<th>Immediate referral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Good evidence of reflection <strong>Some technical issues on p4</strong></td>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 8</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 6.16. Stage 8. A new four-page prototype

### 6.16.1 Simplification of the form (From Postgraduate to Undergraduate)

During the period of the research between 2012 and 2015 the ethical checklist central to the diagnostic model developed at MIRIAD had progressed through several revisions. These revisions already described in previously, were the result of continued feedback from the on-going trial.

During the period of this research study the main governing organisations engaged in Higher Education within the UK have continually sought to promote the requirement for the highest standards of rigour and integrity in all aspects of research. This culminated in 2012 with the publication of a signed concordat to support and promote research integrity. The concordat may be seen as a response to the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity (2011).

Central to the 2012 concordat are requirements on employers of researchers (i.e. universities) regarding:

- ‘having clear policies on ethical approval available to all researchers’
- ‘making sure that all researchers are aware of and understand policies and processes relating to ethical approval’
- ‘supporting researchers to reflect best practice in relation to ethical, legal and professional requirements’
- ‘having appropriate arrangements in place through which researchers can access advice and guidance on ethical, legal and professional obligations and standards’

Also importantly in light of the MIRIAD research process, the concordat reinforces an area that has been central to the project from the beginning, namely the need for a pedagogical element to ethics or ethical thinking. The concordat clearly emphasises the requirement for:
• ‘suitable learning, training and mentoring opportunities to support the development of researchers’
• ‘support and strengthen understanding and application of research integrity issues (for example postgraduate and researcher training, or process reviews)’
• And finally and again importantly:
• ‘discipline-specific guidance’

It is worth noting that whilst the concordat in often referred to in support of an ever-expanding need for ethical appraisal of activity within all areas of higher education, its focus is primary on research activity. As such caution should be applied before transposing the need for ethical appraisal with alacrity, to all intuitional enterprise such as taught activity etc. One of the confounding issues that this study has identified, is the fact that research and taught activity at undergraduate level can often been seen as analogous. It is noticeable however that the concordat has prompted more institutions to reconsider ethical appraisal in light of undergraduate activity.

‘Discussions on research integrity often focus on when researchers should be taught about the principles of good research conduct and the perils of questionable practices and misconduct. Many would say that this teaching is essential for PhD students and early-career researchers. Others argue that it should be taught earlier, at the undergraduate stage. They feel it would benefit undergraduate students and prevent PhDs students and new researchers from learning about the issues too late’. (BioTechniques on the need to teach undergraduates about research integrity, 2012:online)

In January 2015 at MMU in response to growing calls that undergraduate students should more fully engage with ethical process, the possibility of a further redesign of the MIRIAD prototype emerged. These suggestions emerged at the same time as the review of ethical appraisals was being undertaken as part of the January 2015 project review. The proposal was to consider if undergraduate cohorts across the Faculty of Art and Design could utilise the ethical process already deployed to the faculty’s postgraduate research students.

The possibility of extending the MIRIAD ethical process to a much larger audience raised a number of serious questions. How could the ethical thinking sessions be replicated on such a large scale? Was it appropriate to expect undergraduates to engage an ethical appraisal process of this type? In recognising the pressures to expand regulation Kim et al., (2009) cautions that the cost of regulating minimal risk research may greatly out way the ethical benefits afforded by such an approach. However, the proposal to consider a more ubiquitous application of the MIRIAD
prototype prompted a major rethink and triggered several significant improvements to the checklist (see Appendix 1).

6.16.2 The opportunity to make major improvements to the prototype

Firstly, the nature of language employed in part A, of the form (under the ethical categories section) still divided some users. It had been retained as the open-ended nature of these category descriptors encouraged debate and for a postgraduate audience was seen as less prescriptive and therefore more in keeping with a highly context sensitive exercise. This on the whole was seen as befitting the nature of the creative arts field, at postgraduate level. As has been previously described in the earlier chapter, a number of attempts had already been made to support the understanding of these ethical category descriptors for example in the electronic version of the form, via roll-over or ‘pop up’ explanatory text. Additionally from 2014, the format of the taught introductory ethics session had been revised to encourage researchers to engage with the checklist more fully. Researchers were now prompted to start completion of the form and to initiate the process of ethical reflection within the workshop itself. This was a development that had been well received. However, for a small but distinct group of participants, a number of the category descriptors particularly those in section A1 – A6, remained stubbornly troublesome. These descriptors included ‘Potential Applications of Research’ and ‘Anticipated and Unanticipated Consequences’ as well as ‘The Value of Knowledge’.

It should be noted that on the whole the researchers who had most difficulty with this section were often those who had missed the introductory workshop. This difficulty was also observed to coincide more frequently with researchers with less computer confidence, under extreme time pressure or overseas students completing the process at distance. Never the less, in terms of the research study it was considered significant that before any major escalation of the ethical exercise, these issues would need to be addressed further.

Therefore each of the 43 category descriptors on page four of the Prototype 8 ethics form, were changed to read as questions. For example:

‘The Value of Knowledge’, became ‘Is it difficult to sufficiently justify that the project is of value to personal/creative development or academic understanding’? Meanwhile similarly ‘The Problem of Relevance became Does the project lack relevance to your field of study?’

A second aspect of the postgraduate form was its length. At twelve pages long in its paper form it was bulky. The advent of the electronic version of the form was in some aspects a response to this. Whilst there had been little feedback indicating that the length of the original form was deterring engagement with the process, the prospect of distribution on an expended scale
prompted a re-examination of the format. There was speculation that at undergraduate level a shorter document would be preferable or more appropriate.

It was therefore proposed that the new version of the form would instigate a different approach to this supporting material. Instead of the twelve-page version of the ethics form a new four-page document would be developed. Replacing the mainly generic MMU guidance section at the end of the old version, the new document would incorporate a component including specific media and arts related ethical examples. It was decided to place this prominently on the front page.

![Figure 15: Thumbnail of Prototype 15.7. Spencer, (2015).](image)

This task highlighted a number of issues notably the issue of technical compatibility raised in the analysis from the March 2015 project review.

The new document (fig.14) would rely more than ever on the ability of Adobe Acrobat software to produce a complex layered interactive PDF. This would mean a more technically demanding document, one with upwards of twenty layers and many embedded links. This would inevitably create a larger file size. Whilst this was unlikely to create any issues downloading from a university server there was a desire to keep the file size as low as possible to facilitate easier email attachment particularly from student home email accounts. The Prototype 8 version was already 2.9 megabytes. The eventual file size for Prototype 15.7 was 8.8 megabytes. More importantly perhaps than these technical issues was the eventuality, that as the document became more heavily reliant on electronic delivery, the link with a paper-based version would be lost. The original proposal had always valued the importance of a physical document. It allowed completion of the form when there was no IT infrastructure present. It was in a pedagogical sense useful for group activities and the introductory ethical sessions. However as part of the research study it was considered appropriate to follow the general predilection for electronic documents and appraise the result.

A range of case study examples of ethical issues specific to art, architecture, design and media were developed. (See figure 16).
Each of the images or text in the figure above is designed to reveal either a brief definition, an explanation layer within the document itself, or link externally to a website with a fuller illustration of the arts and design related example.

Several further amendments to the form were then made. As mentioned it had been noted earlier in the March 2014 review of early prototype 8 submissions that some participants in the appraisal process we missing the advice that the electronic version of the document would only work correctly in Adobe Acrobat Reader or the full version of the Acrobat software. In prototype version 8 of the ethics form this advice was prominently displayed at the top of the covering page. However, there was fundamental flaw in this premise i.e. by the time a participant had opened the document to read this advice it might be too late, as it may already be open in Apple Preview.

Within the media and the creative arts there is a high usage of Apple Macintosh computers that come preinstalled with Apple Preview. This software is Apple’s proprietary image and PDF viewer within the OS X operating system. If the electronic ethics document was opened in error and saved in Preview many of the features of the form and potentially data would be corrupted or lost. It had been noted that a number of students from each postgraduate cohort would
encounter difficulties in this way. The redesign of the form provided the opportunity to include an embedded device that would display a warning if the new document were to be opened in anything other than Acrobat (see figure 18).

The new form also utilised a further possibility afforded by Acrobat. Having been reduced from twelve pages to four, the space for student reflection had been reduced. Given the central importance of this element to the exercise, the new electronic version was amended to allow unlimited reflective data to be entered by utilising scrolling text in the reflection section.

Finally small adjustments were made to the text in the checklist in preparation to meet a wider faculty audience for example a new heading to encompass the faculty structure at the undergraduate level.

### 6.16.3 Determining which undergraduate projects might require completion of the form

The next major factor before any expansion of the process could be considered, was how to determine which undergraduate (or taught?) activities would require completion of the ethics exercise?

For example formal ethical appraisal at undergraduate level could be required for:

- All student projects including group projects
- All student led activities or self-directed study
- All research activities outside of taught sessions (though within Art Design Media these delineations of these two definitions are sometimes conflated).
- or Projects where there was a major research element
- or Projects involving human participants or personal data. (*Ethical review, CUREC Oxford University*: online)
- or Projects determined as higher risk by a tutor or director of studies. (*University of Warwick Arts Ethics Review Form*, n.d.), (*Research Ethics and Integrity - The University of Sheffield*: online)
or “Research involving human participants or other species beings or with data and materials derived from such participants or that might unduly affect the environment of such beings” (Governance of Research Ethics Committees, Goldsmiths, University of London: online.)

or at undergraduate level “Research that concerns human participants or other species” (Governance of Research Ethics Committees, Goldsmiths, University of London: online), (Undergraduate Online Handbook, Manchester University: online)

• or conversely, projects could excluded form the process if they subscribe to a predetermined criteria and are therefore considered to be of minimal risk. The following example from the Goldsmiths College University of London website (accessed 8/08/2015), lists what might be considered indices of minimal risk factors. This includes ‘Research with secondary data (providing that such data sets are anonymised); research that doesn’t involve vulnerable persons or groups (e.g. children and young people, the mentally ill, persons with cognitive impairment, etc); research that doesn’t involve sensitive subjects (such as sex, drug use, violence, or ‘race’); research that doesn’t involve permission of a gatekeeper for access to persons or groups of persons; research that doesn’t involve deception or that is not covert; research that doesn’t involve access to personal or confidential records; research that doesn’t bring about psychological or physical harm, duress or anxiety; and research that is not intrusive in any physical or psychological manner’.

However, if a decision was made to roll out ethical appraisal to selective undergraduate projects in this way the issue of how to adequately deliver a subject specific ethical thinking session remained.

6.17 Stage 9: The student workshop evaluation events for the simplified form

6.17.1 Performance Arts session and feedback
In February 2015 an ethics workshop was organised to test the new shortened Prototype 15.7 form. The undergraduate group selected for this first test were drawn from the Department of Media. It was envisaged that the range of media and drama related activities encountered by these students on their course would provide a good first test for the shortened form.

This ethics workshop and evaluation session took place in March 2015 and comprised 20 students. The structure of the session followed the well-established format developed over the course of this study. It comprised an introduction to ethics with in Art, Design and Media and employed case study examples. Participants were encouraged to ask questions and share their
experiences. As in all the ethics sessions at MIRIAD the emphasis was on dialogue, debate and an encouragement for ‘ethical thinking’.

The introductory session went well. The central point raised by the student group concerned whether ethical appraisal was appropriate for students who considered themselves not necessarily the originators of their own major project work. (Acting in plays under direction, Musicians, Conservatoire etc.) Undergraduates in this group voiced concern that an ethical appraisal system in the current format, lacked relevance as they were not the authors in relation to their main activities. During a useful and constructive discussion, the group provided examples of why they were not able to complete the checklist. These concerns centred around, the control and authorship of their course material and activities. This was an unexpected finding, but significant and would encompass endeavours such as acting in plays under direction, musicians and the conservatoire approach in general. Furthermore, one student raised an ethical issue relating to the selection of material (plays) by tutors. The example of feeling uncomfortable been required to work with certain material was expressed.

These findings also clearly signalled the need for a second pilot test of Prototype 15.7 with a different visual arts cohort.

6.17.2 Unit X student session and feedback on simplified form

Unit ‘X’ is the title given to a cross-disciplinary student design activity. It takes place annually within the school of Art and Design at MMU. Given that Unit ‘X’ students were drawn from across the Art and Design Faculty it was considered that this diverse group would provide a broad second test for the Prototype 15.7 form.

This ethics workshop and evaluation session took place in May 2015 and comprised 19 students. Responses from the feedback questionnaire were generally supportive of the process. All the respondents stated they did not encounter technical difficulties with the interactive document. One, however, later stated a problem getting all the rollovers to work. This may have been due to the ‘signposting’ of this interactivity within the document itself and not a software issue. When asked ‘How useful did you find the rollover examples and links within the document?’ the students all stated ‘good’, apart from the one student previously stated who expressed difficulty with accessing the information. In response to the question ‘Can you think of any improvements to the rollover examples or links?’ one student expressed a concern understanding question B1 on the form i.e. ‘Is objectivity central to your study?’ The linked reference here is Christopher Frayling’s 1993 paper, Research in Art and Design. It is now clear with hindsight that for an undergraduate audience a much simpler example would have been sufficient.
Question four which enquired ‘How useful was it to respond on page 3, to the ethical issues you had indicated earlier?’ elicited comments such as “It did make it easier to explain how there was no issue with yes points” and “It forced you to develop a clear understanding of the issue and how you can overcome it”. These are clearly positive comments, as major criteria from the beginning of the study have been to avoid a climate where students were reluctant to fully engage for fear of their ideas being proscribed and rather to encourage a student response to any issues raised. Most students stated ‘good’ in answer to question five when asked if the form was easy to complete, with only one saying it was average. When asked to suggest how the checklist could be improved one student advanced the possibility of an online version of the form. Another student commented that the use of colour behind text made it a little hard to read whilst this was countered by another who declared ‘the form itself was simply laid out and made sense’. There was some evidence that two questions in section ‘A’ required further support or clarification, in addition to question B1 already mentioned.

In question seven the students were asked if the process of completing the form had raised any new ethical considerations for their project. One student appeared to not to connect the term ‘research’ to practical work so did not feel the checklist fully applied to them. Further answers where the checklist was useful in encouraging a reflective response, included a student who intended to pay collaborators and who was also prompted for the first time to consider the health and safety aspects of their work. Another student commented that it made them consider things in more detail. Finally question nine sought to determine if students thought it would ever be justifiable to withhold information from an ethics form – the majority stated that it was never justifiable. This finding correlates with chapter five where undergraduates generally acknowledged research ethics to be relevant whilst at the same time also indicating that creative activity need not always be ethically justifiable nor was ethical evaluation necessarily relevant to the appraisal of contemporary artwork. An example of the questionnaire can be found in appendix 13.

6.17.3 Unit X (cross disciplinary design group): the appraisal of returned checklists
All the forms electronically submitted opened correctly and none were corrupted as has been witnessed in the earliest versions of the electronic document. This is a possible indication that the automatic software warning function was doing its job. The returned forms were generally consistent in terms of transposing any highlighted ethical issues and attempting a response to address ethical concerns. There was evidence again of an issue with question B1, where having highlighted it, a student failed to transpose it onto page three in order to provide a response.
Amusingly one student managed to create a new tick icon that they applied both to their questionnaire and the checklist itself. Not an easy thing to do in a PDF document of this nature, though possibly an indication of their computer design skill level.

16.18 Stage 10: Preparing the simplified form to go live on the MMU website

The results from the trials above showed that the new form appeared to work well. However, there were still unresolved concerns over when it was appropriate to require an undergraduate to submit an ethical form and the need for a physical taught ‘ethical thinking’ session.

As no major or unexpected procedural issues had been discovered in the completion of the returned forms themselves it was decided to prepare the new form for distribution on the main university website. This would allow the continued gathering of data.

Before this could be done there were two issues that needed to be addressed (figs. 19/20). For some time there had been a nagging doubt over ownership of four images used in the interactive examples section on the front of the form (fig.19). It was clear that it would be unacceptable for any accusation of improper use of imagery, particularly given the nature of the document. Whilst recent exemptions to copyright guidance for education and teaching appear to permit such use under fair dealing, there is no statutory definition of fair dealing (Exceptions to copyright: Education and Teaching, 2014). It was decided therefore to take a conservative approach and replace three of these photographs with stock, attribution free images. In the case of the fourth photograph the original owner of the image was contacted and gave written permission for its use in the document.

![Examples of ethical issues specific to art, architecture, design and media might include:](image)

Figure 19. Prototype 15.7. Ethical issues interactive box (detail).
The second issue that required a response before the new prototype 17 form could go online was a request by the University’s Ethics and Research Governance Manager in September 2015 to include an explicit question concerning whether research concerned any of a list of the security sensitive categories:
- Commissioned by the military.
- Commissioned under an EU security call.
- Involve the acquisition of security clearances.
- Concerns terrorist or extreme groups.

This was incorporated into a new question E4 on the form, with further information on the topic accessible via a mouse rollover.

The responsibility for universities to register activity in the security area had been growing since the Terrorism Act (2006). In 2012, Universities UK, the representative organisation of the UK’s universities issued guidance that ethics offices/committees should play a central role in monitoring this type of security related activity (Oversight of security-sensitive research material in UK universities: guidance, 2012).

A final requirement also raised in September 2015, was the need for researchers also to complete an insurance checklist. This was added to the first page of the form.

In October 2015 all the amendments were complete and the new document was placed on the MMU website (fig.21). Additional guidance text was placed along side the download link in the attempt to reinforce the software requirement of the form.
It was very quickly observed that prototype 17 would require one further final revision to satisfy the procedural requirements. There was a requirement to provide evidence of discussion between supervisor and researcher and where appropriate Reviewer and Head of Faculty ethics. Therefore the supervisor ‘sign off’ box that had been removed during the redesign was returned to the form on page three of the prototype (fig 22).

A prototype version 18 was produced with this amendment replacing version 17 on the university website during December 2015.
6.19 Stage 11. The opportunity for analysis

6.19.1 Data analysis of ethical issues indicated by postgraduates during ethical appraisal to September 2015

Towards the end of 2015 it became apparent that there was the unique opportunity to examine more closely data contained within the archive of completed ethical appraisals. To this point the research focus had largely concerned participants engagement with the process itself and the quality of their subsequent reflective response. The completed forms however also offered the chance to investigate the prevalence of ethical issues highlighted by visual arts researchers themselves. By reviewing the entire sample, it would furthermore be possible to obtain a qualitative overview of the process to date.

By October 2015 forty postgraduates had completed the MIRIAD ethical appraisal process. This figure represented a very small rise on the March 2015 number due to an unusually small cohort, who submitted forms at the end of the 2015 summer semester. Data was from the forty completed forms was compiled into an Excel Spread sheet. A range of additional criteria were developed to assist analysis these included:

- The cohort or group of submitting researchers
- Whether a participant had completed an electronic interactive prototype
- Had the participant attempted to self edit a non-interactive prototype?
- The version of the prototype form used by the participant
- Was there any technical issue evident within the returned form?
- The completion date of the ethical appraisal
- Whether the researcher was male or female
- A mark indicating the quality of reflective response by the researcher, (awarded one to ten, with ten representing an exemplar response and zero for no reflection present). The grade descriptors for this exercise broadly reflecting MMU University standard descriptors at level seven, section two ‘professional practice and self management’.
  (MMU Centre for Excellence in Learning and Teaching, 2015)

During the period December 2013 to March 2015 there had been four main submissions of ethical appraisals within the School of Art and Design, concomitant with the necessity for researchers to submit their RD1 within three months (full-time students) or six months (part-time students) of their start date.
The overall submission of ethical assessments was split approximately 60/40 in favour of female researchers. Of the forty ethical appraisals returned over the period, 35% had used a version of the interactive electronic prototype. It was not a surprise following the March 2015 review of interactive submissions detailed earlier that over a third (five forms) contained evidence of some level of technical issue. The most likely cause of these problems, being the inadvertent use of Apple Preview software to view the file.

It was interesting in an additional three instances, that students using earlier non-interactive versions of the PDF prototype had attempted to self-edit the ethical appraisal form, either by annotating it electronically or adding ‘electronic ticks’ onto Part A the ethical categories section.

Overall 27% of returned forms had either no attempt to give an ethical response to points raised, or the researcher indicated no ethical issues within the project. However it should be stressed that the incidence of such forms was exceptionally high (45%) within the first cohort, as discussed in the February 2013 Academic team ‘launch review’. If we exclude this first group, the number of such ‘non-reflective’ submissions drops to 20% over the subsequent three tranches of submission. If we then solely look at the most recent forms completed in 2015, when the continually refined ethical protocol had become more embedded, the figure of ‘non-reflective’ submissions drops to a more acceptable 12.5%.

Of those participants who attempted a response to the ethical issues in section B, 30% of commentaries were judged in qualitative terms as grade eight or higher. The mean average grade across the submissions from researchers who had attempted a reflective response was therefore 6.72. With reference to the postgraduate grade descriptor previously mentioned, a score of 6-7 would equate with ‘evidence of the ability to work autonomously with reference to professional standards and values, reflecting critically on their own practice’. (MMU Centre for Excellence in Learning and Teaching, 2015) To assess the incidence of ethical issues highlighted by visual arts researchers, it was helpful to use the automated sum and COUNTIF functions in Excel. From this it was possible to determine the number of researchers indicating the relevance of the protocol’s individual ethical descriptors to their work. Furthermore, it was then possible to calculate the percentage of the sample that, for example highlighted ‘cultural copyright’, as being a pertinent ethical issue within their research. Finally a second ‘adjusted percentage’ was calculated which excluded ‘non-reflective’ forms. This provides a second comparative figure and one that only includes researchers who have evidenced some level of ethical thinking in section B. Accordingly the table below illustrates the incidence of ethical issues highlighted by visual arts researchers undertaking ethical appraisal via the MIRIAD ethical protocol (fig.23).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIRIAD Ethical descriptor</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Percentage Total sample</th>
<th>Adj. Percentage Reflective forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C11 Health and safety risk assessment attached</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 Use of collaborators, participants or subjects</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Acknowledging sources</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Documenting consent</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7 Public exhibition of research outcomes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Active consent</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D15 Future uses of data</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 Acknowledging participants or collaborators</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7 The right to withdraw</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Integrity and the reporting data and findings</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 Need for informed consent</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4 Anonymity in reporting data</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1 Intellectual property rights and dissemination</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5 Sensitivity to participants special needs or expectations</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10 Conflicts between around neutrality</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5 Confidentiality</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 Potential adverse applications of the work</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 Objectivity</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6 Consent as process not event</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11 Participant-research</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10 Research outside of the UK</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 Managing access to data</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3 Secondary uses of data</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 Cultural copyright</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6 Visual representations of individuals or social groups</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Value to research/creative development or academic understanding</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5 Supervisory relationship</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Anticipated or unanticipated consequences</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Negative impact on third parties or the environment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5 Relevance to the field of study</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Risk of physical harm</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12 Gatekeepers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14 Closure to participants</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Privileged information and secure storage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9 Material and other benefits from research</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8 Harm to the reputation of participants/third parties</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 Element of the work is intrusive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4 Conflict of interest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9 Drugs, placebos or other substances (e.g. food substances, vitamins)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Pay for participants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8 Vulnerable populations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Psychological wellbeing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 Sensitive issues</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6 Danger of a negative psychological impact</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7 NHS Staff or patients or NHS Trust approval</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8 Blood or tissue samples</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9 Issue of power relationships and exploitation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13 Deception and covert research</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4 Security sensitive research (Not present until protocol version 17)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*note adjusted figure not required due to the descriptor positioning on page three of protocol 7.9v4 to 8, and therefore all postgraduates provided a response.

Figure 23. Incidence of ethical issues highlighted by visual arts researchers, 2013- March 2015.
Looking at the table above it is clear that issues such as consent, acknowledgement and integrity are considered to be inherent by many of the visual arts postgraduates who provided ethical reflection. More than 50% of reflective forms analysed accentuated the relevance of these areas to the researchers’ own individual studies. Significantly though not unexpectedly given the discipline, 69% of this group highlighted that the public exhibition of research outcomes was implicit in their work and may therefore require ethical consideration. Likewise other issues likely considered discipline specific such as cultural copyright or the visual representations of individuals or social groups both featured in 34.5% of the more contemplative responses. Predictably also perhaps given the generally cooperative nature of the visual arts was the 79% of reflective feedback that evinced the use of collaborators, participants or subjects as an ethical factor in personal research studies.

More unexpected perhaps was the relatively high proportion of research (25%) taking place outside the UK. The number of respondents (27%) who thought ethical issues around supervisory relationships might be germane to their research was also a surprise. Furthermore in light of the examination of creative risk in chapter two and discussion of ethical transgression within the literature review of this thesis, the absence of areas which might be considered more conspicuous candidates for ethical transgression was interesting. A number of sections within the completed appraisals failed to receive significant attention. These were the categories relating to: ‘sensitive issues’, ‘vulnerable populations’, ‘deception and covert research’ and ‘psychological wellbeing’.

In chapter seven there is an exploration of how this data might be visually represented.

6.20. Stage 12. Comparing the current MIRIAD protocol, with an online ethical appraisal system

In November 2015 the opportunity arose to benchmark the MIRIAD prototype against a fully online system. Whilst the PDF route was appropriate in the context of this research project. Longer-term there are several advantages of a fully online system over this method. It was thought that an online version might represent a direction for further work on the MIRIAD prototypes. Possible advantages include: The ability to centralise administration and produce management reports, electronic communication with all participants and universal access to view the material, through web browsers. Additionally, Kumar et al., (2010) posit that archiving may be a longer term issue with the interactive PDF format.

When the opportunity arose therefore to review an online system, it was thought prudent to investigate this system by way of comparison with the on-going work at MIRIAD.
The University of Sheffield online ethics website is a system devised to manage and administer ethical applications by research students and staff of the university (fig 24). It was designed by epiGenesys a software development company that is a wholly owned subsidiary of the University of Sheffield.

![Screenshot of the University of Sheffield online ethics website.](image)

Figure 24. Screenshot of the University of Sheffield online ethics website.

A comparative review was conducted on a demonstration version of the Sheffield online website in November 2015 and a break down of reflections can be found in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comment on the Sheffield site operation/online content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Sheffield system shows good technical capability – and it appears stable. Automated reporting/database link/navigation/log in/interface etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Useful ability to differentiate between staff and student users whilst also managing completed forms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Easy access to view the site, through web browsers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Ability to upload documents is useful as is the ability to download completed on-line forms as Pdfs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Good</td>
<td>Unlike the MIRIAD protocol, the Sheffield form (excepting payment and consent) does not explicitly encourage reflection by the researcher/student on any ethical issues raised. This means less evidence for a reviewer to determine researcher/student comprehension or engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Good</td>
<td>Actual content is basic and in several areas deficient. A narrow spectrum of ethical issues is deployed. Many areas that may require ethical scrutiny are missing, for example: Covert research, Animals, Supervisory relationships, Further consent issues like the right to withdraw, Issues around reputation, Copyright/intellectual property etc. These issues in the MIRIAD system act as prompts, without them the form is diminished in scope. (Additionally the broader ethical ‘catch all’ areas used in the MIRIAD pilot are absent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Good</td>
<td>It is frustrating university ethics procedures like the Sheffield example repeatedly foreground medical matters, whilst apparently overlooking the fact the majority of their student/researchers are engaged in other areas. This creates an impression that non-medical areas consequently require less scrutiny. A hypothesis reflected perhaps by the absence of so many potential ethical issues in the Sheffield example.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missed Opportunity</td>
<td>There is a missed opportunity within the on-line form for an introduction to ethics. Whilst accepting the focus here is to centrally monitor activity, rather than be a purely pedagogical exercise, given the nature of the sector, it is disappointing that little attempt has been made to introduce students to ethics. In terms of research, ethics can be enriching and not always simply about restriction. On the main Sheffield ethics website there is a link for staff to request resources around ethical thinking – but this separate from the process and reliant on staff interest. Encouraging ethical thinking is something that has been central to the ethics work in MIRIAD and the online system would seem a natural place to locate material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missed Opportunity</td>
<td>An on-line system also provides the opportunity to customise user interaction. This would be useful particularly in terms of providing an introductory element for student/researchers appropriate to their academic area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It’s unclear when the Sheffield on-line form needs to be completed. The form states that it is for ‘research involving human participants, personal data or human tissue’. What about research involving animals or with environmental issues? This appears not to trigger completion of the form.

The Sheffield form is aimed at research. Staff guidance therefore on differentiating taught activity from research activity, particularly at UG level, would be useful as this can sometimes be analogous. Maybe these points are acknowledged elsewhere, but it is not clear. This needs to be addressed whilst also considering the next point below.

The number of forms, versus use of staff time?
Consideration should be given to an improved completion criteria, whilst considering pressures on staff time and the practicality of the system.

The accompanying flow chart on the Sheffield website emphasises the resource cost required for the system to be fully effective. Can it be both achievable and meaningful for every research project at undergraduate level? In the Sheffield example a central administrator sets a response deadline time for staff - for every form. How would this work for a tutor with 50 undergraduates on several research projects?

What about research activity that takes place spontaneously or a short notice like vox-pop in Media etc.
Could a development of the MIRIAD system’s ‘green highlighted boxes system’ allow partial student self-assessment?

Section 5 on the on-line form. The Potential Harm to Participants
This appears to be a request to assess risk, but are those completing the form competent to do this?
How is this evidenced? How is risk quantified i.e. what is high risk – what is low risk? Supporting material here is not very helpful.

The ability on the Sheffield site for teaching staff to quickly refer projects they feel unsure about to ethics administration is good but how will this work in practice? There are some inherent issues e.g. timing, etc.
From the Miriad experience the process would also be enhanced if the student/researcher could ask questions whilst completing the form - rather than relying on rectifying a simple issue later.

Figure 25. Review of the University of Sheffield online ethics website.

What the comparison above shows is that whilst the medium of a web-based delivery affords a number of advantages it is essential to get the content right. The same issues are present in the University of Sheffield online ethics website that have been noted many times before in print based ethical appraisal forms. Again in this example there is an over reliance on a one size fits all generic system that fails to maximise the opportunity afforded by an alternate discipline specific method of ethical appraisal. The lack of an encouragement for dialogue and absence of an introduction to ethical issues is also an issue.

Other familiar themes also re-emerge in the website illustration for example the failure to be clear when ethical appraisal is required.
6.21 Key findings

6.21.1 The September 2015 Review meeting

In September 2015 there was a cross-university ethics meeting at MMU where the MIRIAD Ethics prototype and research study in general was appraised. An interim research report was prepared which detailed the findings from the ‘simplified form’ pilot. A follow-up meeting with the Ethics and Research Governance Manager at the university was arranged. It was acknowledged that the simplified form and MIRIAD approach encompassed a range of relevant and advantageous features, which demonstrated a new and novel approach to ethical appraisal within the visual arts discipline. These were:

1) The MIRIAD prototype is part of a process that combines a discipline specific, introductory ‘research in practice ethics session’ with a broader pedagogical ambition to encourage ethical thinking and understanding by researchers. As previously mentioned this original idea was derived from the Liverpool pilot study that originally concerned health and safety and the competence to assess risk. The premise was how could a researcher be competent to assess physical risk or ethical issues for that matter, if they themselves have little understanding (or competence) of the subject. The formalised transposition of this premise, already well established within risk assessment, to the ethical arena marks a key shift.

2) The MIRIAD prototype encourages researchers to consider and reflect on a range of ethical issues linked to an individual research activity, i.e. there is an encouragement for the researcher to breakdown their research methodology and reflect, rather than simply complete a tick box exercise. This approach requires an active learning response from the researcher in order to complete. Additionally this allows reviewers of the form to determine researcher/student comprehension or engagement.

3) A wider range of ethical issues are included on MIRIAD form versus other documents reviewed and there is a greater range of explicit subject specific prompts pertinent to art, design and media

4) The MIRIAD form includes the question section ‘The General Good’ derived from the Research Ethics in Art and Design Media Project. Whilst initially, concepts listed under this heading sometimes appeared somewhat intangible, more recent revisions including transposing the issues to a question format, has meant they have often been useful in opening up a serious and broad ethical debate amongst Art, Design and Media researchers in the workshop sessions. Cederblom and Spohn, (1991) emphasise the importance of this type of debate to encourage ethical thinking.
In terms of the prototype design they can perhaps best be seen as ‘catch all questions’.

5) The MIRIAD process also makes it clear on the form itself, by way of the green box designation, which research activities will by their very nature demand further scrutiny before they can be agreed. This helps to make the process more transparent to both researcher and their supervisor.

6) Throughout the project an emphasis has always been placed on the ability for participant researchers to seek clarification or ask questions before they submit their form. As ethical judgments are highly context sensitive and sometimes complex the encouragement for dialogue afforded within the MIRIAD process is beneficial. During the early period of the research project this was facilitated by bookable one to one sessions. More lately these have largely, been superseded by online, ‘Skype meetings’.

7) The MIRIAD protocol embeds subject specific examples within the interactive document aimed at supporting comprehension during the completion of the form.


The chart below (fig.26) shows a breakdown of the ethical submissions that were processed between March 2015 and January 2016, which marks the end of the sampling period for this study.

From the analysis we can see that the earlier technical issues appear to have been resolved, with no occurrences of software corruption in the MIRIAD 15.7 forms evident. This is a significant improvement on previous submissions made using the earlier version 8 prototype observed in the March 2015 review. This would suggest that the improvements made to the form including the embedded software warning had been successful.

We can note that there appears to be a slightly higher percentage of forms requiring immediate referral than in early reviews.

Other distinguishing characteristics noted in the September ‘15 and January ‘16 sample include the presence of ‘legacy’ versions of earlier ethical appraisal prototypes. Research students have typically up to a year to submit a formal research proposal and ethical appraisal (RD1). The presence of version 8 prototypes in the sample points to this circumstance, but also the duration it takes for the forms to be processed i.e. the time between meetings of academic committees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Completion of Ethical Categories</th>
<th>Ethical response attempted</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Prototype version</th>
<th>Immediate referral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Satisfactory of reflection. No technical issues.</td>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 15.7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Satisfactory evidence of reflection. No technical issues.</td>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 15.7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Satisfactory evidence of reflection. No technical issues.</td>
<td>Scanned photocopy of MIRIAD Prototype 4.a</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Excellent evidence of reflection. No significant technical issues, though submitted in portrait rather than Landscape format</td>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Good evidence of reflection. No technical issues.</td>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 15.7</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Borderline evidence of reflection. No technical issues.</td>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 15.7</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Partial - Three questions left unanswered</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Good evidence of reflection. No technical issues.</td>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 15.7</td>
<td>Contact ref. missing answers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Good evidence of reflection. Technical issues on p4 Possibly opened in preview by researcher</td>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 8</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Good evidence of reflection. No technical issues.</td>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 8</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Satisfactory evidence of reflection. No technical issues.</td>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 15.7</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Satisfactory evidence of reflection. No technical issues.</td>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Excellent evidence of reflection. No technical issues.</td>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 15.7</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Good evidence of reflection. Technical issues on p4 Possibly opened in preview by researcher</td>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 8</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Good evidence of reflection. No technical issues.</td>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 8</td>
<td>Yes Extensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Extensive technical issues.</td>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 8</td>
<td>Needs to resubmit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Researcher mistakenly submitted generic form.</td>
<td>Generic MMU form</td>
<td>Yes Work outside UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Satisfactory evidence of reflection. No technical issues.</td>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 8</td>
<td>Yes H&amp;S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The latest analysis of forms above support the proposition that the subject specific MIRIAD protocol (15.7 onwards) for visual arts researchers is functioning effectively. Further work beyond the scope of this study might include the possibility to transposing the protocol to a web-based format.

6.22 Discussion
The evidence from this case study suggests that the latest version of the interactive form, in conjunction with the ethical thinking session and readily available guidance would be effective for a high percentage of postgraduate researchers. The quality of reflective responses assessed in appraisal forms submitted by researchers is a marked improvement against the old system it replaces.

The new system highlights the need to approach ethical appraisal from the perspective of being an art, design or media research student rather than from that of a practitioner working outside the parameters of the academy. This is delicately complex distinction. The potential for difficulty with the emergent pluralistic approach to ethics (Cashell, 2009) favoured in the arts, appears at times dissonant with the institutional model. A factor raised in the literature review and reflected in chapter six.

The study has also emphasised that ethical regulation concerning visual arts research needs to take great care to avoid being overly prescriptive and infringe ‘upon the autonomy needed by researchers’ (Hammersley and Traianou, 2012:50) or ‘distort its substance’ (Bledsoe et al., 2007:593). This in itself however, can be difficult as several observers note the emergence of a constricting managerial audit culture around ethical regulation within higher education (Lederman, 2007; Bledsoe et al., 2007).

It was noted in the ethical sessions that participants appeared previously to have given only limited consideration to ethics and as such were unfamiliar with a range of implications and fundamental considerations. This impression is corroborated by findings from the surveys in chapter five where all but one of the respondents confirmed that they had never received training research ethics either generally or in relation to their subject.

Up to this point the process has been largely reliant on a taught session. This has worked well with PGR students and undergraduates in the trial groups. Having a session, specifically focusing on ethics and the creative arts, involving a dialogue and discussion has been generally well received.
Time after time researchers attend with little enthusiasm for the subject, cautious of new forms and wary of a process that might restrict creative endeavour. Largely by a way of the process described above they leave with a greater appreciation of ethics. Often this is reported as beneficial to their work. Sometimes it is simply the realisation of the distinction between their roles as researchers rather than as practitioners operating outside the academy that makes the difference. It is certainly helped by the supporting use of relevant examples drawn from the creative arts in the workshop session, the breadth of the ethical categories contained in section one of the form and the encouragement for researchers to reflect.

The subsequent return of ethical appraisal forms in the trial, has largely been in line with expectation, albeit with a notable differentiation between PGRs and undergraduate groups, in terms of the overall quality of written reflective responses. This is not surprising given the different academic levels. It has also been noted that non-mandatory, generic ethics sessions at MMU aimed at a university wide postgraduate attendance have struggled in the past to attract an audience

Would an extension to this new system work for undergraduates?

In the current climate there is talk of the extent to which ethical scrutiny might be extended to undergraduate students. A central question however remains concerning which projects at undergraduate level would require this level of ethical scrutiny.

For the successful rollout of the MIRAD process to undergraduate students, the first choice would be a to extend the mandatory ethical thinking introduction. This could be accomplished by introducing in a rolling programme to level C students or alternatively by offering support for this to be achieved in tutor groups. There is the possibility that a ‘blended learning’ approach could be employed to support this initiative however, as it is necessary to preserve an element of ‘face to face’ communication to facilitate ethical discussion. The need to foster the climate of debate emphasised by Cederblom and Spohn, (1991) cannot be easily replicated solely within electronic materials (e-learning). ‘Institutions of higher education are increasingly adopting BL, the combination of face-to-face and technology-mediated instruction’ (Porter et al., 2014:1). Conversely, the interactive PDF checklist would probably be enhanced by its transposition to a web-based platform.

If the current postgraduate ethical appraisal were to be extended to undergraduate students as mentioned, it would be important to determine which undergraduate projects might require completion of this approval process. Lederman, (2007:310) suggests that ‘it is not always easy to demarcate research from non-research by identifying its locations, time frames, personnel, and
procedures’. However there is concern that a blanket undergraduate system if it was to be adopted for all projects might be inappropriate both in terms of meaningfulness and practicality. For example, it would be impractical to rule that every undergraduate student activity without exception requires competition of an ethical checklist and for this to be at the same time meaningful. Although the benefits of regulating minimal-risk research are minimal the costs are not (Kim et al., 2009).

Findings from the performing arts group mentioned previously suggest ethical regulation is inappropriate in certain areas (e.g. conservatoire approach). These factors need to be considered, as does ‘class based taught activity’ that does not seek an external audience. This study suggests however there is a danger the calls for the widespread ethical appraisal for undergraduate work, are conflating two separate but allied notions. The first is the genuine need for ethical regulation to promote ‘sound research practices which are collectively referred to as integrity in research’ (De Wet, 2010:303). The second is the need for an adequate introduction to ethical thinking for undergraduates in such that it applies to their discipline. Authors across several disciplines attest to the benefits of this approach (e.g. Monteverde, 2014; Saunders, 2010). It is of course possible, even likely that specific undergraduate activity on occasion may require ethical scrutiny. There are a number of ways forward here; a solution at undergraduate level might be delegation to course level of the responsibility to determine if student work requires ethical appraisal. This would be supported by general guidance for the tutor regarding in what circumstances this may be necessary.

The argument for a discipline specific process - not an opt out.

The arts arena intermittently encompasses work that is transgressive, politically challenging or subversive. However, the analysis of ethical appraisals by this study suggests visual research more frequently concerns public exhibition, consent and acts that are representational of groups or individuals. As such an ethical perspective should rightly be placed central to any contextual debate in the area. It is however acknowledged that this position has its opponents within the field, who argue that ethic scrutiny should have no role in the arts or any other discipline for that matter (De Wet, 2010)\(^7\). In the visual arts context this view however may be partially obscured by conflating professional practice outside the academy with regulated research operating within it. It is important therefore to avoid making the visual arts research a special case, Lederman, (2007:320) argues fairness dictates that all disciplines be scrutinised in the same manner’. However, the fact at times visual arts practice challenges socially accepted norms is perhaps an indication that best practice would support the discipline employing a subject specific ethical appraisal procedure.

\(^7\) (also autonomism Cashell, 2009)
6.23. Taxonomy of prototypes

Below is a taxonomy illustrating the progression in the development of the MIRIAD Protocol from version 1 to the current version 18.

Taxonomy of ethics forms referred to in the case study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document/Prototype</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MMU Ethics checklist 2010</td>
<td>MMU centrally produced ethical checklist at commencement of project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMU Ethics checklist 2012</td>
<td>First major change to central ethical procedures at MMU during research project. Revised paperwork – but issues remain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMU Application for ethical approval 2012</td>
<td>Revised central form and new procedures coincide with increased interest in role of ethics (Concordat etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MMU draft interactive checklist February 2014</td>
<td>Centrally produced draft proposal for an interactive form, not implemented in A&amp;D. Viewed as possible response to MIRIAD interactive form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIRIAD Research Prototype 1/1a</td>
<td>Two colour, No green boxes to designate mandatory referred issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 6.5 v2</td>
<td>Two colour, No green boxes to designate mandatory referred issues. More space for reflective responses on form. Space for comments by supervisor. Used at the Chester Pilot in April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 7.5v3</td>
<td>Two colour. Personal details now on front page redesign. New green highlights to indicate referral. Introduction of risk assessment requirement and working outside UK question. Clearer instructions on filling in the form (page 3) and new heading on page 4 in response to Chester pilot. Introduction of glossary and further recourse information. Document now states: ‘Completion of this exercise will be supported by bookable one to one sessions aimed at helping you appraise your research project in ethical terms or simply to assist you with completion of the checklist’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 7.9v4</td>
<td>Two colour. Minor changes to language, i.e. Mentor, Research centre leader. Stronger guidance on page 4 heading. Completed 7.9v4 forms were the basis of the first MMU review meeting in February 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 7.9v4a</td>
<td>Two colour. Minor changes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 7.9b</td>
<td>Two colour Minor changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 7.9bv</td>
<td>Blue colour front. First attempt at interactive layered PDF document that could be completed electronically. Piloted by first researcher in December 2013, Forms in use Jan 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 8</td>
<td>The orange colour front of the series 8 prototypes marked a period of development and consolidation for the interactive version of the form, 4 versions. It should be noted that version 8 was the last of the prototypes specifically designed to operate as both an electronic and standalone paper-based solution. Version 8 is the first of the MIRIAD prototypes to be available as a download on the MMU website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 11</td>
<td>Prototype 11 signalled the first of the attempts at a simplified form. Four pages rather than twelve pages. Not interactive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 12</td>
<td>Simplified form – but no attempt at case studies – no colour images</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 12.1</td>
<td>Simplified form – but no attempt at case studies – no colour images</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 14</td>
<td>Simplified form – With case studies and colour images New title: A REFLECTION EXERCISE FOR ART, ARCHITECTURE, DESIGN &amp; MEDIA – minor amendments to reflect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 15v6.1</td>
<td>Simplified form – With case studies and colour images 2015. Now with software warning if participants attempt to open in Preview etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 15v7</td>
<td>Simplified form -With case studies and colour images.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 17</td>
<td>Intellectual property issues are resolved with new images. Simplified form amended in October 2015. Security sensitive categories added This form is available on MMU website both internally and externally from October 2015. Guidance is now included on the website to promote use of Acrobat software.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIRIAD Prototype 18</td>
<td>Sign off box for Supervisor and Reviewers returns to form This form is available on MMU website both internally and externally from December 2015.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 27. MIRIAD Ethical Prototypes.
7. Case study 3

Creating visualisations of ethical appraisal, creative risk and pedagogy within the visual arts.

7.1. The need for a practice component

As outlined within the research aims in chapter one, an element of research through practice is viewed as critical to developing a deeper understanding of the subject from a different perspective. This ‘learning from doing’ approach is particularly pertinent in relation to investigating the ethical use of photographic images amassed during the project i.e. where the ‘creative artifact is the basis of the contribution to knowledge’ (Candy, 2006:1).

A second important objective is to examine ways to visually represent data assembled during the research study. This is an established method which resonates with the creative research of Jackson et al., (2006). It is hoped this approach will present the opportunity for a synthesis of the findings from earlier chapters. The outcome of this activity will include a public exhibition of completed work where feedback will be sought. The exhibition will also act as a medium for raising awareness of the research findings.

The data that will be explored in this chapter is derived from a variety of channels. Firstly it is manifest in the responses to surveys on the perception of ethical and creative risk, outlined in chapter five. It also originates from the discoveries revealed during the development and testing of a new ethical appraisal model for visual arts researchers, detailed in chapter two.

Finally, this approach draws on supportive photography assembled during the preparation for this research study. By its nature the public display of this photography will present a range of ethical issues. The engagement with these issues will in turn necessitate an element of practice-based research, in contrast to the practice-led focus of the earlier chapters. Candy, (2006:1) describes this this form of practice-based research as an ‘investigation undertaken in order to gain new knowledge partly by means of practice’.

With reference to the visualisation of findings, the justification for this approach draws on a range of texts. Ainsworth and Th Loizou (2003:680), suggest there to be a ‘growing body of evidence that shows that self-explaining is an effective metacognitive strategy and supplies a further reason why graphical representations can be beneficial for learning.’ It can be argued this is helpful in light of this chapter’s practice-based enquiry. Furthermore, it is a research approach where there is an emphasise the importance of synthesising the creative and analytic components of research (Hockey, 2007).
7.2. Methodology

7.2.1. Approaches to data visualisation
In any attempt to build a visual representation of a involved system such as that found within ethics, creative risk and pedagogy, it is useful to be familiar with a range of approaches and analytical instruments. These will be important if the visual expression of findings from earlier chapters is to be successful.

7.2.3. Gestalt
Several authors refer to the usefulness of Gestalt principles within graphic design, particularly in relation to complex situations. Moszkowicz, (2011:57) argues ‘there is little doubt that Gestalt theory has been used to devise laws of visual perception within the fields of Fine Art and Graphic Design’. The key principle here is the notion expounded within Gestalt that ‘the whole is 'other' than the sum of its parts’. This definition is often supplanted by the phrase ‘the whole is greater than the sum of its parts’. The idea originated within philosophy and psychology in Germany, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. The concept describes how perceptions of a whole object may be better understood, if during its design the relation between the elements it contains are first considered. ‘It presents a range of possible anchorage points to help the human subject, who may be lost in something, to find himself or herself again: simplicity, 3D (or “visual depth”), homogeneity, familiarity, similarity, and proximity. It is a method of solving the problem of a potentially chaotic world and life experience’ (Moszkowicz, 2011:64). O’Connor (2015:85), is a proponent of Gestalt theory and posits ‘the challenge for designers is to create designs that are aesthetically appropriate and visually engaging for the target audience, but which are also functionally-legible and support the encoding of communication messages so that these are effectively decoded as intended”.

7.2.4. Information graphics and data visualisation
In many ways the fundamental aspects of Gestalt described by Moszkowicz, (2011) can also be seen in the apparent ubiquitous rise of information graphics within contemporary graphic design. It is interesting that whilst the term ‘info-graphics’ (a conflation of information and graphics), appears new, entomologically dating back to the 1960s, its style of presentation is not. The visual representation of information or statistical data can be traced to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries within the designs of astronomers, cartographers and engineers. Tufte, (2006) cites the work of Charles Minard as an example of an early pioneer within this field, referencing his 1869 statistical map that portrays the successive losses of the French Army in Napoleon’s Russian campaign of 1812 (fig.28). ‘Minard’s eloquent depiction of clear portrayal of complexity is a good example for quantitative and qualitative researchers to emulate’ (Prosser and Loxley, 2008:44).
Tufte (2001:76) is vocal in calling for graphical honesty in the interpretation of statistical data and cautions against misleading the viewer with the misrepresentation of data. In rallying against what he terms the ‘lying graphic’, Tufte (2001:53) advances principles that are more likely to result in ‘graphical integrity’. These include: the representation of numbers as physically measured on the surface of the graphic should be directly proportional to the numerical quantities measured; clear detailed labelling; the need to show data variation not design variation; and the requirement that graphics must not quote data out of context (Tufte, 2006).

Tuft’s concerns over integrity echo a motif in one of the earliest journal articles to actively appraise the use of statistical graphics. In his paper Larsen (1924:585) attempts a taxonomy of chart variations and advocates the use of ‘unusual graphical arrangements’ to convey academic information. Larsen’s work published in the American Journal of Public health contains a number of examples that look strikingly contemporary. The Larsen graphic below illustrates total sickness for any given week in a year. Larsen, like Tufte, rallies against the misleading visual portrayal of data. ‘There should be an exact relation between the numbers and the areas, the numbers and the volume, or the numbers and the lines, as the case may be’ (Larsen, 1924:591).

This image (Fig.30) entitled ‘Being defensive’ has been removed, as the copyright is owned by another organisation or individual.

Above left: Figure 29. Chart from Graphs in Public Health Reports (Larsen, H. T., 1924).
Above Right: Figure 30. Detail from the chart ‘Being defensive’ (McCandless, D., 2012).
Information graphics is therefore not an entirely new discipline. However it is perhaps the expansion of colour printing and introduction of computing, notably in newspaper production that has signalled the greatest expansion in this method of data visualisation. In its contemporary form it encompasses more than statistical visualisation. Other sorts of representational data such as flowcharts, timelines, lists and comparisons are commonly expressed. Frequently the field is characterised by infographics of varying quality that have, to some extent, tarnished the aspirations set by earlier commentators. ‘Conceptual design is often overlooked and underestimated by information designers who tend to be more focused on implementation and concerned with aesthetic qualities. Consequently, there is a lack of thorough thinking and understanding during the conceptual part of the design process that results in a recurrent development of unintelligible diagrams in information design practice’ (Pontis, 2014:115). Polman and Gebre, (2015:887) remind us that to ‘appraise the data gathered and incorporated by infographic designers, it is important to first take into account how credible these sources are, and consider the organisation or conceptual structure of those data and ideas’. Another factor to consider is the recent rise within graphic design of automated template processes for diagram design. These have served to both empower those with limited technical means whilst also freeing designers from repetitive tasks. However within graphic design there is a risk that ‘the use of the same repeated solutions may lead to over familiarisation with the content and a diminished stimulation’ (Cleveland, 2010:4). Conversely in its most exalted form data visualisation and infographics has become accepted as an artistic subgenre in its own right, with the work of designers such as David McCandless exhibited at Tate Britain and the Museum of Modern Art in New York. ‘Understanding is really the key. The more you understand information in this way, the more connected and contextualised it becomes, the more it starts to morph and grow into knowledge’ (McCandless, 2014:6).

7.2.4. Communication Modelling.
Communication modelling is an academic field distinct from information graphics. Within this discourse McQuail, and Windahl, (1993:2-3) differentiate models that only describe the structure of a phenomenon from models that they delineate as being ‘functional’. Functional models ‘describe systems in terms of energy, forces and their direction, the relation between parts and the influence of one part on another’. (McQuail, and Windahl, 1993). Using this definition most info-graphics like those seen in the work of McCandless can be described as structural models in that they describe data phenomenon. There is of course some common ground between structural and functional models; both for example, have an organising function. However it is the role of the functional model in assigning probabilities to various outcomes and developing hypotheses that is a distinguishing and attractive feature.
Communication models in their simplest form serve the purpose of annotating the way in which the main elements of the sender, message and receiver take on distinctive characteristics and meanings. The models themselves have an organising function in the way they provide us with images of wholes, simplifying information which might otherwise be ambiguous. Whilst they undoubtedly perform a function, which sometimes allows us to predict outcomes or isolate problems in the communication process, the inherent beauty of their simplicity can sometimes be a risk and occasionally conceal assumption. This risk can however, be reduced by testing.

McQuail, and Windahl, (1993:3) actively encourage researchers to explore the possibilities of testing models against various circumstances and adapt them for different applications, stating that no model is ‘so sacred that they cannot be given a somewhat different shape and formulation’.

The act of compiling such models dates back to the 1940s coinciding with the rise of modern media, advertising and mass promotional activity. The construction of communication models evolved from simple direct propositions such as the Lasswell Formula (1948). This formula, when translated into a diagrammatic model details: who says what - in which medium - to whom - with what effect. Over time more complex models have been developed that consider the role of within these models of gatekeepers, feedback, noise and an individuals own objectives, self-image, intentions and interests.
7.3. The art works

As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter the intended outcome is a synthesis of research data, with the range of visual measures described above. In the process the visualisation of findings will therefore require the development of a range of designs or charts. Additionally the display of supportive photography will likewise require careful analysis particularly in terms of consent and intellectual property issues.

7.3.1. Chart 1

Designing a system of ethical appraisal for visual arts research, within higher education.

*Spencer (2016) with reference: Maletzke (1963) and Nowak and Wärneryd (1985).* (Figure 31)

The intention of this first chart is to represent the relevant issues within a university context, pertinent to the design of a system for ethical appraisal. The model described will therefore be, by its nature complex and as such, an explanation will need to encompass multiple components.

Communication modelling theory provides a range of options but a helpful starting point is Maletzke (1963). McQuail, and Windahl, (1993) describe Maletzke’s original communication model as useful, in that it contains a number of important factors and relationships. The Maletzke model draws attention within any process of planned communication, to the need for a communicator to have a clear definition of the intended audience. This has a resonance within the design of an ethical appraisal system where the distinct nature and character of a research discipline needs to be considered by the communicator. Furthermore the Maletzke model
illustrates a range of pressures exerted on both the communicator and receiver. In the original model these forces were often general factors such as ‘the communicator in the organisation’. In the reworking of the model by the author more specific pressures relevant to the design of a system of ethical appraisal have been included. These values are drawn from research in chapter two of this study. In the case of the communicator they concern the pressure to have a demonstrable system of ethical appraisal in place. Usefully Matetzke’s model also provides recognition of the importance of feedback in communication process.

Figure 32 (detail) below shows pressures on the institution for an ethical appraisal system.

By the reimagining of Matetzke’s original design, a new model describing ethical appraisal emerges. It is useful that this model reminds us of the importance of the relationship between the communicator and receiver, whilst at the same time acknowledging the important implementation role played by the faculty or department.

A further development to the model is the inclusion of a ‘points of departure’ depiction (see fig 33 below). This concept derives from the work of Nowak and Wärneryd (1985) who determined that the factors in a model maybe closely interrelated. The change in one component may cause change to another. The concept of ‘points of departure’ therefore refers to variable elements that might affect the outcome.
In the model ‘points of departure’ include the contested nature of ethical norms in some areas of the visual arts which present a schism or at least tension been those who seek to appraise a work purely on its aesthetic merits versus those prepared to recognise a moral component, described by Cashell (2009:29) as the ‘intertwinement of value dimensions in certain art objects’. A further ‘point of departure’ concerns an individual’s propensity for taking creative risks. In the research surveys for example the majority of respondents saw creative risk taking as important. However a significant number thought that the process of ethical appraisal had the potential to inhibit creative risk and over a third of undergraduate and postgraduate researchers thought it was sometimes justifiable to work unethically: “(Ethical appraisal) … would act as a guideline … but you could still ignore it”. Anon UG student survey (2015)

In addition, chapter two of this study described the development of the MIRIAD protocol, confirming the need for a researcher to comprehend the ethical assessment process and particularly the technical terms it employed. The importance of discipline specificity was also emphasised. Therefore comprehension and relevance also represent a potential ‘point of departure’ on our new model. Finally, ‘consistency of implementation and resource’ is recognised as a point of departure, an acknowledgement of both the resource cost to maintain an effective system and the technical requirements necessary to ensure the consistent delivery of an ethical appraisal procedure.

Figure 33. (detail) illustrates points of departure, or variable elements that may alter the outcome.

Please note larger versions of the finished charts from this chapter can also be found in Appendix nine.
7.3.2. Chart 2
Quantifying ethical issues in Visual Arts Research. Spencer (2016)

By October 2015 forty postgraduates had completed the MIRIAD ethical appraisal process. The analysis in chapter two of completed ethical appraisal forms provided an insight into the prevalence of ethical issues as highlighted by visual arts researchers.

To the author’s knowledge this was the first time such a comprehensive discipline specific study of this nature had been undertaken. The resulting findings therefore provided the ideal opportunity to visually represent this new data.

A number of ways were explored to visualise the data. The first idea was to use the ethical issue categories themselves within the design. The idea was that the weight of type or font size would be calculated to reflect a proportional manner a representation of the findings. For example a large type size would indicate a high number of researchers had referenced this particular ethical issue in their work.

A first attempt at this technique is shown below.

Figure 34. Quantifying ethical issues in Visual Arts Research: weighted typographic layout.

The design above displays a number of characteristics that are comparable to the Gestalt principles described earlier in this chapter. In this case the uniform typographical treatment creates a sense of similarity that occurs when objects look similar to one another. This results in the perception that they form a group or pattern. A notion reinforced by the proximity that occurs
when elements are placed close together, again reinforcing the tendency for them to be perceived as a group.

However whilst the weighted typographic layout provided the basis for an interesting info-graphic worthy of further development it was decided that in order to more clearly present the numerical findings for scholarly publication an alternate plot of the data would be desirable. ‘Data graphics are data graphics because they have scales of measurement’ (Tuft, 2006:133). Therefore to more precisely convey the academic information a number of graphical visualisations were explored.

The comparative bubble graph below uses circle area to represent the numbers of researchers who have indicated the presence of particular ethical issues in their study. On the Y-axis there is indication of a numerical scale (number of researchers), whilst on the X-axis the ethical issues are presented in ascending order of magnitude. To further aid comparison the traces are emphasised by use of a semi transparent blue under fill to give depth, numerical labelling and yellow line graph. Tuft, (2006:127) reminds us that if the intellectual task is to make comparisons, as it is in nearly all data analysis, then "Show comparisons" is the design principle.

Figure 35. Below: Quantifying ethical issues in Visual Arts Research. Spencer (2016).
Figure 36. Above: Breakdown of ethical issues encountered in Visual Arts Research (detail).

(Please note for a larger image of this chart see appendix nine).
7.3.3. Chart 3

Designing a system of ethical appraisal for visual arts research

Chart three is the attempt to find a way of disseminating the central research strands from this study. This will include the research narrative from chapter two concerning the design of an ethical appraisal system for the visual arts. In addition, chart three will include survey findings from chapter one that will contextualise the research along with visual examples from Chapter three. As such it will have many of the characteristics of a traditional PhD poster. Whilst the suggested templates for PhD posters differ between conference events and institutions it is common that they conform to the format of a single sided A1 sized colour poster.

Figure 37. PhD poster design version one.

Figure 38. PhD poster design version two.
The production of the chart or poster was useful in that it was possible to see within one image the way individual constituent elements of the research interrelated and were important contributing to a sense of the whole. This is a notion evocative of the central Gestalt principle ‘the whole been greater than the sum of its parts’.
7.3.4. Chart 4

Defining creative risk and the characteristics of visual arts risk-takers

‘A bit like betting on outsiders. The odds are against you but potential rewards are greater’. Anon PGR student survey (2015) (Figure 39).

In chart four an attempt has been made to visually reflect the defining themes that characterise perceptions of creative risk. The quotes are taken from the four principal surveys described in chapter one. Within the image colour is used to emphasise the recurring motifs. These encompass; thinking differently, unconventionally, or from a new perspective; a speculative situation involving exposure to peril and chance or an affinity to crossing the limits of the field or subject area. Each quote derives from a separate individual in the survey.

Whilst attempts at defining creativity abound, there is a scarcity of research concerning creative risk, a factor identified by Ellis and Meneely, (2015). This is the first time that an enquiry has sought the views of visual researchers in an attempt to better understand the term creative risk.
7.3.5. Chart 5

**Perceived relationships between theory and practice**

*’In theory there is no difference between theory and practice...in practice, there is’. Powell (2011)*

Reflecting on your experience of assessment in arts education, which is held in higher esteem?

![Pie chart](image)

Figure 40.

The pie chart above is derived from the 2015 convergence survey detailed in chapter one. The convergence questionnaire had been developed to revisit themes from earlier questionnaires, where the findings had been inconclusive or it was thought further enquiry might be beneficial. The sample group were twelve postgraduate students drawn from different areas of the visual arts who were in the early stages of their research.

The chart above is both simple and stark. For the purposes of transparency it should be noted that one respondent stated written work was more valued in academia whist practice was more highly valued in industry. Due to the nature of the question, their response has been included in the ‘theory is held in higher esteem’ camp.

Consideration was given to further developing this ‘info-graphic’. However, after some experimentation it was thought that simplicity was the key to best visualising this finding.
7.4. Ethical research through practice: ‘Bad photos’. An exhibition of supportive photographic research material

During the last decade there has been an increasing interest in the ethics of visual research. This echoes the increased significance of research ethics in general. The reasons for this have been covered at length in chapter two.

From early in the development of the proposed research into ethics, creative risk and pedagogy, photography had been a useful means of conveying the intersection of these three topics. The photographs reflected a way of thinking or line of enquiry in the manner of a visual essay.

Approximately forty still photographic images had been amassed which recorded activity that raised issues in terms of ethics and creative risk. Some of these photographs were taken by the author, others emanated from examples of student work gathered over previous years. A number of the images were photographs taken by students in the course of their projects and a few were found images. Most predated the research study itself. Several were originally obtained for other purposes and only later recognised to be useful illustrations for the study. This body of visual evidence served the purpose of quickly and graphically conveying some of the ethical dilemmas faced by supervisors within media and the visual arts. Many of the images illustrated student activities that whilst creatively ambitious were simultaneously considered to have an uncertain level of physical or risk. Others, such as the photographs of in-classroom surveillance methods, hinted at deeper ethical issues.

Prosser and Loxley, (2008:4) acknowledge the usefulness of this type of material and suggest ‘visual methods can provide an alternative to the hegemony of a word-and-number based academy’. However, due to the nature of acquisition of these images, there was awareness that without careful ethical consideration their use was limited. This collection was referred to somewhat ironically as the ‘bad photos’.

From the start of this research study it had always been planned to include a practical element within the research. Initial ideas had included the production of visual work with a transgressive edge, which would serve the purpose of testing the ethical appraisal process described in chapter two. However, as the research progressed it became clearer that a more realistic challenge might already be at hand in terms of the aforementioned photographs. This was reinforced by the findings from the analysis of the incidence of ethical issues, described in chapter two. The study had confirmed that issues such as consent, acknowledgement and integrity were considered to be important by more that 50% of the visual arts postgraduates who provided ethical reflection. A
The table below describes six representative images selected from the ‘bad photos’ collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image</th>
<th>Description of image</th>
<th>Image copyright owner</th>
<th>Fair Use?</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Portrays potentially dangerous or unethical practice?</th>
<th>Possibility to contact copyright holder/subject(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Image 1</td>
<td>Girl with knife in eye (physical effect).</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>Unidentifiable</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Partially, through social media the individual in photograph has provided permission. This is a still image is a from a student film.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image 2</td>
<td>School boy with a shotgun</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>Countryside: Identifiable</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Possible, though all attempts so far have failed to elicit response. Originating from a student’s school project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image 3</td>
<td>Cameraperson in the boot of car</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>Difficult to identify</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Difficult, no record of subjects in photograph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image 4</td>
<td>Tractor next to a power line lifting an unsecure large film spot light, over heads of crew.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Yes in education context</td>
<td>Farm lane (1970’s?)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Image obtained from a PowerPoint presentation at Pinewood studios event. Possible to contact speaker. Question whether speaker holds copyright?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image 5</td>
<td>School project questionnaire on sexual behaviour</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>School, but close-up so not identifiable</td>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>Whilst possible high likelihood of refusal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image 6</td>
<td>Covert CCTV in the classroom</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Probably</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 41. Table outlining characteristics intrinsic to the research images.

Conducting research ethically is viewed as a cornerstone of good practice (Clark et al., 2010)

However concordant with increasing interest by institutions in systems of ethical appraisal, it is possible to chart differing approaches, relating to the acceptable use of images within research. Whilst many of these approaches emerge from social research they are pertinent to the visual arts. ‘Due the relative newness of visually orientated research, there is limited agreement among ethics committees and visual researchers on ethical guidelines and subsequent practices (Prosser and Loxley, 2008:49). ‘A distinction that is often drawn within debates on research ethics between a rules-based approach and an approach which is grounded within an understanding of the specific context within which a piece of research is being conducted: what is often referred to as situated ethics. The rules-based approach is based on a notion of ethical absolutes in relation to classic concerns such as informed consent, avoidance of harm, and guarantees of confidentiality and anonymity. An approach based on situated ethics, in contrast, emphasises the importance of making judgements based on the very specific context of any given ethical dilemma: in other words, there are very few, if any, absolute rights and wrongs in relation to ethical practice’ (Heath et al., 2009:22). Whilst it is perhaps the second example here that is most
familiar to those operating within the visual arts context, Wiles et al., (2008:6) reminds us that ‘researchers are legally obliged to conform with legal regulation relating to their research. Ethical regulation does not carry such weight but nevertheless researchers are generally obliged to comply with ethical regulation by their institution or by the organisations they are conducting research with or for’.

It is within this context we should consider ‘bad photos’ and the ethical issues they infer.

7.4.1. The issue of consent
In a number of cases it may be possible to locate either the photographers or the subjects of the photographs to obtain retrospective consent. The issue of consent though in certain areas of visual research is problematic. Heath et al., (2009:129) affirms that ‘it may be difficult to track down all those captured on film or in photographs to seek their consent – for example, when video footage of public spaces has been taken by respondents or researchers as part of a research project or when young people are showing a researcher old family photos’. Banks, (2001) notes that as acceptable that consent might take differing forms depending on circumstance and can vary widely from formal written consent to verbal acknowledgment. More difficult areas for visual research, include situations where the attempt to obtain consent would terminate the possibility of documenting certain areas of behaviour. It may not always be appropriate to obtain informed consent from individuals involved in research (Clark et al., 2010). ‘Potential participants may fear that they will be identifiable if they provide a signature, and insistence might result in an understandable reluctance, if not a refusal, to take part’. (Heath et al., 2009:27).

The ‘bad photos’ collection was amassed as witness to forms of pedagogical practice that are common in the UK. As such, it has been successful in capturing areas of practice until now relatively overlooked by research. However the nature of its assemblage, particularly with regards consent should be considered.

It is helpful in situations where the lack of active consent presents uncertainty, to consider how the images themselves might be evaluated in an ethical context. ‘One fundamental way to interrogate the responsibilities and liabilities of abstracted ethical perception is to interrogate the ethics of the images’ (Grønstad and Gustafsson, 2012:xiii)

Whilst a number of the photographs such as the image of a covert CCTV camera in a classroom point to wider ethical issues, many are pedagogically focused.
Almost exclusively the images in the ‘bad photos’ collection document ambitious attempts by students at creative activity, yet simultaneously engender uncertainty in terms of supervision. These images are not about bad behaviour per se, rather the contrary. They witness students demonstrably enmeshed with creative activities that might be considered risky. The issue in many of the ‘bad photo’ images lies not wholly with the student, rather it is how an institution’s systems respond to the realpolitik of creative enterprise. This is particularly pertinent not only in terms of the procedures to ensure student competency with equipment and processes, but to actively encourage ethical thinking as discussed in chapter two.

In chapter one we discovered the importance placed on creative risk within the survey findings. Across the UG/PG cohorts definitions of creative risk often referenced experimentation and taking chances with 74% of the undergraduate sample stating that they sometimes or quite often took creative risks. Whilst the research in chapter one points to a definition of creative risk expanding far beyond simple notions of physical risk, it is notable that comments from the staff survey revealed concerns over physical well being i.e. ‘Students lighting a fire in a wood for a film with use of petrol (sic) – no permission from landowner, nor consideration to their own and others safety’.

Therefore the photographs themselves, it can be argued, are useful research evidence that supports the wider academic enquiry. If they are to be used without retrospective permission and considering the content of the images, thought must be given to preserving the anonymity of subjects. Whilst none of the ‘bad photos’ portray willful criminal acts, Banks (2001), provides examples where the researcher has a duty to preserve the anonymity of subjects engaged in unlawful acts. Others, in more general terms argue for confidentiality of those involved. This theme is particularly evident in social research ‘There is strong agreement in word and number based research that researchers should protect the privacy of research subjects ... This applies to found images, i.e. images already in existence, as well as those produced as part of a fieldwork practice research project’. (Prosser and Loxley, 2008:54). Commonly where anonymity is recognised as an issue, images are altered to protect the identity of participants. This is often accomplished by blurring faces using computer software. This process though has its opponents though who criticise the process of blurring or obscuring faces in that this objectifies people and removes their identity and viewing such images with faces obscured can be disconcerting. (Wiles et al., 2008). However the key issue here must be whether the overall, meaning of the image has been substantially altered by the blurring. ‘Clearly, if the images collected are not concerned with individuals, identity or interaction but with a more general scene ... then blurring faces, arguably, may not impact negatively on the overall aim of the work’. (Wiles et al., 2008:23).
7.4.2. Copyright

“For an image to be stolen, it must belong to someone in the first place”.
(Banks, 2001:167).

It is useful for all researchers involved in visual research to be mindful of issues concerning intellectual property. ‘Usually, the person who creates an image is the copyright holder, although ownership can change for two reasons: when the image-maker created the imagery as part of her or his work the copyright may rest with the employer; or when a creator sells or gives the copyright to another person’. (Clark et al., 2010:84)

There are clear links between the issue of copyright and consent ‘while legally the film or photograph taker owns the image, and can assign copyright to the researcher if they wish to do so, the people in the images have not necessarily given their consent to the image’. (Wiles et al., 2008:19). It is evident that whilst many commentators discuss the implications of copyright to visual researchers at length, most do so without detailed reference to current legislation in this area. It is useful to be aware in terms of pure not-for-profit research, that the situation in the UK has recently been revised. Following the Hargreaves report on Digital Opportunity commissioned in 2010 by the UK Government and a subsequent consultation on copyright, amendments to the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 came into force in June 2014. This has resulted in new copyright guidance for researchers appearing in October 2014. The advice was aimed at those carrying out non-commercial research or private study, wishing to copy copyright works as part of their research. However the advice that relates to exceptions on photographic copyright for researchers is not emphatic.

Whilst the exception applies to all types of copyright work, it would only be in exceptional circumstances that copying a photograph would be allowed under this exception. It would not be considered fair dealing if the proposed use of a copyright work would conflict with the copyright owner’s normal exploitation of their work. For example, the ability to sell or license copies of photographs for inclusion in newspapers would be a normal exploitation.
(Intellectual Property Office, 2014:11)

The examples on ‘fair dealing’ provided for researchers in the IPO guidance quoted above are woefully limited. The term ‘fair dealing’ is a legal one. There is no statutory definition of ‘fair dealing’. However it is accepted that issues such as whether the commercial value is reduced by the image being copied are pertinent. Additionally, consideration may be given to whether the amount of work taken is reasonable and appropriate, rather than substantial.
7.4.3. So what about the visual arts research and the use or appropriation of images?

‘Creative process typically involves appropriation and transformation’
(Deazley, and Bartolomeo, 2016:16).

Whilst in the most extreme scenario it is only in the courts that individual cases relating to fair dealing and copyright will be settled. Advice to visual researchers on the use of photographs, where someone else has created the original image or photograph appears ambiguous. ‘Since the introduction of the 1988 Act, photographers have always enjoyed a level of protection with respect to the fruits of their work, which other copyright owners have not’ (Fair Dealing Guidelines. Channel 4, 2016).

Given the recent amendments to copyright legislation within the UK there is little in the way of judicial consideration apart from case law to provide guidance on its parameters. For example, at the time of writing the website for researchers at Brunel University London, states that researchers may copy an image without seeking permission for own non-commercial private study or research. Whilst below this statement there is a suggestion of further conditions these are not stated on the site and it is unlikely that many researchers would feel the need to investigate further here. The University of Birmingham’s website on the other hand suggests in relation to pre-publication theses and dissertations, that the use of images is permissible though cautions that ‘you should only use low resolution images or extracts of images that fully support the arguments you are making’. The low-resolution clause being an attempt to counter arguments from the rights holder that use of the image restricts its commercial value. The website of the University of Leicester takes a firmer view, stating that unless images are out of copyright, researchers will require permission from the rights-holder. Again, on the Manchester Metropolitan University website researchers are directed to this guidance from the University of Leicester.

Confusion of this kind can only engender uncertainty with the visual arts research community. This uncertainty may lead some visual researchers to avoid engaging with works entirely as ‘users are likely to err on the side of caution, to their detriment’ (Ncube, 2015:58). This is disappointing given the findings from the 2011 Hargreaves report, on which the 2015 revisions to UK copyright rest. The report acknowledged calls for an’urgent need reform copyright to realise opportunities, and to make it clear what researchers and educators are allowed to do (Hargreaves, 2011). The danger of this uncertainty is clear, ‘the lack of certainty as to the extent of permissible licence free use of copyrighted works negatively affects the contractual bargaining space because the user approaches negotiations with uncertainty as to the parameters of their permission free use of the work’ (Ncube, 2015:59).
Adding to this dilemma, it was also noted during the development of the ethical thinking sessions described in chapter two, that researchers would often confuse notions of consent and copyright, conflating the two. This served only to further obscure a position on the acceptable use of visual material.

7.4.4. Consent, Copyright and the ‘Bad photos’.

Let us now consider the ‘bad photos’ collection discussed earlier. Particularly those images where the researcher is not also the rights holder. In this scenario the researcher wishes to use a photographic image in their unpublished thesis and also within an exhibition of their visual work. Though the exhibition is not a commercial one, the researcher also does not hold the copyright for the picture. The arguments relating to copyright for the use of this image will revolve around a number of factors.

The four major issues identified by this study are:

1) Is the use of the image justifiable in terms of the research study?
2) Does the use of the image for research undermine its commercial value?
3) How substantial is the material used?
4) Is this non-commercial research?

Whilst further considerations might include:

5) Has the photograph been in the public domain before?
6) With regard to exhibitions connected to research. Does this fall within the ‘no copyright infringement for research’ or ‘anything done for the purposes of an examination’?
7) How significant is it that members of the public may attend the exhibition? Would even inadvertent attendance by members of the public undermine the exemption, or mean the exhibition would count as published work?
8) What is the policy of the awarding body or institution on copyright, particularly in relation to the later publication of theses?
9) How old is the image? Does copyright still apply?
10) To what extent has the photograph been transformed?
11) Can a rights owner be identified or contacted?
12) Could copyright dispensations other than the research/teaching exemptions also apply to the image such as ‘fair dealing’ for a quotation from a work for criticism or review?

The list above is not exclusive, merely an indication of some of the features likely to be discussed when making a judgement. In the visual arts research environment, we should also then consider a range of separate ethical issues. These might concern the consent of subjects portrayed within
the image or the process of the images acquisition. Furthermore these ethical judgements may extend to the nature of the image itself.

7.4.5. The creative risk of mundane creative decisions
As it can be from the arguments above, whilst it is not impossible for a researcher within the visual arts to use photographs without the permission of the copyright holder, in practice it not without obstacle. This would be further complicated when for example, a doctoral thesis was published. At this point many institutions now require candidates to provide assurances over the copyright. Subsequent transposition of research findings into journal articles would also be affected, as would any later commercial exploitation of the work. In reaching any decision the researcher may consider the tendency for universities to take a conservative approach to any interpretation of the law. Whilst a researcher may consider if it is possible to use the fair dealing provisions in support of the quotation from a copyrighted work for criticism or review rather than the research proviso, this carries with it the risk of subsequent contest and legal challenge. Legal precedent can of course help. Channel 4 was responsible for the first major test of fair dealing in a contested legal case for the purposes of criticism and review. The case concerned their use of clips from the film *A Clockwork Orange*, whilst Channel 4 won the case few researchers would relish becoming enmeshed in litigation.

For visual arts researchers therefore what might initially appear to be a simple even mundane creative decision, for example the use of found family photographs, may in itself now necessitate the need for a level of creative risk taking.
7.5. Finding a treatment for the case study images

Cameraperson in the boot of car

Figure 42.

In this colour landscape image we can see a hatchback car parked on a narrow wooded lane. Inside the open car, sits a young man holding a tripod and looking through the lens of a video camera. The cameraperson is smoking a cigarette. Outside of the car to right we can see another young male holding a soft dink bottle in his left hand and pointing with his right hand into the distance. It appears that the car is stationary and the driver’s door is open. There is no evidence to suggest that the car has been driven in this manner but never the less there is something disconcerting about the scene. The issue within the image is one of safety. Filming from the back of moving vehicles would be deemed unsafe practice. A counter narrative that the cameraperson is simply sheltering from the rain under the hatchback door, feels unlikely.

Whilst the issue of copyright is not central to this image, there is a clear concern regarding anonymity. At the time of the photograph, there was a sense of personal trust between the photographer and the subjects and consent for the image would have been informal. This image was taken before a research proposal had been developed or an appreciation for ethical aspects of visual arts pedagogy had been explored. The impetus for the photograph at this point was possibly to record a scene that felt unsettling. Even if at this point formal consent had been obtained it is unlikely to have remained valid as the intended use for the image changed. ‘Participants may give consent to having their photograph taken, they may not be consenting to subsequent display of those images’ (Clark et al., 2010:86) The photograph ‘features’ two young males and is not a crowd or group photograph. It has not previously been published or placed in the public domain. As such there are may be ethical issues over privacy. For the purpose of the Data Protection Act 1998, a digital image of an individual can be considered to be personal data even if the photograph was taken in a public space and therefore requires consent (Clark et al.,
The central issue here is trust and to display these images without consent would not seem appropriate. Attempts to trace the subjects of the photographs in order to retrospectively seek consent; having failed an alternative option was required.

As a visual artist this presents a challenge and requires the attempt at least at an elegant solution. If the issue here, is one of anonymity, then the methods described earlier to cover or blur faces would be an option. It would be interesting to determine if obscuring or blurring the subject’s faces would feel primitive or crude and whether this technique would indeed contribute to a sense of criminality and disconcertion within the image.

The speculation by Wiles et al., (2008) that anonymity may sometimes mean making the decision not to use aspects of visual data prompted a further interest in next more boldly redacting areas of the image. After further consideration it was decided to experiment with the notion of removing all identifying elements from the photograph in a series of stages and evaluate the result. In this way the subjects would be removed from the image but would leave a trace of their presence in the empty white space. Finally, with reference to the genre of documentary reenactment it was decided to explore a solution where the original image was reimagined in its entirety. The results of this experiment can been seen below. Feedback at the exhibition event would be sought with the aim at evaluating the four images.

Figure 43. Top left: covering face. Top right: Blurring face. Bottom left: removal. Bottom right: reenactment.
Girl with a knife in her eye.

Figure 44.

The colour image is a 16:9 format frame from a short film. The background is very dark. We can see the face of a girl wearing glasses. On closer examination we can see that the subject appears to have suffered a physical trauma. Though indistinct, we can see what appears to be the blade of a knife piercing the left girl's eye. Blood flows down her cheek. The image evokes a feeling of shock. To the viewer it will not be immediately clear that this is a physical effect. From a pedagogical perspective there are questions concerning the technical competence of the student filmmakers to safely accomplish this effect. From a supervisor's viewpoint there is a tension between wanting to celebrate the construction of a sophisticated image by the filmmaker and concern over vulnerability should something have gone wrong.

This image derives from a short film that was included and distributed on a show-reel of student work and as such it could be argued that the material has entered the public domain. In terms of copyright it may be possible to contend therefore that the use of the image meets the criteria both for research use and the wider fair dealing provision for criticism and review or quotation from a work.

The student in the photograph was traced through social media and retrospectively gave their permission for use of the photograph. Consent was obtained for use of image as an illustration in the publication of research findings, and in supportive academic teaching and research materials. Additionally consent was agreed for exhibition of the image in the context of other examples of challenging media production activity in an exhibition.

The image has been selected for exhibition as an illustration of explicit creative and physical risk undertaken by visual arts students.
Covert CCTV in the classroom

![Figure 45.](image)

The diptych above comprises two portrait photographs. The colour photograph on the left shows a classroom in which students are working. Due to the depth of field the identity of these students is obscured and anonymity preserved. The photograph on the right is reproduced in black and white. However within this same image there is a device on the ceiling that appears in colour. There is an apparent attempt to draw the viewer’s attention to this element of the image. To most observers the device might appear to be a smoke alarm. However, the device on the ceiling is in fact a sophisticated 360-degree CCTV camera. There are no signs indicating that activity in the room is being recorded. The students and staff are unaware that they were being filmed. There are clear ethical issues here particularly as this camera is being operated as a covert device.

As a teacher, the use of the recording device elicits a number of emotions, notably around trust; who is being watched and who has access to this material? Why aren’t there clear signs stating that activity in the room is being recorded? What does this say about the teaching environment in the school that necessitates these measures? There is the sense that without prior notification the use of this camera has crossed an ethical boundary. Its use seem redolent of caution expressed over the rights of individuals in relation to their personal data (Clark et al., 2010).
The photograph above shows an old tractor lifting a large film spotlight. The light has been lifted in this manner presumably to replicate or augment sunlight during filming. Three men appear to be balancing the spotlight on a makeshift platform by pulling down on its power cable. Another man is sitting on the tractor apparently controlling the loader. In the background, a person slightly removed from the scene observes the activity.

There are several issues in the shot. Firstly it is clear that the load carried by the tractor is unstable. It would also be considered unsafe for people to stand directly under a loader due to the risk of falling objects, operator error or hydraulic failure. Though less obvious, another danger in this scene is the thick electric cable, linking buildings. This can be seen above and behind the tractor. With the loader raised in this manner there is a risk of the tractor making contact with the cable and a risk of electrocution.

Whilst it is clear that there is significant risk portrayed within the image, the central reason for its inclusion here though, relates to the nature of its acquisition and the possibility of its use within visual research. It is an example of a found image, one that can present a researcher with an ethical and legal dilemma.
Initially the only information concerning the origin of the photograph was that it had appeared some years ago at a conference at Pinewood film studios. There was no record of consent or details of the photographer.

Looking through the prism of UK copyright legislation it might be possible under these circumstances to use the image under the researcher ‘exceptions to copyright’ principle however here as we have previously discussed, clear guidance relating to photographs is muted. ‘Whilst the exception applies to all types of copyright work, it would only be in exceptional circumstances that copying a photograph would be allowed under this exception’ (Intellectual Property Office, 2014:11).

That the image had been in the public domain at the conference was significant to the possibility of its use under alternative fair dealing provisions for the quotation from a copyrighted work for criticism or review. However this does not resolve the dilemma faced by a visual researcher where universities require postgraduate researchers to obtain permission from the rights-holder for all images (e.g. Copyright and Research. University of Leicester, 2016.) Our photographic example illustrates the conservative approach taken towards copyright by higher education bodies. Kim et al., (2009:535) notes ‘Institutions have a tendency to impose on themselves requirements that are even more stringent than those required by law’. Furthermore the issue of consent remained unresolved. Should the image be redacted in some way to preserve anonymity or was it enough that the photograph had been in the public domain. This was a situation strongly reminiscent of the notion discussed earlier that for the researcher there is creative risk even in apparently mundane creative decisions.

In this instance it was decided to start by trying to track down the rights holder for the tractor image to see how hard it would be to obtain permission. Firstly this required the location of a list of speakers from the 2008 Pinewood conference, fortunately this was found using old emails and archived data. Next from the list of speakers it was necessary to identify the person who had used the image in their PowerPoint. Providentially it was next possible to locate a pen-drive that had been given away to delegates at the end of the conference that included copies of these presentations. When there was a name, it was then relatively simple to trace the speaker who it was discovered conveniently had their own website. Through this website it was possible to obtain a telephone number and finally speak with the person who had first presented the tractor image. It emerged that the conference speaker had not taken the photograph. However, having described the purposes on the research project in an act of great kindness he offered track down the photographer and seek permission for its use with in this study. Later that day an email arrived, forwarded from the original photographer giving permission for the photograph’s use.
At this point by way of a comparison, it was decided to trace the photographer of a second image ‘Boy with a shotgun’, described in fig 4 earlier.

Boy with a shotgun

In this image two well-dressed young men in country clothing. They are standing in a field on the brow of a hill looking across several miles of rural landscape. Their backs are to the camera, so you cannot see their faces. Both carry shotguns. There is no one else in the picture. At their feet are two dogs, one of which carries a rabbit in its mouth. The image was submitted as part of a sixth form media assignment by one of the young men in the photograph. The image was produced in support of an ambitious idea for a cooking programme where contestants would hunt their ingredients and then cook them. There is nothing within the photograph to suggest anything is being done illegally. The reason that the photograph is notable pertains to the nature of the activity. For a sixth form project there is the sense that this work may be crossing a boundary between ambitious work that seeks to mimic professional practice and what can be ethically condoned within a school environment. The image has not been in the public realm and there is no consent for its use.

Having sought help from a previous work colleague, it was a fairly easy process to locate the student who had taken the image described above. As the photograph was several years old, by the point communication was re-established the student was working commercially in a fairly high profile role. Contact was made via a professional business website. A written request for use of the image was made, detailing the research project and way in which the photograph might be used. However there was no reply. Eventually telephone contact was established and the ex-student initially sounded exuberant that his image might be used in the study. It was explained however that written permission would be required and another information email was sent. This was followed up by a text message. Unfortunately there was no further response from the ex-student.

It was thought at this point that further communication would be inappropriate as it might be interpreted as pressuring the ex-student over use of the image. It was decided that the photograph could not be used on the grounds of:

a) It had not previously been in the public domain
b) Consent had not been obtained
c) There was a sense from the lack of communication, despite the initial verbal response that there was a preference for the image to remain private.
Student filmmaking in the Alps

Figure 47.

The black and white photograph shows a postgraduate film student on location in the French Alps. Whilst the image is an example of visual research material for which initially there was no record of consent or copyright approval, its inclusion however primarily illustrates how creative risk and ethics can become entwined.

The project documented here, concerns the production of a documentary for a Masters level qualification. Significant resource is required to successfully produce a film made in a remote location like the one pictured above. To independently achieve outstanding work requires substantial levels of problem solving, considerable determination and the ability to embrace creative risk. Engaging with creative risk ‘can lead students to develop cutting-edge and novel solutions in their work’ (Ellis and Meneely, 2015:30), where for filmmakers higher levels of attainment are often confirmed by festival commendation.

The MIRIAD study earlier defined the nature of creative risk as:

a) Thinking differently, unconventionally, or from a new perspective.
b) A speculative situation, that involves exposure to peril and chance.
c) An affinity to crossing the limits of the field or subject area.

From the supervisor’s point of view, supporting projects of this nature can itself also feel like an exposure to ethical risk. Ethical rules and procedures can feel vague, (De Wet, 2010) and assessment outcomes sometimes appear generic (Davies, 2012).
Is it always equitable to accord adventurous projects that clearly embrace creative risk higher assessment grades? At the time the student in this example was working at the boundary of established or accepted institutional practice. Orr, (2011:11) recognises ‘testing of boundaries as related to outstanding fine art practice’. Conversely Ellis and Meneely, (2015:30-31) remind us ‘that safekeeping is also necessary to ensure that solutions are appropriately resolved to a given context’. In these cases assessment can often be complex as ‘for art and design lecturers, the work and the student are entangled’ and the role of learning outcomes can sometimes feel contested, (Orr, 2010:2).

Furthermore is the promotion and commendation of high levels of craft adequately supported by the resources of the institution? Is the student technically and personally competent to work at distance unsupervised? How is this evidenced? Do we simply sometimes expect too much?

A number of questions within in the new MIRIAD ethical appraisal process described in chapter six attempt to reflect these equivocal concerns. For example in question A4 of the appraisal document the researcher is asked, ‘is it difficult to sufficiently justify that the project is of value to research/creative development or academic understanding?’ Question A5 examines ‘does the project lack relevance to your field of study?’ Furthermore question C1 enquires, ‘does the work introduce any risk of physical harm to the researcher, participants, general public or animals?

7.6 The exhibition

The exhibition of visual work was staged at the Grosvenor gallery, between the 9th and the 20th May 2016. It was promoted online and invitations were sent out for a special view event on Thursday 19th May 4.30-6.30pm.

A written contextual preface was provided under each image and an overall introduction was displayed at the beginning of the exhibition.

Comment slips were provided at the show in the hope of encouraging feedback. In addition audio interviews were recorded with attendees at the special view event on the 19th.

The interview questions asked linked to the findings from the survey work in chapter five. The central topics being ‘is the academy suitably prepared to encourage creative risk taking’ and ‘in relation to your research have you ever taken a creative risk that transcends normative ethical behaviour?’
Figure 48. Above: Promotion on the events section of the MMU website (also appendix 14) Below: Email flyer that was sent out to invitees (Figure 49).

John Spencer

Ethics and the Academy

The Grosvenor Gallery 9th – 20th May 2016

An exhibition of work connected to the development of a new discipline-specific model for ethical appraisal, within which a student might meaningfully engage with ethical issues inherent in their visual research.
Below: Photographs of the exhibition

Figure 50. Ethics and the academy at the Grosvenor gallery, May 2016.
7.7. Findings from the exhibition

The response from the comments cards was poor with only one being returned however; the audio interviews at the exhibition on Thursday 19th May, were more productive.

The feedback from the audio interviews that concerned whether the academy was suitably prepared to encourage creative risk taking, generally reinforced the responses from the earlier surveys in chapter five. These had identified issues with ‘University rules’ and raised concern that ‘(Ethical appraisal)...might preclude risk-taking’ yet whilst they highlighted that procedures might ‘restrict the possibility for quick fire, chance and intuitive responses’ they also acknowledged ‘Institutional boundaries are counter productive but clearly necessary’. In summary it was a question of how appraisal was conducted and rules implemented that needed consideration. An environment where ‘current practices and knowledge should constantly be critically questioned, analysed and subsequently renewed’ (De Wet, 2010:313).

Comments from the exhibition audio interviews on this topic, extended these themes to include a palpable sense of frustration with institutional process:

‘The risks that we once took or encouraged as just part of the process of teaching creativity and innovation through learning is becoming more and more challenged ... there’s a risk adverse approach which we are coming up against time and time again’. -Exhibition interview with a Head of Department.

‘Creative risk taking is actively discouraged – it’s definitely a negative climate’. -Exhibition interview with art and design lecturer A.

‘I think where we work... they don’t have an academic confidence really and so they put a lot of rules in place to cover their backs because they think things will go wrong when actually if they’d a had lot more experience they realise you just need to be a bit more relaxed with it’. -Exhibition interview with an art and design lecturer B.

Whilst this study has earlier described the multiple factors that influence institutional behaviour in relation ethical risk, in summary it is apposite here to note the recognition by Delgado and Ross, (2016:3) of ‘the rise of the corporate university and the general reorganization of higher education that mirrors corporate style governance’ with all its attendant commercial concerns.

The interviewees were next questioned whether within their research they had ever taken a creative risk that transcended normative ethical behaviour. The reason for revisiting this theme was to examine if staff had ever in the past knowingly engaged in unethical research practices. In earlier surveys outlined in chapter five, this had only being examined in relation to intent. By
asking this question retrospectively it was hoped to more accurately determine the relationship between risk-taking and ethical transgression by visual arts lecturers.

All those staff questioned could provide examples where they felt they had either intentionally or unintentionally taken risks relating to consent.

Examples included:

‘Emm... I am in the process of perhaps doing that (working outside ethical guidelines), err... in terms of doing a research project that hasn’t had all the participants’ full approval ... So I’m running a project just in terms of timescale and what I might get out of it, that all those who participated didn’t necessarily agree that they wanted to be part of the research and their information might be used without their consent or knowledge in fact, which probably breaks all the rules (sic)’. -Exhibition interview with art and design lecturer A.

‘I have taken research risks...I ask participants to participate in answering a question on camera which they agree to do and I said it was for educational purposes only, but did not back it up by getting written permission – now would you call that out of the norm and would you call that taking a risk?’ -Exhibition interview with art and design lecturer C.

‘It can hinder if you follow ethical paths too closely ... I have had direct experience of this’ - Exhibition interview with part-time art and design lecturer D.

Concerning the use of visual images one interviewee posited ‘Its interesting how CCTV seems to capture us all naturally and we don’t think about objecting to it ... and yet we need to get signed approval to ..(take a photograph for research).

This focus on issues of consent by interviewees, accords with this study’s earlier finding that identified consent (rather than more transgressive acts) as a major ethical issue for visual arts researchers.
7.8. Summary

This chapter’s research through practice focus has been important to developing a deeper understanding of ethics and risk from practical perspective. Examining the photographs and their display has necessitated an exploration of complex consent and copyright issues which visual researchers are more increasingly being expected to address. The preparation of the charts has been useful in terms of combining components or elements to form a connected whole. This is demonstrated for example in chart four ‘Defining creative risk and the characteristics of visual arts risk-takers’ where data and design combine to provide a visual synthesis.

In terms of the exhibition and the images themselves, visitors commented:

‘There’s little bits of everything ...little bits that have an implication on everything that we do as researchers in each of the images anyway, it just kind of reminds ...brings those things back in’ - Exhibition interview with art and design lecturer A.

‘I think the images and the different situations ... are very prevalent and thought provoking and it’s interesting that we can relate to them’. -Exhibition interview with art and design lecturer C.
8. Conclusion

8.1 Structure of the conclusion
The conclusion presented here contains an introduction and a middle section containing a synthesis of the study’s empirical findings as answers to the research questions together with theoretical and policy implications. Towards the end of the chapter there is an indication the direction of future research.

8.2 Introduction
This study set out to make an original contribution to knowledge, by an examination of the relationship between ‘creative risk’ and ethics within media and visual arts pedagogy at a higher education level.

The study sought to know if the development of a new discipline-specific model for ethical appraisal, within which a student might meaningfully and reflectively engage with ethical issues inherent in their visual research could result in an improved appraisal process? What would be the consequences of a new system and how would researchers respond to it?

The necessity for the research addresses a contemporary problem, namely the maturing of art and design as a research discipline, where visual arts researchers are often being required to complete ethical assessments of their work, with generic paperwork or online scrutiny. This process often provides little in the way of a discipline-specific introduction to ethical thinking or appraisal. A factor De Wet, (2010) noted as also absent within social research. However the observation that ethical issues implicit in visual research are different than those derived from purely textual sources, (Wiles et al., 2008), together with the recognition that quality assurance may hinder creative approach, (Hargreaves, 2008), necessitates the need to seek better solutions. The possible consequences of not attending to this problem would mean that postgraduate visual arts researchers do not fully profit from the ‘beneficial repercussions of ethical awareness,’(De Wet, 2010:301).

A second allied aim of the study was to consider the role of ‘creative risk’ and how this might affect the ethical decision-making of visual arts researchers and staff? Was it possible to provide an original definition for the term ‘creative risk’ in this context?

Whilst there are indications that creative risk is emerging as a topic of interest (e.g. Ellis and Meneely, 2015), no study so far from a visual arts perspective, has fully considered the ubiquitous
nature of risk defined by Jackson et al., (1972) or the difficulty individuals have comprehending this risk described by (Gigerenzer, 2002). Whilst the link between ethics and creative risk is explored by Cashell (2009), this focuses on more extreme activity, taking place outside the academy. Within a visual arts research context however, applied ethical procedures are largely unexplored. The importance of better understanding creative risk is critical. In pointing to the paucity of research in this area Ellis and Meneely, (2015:17), emphasise the importance for visual arts students to learn to ‘take creative risks and challenge the status quo’. A starting point would reasonably be a definition or interpretation of the term itself. It is proper therefore that the research addresses this gap in the field of study.

Finally by analysing data assembled during the study, a ‘research through practice’ component explored a visualisation of the findings and considered the ethical risks associated with the display of problematical images. In doing so it considered the ethical issues associated with the use within research of images without consent or copyright. Here Prosser and Loxley, (2008) identify the limited agreement and uncertainty which characterise the ethical appraisal of images within research, whilst legal considerations are raised by Rosie Wiles et al., (2008)

By examining the practical implications the study sought to link ethics, creative risk and appraisal procedure to identify the options for researchers working in this area.

8.3 Empirical findings
The main empirical findings are chapter specific and were summarised within the respective empirical chapters:

Case study one. An examination of perspectives on ethics and creative risk
Case study two. Developing an diagnostic ethical model for visual arts research
Case study three. Creating visualisations of ethical appraisal and creative risk.

This section will synthesise the empirical findings to answer the study’s three research aims.

8.3.1 Creative risk
How might ‘creative risk’ affect the ethical decision-making of visual arts researchers?

The study identified that within the visual arts an overwhelming majority of undergraduates, postgraduates and staff consider creative risk-taking to be important. Only one third or less of all visual arts respondents questioned, directly linked the appraisal of contemporary art to its ethical status. In the revised convergence group survey this figure remained steady at 33%, however here and in staff survey, a significant further percentage chose to give more qualified answers. These are sometimes best described as ambivalent for example, ‘tastes, ideas, truths and opinions
about what is ethically good changes over time’ or art ‘needs to be ethically aware but can challenge perceived ethics’. In terms of the study this has highlighted the equivocal context in which ethical appraisal, must reside.

‘Creativity is not always ethically justifiable or accountable to the rules and regulations laid down by the institution,’ Staff survey response.

These tentative opinions also contribute to an initial sense of confliction where the study identifies the necessity for those engaged in ethical appraisal to differentiate between an institutional research context and art practice operating outside of the academy.

Importantly the research has also identified a significant proportion of visual arts researchers and students who consider it to be acceptable to work unethically or to break moral codes when taking a creative risk. For example in the convergence researcher sample this figure was 75%, whilst in earlier student surveys this ranged between from 68% to 87%. However when the same group, were directly asked if they themselves would work unethically only 25% said they might.

Whilst there are a variety of plausible reasons for the discrepancy between these two figures such as participants situated within the research context or the reluctance to admit to unethical behavior, we cannot be certain. Vrij et al., (2011) describe the difficulty in distinguishing between the true and false intent of participants.

A number of respondents mention the desire to shock, create tension or challenge however, it is also clear that the majority of visual arts researchers do not set out to inflict unnecessary harm or distress, rather they are wary of attempts to limit their self expression. For example in the undergraduate survey ‘Having a set of rules to abide by will restrict what I can create’ and ‘creative minds should not be restricted’. This theme is extended in postgraduate responses with comments such as ‘Moral codes are essentially individually ascribed although consensus is clearly important in order for there to be agreement and some form of legislation. It is the imposition that concerns me, or not having the opportunity to challenge’.

What is significant here is that the responses from the surveys emphasise a conflicted or paradoxical approach to ethical thinking in relation to creative working.

These contradictory themes emerge again in the staff survey. By comparison to students this questionnaire identified that staff sometimes took creative risks and generally view this as being important. Whilst acknowledging it is not always possible to ethically justify creative work, staff unlike students appeared to be extremely reluctant to actively consider personally breaking ethical codes in the pursuit of creative risk-taking. However in the survey the focus of this last
question was again on intent, recognised by Vrij et al., (2011) as difficult to verify. Given their position in an institutional context it is perhaps not surprising staff would be resistive to an admission of premeditated ethical transgression. To address this issue during the audio interviews conducted at the exhibition, staff were asked to retrospectively reflect on occasions where they had actually taken risks in their research that transcended normative ethical behaviour. The subsequent responses documented in chapter seven appear to suggest a more widespread departure by visual arts staff from institutional ethical policy, than initially identified. This finding is also again consistent with the suggestion by Hargreaves, (2008) that within the university environment it is difficult to balance quality assurance with the flexibility required for really creative approaches.

One particular policy applying to all fields of research, with ubiquitous support in the UK due to its link to funding (Israel, 2014), and as response to a string of high profile ‘fact fabrication’ cases (Lawless, 2013) was the ‘The concordat to support research integrity’ (2012). The thrust of the concordat is resolute in demanding rigour and integrity in research, whilst requiring suitable training opportunities for researchers (Universities UK, 2012). However, perhaps inconveniently, this study has used empirical findings to show that visual arts researchers propelled by the overwhelming implicit desire to take creative risks, grapple with irresolute notions of normative artistic ethical behavior. Whilst the concordat calls for clear guidelines it contains little practical advice to address what De Wet, (2010) identified as a lack of guidance with which to address problematic ethical issues, experienced for example in the visual arts.

The first policy implication of this study is the recommendation that discipline specific ethical training is provided to visual arts researchers and staff with the clear distinction made between visual arts research within the Academy and creative activity outside its confines. This finding also links to the MIRIAD discipline-specific model for ethical appraisal described later in this chapter.

**Was it possible to provide an original definition for the term ‘creative risk’?**

The common recurrent themes from the four surveys that have been identified as characterising ‘creative risk’ are:

a) Thinking differently, unconventionally, or from a new perspective.
b) A speculative situation, that involves exposure to peril and chance.
c) An affinity to crossing the limits of the field or subject area.

The responses from the surveys also suggest that the demarcation ‘crossing the limits of the field’ may further include at times a ‘contrarian’ element of direct challenge to accepted norms of moral or ethical behaviour or ‘current orthodoxy’. ‘We need to put question marks in peoples’
heads...we need to be considerate but at the same time provoke’, (chapter six Lecturer interviews). In the undergraduate survey this was also linked to ‘a drive or persistence, despite resistance from perceived constraints’.

Also notable was the finding from the staff survey that extended the discourse, to consider those who may determine or validate levels of creative risk. This is a similar enquiry to that which exists around the verification or affirmation of creativity itself, where the role of tacit knowledge may inform the assessment of creative activity. Whilst the suggestion that creative ‘values are contested and co-constructed in communities of practice’(Orr, 2010:13), may suffice in terms of creative assessment, this study’s survey responses suggest more individualistic attitudes to levels of creative risk. This supposition however would also intimate the possible difficulty in reaching a common measure for creative risk, due to an individual’s personal predilection for risk. Gigerenzer’s (2002:26), identifies three alternative methods of interpreting probability that create this confusion for individuals in terms of quantifying risk. These are ‘degrees of belief’ or ‘subjective probability’, propensity and frequency. Therefore an implication of the study would be that a better understanding of risk itself would be beneficial as part of any attempt to develop creativity. Similarly this idiosyncratic feature of creative risk-taking emphasises the need within ethical processes to balance the importance of creative risk-taking with an informed perception and interpretation of risk itself.

In relation to creative risk this study has also shown that the overwhelming response from the surveys reveal the belief that some individuals have a greater propensity for taking creative risks than others. The findings express a prevalent opinion that an individual’s attitude towards taking creative risks might be developed either up to a person’s predetermined or natural capacity for ‘creative risk’ or nurtured in an unlimited way. This discovery adds weight to an earlier early study that identified a majority of Teaching Fellows believed that likewise creativity too could be developed (Fryer, 2006) and challenges the findings of Oliver et al (2006) that tentatively question the possibility that creativity can be taught.

When respondents in our study were asked what qualities these people had that enabled them to be more likely to take ‘creative risks, we can see a theme of separateness or divergence from the norm, i.e. the confident contrarian. Whilst care needs to be exercised in interpreting this finding particularly with regard to the extent that these opinions might unknowingly reflect popular stereotypes. What is clear however is that within the survey groups there is a clear image of the perceived qualities required by creative risk takers.
The factors identified in the study seen as being supportive for stimulating creative risk-taking in an educational context included:

- A need for encouragement to take creative risks or at least a supportive culture
- Assessment that allows visual researchers space for experimentation
- Examples illustrating creative risk in other practitioners’ work

The three descriptors for creative risk earlier highlighted by this study also align with what is traditionally seen as the four main areas of risk: monetary risk, physical risk, ethical risk and social risk (Jackson et al., 1972:486). However, the study’s new definition better and more accurately clarifies creative risk by its emphasis on ‘thinking differently’, ‘speculation’ and the compulsion to cross boundaries or challenge to orthodoxy.

The image ‘chart four’ in chapter seven in turn attempts to visually portray these defining themes and perceptions of creative risk. The work utilises quotes taken from the four principle surveys described in chapter five. Within the design, colour is used to emphasise the recurring motifs. These encompass; thinking differently, unconventionally, or from a new perspective; a speculative situation involving exposure to peril and chance or an affinity to crossing the limits of the field or subject area. Whilst attempts at defining creativity abound, Ellis and Meneely, (2015) clearly note in their literature review the scarcity of research concerning creative risk and research. This study is the first time that an enquiry has sought the views of visual arts researchers in an attempt to better interpret and describe the term creative risk. This new definition of creative risk is therefore an original contribution to knowledge. Chart four is an explicit visual representation of this work.

The study has also identified the concept of creative risk within mundane creative decisions. In chapter seven, the process of research through practice revealed that within the UK the combination of new legislation and tighter intellectual property guidelines by institutions on the use of visual material in research posed a dilemma for some researchers. The new legislation around copyright introduced in 2014 partially aimed at helping researchers, leaves many unanswered questions for those evaluating ethical appraisals. For visual researchers what might initially appear to be a simple even mundane creative decision for example, the use of found family photographs remains problematic. When coupled with a lack of clarity relating to copyright exemption, the use of certain images may necessitate the need in itself for a level of creative risk taking.
8.3.2 The development of a new discipline-specific model for ethical appraisal

The main focus of the MIRIAD ethical appraisal project emerged from the PhD pilot research activity. Here the central role of ethical appraisal within art and design had become apparent, whilst the prevailing inadequacies of the ethical review system both subject specifically at Manchester Metropolitan University and generally across the sector grew increasingly evident. Lederman, (2007:315) testifies to the ‘chasm between regulatory ethics’ and the divergent practical realities of research. The content of many conventional ethics checklists sampled felt remote from the visual arts field and appeared largely to be derived from the sphere of medicine rather than the visual arts. De Wet, (2010) contends that for unrelated disciplines it is unsatisfactory to simply follow the procedures of the biomedical model, yet this it is precisely what many institutional ethical appraisal processes replicate. In criticising the “tick-box” format that characterises ethical clearance in biomedical research De Wet, (2010) argues that this approach does not allow the level of subtlety required where human beings are involved. The problem with a purely tick box system is its inability to allow a more expansive or reflective response by the researcher. Rather ‘gaining ethics approval becomes a curiously disconnected facet of a research project’s life’ (Miller et al., 2012:30).

In addition conventional ethical appraisal processes often lack transparency, for the researcher it can be unclear which activities could be dealt with locally and which would require referral. De Wet, (2010:309) refers to this as the ‘principles of subsidiarity’ where ‘decisions and actions should ideally take place closest to the source’. Finally it was evident that researchers were being required to engage with ethics yet were ill equipped for entry to the discourse. With reference to the pilot study it was clear that simply to provide ethical assessment processes without adequate induction or at least a basic level of understanding was also unsatisfactory. Within health and safety legislation a similar proposition would risk invalidating the entire exercise. For an appraisal of safety, or for that matter ethics it can be argued that a participant needs to have a level competency within the field before exercising judgment if the process is to be considered sound. There was a clear need to foster competency via an introduction to ethical thinking in order to substantiate the exercise. As early as 2011 the need therefore to develop a new discipline specific ethical appraisal protocol for researchers in the visual arts was seen as a priority.

The resultant MIRIAD protocol has extended the ethical criteria adopted for the visual arts in Birmingham City University’s research ethics project (The Ethics Project, 2006) but importantly and uniquely then merged this with the two-part appraisal process commonly found in risk assessment. In so doing the aim has been to devise a model for ethical process within which a student might be encouraged to meaningfully and reflectively engage with ethical issues inherent
in their creative work. At the same time this reflective approach attempts to resist ‘reductive objectification in the interest of consistency’, (Lederman, 2007:311). In the pursuit of transparency the MIRIAD protocol also makes it clear which areas of activity would require mandatory referral to the head of departmental ethics.

During the period of the research between 2012 and 2015 subject specific taught workshop sessions were delivered to all new postgraduate research (PGR) starters at MMU, whilst the ethical checklist central to the diagnostic model progressed through several revisions. These developments were the result of continued feedback from the on-going trial with PGR groups. Major developments to the electronic appraisal document included the inclusion of interactive elements, embedded examples and case studies relevant to visual arts researchers.

Most significantly though the new process included the requirement for documented participant reflection on ethical issues raised, important in evaluating both the project and engagement with the process.

*Could the development of a new visual arts model for ethical appraisal, result in an improved process?*

One of the ways of evaluating the new MIRIAD system is to consider the quality of reflective ethical responses submitted by visual arts researchers using the new protocol. At MMU the MIRIAD protocol replaced a tick-box system of appraisal with limited generic ethical criteria that required no evidence of reflection from the researcher. However whilst ‘tick-box’ systems are commonplace and may be attractive in terms of managerial auditing it is an approach that Lederman, (2007:306) asserts lacks an ‘improvisational subtlety’ needed to encompass the ‘divergent practical realities’ of research. The combination of a mandatory taught session, subject specific descriptors and encouragement for a reflective written response within the MIRIAD protocol sought to critically address this deficiency.

In chapter six the use of standard grade descriptors at level seven (MMU Centre for Excellence in Learning and Teaching, 2015) for the evaluation of ethical forms is described. Whilst these descriptors relate to Masters degree qualifications, rather than M.Phil or PhD they provide a reasonable basis for the qualitative assessment of submissions. Using this method the study examined the data on ethical appraisals submitted by visual arts researchers in a period to September 2015. Overall in these first four tranches of forms there were 27% of submissions where either no attempt had been made by the researcher to give an ethical response to points raised, or the researcher indicated no ethical issues present within the project. Given the
hypothesis that at this level very few submissions would have no ethical dimension, this initially appears to be a disappointingly high figure. However it should be stressed that the incidence of such forms was exceptionally high (45%) within the first cohort. This was at a time immediately following the initially introduction of the system and when supervisor experience with the new process was limited. If we exclude this first group, the number of such ‘non-reflective’ submissions drops to average of 20% over the subsequent three tranches of submission. If we then solely look at the last tranche of forms analysed in 2015, when the ethical protocol had undergone many user initiated revisions and become more embedded, the figure of ‘non-reflective’ submissions drops to more acceptable 12.5%.

Furthermore, it is illuminating to consider the final group of seventeen researchers to submit appraisals in the time frame of this study during the fifth and concluding tranche of forms. These were evaluated in January 2016. Here only one researcher failed to attempt a reflective response (and one researcher mistakenly submitted the wrong form). This equates again to 12% ‘non-reflective’ submission rate or 6% if we exclude the researcher who used the wrong form.

Clearly attempting a reflective response is not the same thing as a satisfactory and reflective response. Here again we must return to the qualitative assessment of submissions using the standard grade descriptors at level seven. Of those participants submitting forms up to September 2015 who attempted a reflective response 30% of commentaries were judged in qualitative terms as grade eight or higher. The mean average grade across the submissions from researchers who had attempted a reflective response was 6.72. With reference to the grade descriptors previously mentioned, a score of 6-7 would equate with ‘evidence of the ability to work autonomously with reference to professional standards and values, reflecting critically on their own practice’. (MMU Centre for Excellence in Learning and Teaching, 2015:online).

Whilst these findings are positive it is also crucial for any system of ethical appraisal to be effective, it must also be dynamic process and respond overtime as projects and methodologies evolve. In much the same way as a risk assessment would require. Miller et al., (2012:39) cautions ‘ethical review and governance as currently configured do not and cannot, reach elements of unfolding research projects, however much they may regulate at the pre-study stage’. However as this is possible in health and safety risk assessment surely it can be attempted in research? Whilst the MIRIAD protocol reminds researchers of the need to resubmit appraisals as circumstances change it is clear that the subject of ethics cannot be abandoned after initial clearances have been obtained.
What would be the consequences of a new system?

The MIRIAD protocol has uniquely provided the opportunity to statistically assess the incidence of ethical issues highlighted by visual arts researchers. This is the first time a study concerning the visual arts has been able to utilise data of this nature.

From this analysis it is clear that issues such as consent; acknowledgement and integrity are considered to be inherent by many of the visual arts postgraduates who provided ethical reflection. More than 50% of reflective forms analysed accentuated the relevance of these areas to the researchers’ own individual studies.

Significantly, 69% of the reflective forms highlighted that the public exhibition of research outcomes was implicit in their work and may therefore require ethical consideration. Likewise other issues such as cultural copyright or the visual representations of individuals or social groups both featured in 34.5% of the reflective responses. Given the generally cooperative nature of the visual arts it was perhaps no surprise was that 79% of reflective feedback that evinced the use of collaborators, participants or subjects as an ethical factor in personal research studies.

More unexpected perhaps was the relatively high proportion of research (25%) taking place outside the UK. The number of reflective respondents (27%) who thought ethical issues around supervisory relationships might be germane to their research was also a surprise. Furthermore in light of the examination of creative risk in chapter two and discussion of ethical transgression within the literature review of this thesis, the absence of areas which might be considered more conspicuous candidates for ethical transgression was interesting. The ethical categories ‘sensitive issues’, ‘vulnerable populations’, ‘deception and covert research’ as well as ‘psychological well being’ all failed to receive any significant attention within the completed appraisals. Whilst within the narrow criteria of current conventional approaches it is possible areas such as cultural copyright or visual representation might risk being neglected, it is acknowledged that these issues cannot be considered in themselves exclusively discipline specific. They are likely to be present to varying degrees in other disciplines for example, anthropology or the wider social sciences. However, this study supports the notion that ethical appraisal processes in themselves should be context specific and reflective of the area or discipline.

Moreover a system of appraisal that encourages reflective responses by the researcher is essential if there can be meaningful evaluation of engagement with the process.
How would researchers respond to it?

Time and time again visual arts researchers would attend the MIRIAD ‘ethical thinking’ sessions and initially exhibit some resistance to the idea of ethical assessment, wary of a process that might restrict creative endeavour or introduce more bureaucracy. Notably, the study suggests here an innate fear of attempts to limit self-expression rather than an implicit desire to create unnecessary harm or distress. However, the findings also clearly emphasise the tension between the implicit desire to take creative risks and irresolute notions of normative artistic ethical behavior. During the sessions it was repeatedly observed that a key moment in the discussion was the realisation by participants of the difference between their roles as researchers rather than practitioners operating outside the academy. This conceptual switch would then almost enviably lead to a greater appreciation of the subject.

There were clearly some technical issues with early versions of the MIRIAD protocol particularly relating to attempts at incorporating interactive elements. The initial incidence of IT related problems encountered by some researchers with the electronic document was disappointing, but resolved by later versions of the protocol. A recommendation for a future direction of the study would be to transpose the MIRIAD process to a web based format. Preserving the reflective, discipline specific nature of the protocol with its introduction and case-studies but allowing the possibility of more universal access and more efficient resubmission of appraisals as projects and methodologies evolve.

8.3.2.1 Policy recommendations from the MIRIAD research ethics project

Findings from the MIRIAD research ethics project support:

- The requirement for a subject specific introduction to ethical thinking for researchers and students within the visual arts is critical.
- A system of appraisal that instigates reflective responses to ethical issues raised by researchers is important. This both encourages contemplative discussion and enables evaluation of the submitted appraisals. In addition Miller et al., (2012) notes by reflecting researchers ‘develop their ethical practice based on their own particular research approach’.
- Consideration within appraisal should be given to incorporating ethical criteria specific to the visual arts. To date it is only medicine appears to have this provision for discipline specific criteria.
- In terms of introducing research ethics to visual arts researchers, the study has shown us it is helpful to differentiate between the roles of the visual arts researcher and the practitioner operating outside the academy.
- For researchers the use of relevant case-studies is beneficial as are explanations of specialist ethical terminology.
From the outset, it needs to be transparent to participants which areas of research activity will require further or enhanced ethical consideration. Within the MIRIAD protocol this was achieved by colour coding.

In evaluating ethical appraisal ideally decisions and actions should be take place locally closest to the source with problematic research cases referred for greater scrutiny. (De Wet, 2010).

Within the process there should be a clear encouragement for open dialogue rather than a prescriptive approach. This is essential within creative arts education where judgments can be complex and there are rarely simple right or wrong answers.

It is important to provide easily accessible advice to participants during the process of appraisal (e.g. via supervisor, drop-in guidance or Skype). Preferably this advice should be discipline related.

Ethical appraisal should be viewed as a dynamic process, which responds as a project or methodology develops. There is a parallel again here with risk assessment. Appraisal should not be seen simply in terms of a hurdle to jump through. Miller et al., (2012) correctly describes ‘the mismatch between formal, pre-study ethics-committee-approval and what can unfold as projects commence’.

Within some areas of arts education such as the conservatoire approach or particular taught practices, an explicit ethical appraisal system may be inappropriate or unnecessary for some or all activities. In areas of minimal risk there is a need to streamline oversight (Kim et al., 2009).

It is clear staff training in research ethics is of importance and the key to further quality enhancements in this area.

It is appropriate to be wary of ‘audit culture’ and bureaucratic regulation enforcing a single manageable standard or generic tick-box exercise across all disciplines, (De Wet, 2010; Miller et al., 2012). Lederman, (2007) argues that ‘this faces the recalcitrant heterogeneity and improvisational subtlety of genuinely ethical research practice’.

There is a need for adequate resource to be made available to facilitate discipline specific schemes and then genuinely evaluate and respond to ethical appraisals submitted by visual arts researchers.

Ethics need to become understood as integral to a research activity, beneficial to researchers and their research rather than presented as a cumbersome ‘bolt on’. De Wet, (2010) is correct when she states ‘there is a need to sensitise the entire Faculty and the institution on the widespread beneficial repercussions of ethical awareness in research and beyond’.

8.3.3. Reflection on research through practice and the exhibition

The feedback from the Grosvenor Ethics and the Academy exhibition confirmed that the ethical dilemmas inherent in the work displayed had a resonance with visual art lecturers.

The findings from the exhibition of work are revealing. Comments by academic staff during the audio interviews at the exhibition link to the earlier survey work in chapter five. Here the propensity for risk-taking and willingness to work at a tangent to institutional ethical process are notable and important reoccurring themes. To an extent these findings are consistent with Lederman, (2007:314) who notes that ‘practitioners of divergent research styles will continue to simulate consilience with the regulatory ideal so as to appear compliant, cooperative, and transparent—therefore ethical’. Similarly Bledsoe et al., (2007) advance the idea that in light of increased ethical regulation researchers are faced with a number of options. At one extreme,
researchers might ignore it and carry on with their productivity; at another, they could conform all of their research and teaching conduct to the letter of ethic requirements. Lederman, (2007) states we should not confuse the simulation of compliance with cynicism on the part of researchers concerning their own actual ethical practice: far from it’. Whilst the surveys in chapter five highlight the opposition by researchers to any perceived limitation to self-expression and emphasise the necessity of creative risk-taking it is perhaps unsurprising that this ambivalence should exist. However it is also clear from the study that a lack of training in ethical thinking and the persistent use of unhelpful and generic regulatory systems contribute greatly to ‘simulated’ or outright non-compliance.

Chapter seven has also shown the difficulty faced by researchers employing visual research methods. In terms of photography for example, there seems an apparent failure by universities to consider copyright in the round. Whilst there are legal dispensations for research/teaching and exemptions such as ‘fair dealing’ for a quotation from a work for criticism or review, many universities instead adopt an unnecessarily hard-line, one-dimensional approach to copyright compliance. This is evident for example in requirement that researchers use only low resolution images or always require permission from the image rights-holder, (University of Leicester, 2016; University of Birmingham, 2016). There is a danger this conservative position lacks the subtlety required and is simply bad for research. What is more, its application is inconsistent. As has been mentioned previously it also engenders a sense of creative risk for researchers in what would otherwise be mundane research decisions. In specific examples like this it is hard to dispute the assertion that the unspoken goal of research ethics committees is clear: to protect the institution from both lawsuits and the suspension of funding (Bledsoe et al., 2007). However, if such a tension exists surely this necessitates an open debate. Within chapter seven, ‘communication modeling’ explicitly highlights the range of institutional pressures and other relevant issues pertinent to the design of a system of ethical appraisal for the visual arts. The resulting chart provides a contemporary illustration of the broad range of factors inherent in applied research ethics.

8.4. Discussion

Many commentators describe the difficulty defining creativity (e.g. Hargreaves, 2008) with a number going so far as to argue that it is simply a ‘Romantic notion’ (Buckingham, 2003; Sennett, 2008). This ‘difficulty with creativity’ also emerges in connection to its assessment, here this study concurs with Orr, (2011) on the tacit nature of the process. The Chester survey tentatively suggests that some students rarely explicitly consider the nature of creativity itself and are unsure of the metric for its assessment. There is much theoretical abstraction on creativity yet when read
en mass it can often appear reminiscent of Don Quixote tilting at windmills. There are too few discipline focused empirical studies on creativity in an university context, though notable among the best are the work of Orr, (2010-14) and the sector wide examination by Jackson et al., (2006).

The preliminary study outlined in chapter three, initially focused on physical risk and led to a clear understanding that the broader term ‘creative risk’ was critically significant and had a strong ethical dimension. In contrast to creativity, creative risk has been greatly overlooked in the literature a factor acknowledged by Ellis and Meneely, (2015) yet it may provide an alternative lens through which to better understand the processes of teaching, research and making. This study has demonstrated in terms of creative risk there appears much less uncertainty seeking a consensus over interpretation. The vast majority of students, researchers and staff all attest to its importance and there is consistency in their definitions:

a) Thinking differently, unconventionally, or from a new perspective.
b) A speculative situation, that involves exposure to peril and chance.
c) An affinity to crossing the limits of the field or subject area.

It is hoped this study’s contribution of an original interpretation of creative risk will assist others in the field. We are also reminded that taking creative risk is neither, determinatively negative or positive (Gigerenzer, 2002; Ellis and Meneely, 2015).

This investigation has identified the nuanced relationship visual arts researchers have with ethical regulation. This is analogous to creative risk and evident in both teaching and research (Bledsoe et al., 2007). The high incidence of visual arts researchers and staff who exhibit some level of ambivalence is significant. This is a factor that may be exacerbated by the generic and sometimes inconsistent nature of ethical regulation within higher education. In areas such as copyright the study has uncovered uncertainty and discrepancy concerning visual arts research and also here identified the concept of creative risk manifest in otherwise mundane research decisions. This finding builds on the work of Prosser and Loxley, (2008). Some authors reject the notion that researchers should always have to adhere to the highest ethical standards (Hammersley and Traianou, 2012; Bledsoe et al., 2007) but surely first, it is more pertinent to examine the application of ethical regulation in our universities. Certainly systems of appraisal that feel remote or removed from the discipline cannot help, neither can a lack of training in ethical thinking. Hammersley and Traianou’s proposal that researchers have a right to take moral licence in accomplishing a research task is in reality just a different school of ethical thought i.e. reminiscent of the plauristic ethical approach favoured by Cashell, (2009). What is needed in the visual arts is a system of ethical appraisal that is at its core discipline specific, and has the means to facilitate discussion around such points.
The investigation of the link between creative risk and ethical regulation is timely as post-Concordat (Universities UK, 2012) institutions hurriedly upgrade their processes around ethical regulation.

The analysis of postgraduate ethical appraisal forms has significantly identified that the occasion of obviously transgressive activity found in postgraduate visual arts research is in reality very low. It has also confirmed the value of including visual arts specific criteria within any such appraisal process.

It is hoped that the key findings and policy recommendations from the MIRIAD research ethics project described earlier in this chapter will be a useful contribution to those charged with developing regulatory oversight in this field.

8.5 Recommendations for further research and future action

Exploring the transposition of the policy recommendations from the MIRIAD research ethics project to a web based application would be a practical next step. The aim here would be to enhance the management of ethical appraisal submission over the lifetime of a research project.

The scale of debate concerning partial or simulated compliance by researchers and staff with ethical regulation is extensive and multifaceted. This has been identified within this visual arts study. To generate achievable policy strategies it is critical to understand this better. Further comparative studies across different research disciplines would be useful.
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Appendix 1: Prototype ethical appraisal forms
ETHICS AND YOUR RESEARCH PROJECT: 
A REFLECTION EXERCISE FOR ART, ARCHITECTURE, DESIGN & MEDIA.

2015/2016

This interactive version of the form requires Adobe Acrobat reader v10 or later to complete. For optimum view turn off ‘show border hover colour’ under Menu - Acrobat Reader: Preferences: Forms. Please note that Apple Macintosh Preview software doesn’t fully support this interactive .PDF (known issue in Preview on page one and four with layers).

Ethical assessment – An introduction

Background

At Manchester School of Art we recognise that ethical judgments within Art, Architecture, Design and Media, are often highly complex and need to be viewed sensitively and in context. For the last four years a research project within Miriad has trialled a two-part evaluative approach, for post-graduate research ethics. The focus has not been to excessively restrict creative freedoms or introduce unnecessary paperwork but to encourage researchers themselves to identify, evaluate and respond to ethical issues they might encounter. The protocol acknowledges earlier work by a consortium of Universities in 2006, during the ‘Research ethics in art and design media project’ funded as part of the Arts and Humanities Research Council Collaborative Research Training Scheme.

Examples of ethical issues specific to art, architecture, design and media might include:

- Transgressive art practice and shock values
- Competency, risk and creative production
- Art practice and political interventions
- The ethics of design, sustainability and social responsibility
- Ref 2014
- Visual representations of individuals/social groups
- Digital media and the question of copyright
- Media privacy, Censorship, Accuracy, Fairness and Bias
- Cultural copyright
- Public exhibition
- Research ethics in art, design, architecture, and media

Who needs to complete this exercise?

This ethical reflection exercise is completed for most major projects. It is used to identify whether there are any ethical issues associated with your project and importantly to begin planning a your response to any issues raised.

It will also help your supervisor or mentor recognise if further consideration is required. Remember this is also a dynamic process and any significant change in your question, design or conduct over the course of the project will require resubmission of this form to your personal tutor, mentor or the Faculty Head of Academic Ethics.

How do I complete this exercise?

1. Fill in your personal details below. Next carefully consider your project methodology and answer the questions in ‘PART A’ overleaf on page 2.

2. Then use ‘PART B’ on page 3 to describe your ethical response to all the issues you have just highlighted, (i.e. the ones you have ticked yes to, on page 2).

3. Submit this document either digitally or as a hard copy together with a completed risk assessment form and an insurance checklist. If you are gathering data from people please also attach examples of your consent form(s) and how you will inform participants about your project. (See page 4 for examples of these forms)

Project and Researcher Details

(please complete)

Name:

Project Title:

Percentage written/practical:

Course:

Email address:

Daytime telephone number:

Name of supervisor:

Project start date and end date:

For further information on the Miriad Ethics Research Project contact J Spencer, PhD Researcher: communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com  Version 1  8  2015.
### PART A – What ethical issues are there in your project? [Please tick YES OR NO to ALL the questions listed below].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The General Good</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 Can you envisage any potential adverse applications of your work?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Can you identify any anticipated or unanticipated consequences of your proposed study?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Does the project have the potential to impact negatively on third parties or the environment?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4 Is it difficult to sufficiently justify that the project is of value to research/creative development or academic understanding?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5 Does the project lack relevance to your field of study?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Integrity and Responsibility to the Discipline</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1 Is objectivity central to your study?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Can you envisage any issues with the integrity of reporting data and findings?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Are there any potential issues with acknowledging sources?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4 Within the work is there any evident conflict of interest?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5 Could you envisage any element of the supervisory relationship undermining or adversely affecting the project?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Well-Being</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1 Does the work introduce any risk of physical harm to the researcher, participants, general public or animals?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Does the work introduce any threats to psychological wellbeing?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 Are sensitive issues addressed in the work such as sexual behaviour, illegal or political behaviour, experience of violence, abuse or exploitation, traumatic experiences, mental health, gender or ethnic status?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 Is any element of the work intrusive?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5 Do participants have any special needs or expectations?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6 Is there any danger of a negative psychological impact?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7 Does your project involve NHS Staff or patients or require NHS Trust approval?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8 Will blood or tissue samples be obtained from participants?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9 Are drugs, placebos or other substances (e.g. food substances, vitamins) to be administered to the study participants or will the study involve invasive, intrusive or potentially harmful procedures of any kind?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants and Informed Consent</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1 Does your study use collaborators, participants or subjects? If so</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Will you pay participants?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 Do you need to obtain informed consent?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Do you need to consider how you ensure active consent?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Do you need to consider how to document consent?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6 Do you need to consider consent as process not event?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7 Do you need to consider the right to withdraw?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8 Will your participants be drawn from vulnerable populations?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9 Is there any potential issue of power relationships and exploitation?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10 Could there be conflicts between your neutrality and your role?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11 Is your work participant-research?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12 Does your study require the use of ‘Gatekeepers’?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13 Are you intending to use deception and covert research?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14 Is it necessary to debrief and provide closure to participants?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D15 Do you need to consider consent for future uses of data?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Management of Data</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1 Will you have privileged information to be securely stored?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 Will you need to manage access to data you hold?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3 Have you considered secondary uses of data?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4 Is your research security sensitive? (rollover here for information)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissemination</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1 Are intellectual property rights important in the dissemination?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 Is copyright a potential issue?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 Are there concerns acknowledging participants or collaborators?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4 Do you plan to use anonymity in reporting data?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5 Are there any potential issues concerning confidentiality?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6 Are visual representations of individuals or social groups an issue?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7 Will there be a public exhibition of research outcomes?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8 Potential for harm to the reputation of participants/third parties?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9 Will there be material and other benefits from research?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[✓] = Refer completed form to Head of Faculty Ethics
PART B – Respond to the issues where you indicated ‘yes’ in Part A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Activity</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Response to ethical issues raised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXAMPLE:</td>
<td>D12 Gatekeepers</td>
<td>Seek written consent of school and parents/guardians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filming in a school</td>
<td>D4 Active Consent</td>
<td>Make it clear from the outset to all involved what the intended outcome might be and whether there will be any public screening of the film.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D5 Documenting Consent</td>
<td>Consider anonymous contributions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F7 The Public Exhibition of Research Outcomes</td>
<td>Seek CRB check and complete risk assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E1 Secure Storage of Privileged Information</td>
<td>Consider policy for withdrawal of participants and storage of material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C5 Do participants have any special needs or expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D8 Vulnerable Populations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C1 Protection from Physical Harm (Health and Safety)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ = Consent of Supervisor/Mentor or R = refer to Head of Faculty Ethics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Independent Reviewer</th>
<th>Faculty Head of Ethics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MIRAI Prototype 18 (page 3)
Glossary

Active consent
In all cases of research, researchers should inform participants of their right to refuse to participate or withdraw from the investigation whenever and for whatever reason they wish. There should be no coercion of research participants to take part in the research. There needs is a but the most exceptional cases, to be able consent. (Source: SRC Framework for Research Ethics (FRE) 2010. Updated Sept. 2013).

Confidentiality
One of the central principles of research ethics as described by the Framework for Research Ethics (a publication of Economic and Social Research Council - the principal funding agency for UK social science research) is confidentiality. The framework states that “confidentiality of information supplied by research participants and the anonymity of respondents must be respected”.

Confidentiality (limits to)
Researchers working with children, families and vulnerable populations should, when eliciting consent, make clear the limits to confidentiality. If for example an interview reveals that a participant or another person identified in the interview is in significant and immediate danger, the researcher will be obliged to take action in response to that disclosure. Before starting a project involving children, families or vulnerable populations, the principal researcher should have established a procedure and the necessary systems and identified contacts to facilitate help and support in the event of a disclosure. If the researcher feels it is necessary to break confidentiality, the participant will normally be informed of the action is being taken by the researcher, unless to do so would place them at a greater risk to those concerned. In projects collecting data on criminal behaviour, it may be necessary to explain to participants that confidentiality will be preserved as far as the law permits. (Source: SRC Framework for Research Ethics (FRE) 2010. Updated Sept. 2013).

Consent as process not event
Consent as a process requires valid consent to be the result of an open process or dialogue. It is not solely about a signature on a form. The central issue is whether the participant was given all the information they needed to make a considered decision. How was this recorded or documented?

Gatekeepers
In the research setting gatekeepers are those whose position affords them formal or informal power to influence researchers’ access to a target population. The term is often used to describe those who are often seen as being able to control access, for example parents/guardians and children, teachers and school pupils, home administrators and the elderly or health professionals and patients. The term might also encompass the roles of individuals such community leaders and others in the community. Communicating with gatekeepers is important, as is recognizing their potential to assist, influence or constrain the course of research.

Informed consent
Informed consent entails giving sufficient information about the research and ensuring that there is no explicit or implicit coercion so that prospective participants can make an informed and free decision on their possible involvement. Typically, the information should be provided in written form, and should be allowed for the participants to consider their choices and the forms should be signed by the research participants to indicate consent. (Source: SRC Framework for Research Ethics (FRE) 2010. Updated Sept. 2013).

Sensitive topics
The ESRC Framework for Research Ethics provides the examples of “participants’ sexual behaviour, their illegal or political behaviour, their experience of violence, their abuse or exploitation, their mental health or their gender or ethnic status”.

Valid consent
For consent to be valid the participant must be capable of understanding all the potential risks involved. (Source: SRC Framework for Research Ethics (FRE) 2010. Updated Sept. 2013).

Vulnerable groups
The ESRC Framework for Research Ethics provides examples of potentially vulnerable groups listing “children and young people, those with a learning disability or cognitive impairment, or individuals in a dependent or unequal relationship”.

Resources

Intellectual property rights (Exceptions to Copyright: Recent changes)
https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/changes-to-copyright-law
(Accessed Jan 2015)

Health and safety
While the principles of health and safety remain constant, it is worth noting that there is range of specific assessment paperwork produced to meet needs in differing creative disciplines. Below is a link to the current generic MMU form. The example of a BBC risk assessment is also included:

MMU H&S Document:
http://www.andres.mmu.ac.uk/resources/healthandsafety/riskassessments.php (Accessed May 2014)

MMU policy (Central):

MMU policy (Art and Design):
http://www.andres.mmu.ac.uk/resources/healthandsafety/ (Accessed May 2014)

BBC Director of Photography/Lighting Directors/Gaffer Risk Assessment Form:

MMU Ethical Framework document:
http://www2.mmu.ac.uk/ke/ethics-forms/ (Accessed May 2014)

Information sheet and Consent form [MMU Art and Design example]

For a copy of the 2015 insurance checklist visit: http://www2.mmu.ac.uk/research/ethics/ethics-forms-and-guidance/

How information from this document might be used in future research at Miriad.
To improve the effectiveness of the ethical protocol it will be important to evaluate responses for departmental and research purposes. All completed checklist material will be anonymised as far as is practically possible and research reports will retain from including detailed information of projects which might be traceable back to an individual. If you wish to opt-out to and withhold your data from this research process, check this box. [ ]
ETHICS AND YOUR RESEARCH PROPOSAL:
A REFLECTION EXERCISE FOR ART, DESIGN & MEDIA.

**Principle 1:** Health, Wellbeing and Dignity.
**Principle 2:** Reputation, Integrity and Dissemination.
**Principle 3:** Legislation, Regulation and the General Good.

---

This interactive Acrobat version requires Adobe Acrobat Acrobat reader.
For optimum view turn off 'show border have color' under Menu - Acrobat Reader: Preferences: Forms.
Note: Apple Macintosh Preview software doesn't fully support this interactive .PDF (known issue on page 4 with layers).

---

**Project and Researcher Details (Please Complete):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of applicant (Principal Investigator):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status: Undergraduate student, Postgraduate Student (Taught or Research), Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/School/Research centre Other Unit:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme of study (if applicable):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of supervisor/mentor/research centre leader (if applicable):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Title:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To be used in conjunction with the taught session. J Spencer: PhD Research Study Version II. MIRIAD 2014.
Ethical assessment – An introduction

“There are many other areas of activity where ethical issues may have an impact and it is the responsibility of a researcher to draw any potential areas of concern to the attention of the appropriate ethics committee”.

MMU Academic Board Research Degrees Committee, October 2002.

This ethical reflection exercise must be completed for every research project. It is used to identify whether there are any ethical issues associated with your project and importantly to begin planning a your response to any issues raised.

It will also help your supervisor or mentor recognise if further consideration is required. A taught introductory ethics session supports the implementation of this exercise and its guidelines. The taught session includes short case study examples and also lists some activities and scenarios that require careful consideration.

Prior to completing the exercise you should refer to the MIRIAD Ethical Guidelines and glossary at the back of this document (see Appendix).

The MIRIAD ethical approval process

“Ethical judgments are highly context-sensitive and there are rarely simple right or wrong answers to the dilemmas faced by researchers.”

The Ethics project [2006]

The ethics approval process comprises three main preliminary stages. In the case of specific ethical issues or where there is uncertainty, referral will be made to the Faculty Head of Academic Ethics.

1. Compulsory introductory ethics session for Art, Design & Media
2. Familiarity with the ethical guidelines and glossary (guidance sensitive available)
3. Completion of the ethical reflection exercise & compulsory health and safety assessment for us

Ethical assessment. Encouraging engagement with potential ethical issues.

Six categories of ethical issues pertinent to art and design media are listed below:

The category framework was originally produced in 2006 by a consortium of Universities, as part of the ‘Research ethics in art and design media project’ funded as part of the Arts and Humanities Research Council Collaborative Research Training Scheme. The ‘ethics project’ examined the role of ethics within postgraduate art and design media research. The project did not set out to be overly bureaucratic or stifling creative work, rather it stated the belief that ethical awareness leads to better research.

[http://www.biad.bcu.ac.uk/research/rti/ethics/about.html -06/05/14]

At MIRIAD this category framework has been used as a starting point and combined it with the two part evaluative approach, familiar to those involved in physical risk assessment. This resulting three-part process is part of a larger individual ongoing research project.

The aim is to encourage researchers themselves, to evaluate and respond to ethical issues they might encounter.

“It is important that these categories are not seen to prescribe particular approaches. For example, the heading ‘communal or general good’ does not imply that all research should have an immediate applied value beyond the context of the research; it can clearly be argued that there is a place for research in fine art where no such immediate application can be demonstrated, and no doubt this is true in other disciplines. On the other hand, it is certainly legitimate to ask whether a particular research question is sufficiently interesting and valuable to justify any investment and risk that answering it entails”.

[http://www.biad.bcu.ac.uk/research/rti/ethics/guidance.html -06/05/14]

Remember this is also a dynamic process and any significant change in your question, design or conduct over the course of the research will require re-submission of this form to your supervisor, mentor or research area leader and/or the Faculty Head of Academic Ethics.

Completion of this exercise will be supported by bookable one to one sessions aimed at helping you appraise your research project in ethical terms or simply to assist you with completion of the checklist. (See the Righton building notice board).
The five basic steps to completing this ethical reflection exercise:

1. Read the ethical guidelines on page 8 and the glossary of ethical terms on page 11.

2. Complete the short introductory questionnaire - below on this page.

3. Read the list of ethical issues on the form overleaf (page 4 - PART A). Indicate YES or NO to the issues which might apply to your study.

4. Use PART B (on page 5), to describe your ethical response to all the issues you have highlighted. (See the example at the top of page 5)

5. Submit this pack together with a completed health and safety assessment form. If you are gathering data from people please also attach examples of your consent form(s) and how you will inform participants about your project and ensure ‘active consent’.

Responses (yes/no) which are highlighted in green will require referral to the Faculty Head of Academic Ethics.
Other issues may also be referred to the Faculty Head of Academic Ethics at the discretion of your supervisor.

Introductory questions - Please tick your response and answer all questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you attached a health and safety risk assessment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From November 2012 all proposals will require a separate health and safety risk assessment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your project involve NHS Staff or patients or require NHS Trust approval?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For example your study will involve the recruitment of patients or staff through the NHS or involve NHS resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will blood or tissue samples be obtained from participants?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are drugs, placebos or other substances (e.g. food substances, vitamins) to be administered to the study participants or will the study involve invasive, intrusive or potentially harmful procedures of any kind?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will research take place outside of the UK?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PART A – What ethical issues are there in your research? [Please tick YES OR NO to ALL the issues listed below].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communal or General Good</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 Potential Applications of Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Anticipated and Unanticipated Consequences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Impact on Third Parties or the Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5 The Value of Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 The Problem of Relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Integrity and Responsibility to the Discipline</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 The Pursuit of Objectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Integrity in Reporting Data and Findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Acknowledging Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4 Conflicts of Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5 Supervisory Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safeguarding the Well-Being of Participants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Protection from Physical Harm (Health and Safety)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Threats to Psychological Well-Being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 Sensitive Issues and Traumatic Experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 Intrusiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5 Sensitivity to the Needs and Expectations of Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6 Psychological Impact on the Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Participants and Informed Consent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 Collaborators, Participants or Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Payment of Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 Informing Consent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Active Consent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Documenting Consent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6 Consent as Process not Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7 The Right to Withdraw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8 Vulnerable Populations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9 Power Relationships and Exploitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10 Neutrality and Maintaining the Role of Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11 Participant-Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12 Gatekeepers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13 Deception and Covert Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14 Debriefing and Closure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D15 Consent for Future Uses of Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Management of Data</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Secure Storage of Privileged Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 Managed Access to Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3 Secondary Uses of Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dissemination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1 Intellectual Property Rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 Cultural Copyright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 Acknowledgment of Participants or Collaborators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4 Anonymity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5 Confidentiality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6 Visual Representations of Individuals or Social Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7 The Public Exhibition of Research Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8 Potential Harm to the Reputation of Participants or Third Parties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9 Material and Other Benefits from Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Flowchart:**

1. **Step 1**: Compare your proposed methodology against the Part A assessment checklist.
2. **Step 2**: Complete Part B - Indicate potential ethical issues.
3. **Step 3**: Part B - Describe your response to issues raised.
**PART B – Respond to the issues you noted in Part A.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Activity</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Response to ethic issues raised</th>
<th>S/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXAMPLE:</strong> Filming in a school</td>
<td>D12 Gatekeepers</td>
<td>Seek written consent of school and parents/guardians. Make it clear from the outset to all involved what the intended outcome might be and whether there will be any public screening of the film.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D4 Active Consent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D5 Documenting Consent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F7 The Public Exhibition of Research Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E1 Secure Storage of Privileged Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C5 Sensitivity to the Needs and Expectations of Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D8 Vulnerable Populations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C1 Protection from Physical Harm (Health and Safety) *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*S/C: ✓ - Consent of Supervisor/Mentor/Research Centre Leader or R - refer to Head of Faculty Ethics*
## PART B – Respond to the issues you noted in Part A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Activity</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Response to ethic issues raised</th>
<th>S/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*S/C: √ = Consent of Supervisor/Mentor/Research Centre Leader or R = refer to Head of Faculty Ethics*
PART C – OUTCOME (TO BE COMPLETED BY MMU STAFF)

Name of applicant (Principal Researcher):

Approval for the above named proposal is granted

I confirm that there are no ethical issues requiring further consideration. (Any subsequent changes to the nature of the project will require a review of the ethical considerations.)

Signature of Supervisor, Mentor or Research Centre Leader

________________________________________

Date: ____________

OR

Approval for the above named proposal is **NOT** granted.

I confirm that there are ethical issues requiring further consideration and will refer the project proposal to the Faculty Head of Academic ethics.

Signature of Supervisor, Mentor or Research Centre Leader

________________________________________

Date: ____________

Additional comments (optional):
Appendix:

**RESEARCHER GUIDELINES ON ETHICAL ISSUES**

A general summary of available/published MMU guidance

The following guidelines are intended to help you identify any potential ethical issues relating to project/research work you may be planning to undertake as part of your studies. Using these guidelines you should reflect upon how, and to what extent, your work may have ethical issues that require consideration and action. These guidelines cannot solve the ethical issues for you. They should instead be used in collaboration with the ethical reflection exercise and your supervisor or mentor to reflect upon the project/research work you plan to pursue. Obviously this thought and reflection must occur prior to starting the project/research work.

Occasionally ethical issues are identified which may require you to change, or even abandon, elements of your project. Additionally, you must continue to consider ethical issues throughout the duration of your project/research investigation including any analysis and/or writing up/photographic/video of your findings. In short, ethical considerations should be inherent in all aspects of the process, from first ideas to the final report or outcome of research/project.

It should be remembered that there is common arts principle of encouraging the articulation of an ethical defence rather than prescribing particular approaches. This said the following principles should be applied to your project/practical work, (including dissertations):

**Principle 1: Health, Wellbeing and Dignity.**

As a researcher you have a duty to avoid, prevent or minimise harm to yourself and others. Procedures and practices that might cause serious or lasting harm to participants must not be used. Consideration should also be given to both the physical and psychological/emotional wellbeing of participants. Whilst it is now a requirement that all research proposals are risk assessed at the outset practical projects such as filmmaking or workshop activities may require additional vocationally specific risk assessment. In these instances a full risk-assessment form must be submitted prior to the activity.

As researchers you should respect human dignity at all times. You should not attempt to discriminate against individuals or groups. Respect should be given to the free and informed consent of participants. Only in exceptional circumstances where there is satisfactory justification (e.g. the likelihood of the end results being affected), should information be withheld. In practical terms, this principle translates into ensuring that everybody who assists you with your project does so willingly and is aware of the purpose for the project. For example, if you are taking a photograph of a person, make sure they are agreeable and you have documented consent. Consider consent for future uses of data and also whether it is appropriate to allow participants a right to withdraw. It is worth remembering that it is the University’s default position that participants can withdraw themselves and their data from the academic activity at any time.

Particular care must be taken in the case of vulnerable populations such as children or adults with learning difficulties. Vulnerable persons are entitled to special protection against abuse, exploitation or discrimination.

The University also stipulates that the size of sample proposed for any group enquiry shall not be larger than justifiably necessary.

**Principle 2: Reputation, Integrity and Dissemination.**

Integrity demonstrated when reporting findings, acknowledging sources and avoiding conflicts of interest is central to academic research. A careful consideration of intellectual property rights, confidentiality and representation of individuals or groups is also key in establishing a strong research reputation. You are expected to adhere to these aims.

Any relationship, other than that required by the academic activity, between the researcher(s) and the participant(s) must be declared.

Participants should give their explicit consent except where there is satisfactory justification for not obtaining this consent.

Plagiarism, deception or the fabrication or falsification of results is regarded as serious professional misconduct and may result in the University invoking disciplinary procedures.

The contributions of formal collaborators and all others who directly assist or indirectly support the research should be properly acknowledged.

Where approaching groups (schools, museums, nursing home residents, societies etc.) it is often advisable to secure the written permission of a gatekeeper. You will need to make this clear in ‘part B’ of your ethics exercise paperwork.

You may need manage access to your research data, consider carefully any secondary uses for it and store/dispose of it securely. Never disclose personal information without permission. Be aware that sensitive personal data requires explicit written consent (see principle 3).
Principle 3: Legislation, Regulation and the General Good

From the beginning you are encouraged to ethically consider in impact of your research project on third parties and the environment. In addition together with your supervisor/mentor or research centre leader you will need to address the complex issue of the value of specific knowledge, its relevance and any potential applications of your research. As the RTI ethics project (2006) outlined ‘general good’ does not imply that all research should have an immediate applied value beyond the context of the research, however it is legitimate from an ethical standpoint to ask whether a particular research question is sufficiently interesting and valuable to justify any investment and risk that answering it entails.

All researchers should be aware of any legal requirements that regulate their work. As a researcher, we have an expectation that your research activities will be undertaken with regard to with current UK legislation and regulation within the field.

If any academic activity is concerned with studies on activities which themselves raise questions of legality there must be a persuasive rationale which demonstrates to the satisfaction of the University that:

The risk to the University in terms of external (and internal) perceptions of the worthiness of the work has been assessed and is deemed acceptable; arrangements are in place which safeguard the interests of the researcher(s) being supervised in pursuit of the academic activity objectives; special arrangements have been made for the security of related documentation and artefacts.

In addition to the ethical considerations students/staff should be aware that information regarding any living person identifiable by data obtained in the University, for either, teaching, research or consultancy purposes, must be stored and used according to the (1998) Data Protection Act. This law makes those who hold this personal information/data, whether in a physical or electronic form, responsible for processing it in accordance with stated principles.

One of these principles is that the personal information must be obtained fairly and lawfully, which includes informing the provider about the purposes for which the data will be used. Another is that you must not disclose the identity of any individual who has provided you with data unless the provider has given you written consent to do so prior to disclosure. In brief, you should:

- Always explain why, where and how data will be used
- Always obtain consent
- Sensitive personal data requires explicit written consent.
- Never disclose personal information without permission
- Data subjects have the right of access to all data held on them
- Consent required for public displays of names/photos
- Don’t send personal data abroad without consent
  (This includes the Internet)
- All personal data must be kept and disposed of securely.

What sort of work requires referral to the Faculty Head of Academic Ethics?

Referral to the Faculty Head of Academic Ethics for ethical approval needs only be sought in instances when a) the person responsible for the research project judges that a significant ethical issue is likely to occur or b) a supervisor/mentor or research centre leader determines it appropriate after submission and appraisal of the ethics reflection exercise/checklist or c) where questionnaires or interviews target children, vulnerable adults or hospitalised patients. In this case ethical approval must be sought from the Faculty Head of Academic Ethics.

Whilst any of the issues noted in the ethics reflection exercise might lead to this need for further consideration, certain areas by their very nature will require greater focus and immediate referral, notably:

Issues highlighted by the project health and safety assessment.
Medically/NHS related studies.
Research activity conducted outside of the UK.

And

B4 Conflicts of interest
C1 Protection from Physical Harm (Health and Safety)
C2 Threats to Psychological Well-Being
C3 Sensitive issues
C6 Psychological impact on the researcher
D2 Payment
D1.2 Gatekeepers
D8 Vulnerable Populations (as mentioned above – also see glossary)
D1.3 Deception and Covert Research
F8 Potential Harm to the Reputation of Participants or Third Parties

---

1 [http://www.biad.bcu.ac.uk/research/rti/ethics/about.html - 06/05/13]
Questionnaires

The Faculty Head of Academic Ethics wishes to review questionnaires if people being asked to complete questionnaires are children, vulnerable adults or hospitalised patients. Researchers and their supervisor/mentor or research centre leader must review questionnaires and may have to be prepared to reconsider and or/remove questions that are sensitive or likely to significantly upset or disturb participants. Tutors and students must also ensure that individuals are prevented from: participating involuntarily; being intentionally misled; being identified or incriminating themselves.

Interviews

The interests of participants should be protected wherever possible. Acquiring informed consent from participants is normally a condition of implementing a planned interview.

Where informed consent for an interview cannot be obtained, even by proxy consent, it should be taken as read that: people are not consciously or willingly participating in the inquiry and the interview should not be undertaken. Only in exceptional circumstances with satisfactory justification for not obtaining this consent, with prior ethics committee approval can covert or deception activity be undertaken.

The interviewer’s work must avoid either direct or indirect harm to participants. Interviewers should try to actively explore and anticipate any harmful consequences their work might have for participants. As already described the Faculty Head of Academic Ethics wishes to review interview questions if the persons being interviewed are children, vulnerable adults or hospitalised patients.

Great care should be taken with questions of a sensitive nature likely to significantly upset and/or disturb someone. They should first be checked by a supervisor/mentor or research centre leader, who should exercise their professional judgment. If this person is unsure on this matter, then they should submit the questions to the Faculty Head of Academic Ethics for judgment.

Any University employee or registered student whose University work will require them to work with babies, children or young people under the age of 18 or vulnerable adults, will be required to undertake an enhanced Criminal Records Bureau disclosure (CRB) through the university’s administration before the Faculty Head of Academic Ethics will consider their ethics application. Note that a Criminal Disclosure will take longer than one month.

Who should apply for ethics approval?

The applicant should apply through their supervisor/mentor or the research centre leader of the study as he/she retains responsibility for the content and conduct of the study. This should normally be a permanent employee of the university.

If the supervisor/mentor fails to apply, or the researcher fails to inform the supervisor/mentor of the project they are undertaking then, in addition to the moral issue of being involved in unethical studies, there is an increased risk in legal actions being taken against the researcher and/or supervisor/mentor by the general public for alleged misconduct.

Insurance

The University holds insurance policies in place to cover claims for negligence arising from the conduct of the University’s normal business, which includes research carried out by staff and by undergraduate and postgraduate students as part of their course. This does not extend to clinical negligence.

In addition, the University has provision to award indemnity and/or compensation in the event of claims for non-negligent harm. This is on the condition that the project is accepted by the insurers prior to the commencement of the research project and approval has been granted for the project from a suitable ethics committee. Research which is applicable to non-negligent harm cover involves humans and physical intervention which could give rise to a physical injury or illness which is outside the participants day to day activities. This includes strenuous exercise, ingestion of substances, injection of substances, topical application of any substances, insertion of instruments, blood/tissue sampling of participants and scanning of participants.

The following types of research are not covered automatically for non-negligent harm if they are classed as the activities above and they involve:

1) Anything that assists with and/or alters the process of contraception, or investigating or participating in methods of contraception
2) Anything involving genetic engineering other than research in which the medical purpose is treating or diagnosing disease
3) Where the substance under investigation has been designed and/or manufactured by MMU
4) Pregnant women
5) Drug trials
6) Research involving children under sixteen years of age
7) Professional sports persons and or elite athletes.
8) Overseas research

If the proposed project results in undertaking any research that includes any of the 8 points above or would not be considered as normal University business it should be approved by the University’s insurance officer.

Glossary

Active consent
In all cases of research, researchers should inform participants of their right to refuse to participate or withdraw from the investigation whenever and for whatever reason they wish. There should be no coercion of research participants to take part in the research. There needs in all but the most exceptional cases to be active consent. (Source: SRC Framework for Research Ethics (FRE) 2010. Updated Sept. 2012).

Confidentiality
One of the central principles of research ethics as described by the Framework for Research Ethics (a publication of Economic and Social Research Council - the principal funding agency for UK social science research) is confidentiality. The framework states that “confidentiality of information supplied by research participants and the anonymity of respondents must be respected”.

Confidentiality (limits to)
Researchers working with children, families and vulnerable populations should, when eliciting consent, make clear the limits to confidentiality. If for example an interview reveals that a participant or another person identified in the interview is in significant and immediate danger, the researcher will be obliged to take action in response to that disclosure. Before starting a project involving children, families or vulnerable populations, the principal researcher should have established a procedure and the necessary systems and identified contacts to activate help and support in the event of disclosure. If the researcher feels it is necessary to break confidentiality, the participant will normally be informed what action is being taken by the researcher, unless to do so would increase risk to those concerned. In projects collecting data on criminal behaviour, it may be necessary to explain to participants that confidentiality will be preserved as far as the law permits. (Source: SRC Framework for Research Ethics (FRE) 2010. Updated Sept. 2012).

Consent as process not event
Consent as a process requires valid consent to be the result of an open process or dialogue. It is not solely about a signature on a form. The central issue is whether the participant was given all the information they needed to make a considered decision. How was this recorded or documented?

Gatekeepers
In the research setting gatekeepers are those whose position affords them formal or informal power to influence researchers’ access to a set population. The term is often though not exclusively connected to a group or individual considered vulnerable for example parents/guardians and children, teachers and school pupils, care home administrators and the elderly or health professionals and patients. The term might also encompass the roles of individuals such community leaders and possibly translators. Communicating with gatekeepers is important, as is recognising their potential to assist, influence or constrain the course of research.

Informed consent
‘Informed consent entails giving sufficient information about the research and ensuring that there is no explicit or implicit coercion so that prospective participants can make an informed and free decision on their possible involvement. Typically, the information should be provided in written form, time should be allowed for the participants to consider their choices and the forms should be signed off by the research participants to indicate consent.’ (Source: SRC Framework for Research Ethics (FRE) 2010. Updated Sept. 2012).

Sensitive topics
The ESRC Framework for Research Ethics provides the examples of “participants’ sexual behaviour, their illegal or political behaviour, their experience of violence, their abuse or exploitation, their mental health, or their gender or ethnic status”.

Valid consent: For consent to be ‘valid’ the participant must be capable of understanding all the potential risks involved. (Source: SRC Framework for Research Ethics (FRE) 2010. Updated Sept. 2012).

Vulnerable groups:
The ESRC Framework for Research Ethics provides examples of potentially vulnerable groups listing; “children and young people, those with a learning disability or cognitive impairment, or individuals in a dependent or unequal relationship”.

\(^2\) \text{http://www.esrc.ac.uk/about-esrc/information/research-ethics.aspx} \text{ (Accessed May 2014)}
Resources

Intellectual property rights

http://www.ipo.gov.uk/ (Accessed May 2014)

Health and safety

Whilst the principles of health and safety assessment remain constant, it is worth noting that there is range of specific assessment paperwork produced to meet needs of differing creative disciplines. Below is a link to the current generic MMU form together with examples other areas within the creative industries.

MMU H&S Document:
http://www.artrades.mmu.ac.uk/resources/healthandsafety/riskassessments.php
(Accessed May 2014)

MMU policy (Central):
(Accessed May 2014)

MMU policy (Art and Design):
http://www.artrades.mmu.ac.uk/resources/healthandsafety/
(Accessed May 2014)

BBC Director of Photography/Lighting Directors/Gaffer Risk Assessment Form:
(Accessed May 2014)

The Royal Parks – Photography
www.royalparks.org.uk/__documents/main/docs/risk-assessments.doc

MMU Ethical Framework document

http://www2.mmu.ac.uk/rke/ethics-forms/
(Accessed May 2014)

Consent sheets [MMU Art and Design example]

Information sheet and consent form examples (rollover).
ETHICS AND YOUR RESEARCH PROPOSAL:
AN ETHICS REFLECTION EXERCISE

Principle 1: Health, Wellbeing and Dignity.
Principle 2: Reputation, Integrity and Dissemination.

### Project and Researcher Details (Please Complete)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of applicant (Principal Investigator):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number</td>
<td>(H Tel:);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(M Tel:);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Undergraduate student, Postgraduate Student (Taught or Research), Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/School/Research centre:</td>
<td>Visual Culture Research Centre, MI RIAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Unit:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme of study (if applicable):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of supervisor/mentor/research centre leader (if applicable):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Title:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To be used in conjunction with the taught module: J Spencer, PhD Research Study Pilot V4. MI RIAD 2013.
Ethical assessment – An introduction

“There are many other areas of activity where ethical issues may have an impact and it is the responsibility of a researcher to draw any potential areas of concern to the attention of the appropriate ethics committee”.

MMU Academic Board Research Degrees Committee, October 2002.

This ethical reflection exercise must be completed for every research project. It is used to identify whether there are any ethical issues associated with your project and importantly to begin planning a your response to any issues raised.

It will also help your supervisor or mentor recognise if further consideration is required. A taught introductory ethics session supports the implementation of this exercise and its guidelines. The taught session includes short case study examples and also lists some activities and scenarios that require careful consideration. Prior to completing the exercise you should refer to the MIRIAD Ethical Guidelines and glossary at the back of this document (see Appendix).

The MIRIAD ethical approval process

“Ethical judgments are highly context-sensitive and there are rarely simple right or wrong answers to the dilemmas faced by researchers.”

The Ethics project [2006]

The ethics approval process comprises three main preliminary stages. In the case of specific ethical issues or where there is uncertainty, referral will be made to the Faculty Head of Academic Ethics.

Compliance with the ethical guidelines and glossary (guidance sessions available)

Completion of the ethical reflection exercise & compulsory health and safety assessment form

Ethical assessment. Encouraging engagement with potential ethical issues.

Six categories of ethical issues pertinent to art and design media are listed overleaf.

The category framework was originally produced in 2006 by a consortium of Universities, as part of the ‘Research ethics in art and design media project’ funded as part of the Arts and Humanities Research Council Collaborative Research Training Scheme. The ‘ethics project’ examined the role of ethics within postgraduate art and design media research. The project did not set out to be overly bureaucratic or stifling, creative work, rather it stated the belief that ethical awareness leads to better research.

[http://www.biad.bcu.ac.uk/research/Rti/ethics/about.html -12/01/12]

At MIRIAD this category framework has been used as a starting point and combined it with the two part evaluative approach, familiar to those involved in physical risk assessment. This resulting three-part process is part of a larger individual ongoing research project.

The aim is to encourage researchers themselves, to evaluate and respond to ethical issues they might encounter.

“It is important that these categories are not seen to prescribe particular approaches. For example, the heading ‘communal or general good’ does not imply that all research should have an immediate applied value beyond the context of the research; it can clearly be argued that there is a place for research in fine art where no such immediate application can be demonstrated, and no doubt this is true in other disciplines. On the other hand, it is certainly legitimate to ask whether a particular research question is sufficiently interesting and valuable to justify any investment and risk that answering it entails”.

[http://www.biad.bcu.ac.uk/research/Rti/ethics/guidance.html -12/01/12]

Remember this is also a dynamic process and any significant change in your question, design or conduct over the course of the research will require resubmission of this form to your supervisor, mentor or research area leader and/or the Faculty Head of Academic Ethics.

Completion of this exercise will be supported by bookable one to one sessions aimed at helping you appraise your research project in ethical terms or simply to assist you with completion of the checklist.

(See the Righton building notice board).
Completing the ethical reflection exercise – *The basic steps.*

- Read the ethical guidelines on page 8 and the glossary of ethical terms on page 11.
- Complete the short introductory questionnaire - below on this page.
- Read the list of ethical issues on PART A of the form overleaf (page 4). Indicate YES or NO to the issues which might apply to your study,
- Use PART B (on page 5), to describe your ethical response to all the issues you have highlighted.
- Submit this pack together with a completed health and safety assessment form. If you are gathering data from people please also attach examples of your consent form(s) and how you will inform participants about your project and ensure ‘active consent’.

*Responses highlighted in green will require referral to the Faculty Head of Academic Ethics. Other issues may also be referred to the Faculty Head of Academic Ethics at the discretion of your supervisor.*

**Introductory questions - Please circle your response and answer all questions.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you attached a health and safety risk assessment?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From November 2012 all proposals will require a separate health and</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>safety risk assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your project involve NHS Staff or patients or require NHS Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approval? For example your study will involve the recruitment of patients</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or staff through the NHS or involve NHS resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will blood or tissue samples be obtained from participants?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are drugs, placebos or other substances (e.g. food substances, vitamins)</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to be administered to the study participants or will the study involve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invasive, intrusive or potentially harmful procedures of any kind?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will research take place outside of the UK?</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PART A – Are there any ethical issues attached to these aspects of your research? (Tick YES OR NO to ALL the issues listed below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Communal or General Good
- **A1** Potential Applications of Research
- **A2** Anticipated and Unanticipated Consequences
- **A3** Impact on Third Parties or the Environment
- **A5** The Value of Knowledge
- **A6** The Problem of Relevance

#### Academic Integrity and Responsibility to the Discipline
- **B1** The Pursuit of Objectivity
- **B2** Integrity in Reporting Data and Findings
- **B3** Acknowledging Sources
- **B4** Conflicts of Interest
- **B5** Supervisory Relationships

#### Safeguarding the Well-Being of Participants
- **C1** Protection from Physical Harm (Health and Safety)
- **C2** Threats to Psychological Well-Being
- **C3** Sensitive Issues and Traumatic Experiences
- **C4** Intrusiveness
- **C5** Sensitivity to the Needs and Expectations of Participants
- **C6** Psychological Impact on the Researcher

#### Research Participants and Informed Consent
- **D1** Collaborators, Participants or Subjects
- **D2** Payment of Participants
- **D3** Informing Consent
- **D4** Active Consent
- **D5** Documenting Consent
- **D6** Consent as Process not Event
- **D7** The Right to Withdraw
- **D8** Vulnerable Populations
- **D9** Power Relationships and Exploitation
- **D10** Neutrality and Maintaining the Role of Researcher
- **D11** Participant-Research
- **D12** Gatekeepers
- **D13** Deception and Covert Research
- **D14** Debriefing and Closures
- **D15** Consent for Future Uses of Data

#### The Management of Data
- **E1** Secure Storage of Privileged Information
- **E2** Managed Access to Data
- **E3** Secondary Uses of Data

#### Dissemination
- **F1** Intellectual Property Rights
- **F2** Cultural Copyright
- **F3** Acknowledgment of Participants or Collaborators
- **F4** Anonymity
- **F5** Confidentiality
- **F6** Visual Representations of Individuals or Social Groups
- **F7** The Public Exhibition of Research Outcomes
- **F8** Potential Harm to the Reputation of Participants or Third Parties
- **F9** Material and Other Benefits from Research

---

#### Flowchart:

1. **Step 1** Compare your proposed methodology against the Part A assessment checklist
2. **Step 2** Complete Part B - Indicate potential ethical issues
3. **Step 3** Part B - Describe your response to issues raised
### PART B – Ethical response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Activity</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Response to ethic issues raised</th>
<th>S/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXAMPLE:</strong></td>
<td>D12 Gatekeepers</td>
<td>Seek written consent of school and parents/guardians. Make it clear from the outset to all involved what the intended outcome might be and whether there will be any public screening of the film.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filming in a school</td>
<td>D4 Active Consent</td>
<td>Consider anonymous contributions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D5 Documenting Consent</td>
<td>Seek CRB check.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F7 The Public Exhibition of Research Outcomes</td>
<td>Complete risk assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E1 Secure Storage of Privileged Information</td>
<td>Consider policy for withdrawal of participants and storage of material</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C5 Sensitivity to the Needs and Expectations of Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D8 Vulnerable Populations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C1 Protection from Physical Harm (Health and Safety) *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*S/C: ✓ = Consent of Supervisor/Mentor/Research Centre Leader or R = refer to Head of Faculty Ethics*
**PART B – Ethical response.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Activity</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Response to ethic issues raised</th>
<th>S/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*S/C: ✓ = Consent of Supervisor/Mentor/Research Centre Leader or R = refer to Head of Faculty Ethics*
PART C - OUTCOME (MMU STAFF)

Name of applicant (Principal Researcher):

Approval for the above named proposal is granted

I confirm that there are no ethical issues requiring further consideration.
(Any subsequent changes to the nature of the project will require a review of
the ethical considerations.)

Signature of Supervisor, Mentor or Research Centre Leader

_____________________________

Date: ______________

OR

Approval for the above named proposal is **NOT** granted.

I confirm that there are ethical issues requiring further consideration and will
refer the project proposal to the Faculty Head of Academic ethics.

Signature of Supervisor, Mentor or Research Centre Leader

_____________________________

Date: ______________

Additional comments (optional):

Additional comments (optional):
Appendix:

RESEARCHER GUIDELINES ON ETHICAL ISSUES
A general summary of available/published MMU guidance.

The following guidelines are intended to help you identify any potential ethical issues relating to project/research work you may be planning to undertake as part of your studies. Using these guidelines you should reflect upon how, and to what extent, your work may have ethical issues that require consideration and action. These guidelines cannot solve the ethical issues for you. They should instead be used in collaboration with the ethical reflection exercise and your supervisor or mentor to reflect upon the project/research work you plan to pursue. Obviously this thought and reflection must occur prior to starting the project/research work.

Occasionally ethical issues are identified which may require you to change, or even abandon, elements of your project. Additionally, you must continue to consider ethical issues throughout the duration of your project/research investigation including any analysis and/or writing up/photographic/video of your findings. In short, ethical considerations should be inherent in all aspects of the process, from first ideas to the final report or outcome of research/project.

It should be remembered that there is common arts principle of encouraging the articulation of an ethical defence rather than prescribing particular approaches. This said the following principles should be applied to your project/practical work, (including dissertations):

Principle 1: Health, Wellbeing and Dignity.

As a researcher you have a duty to avoid, prevent or minimise harm to yourself and others. Procedures and practices that might cause serious or lasting harm to participants must not be used. Consideration should also be given to both the physical and psychological/emotional wellbeing of participants. Whilst it is now a requirement that all research proposals are risk assessed at the outset practical projects such as filmmaking or workshop activities may require additional vocationally specific risk assessment. In these instances a full risk-assessment form must be submitted prior to the activity.

As researchers you should respect human dignity at all times. You should not attempt to discriminate against individuals or groups. Respect should be given to the free and informed consent of participants. Only in exceptional circumstances where there is satisfactory justification (e.g. the likelihood of the end results being affected), should information be withheld. In practical terms, this principle translates into ensuring that everybody who assists you with your project does so willingly and is aware of the purpose for the project. For example, if you are taking a photograph of a person, make sure they are agreeable and you have documented consent. Consider consent for future uses of data and also whether it is appropriate to allow participants a right to withdraw. It is worth remembering that it is the University’s default position that participants can withdraw themselves and their data from the academic activity at any time.

Particular care must be taken in the case of vulnerable populations such as children or adults with learning difficulties. Vulnerable persons are entitled to special protection against abuse, exploitation or discrimination.

The University also stipulates that the size of sample proposed for any group enquiry shall not be larger than justifiably necessary.

Principle 2: Reputation, Integrity and Dissemination.

Integrity demonstrated when reporting findings, acknowledging sources and avoiding conflicts of interest is central to academic research. A careful consideration of intellectual property rights, confidentiality and representation of individuals or groups is also key in establishing a strong research reputation. You are expected to adhere to these aims.

Any relationship, other than that required by the academic activity, between the researcher(s) and the participant(s) must be declared.

Participants should give their explicit consent except where there is satisfactory justification for not obtaining this consent.

Plagiarism, deception or the fabrication or falsification of results is regarded as serious professional misconduct and may result in the University invoking disciplinary procedures.

The contributions of formal collaborators and all others who directly assist or indirectly support the research should be properly acknowledged.

Where approaching groups (schools, museums, nursing home residents, societies etc.) it is often advisable to secure the written permission of a gatekeeper. You will need to make this clear in ‘part B’ of your ethics exercise paperwork.

You may need manage access to your research data, consider carefully any secondary uses for it and store/dispose of it securely. Never disclose personal information without permission. Be aware that sensitive personal data requires explicit written consent (see principle 3).
**Principle 3: Legislation, Regulation and the General Good**

From the beginning you are encouraged to ethically consider in impact of your research project on third parties and the environment. In addition together with your supervisor/mentor or research centre leader you will need to address the complex issue of the value of specific knowledge, its relevance and any potential applications of your research. As the RTI ethics project (2006)1 outlined ‘general good’ does not imply that all research should have an immediate applied value beyond the context of the research, however it is legitimate from an ethical standpoint to ask whether a particular research question is sufficiently interesting and valuable to justify any investment and risk that answering it entails.

All researchers should be aware of any legal requirements that regulate their work. As a researcher, we have an expectation that your research activities will be undertaken with regard to all current UK legislation and regulation within the field.

If any academic activity is concerned with studies on activities which themselves raise questions of legality there must be a persuasive rationale which demonstrates to the satisfaction of the University that:

The risk to the University in terms of external (and internal) perceptions of the worthiness of the work has been assessed and is deemed acceptable; arrangements are in place which safeguard the interests of the researcher(s) being supervised in pursuit of the academic activity objectives; special arrangements have been made for the security of related documentation and artefacts.

In addition to the ethical considerations students/staff should be aware that information regarding any living person identifiable by data obtained in the University, for either, teaching, research or consultancy purposes, must be stored and used according to the (1998) Data Protection Act. This law makes those who hold this personal information/data, whether in a physical or electronic form, responsible for processing it in accordance with stated principles.

One of these principles is that the personal information must be obtained fairly and lawfully, which includes informing the provider about the purposes for which the data will be used. Another is that you must not disclose the identity of any individual who has provided you with data unless the provider has given you written consent to do so prior to disclosure. In brief, you should:

- Always explain why, where and how data will be used
- Always obtain consent
- Sensitive personal data requires explicit written consent
- Never disclose personal information without permission
- Data subjects have the right of access to all data held on them
- Consent required for public displays of names/photographs
- Don’t send personal data abroad without consent (This includes the Internet)
- All personal data must be kept and disposed of securely.

What sort of work requires referral to the Faculty Head of Academic Ethics?

Referral to the Faculty Head of Academic Ethics for ethical approval needs only be sought in instances when **a)** the person responsible for the research project judges that a significant ethical issue is likely to occur or **b)** a supervisor/mentor or research centre leader determines it appropriate after submission and appraisal of the ethics reflection exercise/checklist or **c)** where questionnaires or interviews target children, vulnerable adults or hospitalised patients. In this case ethical approval must be sought from the Faculty Head of Academic Ethics. Whilst any of the issues noted in the ethics reflection exercise might lead to this need for further consideration, certain areas by their very nature will require greater focus and immediate referral, notably:

**Issues highlighted by the project health and safety assessment.**
Medical/NHS related studies.
Research activity conducted outside of the UK.

**And**

- B4 Conflicts of interest
- C1 Protection from Physical Harm (Health and Safety)
- C2 Threats to Psychological Well-Being
- C3 Sensitive issues
- C6 Psychological impact on the researcher
- D2 Payment
- D12 Gatekeepers
- D8 Vulnerable Populations (as mentioned above – also see glossary)
- D13 Deception and Covert Research
- F8 Potential Harm to the Reputation of Participants or Third Parties

---

1 [http://www.biad.bcu.ac.uk/research/rti/ethics/about.html -12/01/12]
Questionnaires

The Faculty Head of Academic Ethics wishes to review questionnaires if people being asked to complete questionnaires are children, vulnerable adults or hospitalised patients. Researchers and their supervisor/mentor or research centre leader must review questionnaires and may have to be prepared to reconsider and or/ remove questions that are sensitive or likely to significantly upset or disturb participants. Tutors and students must also ensure that individuals are prevented from: participating involuntarily; being intentionally misled; being identified or incriminating themselves.

Interviews

The interests of participants should be protected wherever possible. Acquiring informed consent from participants is normally a condition of implementing a planned interview.

Where informed consent for an interview cannot be obtained, even by proxy consent, it should be taken as read that people are not consciously or willingly participating in the inquiry and the interview should not be undertaken.

Only in exceptional circumstances with satisfactory justification for not obtaining this consent, with prior ethics committee approval can covert or deception activity be undertaken.

The interviewer’s work must avoid either direct or indirect harm to participants. Interviewers should try to actively explore and anticipate any harmful consequences their work might have for participants.

As already described the Faculty Head of Academic Ethics wishes to review interview questions if the persons being interviewed are children, vulnerable adults or hospitalised patients.

Great care should be taken with questions of a sensitive nature likely to significantly upset and/or disturb someone. They should first be checked by a supervisor/mentor or research centre leader, who should exercise their professional judgment. If this person is unsure on this matter, then they should submit the questions to the Faculty Head of Academic Ethics for judgment.

Any University employee or registered student whose University work will require them to work with babies, children or young people under the age of 18 or vulnerable adults, will be required to undertake an enhanced Criminal Records Bureau disclosure (CRB) through the university’s administration before the Faculty Head of Academic Ethics will consider their ethics application. Note that a Criminal Disclosure will take longer than one month.

Who should apply for ethics approval?

The applicant should apply through their supervisor/mentor or the research centre leader of the study as he/she retains responsibility for the content and conduct of the study. This should normally be a permanent employee of the university.

If the supervisor/mentor fails to apply, or the researcher fails to inform the supervisor/mentor of the project they are undertaking then, in addition to the moral issue of being involved in unethical studies, there is an increased risk in legal actions being taken against the researcher and/or supervisor/mentor by the general public for alleged misconduct.

Insurance

The University holds insurance policies in place to cover claims for negligence arising from the conduct of the University’s normal business, which includes research carried out by staff and by undergraduate and postgraduate students as part of their course. This does not extend to clinical negligence.

In addition, the University has provision to award indemnity and/or compensation in the event of claims for non-negligent harm. This is on the condition that the project is accepted by the insurers prior to the commencement of the research project and approval has been granted for the project from a suitable ethics committee.

Research which is applicable to non-negligent harm cover involves humans and physical intervention which could give rise to a physical injury or illness which is outside the participants day to day activities. This includes strenuous exercise, ingestion of substances, injection of substances, topical application of any substances, insertion of instruments, blood/tissue sampling of participants and scanning of participants.

The following types of research are not covered automatically for non-negligent harm if they are classed as the activities above and they involve:

1) Anything that assists with and/or alters the process of contraception, or investigating or participating in methods of contraception
2) Anything involving genetic engineering other than research in which the medical purpose is treating or diagnosing disease
3) Where the substance under investigation has been designed and/or manufactured by MMU
4) Pregnant women
5) Drug trials
6) Research involving children under sixteen years of age
7) Professional sports persons and or elite athletes.
8) Overseas research

If the proposed project results in undertaking any research that includes any of the 8 points above or would not be considered as normal University business it should be approved by the University’s insurance officer.

Glossary

Active consent
In all cases of research, researchers should inform participants of their right to refuse to participate or withdraw from the investigation whenever and for whatever reason they wish. There should be no coercion of research participants to take part in the research. There needs in all but the most exceptional cases to be active consent.

Confidentiality
One of the central principles of research ethics as described by the Framework for Research Ethics (a publication of Economic and Social Research Council - the principal funding agency for UK social science research) is confidentiality. The framework states that “confidentiality of information supplied by research participants and the anonymity of respondents must be respected”.

Confidentiality (limits to)
Researchers working with children, families and vulnerable populations should, when eliciting consent, make clear the limits to confidentiality. If for example an interview reveals that a participant or another person identified in the interview is in significant and immediate danger, the researcher will be obliged to take action in response to that disclosure. Before starting a project involving children, families or vulnerable populations, the principal researcher should have established a procedure and the necessary systems and identified contacts to activate help and support in the event of a disclosure. If the researcher feels it is necessary to break confidentiality, the participant will normally be informed what action is being taken by the researcher, unless to do so would increase risk to those concerned. In projects collecting data on criminal behaviour, it may be necessary to explain to participants that confidentiality will be preserved as far as the law permits.

Consent as process not event
Consent as a process requires valid consent to be the result of an open process or dialogue. It is not solely about a signature on a form. The central issue is whether the participant was given all the information they needed to make a considered decision. How was this recorded or documented?

Gatekeepers
In the research setting gatekeepers are those whose position affords them formal or informal power to influence researchers’ access to a set population. The term is often thought not exclusively connected to a group or individual considered vulnerable for example parents/guardians and children, teachers and school pupils, care home administrators and the elderly or health professionals and patients. The term might also encompass the roles of individuals such community leaders and possibly translators. Communicating with gatekeepers is important, as is recognising their potential to assist, influence or constrain the course of research.

Informed consent
Informed consent entails giving sufficient information about the research and ensuring that there is no explicit or implicit coercion so that prospective participants can make an informed and free decision on their possible involvement. Typically, the information should be provided in written form, time should be allowed for the participants to consider their choices and the forms should be signed off by the research participants to indicate consent.

Sensitive topics
The ESRC Framework for Research Ethics provides the examples of “participants’ sexual behaviour, their illegal or political behaviour, their experience of violence, their abuse or exploitation, their mental health, or their gender or ethnic status”.

Valid consent: For consent to be ‘valid’ the participant must be capable of understanding all the potential risks involved.

Vulnerable groups:
The ESRC Framework for Research Ethics provides examples of potentially vulnerable groups listing, “children and young people, those with a learning disability or cognitive impairment, or individuals in a dependent or unequal relationship”.

---

2 http://www.esrc.ac.uk/_images/Framework-for-Research-Ethics_tcm8-4586.pdf (November 2012)
Resources

Consent information sheets

Example:

Intellectual property rights

Intro:

Types of IP:

Health and safety

Whilst the principles of health and safety assessment remain constant, it is worth noting that there is a range of specific assessment paperwork produced to meet needs of differing creative disciplines. Below is the current generic MMU form.

MMU H&S Document:
http://www.artdes.mmu.ac.uk/resources/healthandsafety/riskassessments.php
(Accessed November 2012)

MMU policy (Central):
(Accessed November 2012)

MMU policy (Art and Design):
http://www.artdes.mmu.ac.uk/resources/healthandsafety/
(Accessed November 2012)

Ethical advice hand out (Art and Design at MMU)

General guidance:
Appendix 2: Early examples of completed appraisal forms
Completing the ethical reflection exercise – *The basic steps.*

- Read the ethical guidelines on page 8 and the glossary of ethical terms on page 11.
- Complete the short introductory questionnaire - below on this page.
- Read the list of ethical issues on PART A of the form overleaf (page 4). Indicate YES or NO to the issues which might apply to your study.
- Use PART B (on page 5), to describe your ethical response to all the issues you have highlighted.
- Submit this pack together with a completed health and safety assessment form. If you are gathering data from people please also attach examples of your consent form(s) and how you will inform participants about your project and ensure ‘active consent’.

  *Responses highlighted in green will require referral to the Faculty Head of Academic Ethics.*
  *Other issues may also be referred to the Faculty Head of Academic Ethics at the discretion of your supervisor.*

**Introductory questions – Please circle your response and answer all questions.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you attached a health and safety risk assessment?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From November 2012 all proposals will require a separate health and safety risk assessment.</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your project involve NHS Staff or patients or require NHS Trust approval?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For example your study will involve the recruitment of patients or staff through the NHS or involve NHS resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will blood or tissue samples be obtained from participants?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are drugs, placebos or other substances (e.g. food substances, vitamins) to be administered to the study participants or will the study involve invasive, intrusive or potentially harmful procedures of any kind?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will research take place outside of the UK?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PART A - Ethical Categories

**Please tick YES OR NO to ALL the issues listed below. Do these issues apply to your study?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communal or General Good</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 Potential Applications of Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Anticipated and Unanticipated Consequences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Impact on Third Parties or the Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5 The Value of Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 The Problem of Relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Integrity and Responsibility to the Discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 The Pursuit of Objectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Integrity in Reporting Data and Findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Acknowledging Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4 Conflicts of Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5 Supervisory Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguarding the Well-Being of Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Protection from Physical Harm (Health and Safety)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Threats to Psychological Well-Being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 Sensitive Issues and Traumatic Experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 Intrusiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5 Sensitivity to the Needs and Expectations of Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6 Psychological Impact on the Researcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Participants and Informed Consent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 Collaborators, Participants or Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Payment of Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 Informing Consent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Active Consent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Documenting Consent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6 Consent as Process not Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7 The Right to Withdraw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8 Vulnerable Populations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9 Power Relationships and Exploitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10 Neutrality and Maintaining the Role of Researcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11 Participant-Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12 Gatekeepers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13 Deception and Covert Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14 Debriefing and Closure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D15 Consent for Future Uses of Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Management of Data**

| E1 Secure Storage of Privileged Information | | |
| E2 Managed Access to Data | | |
| E3 Secondary Uses of Data | | |

**Dissemination**

| F1 Intellectual Property Rights | | |
| F2 Cultural Copyright | | |
| F3 Acknowledgment of Participants or Collaborators | | |
| F4 Anonymity | | |
| F5 Confidentiality | | |
| F6 Visual Representations of Individuals or Social Groups | | |
| F7 The Public Exhibition of Research Outcomes | | |
| F8 Potential Harm to the Reputation of Participants or Third Parties | | |
| F9 Material and Other Benefits from Research | | |

---

**Early example of completed form (A)**

---

**Compare your proposed methodology against the Part A assessment checklist**

**Complete Part B - Indicate potential ethical issues**

**Part B - Describe your response to issues raised**
# PART B – Ethical response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Activity</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Response to ethic issues raised</th>
<th>S/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| EXAMPLE: Filming in a school | D12 Gatekeepers  
D4 Active Consent  
D5 Documenting Consent  
F7 The Public Exhibition of Research Outcomes  
E1 Secure Storage of Privileged Information  
C5 Sensitivity to the Needs and Expectations of Participants  
D8 Vulnerable Populations  
C1 Protection from Physical Harm (Health and Safety) * | Seek written consent of school and parents/guardians. Make it clear from the outset to all involved what the intended outcome might be and whether there will be any public screening of the film. Consider anonymous contributions. Seek CRB check. Complete risk assessment. Consider policy for withdrawal of participants and storage of material. | |
| Interviewing Artists | D1  
D3  
D4  
D6  
D7  
D14  
D15  
D17  
F3  
F4 | Send details of research subject, methodology and interview questions to artists in advance. Obtain confirmed consent. Share draft research reports. Acknowledge sources of information or anonymise if requested. | |
| Interviewing Commissioning Bodies | D1  
D3  
D4  
D6  
D7  
D14  
D15  
F1  
F3  
F7 | Send details of research subject, methodology and interview questions to commissioning in advance. Obtain confirmed consent. Share draft research reports. Acknowledge sources of information or anonymise if requested. | |
| Development of case studies in relation to specific commission | A5  
B2  
B3  
C5  
D1  
F1  
F3  
F7 | Acknowledge sources of information regarding case studies. Establish potential confidentiality issues in relation to archived documents and any financial information. Verify sources of audience data. | |

S/C: ✓ = Consent of Supervisor/Mentor/Research Centre Leader or R = refer to Head of Faculty Ethics
Completing the ethical reflection exercise – The basic steps.

- Read the ethical guidelines on page 8 and the glossary of ethical terms on page 11.
- Complete the short introductory questionnaire - below on this page.
- Read the list of ethical issues on PART A of the form overleaf (page 4). Indicate YES or NO to the issues which might apply to your study,
- Use PART B (on page 5), to describe your ethical response to all the issues you have highlighted.
- Submit this pack together with a completed health and safety assessment form. If you are gathering data from people please also attach examples of your consent form(s) and how you will inform participants about your project and ensure ‘active consent’.

*Responses highlighted in green will require referral to the Faculty Head of Academic Ethics. Other issues may also be referred to the Faculty Head of Academic Ethics at the discretion of your supervisor.*

Introductory questions - Please circle your response and answer all questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you attached a health and safety risk assessment?</th>
<th>YES [] NO []</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From November 2012 all proposals will require a separate health and safety risk assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does your project involve NHS Staff or patients or require NHS Trust approval?</th>
<th>YES [] NO []</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For example your study will involve the recruitment of patients or staff through the NHS or involve NHS resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Will blood or tissue samples be obtained from participants? | YES \[\] NO \[\] |

| Are drugs, placebos or other substances (e.g. food substances, vitamins) to be administered to the study participants or will the study involve invasive, intrusive or potentially harmful procedures of any kind? | YES \[\] NO \[\] |

| Will research take place outside of the UK? | YES \[\] NO \[\] |
**PART A - Ethical Categories. Please tick YES OR NO to ALL the issues listed below. Do these issues apply to your study?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communal or General Good</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 Potential Applications of Research</td>
<td>[✓]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Anticipated and Unanticipated Consequences</td>
<td></td>
<td>[✓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Impact on Third Parties or the Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>[✓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5 The Value of Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>[✓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 The Problem of Relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td>[✓]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Integrity and Responsibility to the Discipline</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1 The Pursuit of Objectivity</td>
<td>[✓]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Integrity in Reporting Data and Findings</td>
<td></td>
<td>[✓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Acknowledging Sources</td>
<td>[✓]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4 Conflicts of Interest</td>
<td>[✓]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5 Supervisory Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td>[✓]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safeguarding the Well-Being of Participants</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1 Protection from Physical Harm (Health and Safety)</td>
<td></td>
<td>[✓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Threats to Psychological Well-Being</td>
<td>[✓]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 Sensitive Issues and Traumatic Experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td>[✓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 Intrusiveness</td>
<td>[✓]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5 Sensitivity to the Needs and Expectations of Participants</td>
<td></td>
<td>[✓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6 Psychological Impact on the Researcher</td>
<td>[✓]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Participants and Informed Consent</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1 Collaborators, Participants or Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td>[✓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Payment of Participants</td>
<td>[✓]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 Informing Consent</td>
<td></td>
<td>[✓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Active Consent</td>
<td>[✓]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Documenting Consent</td>
<td></td>
<td>[✓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6 Consent as Process not Event</td>
<td></td>
<td>[✓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7 The Right to Withdraw</td>
<td></td>
<td>[✓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8 Vulnerable Populations</td>
<td>[✓]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9 Power Relationships and Exploitation</td>
<td>[✓]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10 Neutrality and Maintaining the Role of Researcher</td>
<td>[✓]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11 Participant-Research</td>
<td>[✓]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12 Gatekeepers</td>
<td>[✓]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13 Deception and Covert Research</td>
<td>[✓]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14 Debriefing and Closure</td>
<td>[✓]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D15 Consent for Future Uses of Data</td>
<td>[✓]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Management of Data</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1 Secure Storage of Privileged Information</td>
<td></td>
<td>[✓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 Managed Access to Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>[✓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3 Secondary Uses of Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>[✓]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissemination</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1 Intellectual Property Rights</td>
<td></td>
<td>[✓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 Cultural Copyright</td>
<td></td>
<td>[✓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 Acknowledgment of Participants or Collaborators</td>
<td>[✓]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4 Anonymity</td>
<td></td>
<td>[✓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5 Confidentiality</td>
<td></td>
<td>[✓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6 Visual Representations of Individuals or Social Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>[✓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7 The Public Exhibition of Research Outcomes</td>
<td>[✓]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8 Potential Harm to the Reputation of Participants or Third Parties</td>
<td></td>
<td>[✓]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9 Material and Other Benefits from Research</td>
<td></td>
<td>[✓]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Early example of completed form (B)**

1. **Step 1**
   - Compare your proposed methodology against the Part A assessment checklist

2. **Step 2**
   - Complete Part B - Indicate potential ethical issues

3. **Step 3**
   - Part B - Describe your response to issues raised
###PART B – Ethical response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Activity</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Response to ethic issues raised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXAMPLE:</td>
<td></td>
<td>* Seek written consent of school and parents/guardians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filming in a school</td>
<td>D12 Gatekeepers</td>
<td>Make it clear from the outset to all involved what the intended outcome might be and whether there will be any public screening of the film.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D4 Active Consent</td>
<td>Consider anonymous contributions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D5 Documenting Consent</td>
<td>Seek CRB check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F7 The Public Exhibition of Research Outcomes</td>
<td>Complete risk assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E1 Secure Storage of Privileged Information</td>
<td>Consider policy for withdrawal of participants and storage of material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS Sensitivity to the Needs and Expectations of Participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D8 Vulnerable Populations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C1 Protection from Physical Harm (Health and Safety) *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Studies</td>
<td>B1 The pursuit of objectivity</td>
<td>* Remain objective throughout the course of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B2 Integrity in reporting data and findings</td>
<td>* Report data accurately and handle all findings with professionalism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B3 Acknowledging sources</td>
<td>* Always reference primary and secondary sources [including images, photographs and film].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1 Intellectual property rights</td>
<td>* Be aware of copyright law and act responsibly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F2 Cultural copyright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessing libraries/archives and using archival data</td>
<td>B3 Acknowledging sources</td>
<td>* Make sure the library/archive from which I am retrieving data is aware of my project and my role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E2 Managed access to data</td>
<td>* Make sure the library/archive are named and referenced at all times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E3 Secondary uses of data</td>
<td>* Make sure that archival material remains private until otherwise agreed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1 Intellectual property rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F2 Cultural copyright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F3 Acknowledgment of participants/collaborators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F7 The public exhibition of research outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews with specialists in the field of study</td>
<td>D1 Collaborators, participants or subjects</td>
<td>* Provide the interviewees with a letter of consent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D3 Informing Consent</td>
<td>* Orally inform the interviewees about their right to withdraw from the interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D4 Active Consent</td>
<td>* Inform the interviewees about their right to decide to keep all data confidential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D5 Documenting Consent</td>
<td>* Ask for permission to use the data in the future [i.e., for publication or conference presentation].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D10 Neutrality and maintaining the role of researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D15 Consent for future uses of data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F5 Confidentiality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*S/C: ✓ = Consent of Supervisor/Mentor/Research Centre Leader or R = refer to Head of Faculty Ethics*
Completing the ethical reflection exercise – The basic steps.

- Read the ethical guidelines on page 8 and the glossary of ethical terms on page 11.
- Complete the short introductory questionnaire - below on this page.
- Read the list of ethical issues on PART A of the form overleaf (page 4). Indicate YES or NO to the issues which might apply to your study.
- Use PART B (on page 5), to describe your ethical response to all the issues you have highlighted.
- Submit this pack together with a completed health and safety assessment form. If you are gathering data from people please also attach examples of your consent form(s) and how you will inform participants about your project and ensure 'active consent'.

Responses highlighted in green will require referral to the Faculty Head of Academic Ethics.
Other issues may also be referred to the Faculty Head of Academic Ethics at the discretion of your supervisor.

Introductory questions - Please circle your response and answer all questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you attached a health and safety risk assessment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From November 2012 all proposals will require a separate health and safety risk assessment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your project involve NHS Staff or patients or require NHS Trust approval?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For example your study will involve the recruitment of patients or staff through the NHS or involve NHS resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will blood or tissue samples be obtained from participants?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are drugs, placebos or other substances (e.g. food substances, vitamins) to be administered to the study participants or will the study involve invasive, intrusive or potentially harmful procedures of any kind?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will research take place outside of the UK?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# PART A - Ethical Categories

Please tick YES OR NO to ALL the issues listed below. Do these issues apply to your study?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communal or General Good</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 Potential Applications of Research</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Anticipated and Unanticipated Consequences</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3 Impact on Third Parties or the Environment</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5 The Value of Knowledge</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 The Problem of Relevance</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Integrity and Responsibility to the Discipline</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 The Pursuit of Objectivity</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 Integrity in Reporting Data and Findings</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3 Acknowledging Sources</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4 Conflicts of Interest</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5 Supervisory Relationships</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguarding the Well-Being of Participants</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Protection from Physical Harm (Health and Safety)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 Threats to Psychological Well-Being</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 Sensitive Issues and Traumatic Experiences</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4 Intrusiveness</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5 Sensitivity to the Needs and Expectations of Participants</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6 Psychological Impact on the Researcher</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Participants and Informed Consent</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 Collaborators, Participants or Subjects</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 Payment of Participants</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 Informing Consent</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4 Active Consent</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5 Documenting Consent</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6 Consent as Process not Event</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7 The Right to Withdraw</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8 Vulnerable Populations</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9 Power Relationships and Exploitation</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10 Neutrality and Maintaining the Role of Researcher</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11 Participant-Research</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12 Gatekeepers</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13 Deception and Covert Research</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14 Debriefing and Closure</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D15 Consent for Future Uses of Data</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Management of Data</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1 Secure Storage of Privileged Information</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2 Managed Access to Data</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3 Secondary Uses of Data</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1 Intellectual Property Rights</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2 Cultural Copyright</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 Acknowledgment of Participants or Collaborators</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4 Anonymity</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5 Confidentiality</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6 Visual Representations of Individuals or Social Groups</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7 The Public Exhibition of Research Outcomes</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8 Potential Harm to the Reputation of Participants or Third Parties</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9 Material and Other Benefits from Research</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Early example of completed form (C)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Activity</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Response to ethic issues raised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXAMPLE:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filming in a school</td>
<td>D12 Gatekeepers</td>
<td>Seek written consent of school and parents/guardians. Make it clear from the outset to all involved what the intended outcome might be and whether there will be any public screening of the film.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D4 Active Consent</td>
<td>Consider anonymous contributions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D5 Documenting Consent</td>
<td>Seek CRB check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F7 The Public Exhibition of Research Outcomes</td>
<td>Complete risk assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E1 Secure Storage of Privileged Information</td>
<td>Consider policy for withdrawal of participants and storage of material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3 Sensitivity to the Needs and Expectations of Participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D8 Vulnerable Populations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C1 Protection from Physical Harm (Health and Safety) *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary research, inc use of archives, collections, databases and information files at Manchester Art Gallery</td>
<td>A1 potential applications of research</td>
<td>MIRIAD Studentship Memorandum sets out reporting structures, permissions, anticipated use, confidentiality, acknowledgements, IPR and publication. See attached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2 unanticipated consequences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B2 integrity in reporting findings</td>
<td>Use Harvard referencing to acknowledge all sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B3 acknowledging sources</td>
<td>Gain written permission for direct use of sources in any published outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B15 consent for future uses of data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E2 managed access to data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1 IPR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical evaluation of literature</td>
<td>B3 acknowledging sources</td>
<td>Use Harvard referencing to acknowledge all sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1 IPR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Many Many Quite Contrary Project and blog including contributions from project participants and blog visitors</td>
<td>B3 acknowledging sources</td>
<td>Use Harvard referencing to acknowledge all sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D11 Participant Research</td>
<td>Gain written permission for direct use of material from project collaborators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D10 Neutrality + the role of researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D15 consent for future uses of data</td>
<td>Evaluate own position as previous staff member turned researcher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1 IPR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F3 acknowledgement of participants or collaborators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S/C: √ = Consent of Supervisor/Mentor/Research Centre Leader or R = refer to Head of Faculty Ethics
# PART B - Ethical response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Activity</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Response to ethic issues raised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Use of family research and interviews with family members | C5: Sensitivity to expectations of participants  
D1: Collaborators, participants & subjects  
D3, D4, D5: Consent  
D7: The right to withdraw  
D11: Participant research  
D15: Consent for future uses of data | Behave with tact and diplomacy regarding family history  
Seek written consent (see form)  
Critically evaluate family material against other sources  
Acknowledge contribution in outputs |
| Interviews, discussion groups and objects handling with M&G staff and other participants | F1: IPR  
F3: Acknowledgement of participants  
F5: Confidentiality  
F7: The public exhibition of research outcomes  
F2: Cultural copyright | Determine copyright in Greg family material  
Obtain written permissions for use of this material accordingly  
Agree appropriate acknowledgement/confidentiality in public outputs |

- Provide written information and consent form, to be signed by all participants (See form attached)  
- Evaluate impact of own position as previous staff member turned researcher  
- Anonymise participant contributions in acknowledgement  
- Ensure participants have consented to visual representation (photography) and its use in public outputs

S/C: ✓ Consent of Supervisor/Mentor/Research Centre Leader or R = refer to Head of Faculty Ethics
Appendix 4: University of Chester questionnaire
Art, Design and Media Research: Pilot Awareness Questionnaire. (All information will be treated as confidential).
J Spencer. MIRIAD. Manchester Metropolitan University. 2012.

Q1 Gender
Male □ □ Female □ □

Q2 Prior to university did you study on an art, design or media related course(s)?
Yes □ Go to Q3 No □ Go to Q4

Q3 What was the type of qualification(s) you studied? Tick box(es).
AS/A level in an Art, Design or Media related subject □
AVCE/VCE, National Diploma/Certificate in an Art, Design or Media related subject □
OTHER - Please state (e.g. HNC/HND, Foundation Degree etc.) □ □ □

Q4 As part of your art, design or media related studies (at school/college or university) have you ever taken part in activities where you learnt about or considered ethics in relation to your work? (Please tick)
Yes □ □ No □ □

Q5 Can you summarise or define what you think the term 'ethics' means in relation to your art, design or media practice?

Q6 As part of your art, design or media related studies have you ever taken part in any activities where you learnt about or considered the nature of 'creativity' or attempted to define it in connection to your work?
Yes □ □ No □ □

Q7 How would you describe or explain the term 'creativity'?

Q8 List who do you consider decides or determines if something is to be considered 'creative' or not?

Q9 Are there certain situations and circumstances in which you feel more inclined to be 'creative'? (Please tick)
Yes □ Go to Q10 No □ Go to Q11

Q10 Can you describe these conditions?

Q11 In relation to developing your response to an art, media or design brief, how often do you take 'risks'?
Every time □ Go to Q12
Often □ Go to Q12
Sometimes □ Go to Q12
Rarely □ Go to Q12
Never □ Go to Q15
Q12 How would you define what you mean by the term ‘risk’ in these circumstances?

Q13 Why do you take these ‘risks’?

Q14 What type of risks were these? (Please tick any that apply)

- Risks connected to timescale or deadlines
- Risks connected to experimentation
- Risks connected to health and safety
- Risk connected to how the work would be viewed by colleagues, friends or family
- Risk connected to how your tutor might view or assess the work
- Risk connected to breaking the rules or conventions of the discipline
- Other risks (please explain below)

Q15 In relation to developing your response to an art, media or design brief have you ever actively avoided or minimised risks? (Please tick)

- Often
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never

Q16 Why did you actively avoid or minimise risks?

Q17 What sort of risks were these? (Please explain).

Q18 What role(s) have your tutors played in helping you to manage risk in your creative work? (Tick any that apply)

- Introduced the concept of ‘risk’ in relation to work
- Discussed a ‘how to do it’ process of managing risks
- Created an environment where it was safe to take risks
- Actively facilitated an opportunity for creative ‘play’ or experimentation
- Actively involved in helping manage risk through tutorials
- Provided clear project briefs with assessment criteria
- Other (Please explain below)
Q19  In your experience where you have taken risks in terms of your work, do you believe on the whole the output was:

Better as a result  □
Same  □
Worse  □

Why do you think this? (Please explain).

---

Q20  Do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative or not?

Yes  □, Go to Q21  No  □, Go to Q23

Q21  Why do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative?

---

Q22  Can you give any examples of designers, filmmakers or artists you believe demonstrate this?

---

Q23  Can you explain what the term ‘creative risk’ means to you?

---

Q24  Do you think some people are more likely to take ‘creative risks’ than others?

Yes  □, Go to Q25  No  □, Go to Q27

Q25  What qualities do these people have that enable them to be more likely to take ‘creative risks’

---

Q26  Do you think this attitude to risk is also seen in other areas of their lives?

Yes  □  No  □

If answer is ‘yes’ - how is this attitude to risk demonstrated in other areas of their lives? (Please explain below).

---

Q27  Do you think the relationship people have to ‘creative risk’ is fixed or can be developed? (Tick one)

- It is fixed – people are born that way  □
- It can be developed or nurtured in an unlimited way  □
- It can be developed or nurtured but only up to a persons predetermined or natural capacity for ‘creative risk’  □

Q28  What are the most important factors that limit your desire or scope to take ‘creative risks’ with your work?

---

Q29  What are the most important factors that encourage you take more ‘creative risks’ in your work?
Q30 How do you believe creativity is currently assessed by your tutors?

Q31 In terms of course work, do you think the 'creative process', (the development of the work) and 'creative output' (the finished product or artefact) are on the whole assessed by tutors as:

- Equally important
- Creative output is more important than the creative process
- Creative process is more important than the creative output

Q32 In terms of your assessment which do you think on the whole is more important, creative process or creative output?

- Both equally important
- Creative output is more important than the creative process
- Creative process is more important than the creative output

Q33 Indicate (tick boxes) if you have ever asked a teacher, tutor or lecturer to explain what they mean by?

- Creativity
- Creative risk
- Ethical

Q34 Have you ever sought to examine why something is called creative?

- Yes
- No

Q35 Reflecting on your entire art, design or media educational experience, what do you feel has been more highly valued by teachers, tutors or lecturers (tick one):

- Written work and theory
- Craft and practice
- Neither as both have been held in similar esteem

Q36 One simple definition of ethics is: '*the discipline dealing with what is good and bad and with moral duty and obligation*'.

Consider an example of work that is extremely controversial or seen as transgressive. (Example)

Do you think that work that embodies or expresses poor ethical judgement is also therefore flawed in terms of its creative merit?

- Yes
- No

**Explain your answer:**

Q37 Can you think of any ethical issues you have encountered in recent art, design or media work?

- Yes
- Go to Q38
- No

Thank you – end of questions.

Q38 Please explain what they were

Thank you for your time - end of questions

If you would like any more information with regard to the study contact:
J Spencer (PhD Researcher at MIRIAD. MMU. Manchester)
Communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com
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Q1  Gender  Male [✓]  Female [ ]

Q2  Prior to university did you study on an art, design or media related course(s)?
   Yes [✓]  Go to Q3  No [ ]  Go to Q4

Q3  What was the type of qualification(s) you studied? Tick box(es).
   AS/A level in an Art, Design or Media related subject [ ]
   AVCE/VCE, National Diploma/Certificate in an Art, Design or Media related subject [ ]
   OTHER - Please state (e.g. HNC/HND, Foundation Degree etc.) [ ]

Q4  As part of your art, design or media related studies (at school/college or university) have you ever taken part in activities where you learnt about or considered ethics in relation to your work? (Please tick)
   Yes [✓]  No [ ]

Q5  Can you summarise or define what you think the term ‘ethics’ means in relation to your art, design or media practice?

Q6  As part of your art, design or media related studies have you ever taken part in any activities where you learnt about or considered the nature of ‘creativity’ or attempted to define it in connection to your work?
   Yes [✓]  No [ ]

Q7  How would you describe or explain the term ‘creativity’?

Q8  List who do you consider decides or determines if something is to be considered ‘creative’ or not?

Q9  Are there certain situations and circumstances in which you feel more inclined to be ‘creative’? (Please tick)
   Yes [✓]  Go to Q10  No [ ]  Go to Q11

Q10  Can you describe these conditions?

Q11  In relation to developing your response to an art, media or design brief, how often do you take ‘risks’?
   Every time [ ]  Go to Q12
   Often [ ]  Go to Q12
   Sometimes [✓]  Go to Q12
   Rarely [ ]  Go to Q12
   Never [ ]  Go to Q15
Q12 How would you define what you mean by the term 'risk' in these circumstances?

Financial outcome for a project are going out of the business or a failure.

Q13 Why do you take these 'risks'?

To get the best result for a client.

Q14 What type of risks were these? (Please tick any that apply)

- Risks connected to timescale or deadlines
- Risks connected to experimentation
- Risks connected to health and safety
- Risk connected to how the work would be viewed by colleagues, friends or family
- Risk connected to how your tutor might view or assess the work
- Risk connected to breaking the rules or conventions of the discipline
- Other risks (please explain below)

Q15 In relation to developing your response to an art, media or design brief have you ever actively avoided or minimised risks? (Please tick)

- Often
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never

Q16 Why did you actively avoid or minimise risks?

To avoid financial cost to my real-world clients.

Q17 What sort of risks were these? (Please explain).

Going over budget or timeline. Clients will not pay a designer to experiment without some guarantee of success.

Q18 What role(s) have your tutors played in helping you to manage risk in your creative work? (Tick any that apply)

- Introduced the concept of 'risk' in relation to work
- Discussed a 'how to do it' process of managing risks
- Created an environment where it was safe to take risks
- Actively facilitated an opportunity for creative 'play' or experimentation
- Actively involved in helping manage risk through tutorials
- Provided clear project briefs with assessment criteria
- Other (Please explain below)
Q19 In your experience where you have taken risks in terms of your work, do you believe on the whole the output was:

Better as a result  
Same  
Worse  

Why do you think this? (Please explain).

Q20 Do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative or not?

Yes  , Go to Q21  
No  , Go to Q23

Q21 Why do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative?

Q22 Can you give any examples of designers, filmmakers or artists you believe demonstrate this?

Q23 Can you explain what the term ‘creative risk’ means to you?

Q24 Do you think some people are more likely to take ‘creative risks’ than others?

Yes  , Go to Q25  
No  , Go to Q27

Q25 What qualities do these people have that enable them to be more likely to take ‘creative risks’

Q26 Do you think this attitude to risk is also seen in other areas of their lives?

Yes  
No  

If answer is ‘yes’ - how is this attitude to risk demonstrated in other areas of their lives? (Please explain below).

Q27 Do you think the relationship people have to ‘creative risk’ is fixed or can be developed? (Tick one)

* It is fixed – people are born that way.  
* It can be developed or nurtured in an unlimited way  
* It can be developed or nurtured but only up to a persons predetermined or natural capacity for ‘creative risk’.

Q28 What are the most important factors that limit your desire or scope to take ‘creative risks’ with your work?

Q29 What are the most important factors that encourage you take more ‘creative risks’ in your work?

 Tiền (with or without)
Q30 How do you believe creativity is currently assessed by your tutors?

Q31 In terms of course work, do you think the 'creative process', (the development of the work) and 'creative output' (the finished product or artefact) are on the whole assessed by tutors as:

- Equally important
- Creative output is more important than the creative process
- Creative process is more important than the creative output

Q32 In terms of your assessment which do you think on the whole is more important, creative process or creative output?

- Both equally important
- Creative output is more important than the creative process
- Creative process is more important than the creative output

Q33 Indicate (tick boxes) if you have ever asked a teacher, tutor or lecturer to explain what they mean by?

- Creativity
- Creative risk
- Ethical

Q34 Have you ever sought to examine why something is called creative?

- Yes
- No

Q35 Reflecting on your entire art, design or media educational experience; what do you feel has been more highly valued by teachers, tutors or lecturers (tick one):

- Written work and theory
- Craft and practice
- Neither- as both have been held in similar esteem

Q36 One simple definition of ethics is: 'the discipline dealing with what is good and bad and with moral duty and obligation'.

Consider an example of work that is extremely controversial or seen as transgressive. (Example)

Do you think that work that embodies or expresses poor ethical judgement is also therefore flawed in terms of its creative merit?

- Yes
- No

Explain your answer:

Q37 Can you think of any ethical issues you have encountered in recent art, design or media work?

- Yes
- No

Q38 Please explain what they were


Thank you for your time - end of questions

If you would like any more information with regard to the study contact:
J Spencer (PhD Researcher at MIRIAD. MMU, Manchester)
Communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com
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Art, Design and Media Research: Pilot Awareness Questionnaire. (All information will be treated as confidential).
J Spencer. MIRIAD. Manchester Metropolitan University. 2012.

Q1 Gender Male [✓] Female [ ]

Q2 Prior to university did you study on an art, design or media related course(s)?
Yes [✓] Go to Q3 No [ ] Go to Q4

Q3 What was the type of qualification(s) you studied? Tick box(es).
- AS/A level in an Art, Design or Media related subject [✓]
- AVCE/VCE, National Diploma/Certificate in an Art, Design or Media related subject [ ]
- OTHER - Please state (e.g. HNC/HND, Foundation Degree etc.) [ ]

Q4 As part of your art, design or media related studies (at school/college or university) have you ever taken part in activities where you learnt about or considered ethics in relation to your work? (Please tick)
Yes [ ]
No [✓]

Q5 Can you summarise or define what you think the term ‘ethics’ means in relation to your art, design or media practice?
The deeper social aspect is of piece, completion.

Q6 As part of your art, design or media related studies have you ever taken part in any activities where you learnt about or considered the nature of ‘creativity’ or attempted to define it in connection to your work?
Yes [ ]
No [✓]

Q7 How would you describe or explain the term ‘creativity’?
Breaking the rules of Society, coming up with an original piece, any different to everyone else.

Q8 List who do you consider decides or determines if something is to be considered ‘creative’ or not?
The artist, the viewer the public

Q9 Are there certain situations and circumstances in which you feel more inclined to be ‘creative’? (Please tick)
Yes [✓] Go to Q10 No [ ] Go to Q11

Q10 Can you describe these conditions?
Working for a client, working on a university brief while being bored at home or with friends

Q11 In relation to developing your response to an art, media or design brief, how often do you take ‘risks’?
Every time [ ] Go to Q12
Often [✓] Go to Q12
Sometimes [ ] Go to Q12
Rarely [ ] Go to Q12
Never [ ] Go to Q15
Q12 How would you define what you mean by the term ‘risk’ in these circumstances?  
Using a controversial piece of art to show in public

Q13 Why do you take these ‘risks’?  
If gets you noticed and remembered, can cause problems but it controlled can make you famous

Q14 What type of risks were these? (Please tick any that apply)
- Risks connected to timescale or deadlines [x]
- Risks connected to experimentation [x]
- Risks connected to health and safety [x]
- Risk connected to how the work would be viewed by colleagues, friends or family [ ]
- Risk connected to how your tutor might view or assess the work [ ]
- Risk connected to breaking the rules or conventions of the discipline [ ]
- Other risks (please explain below) [ ]

Q15 In relation to developing your response to an art, media or design brief have you ever actively avoided or minimised risks? (Please tick)
- Often [ ] Go to Q16
- Sometimes [x] Go to Q16
- Rarely [ ] Go to Q16
- Never [ ] Go to Q18

Q16 Why did you actively avoid or minimise risks?  
To get the best grade, to keep my social morals, for the best interest of others

Q17 What sort of risks were these? (Please explain).
- Not taking pictures at a funeral in respect, not trespassing on private land

Q18 What role(s) have your tutors played in helping you to manage risk in your creative work? (Tick any that apply)
- Introduced the concept of ‘risk’ in relation to work [ ]
- Discussed a ‘how to do it’ process of managing risks [ ]
- Created an environment where it was safe to take risks [x]
- Actively facilitated an opportunity for creative ‘play’ or experimentation [ ]
- Actively involved in helping manage risk through tutorials [ ]
- Provided clear project briefs with assessment criteria [x]
- Other (Please explain below) [ ]
Q19 In your experience where you have taken risks in terms of your work, do you believe on the whole the output was:

Better as a result [x],
Same [ ],
Worse [ ].

Why do you think this? (Please explain). The work was shocking but caused the right response to stop. 

Q20 Do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative or not?

Yes [x], Go to Q21  No [ ], Go to Q23

Q21 Why do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative?

because when people dont take risks they dont get seen

Q22 Can you give any examples of designers, filmmakers or artists you believe demonstrate this?

Banksy
Jackson

Q23 Can you explain what the term 'creative risk' means to you?

producing a piece of work that could be seen the wrong way and could offend people. Doing something different to everyone else.

Q24 Do you think some people are more likely to take 'creative risks' than others?

Yes [x], Go to Q25  No [ ], Go to Q27

Q25 What qualities do these people have that enable them to be more likely to take 'creative risks'

Bravery

Q26 Do you think this attitude to risk is also seen in other areas of their lives?

Yes [x],  No [ ].

If answer is ‘yes’ - how is this attitude to risk demonstrated in other areas of their lives? (Please explain below).

Sky diving and any extreme sports to get a thrill.

Q27 Do you think the relationship people have to ‘creative risk’ is fixed or can be developed? (Tick one)

• It is fixed – people are born that way. [ ]
• It can be developed or nurtured in an unlimited way [x]
• It can be developed or nurtured but only up to a person’s predetermined or natural capacity for ‘creative risk’. [ ]

Q28 What are the most important factors that limit your desire or scope to take ‘creative risks’ with your work?

Social norms, tutors, university rules

Q29 What are the most important factors that encourage you take more ‘creative risks’ in your work?

Free reign with a good brief, no rules or final production
Q30 How do you believe creativity is currently assessed by your tutors?

They have no say other than what the examination body

Q31 In terms of course work, do you think the 'creative process', (the development of the work) and 'creative output' (the finished product or artefact) are on the whole assessed by tutors as:

Equally important  X,
Creative output is more important than the creative process  X,
Creative process is more important than the creative output  X,

Q32 In terms of your assessment which do you think on the whole is more important, creative process or creative output?

Both equally important  X,
Creative output is more important than the creative process  X,
Creative process is more important than the creative output  X,

Q33 Indicate (tick boxes) if you have ever asked a teacher, tutor or lecturer to explain what they mean by?
Creativity  X,
Creative risk  X,
Ethical  X,

Q34 Have you ever sought to examine why something is called creative?
Yes  X, No  X,

Q35 Reflecting on your entire art, design or media educational experience; what do you feel has been more highly valued by teachers, tutors or lecturers (tick one):
Written work and theory  X, Craft and practice  X, Neither- as both have been held in similar esteem  X,

Q36 One simple definition of ethics is: 'the discipline dealing with what is good and bad and with moral duty and obligation'.
Consider an example of work that is extremely controversial or seen as transgressive. (Example)
Do you think that work that embodies or expresses poor ethical judgement is also therefore flawed in terms of its creative merit?
Yes  X, No  X,
Explain your answer:

Q37 Can you think of any ethical issues you have encountered in recent art, design or media work?
Yes  X, Go to Q38  X, No  X, Thank you - end of questions.

Q38 Please explain what they were

Thank you for your time - end of questions

If you would like any more information with regard to the study contact:
J Spencer (PhD Researcher at MIRIAD, MMU, Manchester)
Communicate with john@yahoo.com

Art, Design and Media Research: Pilot Awareness Questionnaire. (All information will be treated as confidential).

J Spencer. MIRIAD. Manchester Metropolitan University. 2012.

Q1 Gender
- Male [ ]
- Female [ ]

Q2 Prior to university did you study on an art, design or media related course(s)?
- Yes [ ] Go to Q3
- No [ ] Go to Q4

Q3 What was the type of qualification(s) you studied? Tick box(es).
- AS/A level in an Art, Design or Media related subject [ ]
- AVCE/VCE, National Diploma/Certificate in an Art, Design or Media related subject [ ]
- OTHER - Please state (e.g. HNC/HND, Foundation Degree etc.) [ ]

Q4 As part of your art, design or media related studies (at school/college or university) have you ever taken part in activities where you learnt about or considered ethics in relation to your work? (Please tick)
- Yes [ ]
- No [ ]

Q5 Can you summarise or define what you think the term ‘ethics’ means in relation to your art, design or media practice?

Q6 As part of your art, design or media related studies have you ever taken part in any activities where you learnt about or considered the nature of ‘creativity’ or attempted to define it in connection to your work?
- Yes [ ]
- No [ ]

Q7 How would you describe or explain the term ‘creativity’?

Q8 List who do you consider decides or determines if something is to be considered ‘creative’ or not?

Q9 Are there certain situations and circumstances in which you feel more inclined to be ‘creative’? (Please tick)
- Yes [ ] Go to Q10
- No [ ] Go to Q11

Q10 Can you describe these conditions?

Q11 In relation to developing your response to an art, media or design brief, how often do you take ‘risks’?
- Every time [ ] Go to Q12
- Often [ ] Go to Q12
- Sometimes [ ] Go to Q12
- Rarely [ ] Go to Q12
- Never [ ] Go to Q15
Q12  How would you define what you mean by the term 'risk' in these circumstances?

a piece out of ordinary or controversial.

Q13  Why do you take these ‘risks’?

for people to get noticed, to
make people think, better grades
for different.

Q14  What type of risks were these? (Please tick any that apply)

Risks connected to timescale or deadlines ☒
Risks connected to experimentation ☐
Risks connected to health and safety ☐
Risk connected to how the work would be viewed by colleagues, friends or family ☒
Risk connected to how your tutor might view or assess the work ☒
Risk connected to breaking the rules or conventions of the discipline ☒
Other risks (please explain below) ☐

Q15  In relation to developing your response to an art, media or design brief have you ever actively avoided or minimised risks? (Please tick)

Often ☐, Go to Q16
Sometimes ☒, Go to Q16
Rarely ☐, Go to Q16
Never ☒, Go to Q18

Q16  Why did you actively avoid or minimise risks?

To gain better marks, play by the rules.

Q17  What sort of risks were these? (Please explain).

a risky subject or project.

Q18  What role(s) have your tutors played in helping you to manage risk in your creative work? (Tick any that apply)

Introduced the concept of ‘risk’ in relation to work ☒
Discussed a ‘how to do it’ process of managing risks ☒
Created an environment where it was safe to take risks ☒
Actively facilitated an opportunity for creative ‘play’ or experimentation ☒
Actively involved in helping manage risk through tutorials ☐
Provided clear project briefs with assessment criteria ☒
Other (Please explain below) ☐
Q19 In your experience where you have taken risks in terms of your work, do you believe on the whole the output was:

Better as a result [ ]
Same [ ]
Worse [ ]

Why do you think this? (Please explain).

Q20 Do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative or not?

Yes [ ] Go to Q21 No [ ] Go to Q23

Q21 Why do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative?

Get noticed.

Q22 Can you give any examples of designers, filmmakers or artists you believe demonstrate this?

Banksy.

Q23 Can you explain what the term ‘creative risk’ means to you?

vandalising for Art.

Q24 Do you think some people are more likely to take ‘creative risks’ than others?

Yes [ ] Go to Q25 No [ ] Go to Q27

Q25 What qualities do these people have that enable them to be more likely to take ‘creative risks’?

less boundaries.

Q26 Do you think this attitude to risk is also seen in other areas of their lives?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

If answer is ‘yes’ - how is this attitude to risk demonstrated in other areas of their lives? (Please explain below).

to not care for rules, e.g. crime.

Q27 Do you think the relationship people have to ‘creative risk’ is fixed or can be developed? (Tick one)

- It is fixed - people are born that way. [ ]
- It can be developed or nurtured in an unlimited way [ ]
- It can be developed or nurtured but only up to a person’s predetermined or natural capacity for ‘creative risk’. [ ]

Q28 What are the most important factors that limit your desire or scope to take ‘creative risks’ with your work?

rules, whether you are breaking them or not.

Q29 What are the most important factors that encourage you to take more ‘creative risks’ in your work?

less specific projects.
Q30 How do you believe creativity is currently assessed by your tutors?

Q31 In terms of course work, do you think the 'creative process', (the development of the work) and 'creative output' (the finished product or artefact) are on the whole assessed by tutors as:

- Equally important
- Creative output is more important than the creative process
- Creative process is more important than the creative output

Q32 In terms of your assessment which do you think on the whole is more important, creative process or creative output?

- Both equally important
- Creative output is more important than the creative process
- Creative process is more important than the creative output

Q33 Indicate (tick boxes) if you have ever asked a teacher, tutor or lecturer to explain what they mean by?

- Creativity
- Creative risk
- Ethical

Q34 Have you ever sought to examine why something is called creative?

- Yes
- No

Q35 Reflecting on your entire art, design or media educational experience; what do you feel has been more highly valued by teachers, tutors or lecturers (tick one):

- Written work and theory
- Craft and practice
- Neither as both have been held in similar esteem

Q36 One simple definition of ethics is: 'the discipline dealing with what is good and bad and with moral duty and obligation'.

Consider an example of work that is extremely controversial or seen as transgressive. (Example)

Do you think that work that embodies or expresses poor ethical judgement is also therefore flawed in terms of its creative merit?

- Yes
- No

Explain your answer:

Q37 Can you think of any ethical issues you have encountered in recent art, design or media work?

- Yes
- No

Q38 Please explain what they were

Thank you for your time - end of questions

If you would like any more information with regard to the study contact:
J Spencer (PhD Researcher at MIRIAD. MMU. Manchester)
Communicate with john@yahoo.com
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Art, Design and Media Research: Pilot Awareness Questionnaire. (All information will be treated as confidential).

J Spencer. MIRIAD. Manchester Metropolitan University. 2012.

Q1 Gender Male [ ] Female [ ]

Q2 Prior to university did you study on an art, design or media related course(s)?

Yes [ ] Go to Q3 No [ ] Go to Q4

Q3 What was the type of qualification(s) you studied? Tick box(es).

AS/A level in an Art, Design or Media related subject [ ]
AVCE/VCE, National Diploma/Certificate in an Art, Design or Media related subject [ ]
OTHER - Please state (e.g. HNC/HND, Foundation Degree etc.)

Q4 As part of your art, design or media related studies (at school/college or university) have you ever taken part in activities where you learnt about or considered ethics in relation to your work? (Please tick)

Yes [ ]
No [ ]

Q5 Can you summarise or define what you think the term ‘ethics’ means in relation to your art, design or media practice?

The difference between what is considered to be right or wrong.

Q6 As part of your art, design or media related studies have you ever taken part in any activities where you learnt about or considered the nature of ‘creativity’ or attempted to define it in connection to your work?

Yes [ ]
No [ ]

Q7 How would you describe or explain the term ‘creativity’?

How imaginative and interesting an idea is.

Q8 List who do you consider decides or determines if something is to be considered ‘creative’ or not?

Myself. Just because someone else doesn’t like it doesn’t mean it is bad.

Q9 Are there certain situations and circumstances in which you feel more inclined to be ‘creative’? (Please tick)

Yes [ ], Go to Q10 No [ ], Go to Q11

Q10 Can you describe these conditions?

All the time! I’d be a bad art + design student if I wasn’t inclined to be creative.

Q11 In relation to developing your response to an art, media or design brief, how often do you take ‘risks’?

Every time [ ] Go to Q12
Often [ ] Go to Q12
Sometimes [ ] Go to Q12
Rarely [ ] Go to Q12
Never [ ] Go to Q15
Q12 How would you define what you mean by the term ‘risk’ in these circumstances?

Something different.

Q13 Why do you take these ‘risks’?

Cause it might be the thing that makes you stand out from the rest.

Q14 What type of risks were these? (Please tick any that apply)

- Risks connected to timescale or deadlines
- Risks connected to experimentation
- Risks connected to health and safety
- Risk connected to how the work would be viewed by colleagues, friends or family
- Risk connected to how your tutor might view or assess the work
- Risk connected to breaking the rules or conventions of the discipline
- Other risks (please explain below)

Q15 In relation to developing your response to an art, media or design brief have you ever actively avoided or minimised risks? (Please tick)

- Often
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never

Go to Q16

Q16 Why did you actively avoid or minimise risks?

To avoid being humiliated or feeling...

Q17 What sort of risks were these? (Please explain).

Not doing what I wanted and doing what I thought others wanted.

Q18 What role(s) have your tutors played in helping you to manage risk in your creative work? (Tick any that apply)

- Introduced the concept of ‘risk’ in relation to work
- Discussed a ‘how to do it’ process of managing risks
- Created an environment where it was safe to take risks
- Actively facilitated an opportunity for creative ‘play’ or experimentation
- Actively involved in helping manage risk through tutorials
- Provided clear project briefs with assessment criteria
- Other (Please explain below)
Q19 In your experience where you have taken risks in terms of your work, do you believe on the whole the output was:

- Better as a result [ ]
- Same [ ]
- Worse [ ]

Why do you think this? (Please explain).

Because it's not what my teachers would have done.

Q20 Do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative or not?

Yes [ ] Go to Q21  No [ ] Go to Q23

Q21 Why do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative?

Because they're being unique and sometimes attention seeking.

Q22 Can you give any examples of designers, filmmakers or artists you believe demonstrate this?

No

Q23 Can you explain what the term 'creative risk' means to you?

Doing something outside the box or something that will cause controversy.

Q24 Do you think some people are more likely to take 'creative risks' than others?

Yes [ ] Go to Q25  No [ ] Go to Q27

Q25 What qualities do these people have that enable them to be more likely to take 'creative risks'?

They don't care what people think.

Q26 Do you think this attitude to risk is also seen in other areas of their lives?

Yes [ ]  No [ ]

If answer is 'yes' - how is this attitude to risk demonstrated in other areas of their lives? (Please explain below).

Just how they act. More spontaneous.

Q27 Do you think the relationship people have to 'creative risk' is fixed or can be developed? (Tick one)

- It is fixed – people are born that way. [ ]
- It can be developed or nurtured in an unlimited way [ ]
- It can be developed or nurtured but only up to a persons predetermined or natural capacity for 'creative risk'. [ ]

Q28 What are the most important factors that limit your desire or scope to take 'creative risks' with your work?

Ethics and what other people think.

Q29 What are the most important factors that encourage you take more 'creative risks' in your work?

Higher marks!
Q30 How do you believe creativity is currently assessed by your tutors?

By their own opinion and view of work, which is unsure as others may think it's brilliant.

Q31 In terms of course work, do you think the ‘creative process’, (the development of the work) and ‘creative output’ (the finished product or artefact) are on the whole assessed by tutors as:

Equally important □
Creative output is more important than the creative process □
Creative process is more important than the creative output □

Q32 In terms of your assessment which do you think on the whole is more important, creative process or creative output?

Both equally important □
Creative output is more important than the creative process □
Creative process is more important than the creative output □

Q33 Indicate (tick boxes) if you have ever asked a teacher, tutor or lecturer to explain what they mean by?

Creativity □
Creative risk □
Ethical □

Q34 Have you ever sought to examine why something is called creative?

Yes □, No □

Q35 Reflecting on your entire art, design or media educational experience; what do you feel has been more highly valued by teachers, tutors or lecturers (tick one):

Written work and theory □, Craft and practice □, Neither as both have been held in similar esteem □

Q36 One simple definition of ethics is: ‘the discipline dealing with what is good and bad and with moral duty and obligation’.

Consider an example of work that is extremely controversial or seen as transgressive. (Example)
Do you think that work that embodies or expresses poor ethical judgement is also therefore flawed in terms of its creative merit?

Yes □, No □

Explain your answer:

Something can still be amazing but it doesn’t make it right.

Q37 Can you think of any ethical issues you have encountered in recent art, design or media work?

Yes □, Go to Q38, No □. Thank you – end of questions.

Q38 Please explain what they were

Perjure aduets - Sexual portrayal of men and women. Size 0 models and buff guys.

Thank you for your time - end of questions

If you would like any more information with regard to the study contact:
J Spencer (PhD Researcher at MIRIAD, MMU, Manchester)
Communicate with john@ymail.com
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Art, Design and Media Research: Pilot Awareness Questionnaire. (All information will be treated as confidential).
J Spencer. MIRIAD. Manchester Metropolitan University. 2012.

Q1 Gender Male ☑ Female ☐

Q2 Prior to university did you study on an art, design or media related course(s)?
Yes ☑ Go to Q3 No ☐ Go to Q4

Q3 What was the type of qualification(s) you studied? Tick box(es).
- AS/A level in an Art, Design or Media related subject ☑
- AVCE/VCE, National Diploma/Certificate in an Art, Design or Media related subject ☐
- OTHER - Please state (e.g. HNC/HND, Foundation Degree etc.) ☐

Q4 As part of your art, design or media related studies (at school/college or university) have you ever taken part in activities where you learnt about or considered ethics in relation to your work? (Please tick)
Yes ☐
No ☑

Q5 Can you summarise or define what you think the term ‘ethics’ means in relation to your art, design or media practice?

Q6 As part of your art, design or media related studies have you ever taken part in any activities where you learnt about or considered the nature of ‘creativity’ or attempted to define it in connection to your work?
Yes ☐
No ☑

Q7 How would you describe or explain the term ‘creativity’?

Q8 List who do you consider decides or determines if something is to be considered ‘creative’ or not?

Q9 Are there certain situations and circumstances in which you feel more inclined to be ‘creative’? (Please tick)
Yes ☑ Go to Q10 No ☐, Go to Q11

Q10 Can you describe these conditions?

Q11 In relation to developing your response to an art, media or design brief, how often do you take ‘risks’?
Every time ☐ Go to Q12
Often ☑ Go to Q12
Sometimes ☐ Go to Q12
Rarely ☐ Go to Q12
Never ☐ Go to Q15
Q12 How would you define what you mean by the term ‘risk’ in these circumstances?

Doing something unaware of what the outcome might be.

Q13 Why do you take these ‘risks’?

Purely creative/learning reasons. Not knowing what the outcome will be is the reason to do.

Q14 What type of risks were these? (Please tick any that apply)

- Risks connected to timescale or deadlines
- Risks connected to experimentation
- Risks connected to health and safety
- Risk connected to how the work would be viewed by colleagues, friends or family
- Risk connected to how your tutor might view or assess the work
- Risk connected to breaking the rules or conventions of the discipline
- Other risks (please explain below)

Q15 In relation to developing your response to an art, media or design brief have you ever actively avoided or minimised risks? (Please tick)

- Often
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never

Q16 Why did you actively avoid or minimise risks?

Q17 What sort of risks were these? (Please explain).

Q18 What role(s) have your tutors played in helping you to manage risk in your creative work? (Tick any that apply)

- Introduced the concept of ‘risk’ in relation to work
- Discussed a ‘how to do it’ process of managing risks
- Created an environment where it was safe to take risks
- Actively facilitated an opportunity for creative ‘play’ or experimentation
- Actively involved in helping manage risk through tutorials
- Provided clear project briefs with assessment criteria
- Other (Please explain below)
In your experience where you have taken risks in terms of your work, do you believe on the whole the output was:

Better as a result □
Same □
Worse □

Why do you think this? (Please explain).

Do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative or not?

Yes □, Go to Q21  No □, Go to Q23

Why do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative?

Can you give any examples of designers, filmmakers or artists you believe demonstrate this?

Can you explain what the term 'creative risk' means to you?

Feeling something in which you do not know how it will be publicly received or how it will finish entirely.

Do you think some people are more likely to take 'creative risks' than others?

Yes □, Go to Q25  No □, Go to Q27

What qualities do these people have that enable them to be more likely to take 'creative risks'?

Do you think this attitude to risk is also seen in other areas of their lives?

Yes □, No □.

If answer is 'yes' - how is this attitude to risk demonstrated in other areas of their lives? (Please explain below).

Do you think the relationship people have to 'creative risk' is fixed or can be developed? (Tick one)

* It is fixed – people are born that way. □
* It can be developed or nurtured in an unlimited way □;
* It can be developed or nurtured but only up to a persons predetermined or natural capacity for 'creative risk'. □

What are the most important factors that limit your desire or scope to take 'creative risks' with your work?

What are the most important factors that encourage you take more 'creative risks' in your work?
Q30 How do you believe creativity is currently assessed by your tutors?

Q31 In terms of course work, do you think the ‘creative process’, (the development of the work) and ‘creative output’ (the finished product or artefact) are on the whole assessed by tutors as:

Equally important □
Creative output is more important than the creative process □
Creative process is more important than the creative output □

Q32 In terms of your assessment which do you think on the whole is more important, creative process or creative output?

Both equally important □
Creative output is more important than the creative process □
Creative process is more important than the creative output □

Q33 Indicate (tick boxes) if you have ever asked a teacher, tutor or lecturer to explain what they mean by?

Creativity □
Creative risk □
Ethical □

Q34 Have you ever sought to examine why something is called creative?

Yes □ No □

Q35 Reflecting on your entire art, design or media educational experience; what do you feel has been more highly valued by teachers, tutors or lecturers (tick one):

Written work and theory □
Craft and practice □
Neither- as both have been held in similar esteem □

Q36 One simple definition of ethics is: ‘the discipline dealing with what is good and bad and with moral duty and obligation’.

Consider an example of work that is extremely controversial or seen as transgressive. (Example)

Do you think that work that embodies or expresses poor ethical judgement is also therefore flawed in terms of its creative merit?

Yes □ No □

Explain your answer:

Q37 Can you think of any ethical issues you have encountered in recent art, design or media work?

Yes □ Go to Q38  No □ Thank you – end of questions.

Q38 Please explain what they were

Thank you for your time - end of questions

If you would like any more information with regard to the study contact:

J Spencer (PhD Researcher at MIRIAD, MMU, Manchester)
Communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com
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Art, Design and Media Research: Pilot Awareness Questionnaire. (All information will be treated as confidential).
J Spencer. MIRIAD. Manchester Metropolitan University. 2012.

Q1 Gender Male [ ] Female [ ]

Q2 Prior to university did you study on an art, design or media related course(s)?
Yes [ ] Go to Q3 No [ ] Go to Q4

Q3 What was the type of qualification(s) you studied? Tick box(es).
AS/A level in an Art, Design or Media related subject [ ]
AVCE/VCE, National Diploma/Certificate in an Art, Design or Media related subject [ ]
OTHER - Please state (e.g. HNC/HND, Foundation Degree etc.) [ ]

Q4 As part of your art, design or media related studies (at school/college or university) have you ever taken part in activities where you learnt about or considered ethics in relation to your work? (Please tick)
Yes [ ]
No [ ]

Q5 Can you summarise or define what you think the term 'ethics' means in relation to your art, design or media practice?

Q6 As part of your art, design or media related studies have you ever taken part in any activities where you learnt about or considered the nature of 'creativity' or attempted to define it in connection to your work?
Yes [ ]
No [ ]

Q7 How would you describe or explain the term 'creativity'?

Q8 List who do you consider decides or determines if something is to be considered 'creative' or not?

Q9 Are there certain situations and circumstances in which you feel more inclined to be 'creative'? (Please tick)
Yes [ ], Go to Q10 No [ ], Go to Q11

Q10 Can you describe these conditions?

doing a project for anyone

designing something for someone that is different or requires a level of thought

Q11 In relation to developing your response to an art, media or design brief, how often do you take 'risks'?
Every time [ ] Go to Q12
Often [ ], Go to Q12
Sometimes [ ] Go to Q12
Rarely [ ] Go to Q12
Never [ ] Go to Q15
Q12 How would you define what you mean by the term ‘risk’ in these circumstances?

challenging myself or designing something that could create controversy.

Q13 Why do you take these ‘risks’?

as it teaches me what my boundaries are, and teaches me what I can design.

Q14 What type of risks were these? (Please tick any that apply)

- Risks connected to timescale or deadlines [ ]
- Risks connected to experimentation [ ]
- Risks connected to health and safety [ ]
- Risk connected to how the work would be viewed by colleagues, friends or family [ ]
- Risk connected to how your tutor might view or assess the work [ ]
- Risk connected to breaking the rules or conventions of the discipline [ ]
- Other risks (please explain below) [ ]

Q15 In relation to developing your response to an art, media or design brief have you ever actively avoided or minimised risks? (Please tick)

- Often [ ] Go to Q16
- Sometimes [ ] Go to Q16
- Rarely [ ] Go to Q16
- Never [ ] Go to Q18

Q16 Why did you actively avoid or minimise risks?

To avoid upset and to not create any problems.

Q17 What sort of risks were these? (Please explain).

Trying to create an advert about smoking

for children.

Q18 What role(s) have your tutors played in helping you to manage risk in your creative work? (Tick any that apply)

- Introduced the concept of ‘risk’ in relation to work [ ]
- Discussed a ‘how to do it’ process of managing risks [ ]
- Created an environment where it was safe to take risks [ ]
- Actively facilitated an opportunity for creative ‘play’ or experimentation [ ]
- Actively involved in helping manage risk through tutorials [ ]
- Provided clear project briefs with assessment criteria [ ]
- Other (Please explain below) [ ]
Q19 In your experience where you have taken risks in terms of your work, do you believe on the whole the output was:

Better as a result [ ]
Same [ ]
Worse [ ]

Why do you think this? (Please explain).

Q20 Do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative or not?

Yes [ ] Go to Q21
No [ ] Go to Q23

Q21 Why do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative?

As their work stands out more (makes the viewer identify more with it).

Q22 Can you give any examples of designers, filmmakers or artists you believe demonstrate this?

Damien Hirst, Marcus Harvey

Q23 Can you explain what the term ‘creative risk’ means to you?

Designing something that could repel the viewer or cause upset or could harm the creator whilst designing it.

Q24 Do you think some people are more likely to take ‘creative risks’ than others?

Yes [ ] Go to Q25
No [ ] Go to Q27

Q25 What qualities do these people have that enable them to be more likely to take ‘creative risks’?

They are willing to accept consequences I have planned for them to happen.

Q26 Do you think this attitude to risk is also seen in other areas of their lives?

Yes [ ]
No [ ]

If answer is ‘yes’ - how is this attitude to risk demonstrated in other areas of their lives? (Please explain below).

They try new things I aren’t afraid to experiment.

Q27 Do you think the relationship people have to ‘creative risk’ is fixed or can be developed? (Tick one)

• It is fixed – people are born that way. [ ]
• It can be developed or nurtured in an unlimited way [ ]
• It can be developed or nurtured but only up to a persons predetermined or natural capacity for ‘creative risk’. [ ]

Q28 What are the most important factors that limit your desire or scope to take ‘creative risks’ with your work?

What the target audience is, the actual brief, and worried what people’s reactions could be.

Q29 What are the most important factors that encourage you to take more ‘creative risks’ in your work?

I learn from it and it teaches me what is acceptable & challenges me.
Q30 How do you believe creativity is currently assessed by your tutors?

Q31 In terms of course work, do you think the ‘creative process’, (the development of the work) and ‘creative output’ (the finished product or artefact) are on the whole assessed by tutors as:

- Equally important
- Creative output is more important than the creative process
- Creative process is more important than the creative output

Q32 In terms of your assessment which do you think on the whole is more important, creative process or creative output?

- Both equally important
- Creative output is more important than the creative process
- Creative process is more important than the creative output

Q33 Indicate (tick boxes) if you have ever asked a teacher, tutor or lecturer to explain what they mean by:

- Creativity
- Creative risk
- Ethical

Q34 Have you ever sought to examine why something is called creative?

- Yes
- No

Q35 Reflecting on your entire art, design or media educational experience; what do you feel has been more highly valued by teachers, tutors or lecturers (tick one):

- Written work and theory
- Craft and practice
- Neither - as both have been held in similar esteem

Q36 One simple definition of ethics is: ‘the discipline dealing with what is good and bad and with moral duty and obligation’.

Consider an example of work that is extremely controversial or seen as transgressive. (Example)

Do you think that work that embodies or expresses poor ethical judgement is also therefore flawed in terms of its creative merit?

- Yes
- No

Explain your answer:

Q37 Can you think of any ethical issues you have encountered in recent art, design or media work?

- Yes
- No

Q38 Please explain what they were

Q39 If you would like any more information with regard to the study contact:

J Spencer (PhD Researcher at MIRIAD, MMU, Manchester)

Communicate with joh@1ahoo.com

Art, Design and Media Research: Pilot Awareness Questionnaire. (All information will be treated as confidential).
J Spencer. MIRIAD. Manchester Metropolitan University. 2012.

Q1 Gender Male [ ] Female [ ]

Q2 Prior to university did you study on an art, design or media related course(s)?
Yes [ ] Go to Q3 No [ ] Go to Q4

Q3 What was the type of qualification(s) you studied? Tick box(es).
- AS/A level in an Art, Design or Media related subject [ ]
- AVCE/VCE, National Diploma/Certificate in an Art, Design or Media related subject [ ]
- OTHER - Please state (e.g. HNC/HND, Foundation Degree etc.)

Q4 As part of your art, design or media related studies (at school/college or university) have you ever taken part in activities where you learnt about or considered ethics in relation to your work? (Please tick)
Yes [ ]
No [ ]

Q5 Can you summarise or define what you think the term 'ethics' means in relation to your art, design or media practice?

Q6 As part of your art, design or media related studies have you ever taken part in any activities where you learnt about or considered the nature of 'creativity' or attempted to define it in connection to your work?
Yes [ ]
No [ ]

Q7 How would you describe or explain the term 'creativity'?

Q8 List who do you consider decides or determines if something is to be considered 'creative' or not?

Q9 Are there certain situations and circumstances in which you feel more inclined to be 'creative'? (Please tick)
Yes [ ], Go to Q10 No [ ], Go to Q11

Q10 Can you describe these conditions?

Q11 In relation to developing your response to an art, media or design brief, how often do you take 'risks'? 
Every time [ ] Go to Q12
Often [ ] Go to Q12
Sometimes [ ] Go to Q12
Rarely [ ] Go to Q12
Never [ ] Go to Q15
Q12 How would you define what you mean by the term ‘risk’ in these circumstances?

Doing something that could possibly go wrong but turn out great!

Q13 Why do you take these ‘risks’?

Because these risks could turn our to be great pieces of art work if all turns out well.

Q14 What type of risks were these? (Please tick any that apply)

Risks connected to timescale or deadlines
Risks connected to experimentation
Risks connected to health and safety
Risk connected to how the work would be viewed by colleagues, friends or family
Risk connected to how your tutor might view or assess the work
Risk connected to breaking the rules or conventions of the discipline
Other risks (please explain below)

Q15 In relation to developing your response to an art, media or design brief have you ever actively avoided or minimised risks? (Please tick)

Often
Sometimes
Rarely
Never

Q16 Why did you actively avoid or minimise risks?

In order to keep my time schedule and if I knew I couldn’t work a deadline

Q17 What sort of risks were these? (Please explain).

Things that could have a long process of creating final outcomes

Q18 What role(s) have your tutors played in helping you to manage risk in your creative work? (Tick any that apply)

Introduced the concept of ‘risk’ in relation to work
Discussed a ‘how to do it’ process of managing risks
Created an environment where it was safe to take risks
Actively facilitated an opportunity for creative ‘play’ or experimentation
Actively involved in helping manage risk through tutorials
Provided clear project briefs with assessment criteria
Other (Please explain below)
Q19  In your experience where you have taken risks in terms of your work, do you believe on the whole the output was:

Better as a result [ ]
Same [ ☑ ]
Worse [ ]

Why do you think this? (Please explain).

Q20  Do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative or not?

Yes [ ☑ ], Go to Q21  No [ ], Go to Q23

Q21  Why do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative?

because it shows great dedication

Q22  Can you give any examples of designers, filmmakers or artists you believe demonstrate this?

Banksy

Q23  Can you explain what the term ‘creative risk’ means to you?

creating something which is creative using different techniques and risk

Q24  Do you think some people are more likely to take ‘creative risks’ than others?

Yes [ ], Go to Q25  No [ ], Go to Q27

Q25  What qualities do these people have that enable them to be more likely to take ‘creative risks’?

a creative mindset

Q26  Do you think this attitude to risk is also seen in other areas of their lives?

Yes [ ], No [ ]

If answer is ‘yes’ - how is this attitude to risk demonstrated in other areas of their lives? (Please explain below).

shows them as a dedicated person

Q27  Do you think the relationship people have to ‘creative risk’ is fixed or can be developed? (Tick one)

• It is fixed – people are born that way [ ]
• It can be developed or nurtured in an unlimited way [ ]
• It can be developed or nurtured but only up to a persons predetermined or natural capacity for ‘creative risk’ [ ]

Q28  What are the most important factors that limit your desire or scope to take ‘creative risks’ with your work?

a fear of going wrong or not turning out great

Q29  What are the most important factors that encourage you take more ‘creative risks’ in your work?

the possibility of a great piece of art
Q30 How do you believe creativity is currently assessed by your tutors?

Q31 In terms of course work, do you think the 'creative process', (the development of the work) and 'creative output' (the finished product or artefact) are on the whole assessed by tutors as:

- Equally important □
- Creative output is more important than the creative process □
- Creative process is more important than the creative output □

Q32 In terms of your assessment which do you think on the whole is more important, creative process or creative output?

- Both equally important □
- Creative output is more important than the creative process □
- Creative process is more important than the creative output □

Q33 Indicate (tick boxes) if you have ever asked a teacher, tutor or lecturer to explain what they mean by?

- Creativity □
- Creative risk □
- Ethical □

Q34 Have you ever sought to examine why something is called creative?

- Yes □, No □

Q35 Reflecting on your entire art, design or media educational experience; what do you feel has been more highly valued by teachers, tutors or lecturers (tick one):

- Written work and theory □
- Craft and practice □
- Neither- as both have been held in similar esteem □

Q36 One simple definition of ethics is: 'the discipline dealing with what is good and bad and with moral duty and obligation'.

Consider an example of work that is extremely controversial or seen as transgressive. (Example)

Do you think that work that embodies or expresses poor ethical judgement is also therefore flawed in terms of its creative merit?

- Yes □, No □

Explain your answer:

Q37 Can you think of any ethical issues you have encountered in recent art, design or media work?

- Yes □, Go to Q38, No □

Thank you - end of questions.

Q38 Please explain what they were

Thank you for your time - end of questions

If you would like any more information with regard to the study contact:
J Spencer (PhD Researcher at MIRIAD. MMU. Manchester)
Communicate with john@yahoo.com
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Q1 Gender
- Male [✓]
- Female [ ]

Q2 Prior to university did you study on an art, design or media related course(s)?
- Yes [✓] Go to Q3
- No [ ] Go to Q4

Q3 What was the type of qualification(s) you studied? Tick box(es).
- AS/A level in an Art, Design or Media related subject [✓]
- AVCE/VCE, National Diploma/Certificate in an Art, Design or Media related subject [ ]
- OTHER - Please state (e.g. HNC/HND, Foundation Degree etc.) [ ]

Q4 As part of your art, design or media related studies (at school/college or university) have you ever taken part in activities where you learnt about or considered ethics in relation to your work? (Please tick)
- Yes [✓]
- No [ ]

Q5 Can you summarise or define what you think the term ‘ethics’ means in relation to your art, design or media practice?
- I think ethics is about doing the right thing as an artist, understanding what would be acceptable to what would be seen by an audience.

Q6 As part of your art, design or media related studies have you ever taken part in any activities where you learnt about or considered the nature of ‘creativity’ or attempted to define it in connection to your work?
- Yes [ ]
- No [✓]

Q7 How would you describe or explain the term ‘creativity’?
- Creativity is something that comes within you, it is something in which you use your ideas to produce works.

Q8 List who do you consider decides or determines if something is to be considered ‘creative’ or not?
- As ethics I guess... they seem to have a lot of power.
- But really I guess it’s anyone in charge or in a high position.

Q9 Are there certain situations and circumstances in which you feel more inclined to be ‘creative’? (Please tick)
- Yes [✓] Go to Q10
- No [ ] Go to Q11

Q10 Can you describe these conditions?
- If something has happened I feel strongly about I like to be able to follow my own opinion on it, if I’m inspired by something I will also try to create, to be novel, I’m always thinking about creating something.

Q11 In relation to developing your response to an art, media or design brief, how often do you take “risks”?
- Every time [ ] Go to Q12
- Often [✓] Go to Q12
- Sometimes [ ] Go to Q12
- Rarely [ ] Go to Q12
- Never [ ] Go to Q15
Q12 How would you define what you mean by the term ‘risk’ in these circumstances?

Q13 Why do you take these ‘risks’?

Q14 What type of risks were these? (Please tick any that apply)

- Risks connected to timescale or deadlines
- Risks connected to experimentation
- Risks connected to health and safety
- Risk connected to how the work would be viewed by colleagues, friends or family
- Risk connected to how your tutor might view or assess the work
- Risk connected to breaking the rules or conventions of the discipline
- Other risks (please explain below)

Q15 In relation to developing your response to an art, media or design brief have you ever actively avoided or minimised risks? (Please tick)

- Often
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never

Q16 Why did you actively avoid or minimise risks?

Q17 What sort of risks were these? (Please explain).

Q18 What role(s) have your tutors played in helping you to manage risk in your creative work? (Tick any that apply)

- Introduced the concept of ‘risk’ in relation to work
- Discussed a ‘how to do it’ process of managing risks
- Created an environment where it was safe to take risks
- Actively facilitated an opportunity for creative ‘play’ or experimentation
- Actively involved in helping manage risk through tutorials
- Provided clear project briefs with assessment criteria
- Other (Please explain below)
Q19 In your experience where you have taken risks in terms of your work, do you believe on the whole the output was:

Better as a result [✓]  
Same [ ]  
Worse [ ]

Why do you think this? (Please explain).

Q20 Do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative or not?

Yes [✓] Go to Q21  
No [ ] Go to Q23

Q21 Why do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative?

Q22 Can you give any examples of designers, filmmakers or artists you believe demonstrate this?

Lady Gaga (David Carson)

Q23 Can you explain what the term ‘creative risk’ means to you?

Q24 Do you think some people are more likely to take ‘creative risks’ than others?

Yes [✓] Go to Q25  
No [ ] Go to Q27

Q25 What qualities do these people have that enable them to be more likely to take ‘creative risks’?

Q26 Do you think this attitude to risk is also seen in other areas of their lives?

Yes [ ]  
No [✓]

If answer is ‘yes’ - how is this attitude to risk demonstrated in other areas of their lives? (Please explain below).

Q27 Do you think the relationship people have to ‘creative risk’ is fixed or can be developed? (Tick one)

* It is fixed – people are born that way. [✓]
* It can be developed or nurtured in an unlimited way [ ]
* It can be developed or nurtured but only up to a persons predetermined or natural capacity for ‘creative risk’. [ ]

Q28 What are the most important factors that limit your desire or scope to take ‘creative risks’ with your work?

Q29 What are the most important factors that encourage you take more ‘creative risks’ in your work?

To push boundaries but ensure that morally one risk I have taken is backed up with logical and intelligent reasoning.
Q30  How do you believe creativity is currently assessed by your tutors?

As an individual

Q31  In terms of course work, do you think the ‘creative process’, (the development of the work) and ‘creative output’ (the finished product or artefact) are on the whole assessed by tutors as:

Equally important □
Creative output is more important than the creative process □
Creative process is more important than the creative output ✗

Q32  In terms of your assessment which do you think on the whole is more important, creative process or creative output?

Both equally important □
Creative output is more important than the creative process □
Creative process is more important than the creative output ✓

Q33  Indicate (tick boxes) if you have ever asked a teacher, tutor or lecturer to explain what they mean by?

Creativity □
Creative risk □
Ethical ✓

Q34  Have you ever sought to examine why something is called creative?

Yes □, No ✓

Q35  Reflecting on your entire art, design or media educational experience; what do you feel has been more highly valued by teachers, tutors or lecturers (tick one):

Written work and theory □, Craft and practice □, Neither- as both have been held in similar esteem □

Q36  One simple definition of ethics is: ‘the discipline dealing with what is good and bad and with moral duty and obligation’.

Consider an example of work that is extremely controversial or seen as transgressive. (Example)

Do you think that work that embodies or expresses poor ethical judgement is also therefore flawed in terms of its creative merit?

Yes ✓, No □,

Explain your answer:

I do feel insensitive is insensitive to the victims of the words however, the power use potential of I somewhat unethically

Q37  Can you think of any ethical issues you have encountered in recent art, design or media work?

Yes □, Go to Q38
No ✓, Thank you - end of questions.

Q38  Please explain what they were


Thank you for your time - end of questions

If you would like any more information with regard to the study contact:
J Spencer (PhD Researcher at MIRIAD. MMU. Manchester)
Communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com

Art, Design and Media Research: Pilot Awareness Questionnaire. (All information will be treated as confidential).
J Spencer. MIRIAD. Manchester Metropolitan University. 2012.

Q1 Gender Male ☐ Female ☑

Q2 Prior to university did you study on an art, design or media related course(s)?
Yes ☑: Go to Q3 No ☐: Go to Q4

Q3 What was the type of qualification(s) you studied? Tick box(es).
AS/A level in an Art, Design or Media related subject ☑
AVCE/VCE, National Diploma/Certificate in an Art, Design or Media related subject ☐
OTHER - Please state (e.g. HNC/HND, Foundation Degree etc.) ☐

Q4 As part of your art, design or media related studies (at school/college or university) have you ever taken part in activities where you learnt about or considered ethics in relation to your work? (Please tick)
Yes ☑
No ☐

Q5 Can you summarise or define what you think the term ‘ethics’ means in relation to your art, design or media practice?
The right thing to do, like being a Jedi or being a part of the rebellion in Star Wars.

Q6 As part of your art, design or media related studies have you ever taken part in any activities where you learnt about or considered the nature of ‘creativity’ or attempted to define it in connection to your work?
Yes ☑
No ☐

Q7 How would you describe or explain the term ‘creativity’?
Coming up with new and interesting things, being able to experiment.

Q8 List who do you consider decides or determines if something is to be considered ‘creative’ or not?
Teachers and critics.

Q9 Are there certain situations and circumstances in which you feel more inclined to be ‘creative’? (Please tick)
Yes ☑: Go to Q10 No ☐: Go to Q11

Q10 Can you describe these conditions?
Relaxed, not under pressure to hand in, clear instructions.

Q11 In relation to developing your response to an art, media or design brief, how often do you take ‘risks’?
Every time ☐, Go to Q12
Often ☐, Go to Q12
Sometimes ☑, Go to Q12
Rarely ☐, Go to Q12
Never ☐, Go to Q15
Q12 How would you define what you mean by the term ‘risk’ in these circumstances?

When it can go wrong.

Q13 Why do you take these ‘risks’?

In case it goes right and looks really good.

Q14 What type of risks were these? (Please tick any that apply)

- Risks connected to timescale or deadlines
- Risks connected to experimentation
- Risks connected to health and safety
- Risk connected to how the work would be viewed by colleagues, friends or family
- Risk connected to how your tutor might view or assess the work
- Risk connected to breaking the rules or conventions of the discipline
- Other risks (please explain below)

Q15 In relation to developing your response to an art, media or design brief have you ever actively avoided or minimised risks? (Please tick)

- Often
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never

Q16 Why did you actively avoid or minimise risks?

Not enough hue left if the said ‘risk’ failed — back to square 1.

Q17 What sort of risks were these? (Please explain).

Something delicate that fails along the way, trying to rush it or find an easy way out.

Q18 What role(s) have your tutors played in helping you to manage risk in your creative work? (Tick any that apply)

- Introduced the concept of ‘risk’ in relation to work
- Discussed a ‘how to do it’ process of managing risks
- Created an environment where it was safe to take risks
- Actively facilitated an opportunity for creative ‘play’ or experimentation
- Actively involved in helping manage risk through tutorials
- Provided clear project briefs with assessment criteria
- Other (Please explain below)
Q19 In your experience where you have taken risks in terms of your work, do you believe on the whole the output was:

Better as a result □
Same □
Worse □

Why do you think this? (Please explain).

All risks are different but of the answers could happen.

Q20 Do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative or not?

Yes □, Go to Q21 No □, Go to Q23

WELL WHAT DEPENDS really.

Q21 Why do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative?

Q22 Can you give any examples of designers, filmmakers or artists you believe demonstrate this?

Q23 Can you explain what the term 'creative risk' means to you?

Q24 Do you think some people are more likely to take ‘creative risks’ than others?

Yes □, Go to Q25 No □, Go to Q27

Q25 What qualities do these people have that enable them to be more likely to take ‘creative risks’?

No conscience? unable to plan ahead? 

Q26 Do you think this attitude to risk is also seen in other areas of their lives?

Yes □ No □

If answer is 'yes' - how is this attitude to risk demonstrated in other areas of their lives? (Please explain below).

cutting corners in everyday life.

Q27 Do you think the relationship people have to ‘creative risk’ is fixed or can be developed? (Tick one)

• It is fixed – people are born that way. □
• It can be developed or nurtured in an unlimited way □
• It can be developed or nurtured but only up to a persons predetermined or natural capacity for ‘creative risk’. □

Q28 What are the most important factors that limit your desire or scope to take ‘creative risks’ with your work?

handing it in on time. "

Q29 What are the most important factors that encourage you take more ‘creative risks’ in your work?

'I have nothing to loose.'
Q30 How do you believe creativity is currently assessed by your tutors?

They mark my work.

Q31 In terms of course work, do you think the ‘creative process’, (the development of the work) and ‘creative output’ (the finished product or artefact) are on the whole assessed by tutors as:

Equally important ☑
Creative output is more important than the creative process ☐
Creative process is more important than the creative output ☐

Q32 In terms of your assessment which do you think on the whole is more important, creative process or creative output?

Both equally important ☐
Creative output is more important than the creative process ☑
Creative process is more important than the creative output ☐

Q33 Indicate (tick boxes) if you have ever asked a teacher, tutor or lecturer to explain what they mean by?

Creativity ☐
Creative risk ☐
Ethical ☐

Q34 Have you ever sought to examine why something is called creative?

Yes ☐, No ☑

Q35 Reflecting on your entire art, design or media educational experience; what do you feel has been more highly valued by teachers, tutors or lecturers (tick one):

Written work and theory ☐, Craft and practice ☑, Neither- as both have been held in similar esteem ☑

Q36 One simple definition of ethics is: ‘the discipline dealing with what is good and bad and with moral duty and obligation’.

Consider an example of work that is extremely controversial or seen as transgressive. (Example)

Do you think that work that embodies or expresses poor ethical judgement is also therefore flawed in terms of its creative merit?

Yes ☐, No ☑, Unsure ☑

Explain your answer:

[Space for answer]

Q37 Can you think of any ethical issues you have encountered in recent art, design or media work?

Yes ☐, Go to Q38 ☑

Q38 Please explain what they were

[Space for answer]

Thank you for your time - end of questions

If you would like any more information with regard to the study contact:
J Spencer (PhD Researcher at MIRIAD, MMU, Manchester)
Communicate with [email]@yahoo.com
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Art, Design and Media Research: Pilot Awareness Questionnaire. (All information will be treated as confidential).
J Spencer. MIRIAD. Manchester Metropolitan University. 2012.

Q1 Gender  
- Male  
- Female

Q2 Prior to university did you study on an art, design or media related course(s)?
- Yes  
- No

Q3 What was the type of qualification(s) you studied? Tick box(es).
- AS/A level in an Art, Design or Media related subject
- AVCE/VCE, National Diploma/Certificate in an Art, Design or Media related subject
- OTHER - Please state (e.g. HNC/HND, Foundation Degree etc.)

Q4 As part of your art, design or media related studies (at school/college or university) have you ever taken part in activities where you learnt about or considered ethics in relation to your work? (Please tick)
- Yes
- No

Q5 Can you summarise or define what you think the term ‘ethics’ means in relation to your art, design or media practice?

Q6 As part of your art, design or media related studies have you ever taken part in any activities where you learnt about or considered the nature of ‘creativity’ or attempted to define it in connection to your work?
- Yes
- No

Q7 How would you describe or explain the term ‘creativity’?

Q8 List who do you consider decides or determines if something is to be considered ‘creative’ or not?

Q9 Are there certain situations and circumstances in which you feel more inclined to be ‘creative’? (Please tick)
- Yes
- No

Q10 Can you describe these conditions?

Q11 In relation to developing your response to an art, media or design brief, how often do you take ‘risks’?
- Every time
- Often
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never
Q12 How would you define what you mean by the term ‘risk’ in these circumstances?

Q13 Why do you take these ‘risks’?

Q14 What type of risks were these? (Please tick any that apply)
- Risks connected to timescale or deadlines
- Risks connected to experimentation
- Risks connected to health and safety
- Risks connected to how the work would be viewed by colleagues, friends or family
- Risk connected to how your tutor might view or assess the work
- Risk connected to breaking the rules or conventions of the discipline
Other risks (please explain below)

Q15 In relation to developing your response to an art, media or design brief have you ever actively avoided or minimised risks? (Please tick)
- Often
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Never
Why did you actively avoid or minimise risks?

Q16 What role(s) have your tutors played in helping you to manage risk in your creative work? (Tick any that apply)
- Introduced the concept of ‘risk’ in relation to work
- Discussed a ‘how to do it’ process of managing risks
- Created an environment where it was safe to take risks
- Actively facilitated an opportunity for creative ‘play’ or experimentation
- Actively involved in helping manage risk through tutorials
- Provided clear project briefs with assessment criteria
Other (Please explain below)
In your experience where you have taken risks in terms of your work, do you believe on the whole the output was:

Better as a result □,  
Same □,  
Worse □

Why do you think this? (Please explain).

I've never taken enough risks that affected much of anything

Do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative or not?

Yes □, Go to Q21  No □, Go to Q23

Why do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative?

mostly because they get noticed. Think of that (Chinese) artist who stands up to the govt.

Can you give any examples of designers, filmmakers or artists you believe demonstrate this?

I think his name is Ai Wei Wei or something...

Can you explain what the term ‘creative risk’ means to you?

taking risks in your artwork in relation to public view or health/safety and morality in your & others

Do you think some people are more likely to take ‘creative risks’ than others?

Yes □, Go to Q25  No □, Go to Q27

What qualities do these people have that enable them to be more likely to take ‘creative risks’

They're probably either outgoing or very dedicated

Do you think this attitude to risk is also seen in other areas of their lives?

Yes □,  No □

If answer is ‘yes’ - how is this attitude to risk demonstrated in other areas of their lives? (Please explain below).

well if that's their personality then it prob. extends to other areas

Do you think the relationship people have to ‘creative risk’ is fixed or can be developed? (Tick one)

* It is fixed – people are born that way. □  
* It can be developed or nurtured in an unlimited way □  
* It can be developed or nurtured but only up to a persons predetermined or natural capacity for ‘creative risk’. □

What are the most important factors that limit your desire or scope to take ‘creative risks’ with your work?

Time, whether I care enough or not. Others views of it...

What are the most important factors that encourage you take more ‘creative risks’ in your work?

If I find it important enough personally.
Q30 How do you believe creativity is currently assessed by your tutors?

[dedication, experimentation ...]

Q31 In terms of course work, do you think the ‘creative process’, (the development of the work) and ‘creative output’ (the finished product or artefact) are on the whole assessed by tutors as:

- Equally important [x]
- Creative output is more important than the creative process [x]
- Creative process is more important than the creative output [x]

Q32 In terms of your assessment which do you think on the whole is more important, creative process or creative output?

- Both equally important [x]
- Creative output is more important than the creative process [x]
- Creative process is more important than the creative output [x]

Q33 Indicate (tick boxes) if you have ever asked a teacher, tutor or lecturer to explain what they mean by?

- Creativity [x]
- Creative risk [x]
- Ethical [x]

Q34 Have you ever sought to examine why something is called creative?

- Yes [x], No [x]

Q35 Reflecting on your entire art, design or media educational experience; what do you feel has been more highly valued by teachers, tutors or lecturers (tick one):

- Written work and theory [x], Craft and practice [x], Neither- as both have been held in similar esteem [x]

Q36 One simple definition of ethics is: ‘the discipline dealing with what is good and bad and with moral duty and obligation’.

Consider an example of work that is extremely controversial or seen as transgressive. (Example)

Do you think that work that embodies or expresses poor ethical judgement is also therefore flawed in terms of its creative merit?

- Yes [x], No [x]

Explain your answer:

[If may express poor ethical judgement but that doesn’t mean it’s flawed in creative merit. Sure it’s creepy and sad... but well it was the artist’s choice to display it...]

Q37 Can you think of any ethical issues you have encountered in recent art, design or media work?

- Yes [x], Go to Q38, No [x]. Thank you – end of questions.

Q38 Please explain what they were:

[Here was a student at Yale who induced abortions as her final project. Gross, really stirred people up.]

Thank you for your time - end of questions.

If you would like any more information with regard to the study contact:

J Spencer (PhD Researcher at MIRIAD, MMU, Manchester)
Communicate with john@yahoo.com

---

Appendix 5: Postgraduate questionnaire
Sixteen questions:
Your views on research ethics within Art, Design and Media

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed. This new process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek student views on ethical appraisal. The study also seeks your thoughts on how research ethics might effect or influence your creative work.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com).

Your views on ethics in Art, Design or Media

1a. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

Sometimes you make/create for yourself – in these instances no. When you involve other people, yes, but depends whose or what ethical and how they are accounted.

1b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?
Yes [ ] No [x] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

As above, but to add – depends on notion of good ethics.

2 Do you think that research ethics is relevant to researchers in Art, Design and Media?
Yes [x] No [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

Bad art is art that injures people. We all have a responsibility to others safety.

3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your creativity or strengthen your creative work?
Restraints creativity [ ] Strengthens the work [ ] Neither [ ] Combination of both [x] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

Restrains creativity...
4. Where would you draw the line? Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? If possible please give an example and explain why.

A student wants to explore the public's perception of terrorism - he dresses as a 'terrorist' on the bus - but with a plastic AK 47 - armed police stop the bus - he is lucky not to be shot.

5. Focus of your current project or research activity
Mainly practice led [ ] Mainly theory focused [ ] Evenly split between practice and theory [ ] Other [ ] (please explain below)

6. Have you ever received training in general research ethics?
Yes [ ] No [ ]

7. Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?
Yes [ ] No [ ]

8. How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline: (please tick one)

- Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Don't know [ ]

9. Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know/Can't remember [ ]

10. How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?
Often [ ] Sometimes [ ] Never [ ] Don't know [ ]

Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?

Assistant to project entitled "Images of War" working on a project about mental language technology with [redacted] community.

11. How would you best define the term 'creative risk'?
Without creative risk you are not being creative. I think of it in practical + theoretical sense.
2 How often do you take creative risks in your OWN work?
   Very often [X] Quite often [ ] Sometimes [ ] Seldom [ ] Never [ ]

13 How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in OWN work?
   Very important [X] Quite important [ ] Sometimes important [ ] Seldom important [ ] Never important [ ]

14 Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
   Yes [X] No [ ] Sometimes [X] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

There are different types of work code or ethics. So it depends who's or what they are. Every project is or should be different - so done on case by case basis.

15 Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit your ability to take creative risks in your work?
   Yes [X] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

Depends who + how appropriate is done

16 Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?
   Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

Funding, the sensibilities, the government, ideology, etc. are... fear of being sued, insecurity, the desire/need to quantify, measure, measure up, rigid borders fail by the section.

End Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire

Student questionnaire April 2015
4. Where would you draw the line? Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? If possible please give an example and explain why.

5. Focus of your current project or research
- [ ] Mainly practice-led
- [ ] Mainly theory-focused
- [ ] Evenly split between practice and theory
- [ ] Other, please explain below

6. Have you ever received training in general research ethics?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

7. Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

8. How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline: (please tick one)
- [ ] Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline
- [ ] Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline
- [ ] Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline
- [ ] Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline
- [ ] No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline
- [ ] Don't know

9. Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don't know

10. How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?
- [ ] Often
- [ ] Sometimes
- [ ] Never
- [ ] Don't know

11. Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?

12. How would you best define creative risk?
Sixteen questions:
Your views on research ethics within Art, Design and Media

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines.
This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed.
This new process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek student views on ethical appraisal. The study also seeks your thoughts on how research ethics might affect or influence your creative work.

Your answers will be treated with **strict confidentiality**. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com).

Your views on ethics in Art, Design or Media

1.a. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

1.b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

2. Do you think that research ethics is relevant to researchers in Art, Design and Media?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your creativity or strengthen your creative work?
Restrains creativity [ ] Strengthens the work [ ] Neither [ ] Combination of both [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail
1. Where would you draw the line? Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? If possible please give an example and explain why.

   Any project whose primary harm
   Another person.

5. Focus of your current project or research activity
   Mainly practice led [ ] Mainly theory focused [ ] Evenly split between practice and theory [ ] Other [ ] (please explain below)

6. Have you ever received training in general research ethics?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

7. Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

8. How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline: (please tick one)
   Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   Don’t know [ ]

9. Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Don’t know/can’t remember [ ]

10. How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?
    Often [ ] Sometimes [ ] Never [ ] Don’t know [ ]
    Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?

11. How would you best define the term ‘creative risk’?
    Work... in a manner which could fail.
1. How often do you take creative risks in your OWN work?
   - Very often [ ]
   - Quite often [ ]
   - Sometimes [ ]
   - Seldom [ ]
   - Never [ ]

2. How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in OWN work?
   - Very important [ ]
   - Quite important [ ]
   - Sometimes important [ ]
   - Seldom important [ ]
   - Never important [ ]

3. Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]
   - Sometimes [ ]
   - Don't know [ ]
   - Other [ ]

   Why? — Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can.
   
   **IN RESPONSE TO QUESTION: ACCEPTING MORAL AND ETHICAL VALUES. SINCE SOME FORM OF ART (E.G., PAINTING) CAN BE SEEN AS AN ARENA OF THE IMAGINATION.**

4. Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit your ability to take creative risks in your work?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]
   - Sometimes [ ]
   - Don't know [ ]
   - Other [ ]

   Why? — Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can.
   
   **IN RESPONSE TO HEALTH AND SAFETY ISSUES.**

5. Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?

   Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can.
   
   **EXISTING ACADEMIC WORK MIGHT NOT ‘BACK UP’ A POTENTIAL ‘NEW’ PRACTICE.**
   
   **EXISTING MORAL AND ETHICAL FRAMEWORK MIGHT BE HERE RATHER THAN MIND INNOCENT.**

End

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.
1. Where would you draw the line? Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? If possible please give an example and explain why.

Any project where physically harms another person;

5. Focus of your current project or research activity
Mainly practice led [ ] Mainly theory focused [ ] Evenly split between practice and theory [ ] Other [ ] (please explain below)

6. Have you ever received training in general research ethics?
Yes [ ] No [ ]

7. Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?
Yes [ ] No [ ]

8. How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline: (please tick one)
Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
Don't know [ ]

9. Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know/can't remember [ ]

10. How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?
Often [ ] Sometimes [ ] Never [ ] Don't know [ ]

Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?

11. How would you best define the term ‘creative risk’?

We work in a manner which could fail.
Sixteen questions:
Your views on research ethics within Art, Design and Media

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed. This new process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek student views on ethical appraisal. The study also seeks your thoughts on how research ethics might effect or influence your creative work.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com).

Your views on ethics in Art, Design or Media

1a. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

1b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

2. Do you think that research ethics is relevant to researchers in Art, Design and Media?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your creativity or strengthen your creative work?
   Restrains creativity [ ] Strengthens the work [ ] Neither [ ] Combination of both [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

Ethical consideration could of course constrain creativity as progress in the creative field has always depended on the margins, envelope being pushed and current orthodoxy being challenged.
4. Where would you draw the line? Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? If possible please give an example and explain why.

5. Focus of your current project or research activity
   Mainly practice led [ ] Mainly theory focused [ ] Evenly split between practice and theory [✓] Other [ ] (please explain below)

6. Have you ever received training in general research ethics?
   Yes [ ] No [✓]

7. Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?
   Yes [ ] No [✓]

8. How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline: (please tick one)
   Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [✓]
   Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   Don't know [ ]

9. Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?
   Yes [ ] No [✓] Don't know/can't remember [ ]

10. How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?
    Often [ ] Sometimes [✓] Never [ ] Don't know [ ]
    Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?

11. How would you best define the term 'creative risk'?
    A challenge to current orthodoxy.

12.
2 How often do you take creative risks in your OWN work?
   Very often [ ] Quite often [ ] Sometimes [ ] Seldom [ ] Never [ ]

13 How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in OWN work?
   Very important [ ] Quite important [ ] Sometimes important [ ] Seldom important [ ] Never important [ ]

14 Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

Moral codes are essentially individually written although clearly there is a need for there to be an agreement and some form of legislation.

15 Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit your ability to take creative risks in your work?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

End

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.
Sixteen questions:

Your views on research ethics within Art, Design and Media

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed. This new process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek student views on ethical appraisal. The study also seeks your thoughts on how research ethics might effect or influence your creative work.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com).

Your views on ethics in Art, Design or Media

1a. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?
   Yes [X] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

[Handwritten answer]

1b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?
   Yes [X] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

[Handwritten answer]

2. Do you think that research ethics is relevant to researchers in Art, Design and Media?
   Yes [X] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

[Handwritten answer]

3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your creativity or strengthen your creative work?
   Restrains creativity [ ] Strengthens the work [X] Neither [ ] Combination of both [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

[Handwritten answer]
4. **Where would you draw the line?** Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? If possible please give an example and explain why.

No, as long as every stage of the process was monitored with care and thoroughness.

5. **Focus of your current project or research activity**
- Mainly practice led [ ]
- Mainly theory focused [ ]
- Evenly split between practice and theory [ ]
- Other [ ] (please explain below)

6. **Have you ever received training in general research ethics?**
- Yes [ ]
- No [ ]

7. **Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?**
- Yes [ ]
- No [ ]

8. **How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline?** (please tick one)
- Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Don't know [ ]

9. **Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?**
- Yes [ ]
- No [ ]
- Don't know/can't remember [ ]

10. **How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?**
- Often [ ]
- Sometimes [ ]
- Never [ ]
- Don't know [ ]

Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?

11. **How would you best define the term ‘creative risk’?**

open to ideas
2 How often do you take creative risks in your OWN work?
Very often [ ] Quite often [ ] Sometimes [ ] Seldom [ ] Never [ ]

13 How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in OWN work?
Very important [ ] Quite important [ ] Sometimes important [ ] Seldom important [ ] Never important [ ]

14 Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

We have to test the bounds of our world.

15 Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit your ability to take creative risks in your work?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

16 Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?
Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

End Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire
Sixteen questions:

Your views on research ethics within Art, Design and Media

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed. This new process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek student views on ethical appraisal. The study also seeks your thoughts on how research ethics might effect or influence your creative work.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com).

Your views on ethics in Art, Design or Media

1a. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

"It depends on how you define ethics."

1b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

"Good" is very subjective.

2. Do you think that research ethics is relevant to researchers in Art, Design and Media?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your creativity or strengthen your creative work?
Restrains creativity [ ] Strengthens the work [ ] Neither [ ] Combination of both [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

Restricts freedom to work instinctively.
4. *Where would you draw the line?* Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? If possible please give an example and explain why.

5. **Focus of your current project or research activity**
   - Mainly practice led [ ]
   - Mainly theory focused [✓]
   - Evenly split between practice and theory [ ]
   - Other [ ] (please explain below)

6. **Have you ever received training in general research ethics?**
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [✓]

7. **Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?**
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [✓]

8. **How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline?** (please tick one)
   - Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [✓]
   - Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Don't know [ ]

9. **Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?**
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [✓]
   - Don't know/can't remember [ ]

10. **How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?**
    - Often [ ]
    - Sometimes [✓]
    - Never [ ]
    - Don't know [ ]

    *Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?*

11. **How would you best define the term 'creative risk'?**
    - *creating something that it is likely will be misunderstood.*
2 How often do you take creative risks in your own work?
   Very often [ ] Quite often [ ] Sometimes [ ] Seldom [ ] Never [ ]

13 How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in OWN work?
   Very important [ ] Quite important [ ] Sometimes important [ ] Seldom important [ ] Never important [ ]

14 Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can
   Ethics and morality are both subjective.

15 Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit your ability to take creative risks in your work?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

16 Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?
   Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can
   Public perception.

End Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire
Sixteen questions:
Your views on research ethics within Art, Design and Media

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed. This new process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues by using a new ethical appraisal exercise. It is now important to seek student views on ethical appraisal. The study also seeks your thoughts on how research ethics might effect or influence your creative work.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com).

Your views on ethics in Art, Design or Media

1a. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

1b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

Do you think that research ethics is relevant to researchers in Art, Design and Media?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your creativity or strengthen your creative work?
Restrains creativity [ ] Strengthens the work [ ] Neither [ ] Combination of both [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail
4. Where would you draw the line? Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? If possible please give an example and explain why.

I think the line could only be my own personal line.

5. Focus of your current project or research activity
Mainly practice led [ ] Mainly theory focused [ ] Evenly split between practice and theory [ ] Other [ ] (please explain below)

6. Have you ever received training in general research ethics?
Yes [ ] No [ ]

7. Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?
Yes [ ] No [ ]

8. How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline: (please tick one)

- Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Don't know [ ]

9. Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know/can't remember [ ]

10. How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?
Often [ ] Sometimes [ ] Never [ ] Don't know [ ]

Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?

I did a project collecting people's bad thoughts and published them without editing.

11. How would you best define the term 'creative risk'?

I can't
2. How often do you take creative risks in your OWN work?
   Very often [ ] Quite often [ ] Sometimes [ ] Seldom [ ] Never [ ]

13. How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in OWN work?
   Very important [ ] Quite important [ ] Sometimes important [ ] Seldom important [ ] Never important [ ]

14. Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? — Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

   Moral & ethical codes aren't necessarily absolute or relevant — they can change over time

15. Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit your ability to take creative risks in your work?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? — Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

   In my case,
   My work often involves accidental surveillance without explicit permission

16. Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?
   Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

   Corporate Inaction
   Social Concerns

End Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire
Sixteen questions:
Your views on research ethics within Art, Design and Media

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed. This new process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek student views on ethical appraisal. The study also seeks your thoughts on how research ethics might effect or influence your creative work.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com)

Your views on ethics in Art, Design or Media

la. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail
   [Your answer: I'm not sure. Some aspects eg health & safety might be ethically relevant, if the owner of the pool etc had consented to be approached etc.]

lb. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?
   Yes [ ] No [x] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail
   [Your answer: Sometimes art might need to be courageous in order to question what we think about a subject.]

2. Do you think that research ethics is relevant to researchers in Art, Design and Media?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail
   [Your answer: See my answer to (1) – but also issues related to, say, intellectual property.]

3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your creativity or strengthen your creative work?
   Restrains creativity [ ] Strengthens the work [ ] Neither [ ] Combination of both [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail
   [Your answer: I'm not sure. Some aspects eg health & safety might be ethically relevant, if the owner of the pool etc had consented to be approached etc.]
4. Where would you draw the line? Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? If possible please give an example and explain why.

![Handwritten note]

5. Focus of your current project or research activity
   - Mainly practice led [ ]
   - Mainly theory focused [ ]
   - Evenly split between practice and theory [ ]
   - Other [ ] (please explain below)

6. Have you ever received training in general research ethics?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

7. Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

8. How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline? (please tick one)
   - Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Don’t know [ ]

9. Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]
   - Don’t know/can’t remember [ ]

10. How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?
    - Often [ ]
    - Sometimes [ ]
    - Never [ ]
    - Don’t know [ ]

    Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?
    ![Handwritten note]

11. How would you best define the term ‘creative risk’?
    ![Handwritten note]
12 How often do you take creative risks in your OWN work?
Very often [ ] Quite often [ ] Sometimes [ ] Seldom [ ] Never [ ]

13 How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in OWN work?
Very important [ ] Quite important [ ] Sometimes important [ ] Seldom important [ ] Never important [ ]

14 Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

Again, if the act is highly creative and unexpected it might be very relevant. But still there are likely to be some drawbacks, as the artist is not above the law.

15 Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit your ability to take creative risks in your work?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

I’m genuinely unsure. Perhaps if I’m forbidden to reproduce unrecognizable images that might completely derail my work.

16 Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?
Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

Legal restrictions
Laws and guidelines
Individual consent
Social acceptance

End
Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire
Sixteen questions:
Your views on research ethics within Art, Design and Media

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed. This new process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek student views on ethical appraisal. The study also seeks your thoughts on how research ethics might effect or influence your creative work.

Your answers will be treated with **strict confidentiality**. In any research reports all responses will be treated as **anonymous**. If you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer ([communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com](mailto:communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com)).

Your views on ethics in Art, Design or Media

1a. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]
   - Don’t know [ ]
   - Other [ ]
   Why? — Please explain your answer in detail

1b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]
   - Don’t know [ ]
   - Other [ ]
   Why? — Please explain your answer in detail

2. Do you think that research ethics is relevant to researchers in Art, Design and Media?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]
   - Don’t know [ ]
   - Other [ ]
   Why? — Please explain your answer in detail

3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your creativity or strengthen your creative work?
   - Restrains creativity [ ]
   - Strengthens the work [ ]
   - Neither [ ]
   - Combination of both [ ]
   - Don’t know [ ]
   - Other [ ]
   Why? — Please explain your answer in detail

I need to ensure that my work proceeds on a sound basis and is defensible to anyone who might challenge it - including potential patrons.
Where would you draw the line? Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavor so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? If possible please give an example and explain why.

- Use of animals
- Anything that infringes laws around sex discrimination
- Anything with significant negative environmental impact

5. Focus of your current project or research activity
   - Mainly practice led
   - Mainly theory focused
   - Evenly split between practice and theory
   - Other (please explain below)

6. Have you ever received training in general research ethics?
   - Yes
   - No

7. Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?
   - Yes
   - No

8. How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline: (please tick one)
   - Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline
   - Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline
   - Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline
   - Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline
   - No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline
   - Don't know

9. Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don't know/can't remember

10. How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?
    - Often
    - Sometimes
    - Never
    - Don't know

   Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?

11. How would you best define the term 'creative risk'?
    - Experimentation needed for originality to flourish
How often do you take creative risks in your OWN work?  
Very often [ ]  Quite often [ ]  Sometimes [ ]  Seldom [ ]  Never [ ]

13  How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in OWN work?  
Very important [ ]  Quite important [ ]  Sometimes important [ ]  Seldom important [ ]  Never important [ ]

14  Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?  
Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Sometimes [ ]  Don't know [ ]  Other [ ]  
Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

Perhaps the phrase creative risk does not seem to me to be any justification at all for unethical behavior - I just can't see why it ever would.

15  Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit your ability to take creative risks in your work?  
Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Sometimes [ ]  Don't know [ ]  Other [ ]  
Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

It might turn at this way later in my research - but if that inhibition is justified, then it is justified.

16  Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?  
Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

It probably flourishes here more than anywhere else. If there are any factors then it is probably people like me with quite practical and decided views!

End  
Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire
Appendix 6: Staff questionnaire
Sixteen questions:
Your views on research ethics within Art, Design and Media

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed. This new process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek staff views on ethical appraisal. The study also seeks your thoughts on how research ethics might effect or influence your students' creative work.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com).

Your views on ethics in Art, Design or Media

1a. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?
   Yes [ ] No [x] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? — Please explain your answer in detail

   Creativity is not always ethically justifiable or accountable to the rules and regulations laid down by the University.

1b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?
   Yes [ ] No [x] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? — Please explain your answer in detail

   Contemporary art has (or should not have) no boundaries — therefore it is 'ethically good' if it would restrict the artist (ie Damien Hirst / Trace Ennis)

2. Do you think that research ethics is relevant to students or researchers in Art, Design and Media?
   Yes [x] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? — Please explain your answer in detail

   Research ethics is relevant as all students and researchers need to understand the parameters of the research questions to be undertaken and how not to offend or abridge their participants in their research area.

3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your students' creativity or strengthen your students' creative work?
   Restrains creativity [ ] Strengthens the work [ ] Neither [x] Combination of both [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? — Please explain your answer in detail

   The process of ethical approval is purely for the academic and professional practice health and safety parameters.
4. Where would you draw the line? Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? If possible please give an example and explain why.

Unacceptable form undertaken by students to cause harm to those taking part in the research/art project.

5. Focus of your current teaching or research activity
Mainly practice led [ ] Mainly theory focused [ ] Evenly split between practice and theory [x] Other [ ] (please explain below)

6. Have you ever received training in general research ethics?
Yes [x] No [ ]

7. Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?
Yes [x] No [ ]

8. How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline: (please tick one)
   - Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Don't know [ ]

9. Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?
Yes [x] No [ ] Don't know/can't remember [ ]

10. How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your students' work?
   - Often [ ] Sometimes [x] Never [ ] Don’t know [ ]
   
   Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your students' work?

   Students lighting a fire in a wood for a film with use of petrol - no permission of landowner nor consideration of their own and others safety.

11. How would you best define the term 'creative risk'?

   To have considered that the "risk" taken to be creative does not harm any one person or persons.
12 How often do you take creative risks in your OWN work?
Very often [ ] Quite often [ ] Sometimes [ ] Seldom [ ] Never [ ]

13 How important is it for YOUR STUDENTS to take creative risks in their work?
Very important [ ] Quite important [ ] Sometimes important [ ] Seldom important [ ] Never important [ ]

14 Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

15 Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit the ability for your students to take creative risks in their work?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

16 Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?
Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

Rules and Regulations

End
Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire
Sixteen questions:
Your views on research ethics within Art, Design and Media

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed. This new process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues. It is now important to seek views on ethical appraisal. The study also seeks your thoughts on how research ethics might influence your students’ creative work.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com).

Your views on ethics in Art, Design or Media

1a. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?
   Yes [ ] No [x] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail
   In the early stages of learning creativity ethical thinking might hinder spontaneous actions.

1b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [x]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail
   Yes but one person’s ethic is another person’s insult so interpretation may contribute to ethical perception

2. Do you think that research ethics is relevant to students or researchers in Art, Design and Media?
   Yes [x] No [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail
   Yes, because at that level of research there ought to be a professional level of ethical thinking

3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your students’ creativity or strengthen your students’ creative work?
   Restraints creativity [ ] Strengthens the work [ ] Neither [ ] Combination of both [x] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail
   The question suggests an answer one way or the other. I feel that my answer has to be that sometimes an ethical approach will hinder and other times it will strengthen any creative argument.
4. **Where would you draw the line?** Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? *If possible please give an example and explain why.*

   Where creative work might intimidate a person or persons or where a creative work might contribute or insight hatred towards a group of people. Art ought not embarrass or expose the vulnerable but may be permitted to sometimes expose and enlighten / challenge perception on political thinking or unethical thinking. However, I must repeat that one person's ethical thinking may be another person's unethical thinking.

5. **Focus of your current teaching or research activity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mainly practice led [✓]</th>
<th>Mainly theory focused [✓]</th>
<th>Evenly split between practice and theory [✓]</th>
<th>Other [✓] (please explain below)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>audio and photographic image, sometimes still, sometimes moving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Have you ever received training in general research ethics?**

   Yes [✓] No [✓]

7. **Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?**

   Yes [✓] No [✓]

8. **How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline:** (please tick one)

   | Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline [✓] |
   | Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [✓] |
   | Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [✓] |
   | Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [✓] |
   | No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [✓] |
   | Don't know [✓] |

9. **Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?**

   Yes [✓] No [✓] Don’t know/can’t remember [✓]

10. **How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your students’ work?**

    Often [✓] Sometimes [✓] Never [✓] Don’t know [✓]

    *Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your students’ work?*

    Once felt that a student had revealed some gender prejudice issues in their work and I had to engage in a discussion about the words used in the work.

11. **How would you best define the term ‘creative risk’?**

    Stepping outside of the artists comfort zone: engaging in work that is new territory to the artist.
12 How often do you take creative risks in your OWN work?
Very often [x] Quite often [ ] Sometimes [ ] Seldom[ ] Never [ ]

13 How important is it for YOUR STUDENTS to take creative risks in their work?
Very important [x] Quite important [ ] Sometimes important [ ] Seldom important[ ] Never important [ ]

14 Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [x]

Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

well that is a tricky question. My perception of ethical approach may differ for another person. So I will challenge what i feel is unethical but their perception may justify their approach. I have an open mind to approach but will intervene where I feel something may inappropriately challenge or make statement.

15 Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit the ability for your students to take creative risks in their work?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [x] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]

Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

It may discourage the challenging of political thought and action. Artists ought to be able to debate political environments without restriction and without self censorship in their work.

16 Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?

Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

I do not feel liberal enough to enable an honest answer to that question.

End  Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire

Staff questionnaire April 2015
Sixteen questions:
Your views on research ethics within Art, Design and Media

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed. This new process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek staff views on ethical appraisal. The study also seeks your thoughts on how research ethics might effect or influence your students' creative work.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com).

Your views on ethics in Art, Design or Media

1a. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? - Please explain your answer in detail

1b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? - Please explain your answer in detail

2. Do you think that research ethics is relevant to students or researchers in Art, Design and Media?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? - Please explain your answer in detail

3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your students' creativity or strengthen your students' creative work?
Restrains creativity [ ] Strengthens the work [ ] Neither [ ] Combination of both [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? - Please explain your answer in detail

4. Where would you draw the line? Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? If possible please give an example and explain why.

Racist art  
Misogynistic art  
Fascist art  

5. Focus of your current teaching or research activity
Mainly practice led [ ] Mainly theory focused [ ] Evenly split between practice and theory [ ] Other [ ] (please explain below)

6. Have you ever received training in general research ethics?
Yes [ ] No [ ]

7. Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?
Yes [ ] No [ ]

8. How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline?: (please tick one)
- Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Don't know [ ]

9. Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know/can't remember [ ]

10. How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your students’ work?
- Often [ ] Sometimes [ ] Never [ ] Don’t know [ ]

Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your students’ work?

Lack of awareness about how much research activity involves ethical issues

11. How would you best define the term ‘creative risk’?

Challenging to own skills and capabilities, challenging society by asking difficult questions
12. How often do you take creative risks in your OWN work?
   - Very often [ ]
   - Quite often [ ]
   - Sometimes [ ]
   - Seldom [ ]
   - Never [ ]

13. How important is it for YOUR STUDENTS to take creative risks in their work?
   - Very important [ ]
   - Quite important [ ]
   - Sometimes important [ ]
   - Seldom important [ ]
   - Never important [ ]

14. Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]
   - Sometimes [ ]
   - Don't know [ ]
   - Other [ ]

   Why? — Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can.

15. Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit the ability for your students to take creative risks in their work?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]
   - Sometimes [ ]
   - Don't know [ ]
   - Other [ ]

   Why? — Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can.

16. Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?
   Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can.

   Time — not enough to delve into these questions deeply so it becomes a standardized tick box exercise rather than a genuine investigation + debate.

End

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.
Sixteen questions:
Your views on research ethics within Art, Design and Media

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed. This new process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek staff views on ethical appraisal. The study also seeks your thoughts on how research ethics might effect or influence your students' creative work.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com).

Your views on ethics in Art, Design or Media

1a. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

1b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

2. Do you think that research ethics is relevant to students or researchers in Art, Design and Media?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your students' creativity or strengthen your students' creative work?
Restrains creativity [ ] Strengthens the work [ ] Neither [ ] Combination of both [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

IT IS NOT A QUESTION OF ETHICAL APPROVAL THAT MAY AFFECT 'STUDENT'S CREATIVE WORK', BUT THE PROCESS OF APPROVAL THAT NEEDS TO BE CONSIDERED.
4. Where would you draw the line? Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? If possible please give an example and explain why.

5. Focus of your current teaching or research activity
Mainly practice led [ ] Mainly theory focused [ ] Evenly split between practice and theory [ ] Other [ ] (please explain below)

6. Have you ever received training in general research ethics?
Yes [ ] No [ ]

7. Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?
Yes [ ] No [ ]

8. How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline: (please tick one)

- Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Don’t know [ ]

9. Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Don’t know/can’t remember [ ]

10. How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your students’ work?

- Often [ ] Occasionally [ ] Never [ ] Don’t know [ ]

Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your students’ work?

11. How would you best define the term ‘creative risk’?

- Every action has its own consequences beyond our control. Within the context of Art, Design and Media research, ‘creative risk’ is firstly, accepting this fact, and then learning from it.
12 How often do you take creative risks in your OWN work?
   Very often [ ] Quite often [ ] Sometimes [ ] Seldom [ ] Never [ ]

13 How important is it for YOUR STUDENTS to take creative risks in their work?
   Very important [ ] Quite important [ ] Sometimes important [ ] Seldom important [ ] Never important [ ]

14 Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? - Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

   Creative people are not above or beyond ethical or moral codes. However, it is their duty to question and to challenge all commonly held beliefs.

15 Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit the ability for your students to take creative risks in their work?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? - Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

   However, it is again a question of how appraisal is conducted that needs to be considered. Is the student a genuine participant in the process of ethical appraisal, or are they merely compliant with the dominant power of the day?

16 Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?
   Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

   Avant-gardism is just a matter of fashion. The ethical and moral question is, how may we (the university) promote and support new and diverse ways of thinking and practice?

End

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire
Sixteen questions:
Your views on research ethics within Art, Design and Media

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed. This new process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek staff views on ethical appraisal. The study also seeks your thoughts on how research ethics might effect or influence your students' creative work.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com).

Your views on ethics in Art, Design or Media

1a. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?
   Yes [ ] No [x] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? — Please explain your answer in detail

   | I think it would depend on the purpose of the creative activity and the ethical boundaries that the work may be   |
   | challenging. If the work were to be published then there should be a consideration of all ethical aspects, but   |
   | depending on what the work was trying to communicate and who it was aimed at, then there may be valid reasons  |
   | for crossing ethical lines. |

1b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?
   Yes [ ] No [x] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? — Please explain your answer in detail

   Tastes, ideas, truths and opinions about what is ethically good changes over time. Good art or design may be   |
   challenging and it is not necessarily a bad thing to question what is ethical and if an artwork can encourage this |
   questioning then this may be worth it.

2. Do you think that research ethics is relevant to students or researchers in Art, Design and Media?
   Yes [x] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? — Please explain your answer in detail

   Students need to be aware that their research actions have the potential to have a positive or negative impact on   |
   themselves and others and they should be aware of how to both conduct ethical research and to report and use   |
   the results of their findings responsibly.

3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your students’ creativity or strengthen your   |
   students' creative work?
   Restains creativity [ ] Strengthens the work [ ] Neither [ ] Combination of both [x] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? — Please explain your answer in detail

   As with much creative production, constraints can encourage creativity or stifle creativity and the same could be   |
   said for a lack of constraints.
4. Where would you draw the line? Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? If possible please give an example and explain why.

This is a difficult question...
Perhaps a project that had the potential to endanger or harm (physically or emotionally), or that might be seen as harassment or malicious misrepresentation of a person or group of people. It is difficult to give a specific example working with visual communication it is necessary at times to use stereotypes and some of the ideas that students work through may push what would be acceptable in terms of stereotypes or produce something that may offend.

5. Focus of your current teaching or research activity
Mainly practice led [ ] Mainly theory focused [x] Evenly split between practice and theory [ ] Other [ ] (please explain below)

6. Have you ever received training in general research ethics?
Yes [ ] No [x]

7. Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?
Yes [ ] No [x]

8. How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline: (please tick one)

Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [x]
Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
Don’t know [ ]

9. Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?
Yes [x] No [ ] Don’t know/can’t remember [ ]

10. How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your students’ work?

Often [x] Sometimes [ ] Never [ ] Don’t know [ ]

Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your students’ work?

This is a difficult one to pin down to any one example.
I have my own personal ethical boundaries and often feel uncomfortable with the very nature of the industry I am involved in promoting to my students. Visual communication is about conveying messages and sometimes I am uncomfortable with the messages that are being conveyed through the students work. When students work on competition briefs or self generated briefs or open briefs where they can determine the outcome I am often concerned and uncomfortable about the messages being conveyed, the stereotypes that are reinforced and the ethics of the clients/boards they are designing for.

11. How would you best define the term ‘creative risk’?

I don’t think it is possible to come up with a definitive definition.
We are often asking students to take risks when developing work and probably don’t fully explain what we mean by risk and I expect that each individual tutor might think about risk differently. There are probably a number of different areas of creative risk, risks taken with materials, tools, techniques and approaches and risks taken around ideas and concepts. What is risky may be determined by the individual; something not previously tried or tested on a personal level. Or may be determined by the wider community, whether that be the in terms
How often do you take creative risks in your OWN work?
Very often [ ] Quite often [ ] Sometimes [ ] Seldom [ ] Never [ ]

13 How important is it for YOUR STUDENTS to take creative risks in their work?
Very important [ ] Quite important [ ] Sometimes important [ ] Seldom important [ ] Never important [ ]

14 Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? — Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can
Sometimes it is necessary to challenge the status quo to put to the test our belief systems to promote debate and discussion around what is ethically and morally right and in order to do this it may be necessary to break these codes to provoke a reaction.

15 Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit the ability for your students to take creative risks in their work?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? — Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can
Putting together a proposal to put forward to an ethical committee is time consuming and requires careful consideration and there is always the possibility that the committee are not convinced and may not approve the project. This will inevitably restrict the possibility for quick fire, chance and intuitive responses and leave the judgement about the appropriateness of the work to a group of individuals who have their own ethical and moral compass and may be risk averse in relation to how the university might be effected by the results of the project.

16 Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?
Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can
The university as an institution with its own values, mission and target market may not wish to challenge their own status quo or “risk” offending their stake holders, those that hold the financial future of the institution in their hands and therefore may be risk averse.

End Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire
Sixteen questions:

Your views on research ethics within Art, Design and Media

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed. This new process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek staff views on ethical appraisal. The study also seeks your thoughts on how research ethics might effect or influence your students’ creative work.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com).

Your views on ethics in Art, Design or Media

1a. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?
   Yes [X] No [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

1b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?
   Yes [X] No [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

2. Do you think that research ethics is relevant to students or researchers in Art, Design and Media?
   Yes [X] No [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your students’ creativity or strengthen your students’ creative work?
   Restrains creativity [ ] Strengthens the work [X] Neither [ ] Combination of both [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

Encourages them to think more deeply about what they’re doing.
4. **Where would you draw the line?** Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? If possible please give an example and explain why.

Any harm which causes harm to others or demeanes others.

5. **Focus of your current teaching or research activity**

Mainly practice led [ ] Mainly theory focused [ ] Evenly split between practice and theory [ ] Other [ ] (please explain below)

6. **Have you ever received training in general research ethics?**

Yes [ ] No [ ]

7. **Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?**

Yes [ ] No [ ]

8. **How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline:** (please tick one)

- Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Don’t know [ ]

9. **Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?**

Yes [ ] No [ ] Don’t know/can’t remember [ ]

10. **How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your students’ work?**

- Often [ ]
- Sometimes [ ]
- Never [ ]
- Don’t know [ ]

*Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your students’ work?*

11. **How would you best define the term ‘creative risk’?**

Doing something where you’re not sure what the outcome will be.
12 How often do you take creative risks in your OWN work?
   Very often [ ]   Quite often [ ]   Sometimes [ ]   Seldom[ ]   Never [ ]

13 How important is it for YOUR STUDENTS to take creative risks in their work?
   Very important [ ]   Quite important [ ]   Sometimes important [ ]   Seldom important [ ]   Never important [ ]

14 Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
   Yes [ ]   No [ ]   Sometimes [ ]   Don’t know [ ]   Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

15 Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit the ability for your students to take creative risks in their work?
   Yes [ ]   No [ ]   Sometimes [ ]   Don’t know [ ]   Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

16 Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?
   Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

   Fear
   Lack of imagination
   Convention

End

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire
Appendix 7: Undergraduate questionnaire
Sixteen questions:

Your views on research ethics within Art, Design and Media

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed. This new process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek student views on ethical appraisal. The study also seeks your thoughts on how research ethics might effect or influence your creative work.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com).

Your views on ethics in Art, Design or Media

1a. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail
   
   I am interested in work that pushes boundaries, it makes people feel uncomfortable.

1b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail
   
   What makes good art is personal whereas I think ethics are more universal.

2 Do you think that research ethics is relevant to researchers in Art, Design and Media?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail
   
   It is important to understand the implications of what you are doing.

3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your creativity or strengthen your creative work?
   Restrains creativity [ ] Strengthens the work [ ] Neither [ ] Combination of both [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail
   
   It would encourage further thought about what was being done but could be restricting as I think creative work is (or should be) a free expression.
4. Where would you draw the line? Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? If possible please give an example and explain why.

Causing deliberate harm to others

5. Focus of your current research activity

Mainly practice led [ ] Mainly theory focused [ ] Evenly split between practice and theory [ ] Other [ ] (please explain below)

6. Have you ever received training in general research ethics?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

7. Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

8. How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline: (please tick one)

Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
Don’t know [ ]

9. Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?

Yes [ ] No [ ] Don’t know/can’t remember [ ]

10. How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?

Often [ ] Sometimes [ ] Never [ ] Don’t know [ ]

Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?

11. How would you best define the term ‘creative risk’?

Being unsure of the outcome, pushing yourself to try something new even if you don’t know if it will pay off.
12 How often do you take creative risks in your OWN work?
Very often [ ] Quite often [ ] Sometimes [ ] Seldom [ ] Never [ ]

13 How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in your work?
Very important [ ] Quite important [ ] Sometimes important [ ] Seldom important [ ] Never important [ ]

14 Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

If it is for a greater purpose - benefit outweigh the damage.

15 Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit your ability to take creative risks in your work?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

I am interested in making work that makes the viewer feel uncomfortable however I would always be cautious as to how far I would take this.

16 Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?
Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

End Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire
Sixteen questions:
Your views on research ethics within Art, Design and Media

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed. This new process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek student views on ethical appraisal. The study also seeks your thoughts on how research ethics might effect or influence your creative work.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com).

Your views on ethics in Art, Design or Media

1a. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?
Yes [ ] No [x] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

Creativity shouldn't be stunted by a certain persons ethical points. Someone will always find something ethically wrong with it.

1b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?
Yes [ ] No [x] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

A good piece of art can impact the audience by its shock factor. The art can be the viewers opinion - good or bad.

2. Do you think that research ethics is relevant to researchers in Art, Design and Media?
Yes [ ] No [x] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

Research shouldn’t be as broad as possible and not stunted by ethics. Research gets developed and it is not normally seen.

3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your creativity or strengthen your creative work?
Restrains creativity [x] Strengthens the work [ ] Neither [ ] Combination of both [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

If I couldn’t do a piece I was/feel for ethical reasons it means highly restrained. I believe they should be thought about but not stop.
4. Where would you draw the line? Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? If possible please give an example and explain why.

Using photographs of children in work without parental permission

5. Focus of your current research activity
   - Mainly practice led [ ]
   - Mainly theory focused [ ]
   - Evenly split between practice and theory [ ]
   - Other [ ] (please explain below)

6. Have you ever received training in general research ethics?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]
   - Psychology A-level

7. Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

8. How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline: (please tick one)
   - Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Don’t know [ ]

9. Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]
   - Don’t know/can’t remember [ ]

10. How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?
    - Often [ ]
    - Sometimes [ ]
    - Never [ ]
    - Don’t know [ ]

Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?

11. How would you best define the term ‘creative risk’?
    - Something that might challenge or even offend
12 How often do you take creative risks in your OWN work?
   Very often [ ] Quite often [x] Sometimes [ ] Seldom [ ] Never [ ]

13 How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in your work?
   Very important [x] Quite important [ ] Sometimes important [ ] Seldom important [ ] Never important [ ]

14 Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
   Yes [x] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? - Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can
   Creative minds should not be restricted.

15 Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit the ability to take creative risks in your work?
   Yes [x] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? - Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can
   Having a set of rules to abide by will restrict what I can create.

16 Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?
   Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can
   The majority of people do not appreciate avant-garde work for what it is worth. Work would be able to be created but maybe not presented or exhibited if tutors stopped it.

End
Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire

Student questionnaire April 2015
Sixteen questions:

Your views on research ethics within Art, Design and Media

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed. This new process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek student views on ethical appraisal. The study also seeks your thoughts on how research ethics might effect or influence your creative work.

Your answers will be treated with **strict confidentiality**. In any research reports all responses will be treated as **anonymous**. If you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com).

Your views on ethics in Art, Design or Media

1a. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?

- Yes [ ]
- No [ ]
- Don't know [ ]
- Other [ ]

**Why?** – Please explain your answer in detail

To an extent, the creativity shouldn't go out of its way to offend others on purpose. However, Art is made to question the norm and to evoke a certain reaction.

1b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?

- Yes [x]
- No [ ]
- Don’t know [ ]
- Other [ ]

**Why?** – Please explain your answer in detail

If it's good art, being made viewed by a large amount of the public, it should be ethically acceptable to be viewed.

2. Do you think that research ethics is relevant to researchers in Art, Design and Media?

- Yes [ ]
- No [ ]
- Don’t know [ ]
- Other [ ]

**Why?** – Please explain your answer in detail

Sometimes when making art, you don’t think of the potential ethical problems until someone else points them out – and you then research into them.

3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your creativity or strengthen your creative work?

- Restrains creativity [ ]
- Strengthens the work [ ]
- Neither [ ]
- Combination of both [ ]
- Don’t know [ ]
- Other [ ]

**Why?** – Please explain your answer in detail

Restrains creativity as you can’t create exactly anything you want, strengthens your work as you think about your overall concept in more detail.
4. **Where would you draw the line?** Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? If possible please give an example and explain why.

   "Any personal problems that a fellow student may have encountered and find emotionally upsetting."

5. **Focus of your current research activity**
   Mainly practice led [ ]  Mainly theory focused [ ]  Evenly split between practice and theory [ ]  Other [ ] (please explain below)

6. **Have you ever received training in general research ethics?**
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

7. **Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?**
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

8. **How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline?** (please tick one)
   Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   Don’t know [ ]

9. **Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?**
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Don’t know/can’t remember [ ]

10. **How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?**
    Often [ ]  Sometimes [ ]  Never [ ]  Don’t know [ ]

    Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?

11. **How would you best define the term ‘creative risk’?**
    "Pushing the boundaries to see how far you can take your work without upsetting others."


How often do you take creative risks in your OWN work?
Very often [ ]  Quite often [ ]  Sometimes [x]  Seldom [ ]  Never [ ]

How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in your work?
Very important [ ]  Quite important [ ]  Sometimes important [ ]  Seldom important [ ]  Never important [ ]

Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Sometimes [x]  Don’t know [ ]  Other [ ]

Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can
If they can back up their reasoning, rather than doing it just for the hell of it.

Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit your ability to take creative risks in your work?
Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Sometimes [x]  Don’t know [ ]  Other [ ]

Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can
Would make you think more about the decision you making before going ahead with that idea.

Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?

Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can
*Response of the Tutor
*personal problems that would automatically restrict idea.

End

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire
Sixteen questions:
Your views on research ethics within Art, Design and Media

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines.
This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed. This new process sought to encourage
greater reflection on ethical issues by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek student views on ethical appraisal. The study also seeks your thoughts on how research ethics might affect
or influence your creative work.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If
you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer
(communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com).

Your views on ethics in Art, Design or Media

1a. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?
Yes [ ] No [x] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

   while a vast majority of work should be ethical, sometimes
   controversial work is required, especially if the intent of the work
   is to inspire change, confront problematic viewpoints and spark deep
   discussion.

1b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?
Yes [ ] No [x] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

   see answer above.

2. Do you think that research ethics is relevant to researchers in Art, Design and Media?
Yes [x] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

   especially when involving others, matters of consent, safety and
   privacy are more important than the artist's desires, art is viewed
   by willing participants and should be created through willing
   participants.

3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your creativity or strengthen your
   creative work?
Restrains creativity [ ] Strengthens the work [ ] Neither [ ] Combination of both [ ] Don't know [x] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

   having not had a problem with it before, I don't know.
Where would you draw the line? Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? If possible please give an example and explain why.

Racism / Sexism / Homophobia / Transphobia etc
- Minorities already suffer a great deal and creating work that perpetuates that suffering, especially from someone not belonging to that minority, is unnecessary and cruel.

5. Focus of your current research activity
Mainly practice led [X] Mainly theory focused [ ] Evenly split between practice and theory [ ] Other [ ] (please explain below)

6. Have you ever received training in general research ethics?
Yes [ ] No [X]

7. Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?
Yes [ ] No [ ]

8. How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline: (please tick one)
   - Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [X]
   - Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Don’t know [ ]

9. Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?
   Yes [X] No [ ] Don’t know/can’t remember [ ]

10. How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?
    Often [ ] Sometimes [ ] Never [X] Don’t know [ ]

    Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?

11. How would you best define the term ‘creative risk’?
    A controversial decision that could make or break the work and meaning behind it.
13 How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in your work?
Very important [ ] Quite important [ ] Sometimes important [ ] Seldom important [ ] Never important [ ]

14 Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? — Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

15 Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit your ability to take creative risks in your work?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? — Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

If I believe in my work and the risk I’m taking will benefit the viewers then an ethical appraisal would be a consideration but not a guiding factor.

16 Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?
Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

Taboos surrounding subjects such as sex, religion, gender, sexuality and race can mean people are often discouraged or shunned into taking a safer more acceptable path to explore.

End

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

Student questionnaire April 2015
Sixteen questions:
Your views on research ethics within Art, Design and Media

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed. This new process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek student views on ethical appraisal. The study also seeks your thoughts on how research ethics might effect or influence your creative work.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com).

Your views on ethics in Art, Design or Media

1a. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

   I think art should push the boundaries and not be restricted by any codes. Everybody has different ethical opinions, therefore we can not rely on a code.

1b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

   Artists should be able to create what they wish. Contemporary art is contemporary and future thinking.

2. Do you think that research ethics is relevant to researchers in Art, Design and Media?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

   Somebody may disagree with your ethical view.

3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your creativity or strengthen your creative work?
   Restrains creativity [ ] Strengthens the work [ ] Neither [ ] Combination of both [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

   I do not want any restrictions when designing.
4. **Where would you draw the line?** Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? *If possible please give an example and explain why.*

I wouldn't, unless someone would be hurt, or injured.

5. **Focus of your current research activity**

Mainly practice led [ ]
Mainly theory focused [ ]
Evenly split between practice and theory [ ]
Other [ ] (please explain below)

6. **Have you ever received training in general research ethics?**

Yes [ ]
No [ ]

7. **Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?**

Yes [ ]
No [ ]

8. **How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline:** (please tick one)

- Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Don't know [ ]

9. **Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?**

Yes [ ]
No [ ]
Don't know/can't remember [ ]

10. **How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?**

- Often [ ]
- Sometimes [ ]
- Never [ ]
- Don't know [ ]

*Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?*

11. **How would you best define the term ‘creative risk’?**

Pushing the boundaries of creativity.
2 How often do you take creative risks in your OWN work?
Very often [ ] Quite often [ ] Sometimes [ ] Seldom [ ] Never [ ]

13 How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in YOUR work?
Very important [ ] Quite important [ ] Sometimes important [ ] Seldom important [ ] Never important [ ]

14 Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

15 Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit ability to take creative risks in your work?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

16 Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?
Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

End

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire

Student questionnaire April 2015
Sixteen questions:
Your views on research ethics within Art, Design and Media

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed. This new process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek student views on ethical appraisal. The study also seeks your thoughts on how research ethics might effect or influence your creative work.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com).

Your views on ethics in Art, Design or Media

1a. Do you think all creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?
   - Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail
   
   No, someone should be able to make whatever they want without boundaries or questions.

1b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?
   - Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail
   
   Sometimes thinking outside the box to create unique artwork can be ethically wrong to attract a viewer.

2. Do you think that research ethics is relevant to researchers in Art, Design and Media?
   - Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail
   
   

3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your creativity or strengthen your creative work?
   - Restrains creativity [ ] Strengthens the work [ ] Neither [ ] Combination of both [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail
   
   Restraint due to too much red tape and safety. Good – because no complaints if sticking to the guidelines.
4. **Where would you draw the line?** Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? If possible please give an example and explain why.

[Blank space for example and explanation]

5. **Focus of your current research activity**
   - Mainly practice led [ ]
   - Mainly theory focused [ ]
   - Evenly split between practice and theory [ ]
   - Other [ ] (please explain below)

6. **Have you ever received training in general research ethics?**
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

7. **Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?**
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

8. **How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline?** (please tick one)
   - Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Don’t know [ ]

9. **Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?**
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]
   - Don’t know/can’t remember [ ]

10. **How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?**
    - Often [ ]
    - Sometimes [ ]
    - Never [ ]
    - Don’t know [ ]

   *Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?*

[Blank space for examples]

11. **How would you best define the term ‘creative risk’?**
    - Working outside the box, creating something to attract the attention of a viewer: possibly good/bad
2 How often do you take creative risks in your OWN work?
Very often [ ] Quite often [ ] Sometimes [ ] Seldom [ ] Never [ ]

13 How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in your work?
Very important [ ] Quite important [ ] Sometimes important [ ] Seldom important [ ] Never important [ ]

14 Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

Depending if it is for a good cause / morally right.

15 Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit the ability to take creative risks in work?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

If this sits people away from being creative, then all artwork will become boring and un-creative.

16 Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?
Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

can sometimes be too strict with health and safety aspects.

End Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire
Sixteen questions:

Your views on research ethics within Art, Design and Media

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed. This new process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek student views on ethical appraisal. The study also seeks your thoughts on how research ethics might effect or influence your creative work.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com).

Your views on ethics in Art, Design or Media

1a. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]

Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

I feel all creative activity should challenge ethical issues.

1b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]

Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

People should be able to express themselves. There is no one correct answer. They can’t be defined as ‘ethically good’.

2. Do you think that research ethics is relevant to researchers in Art, Design and Media?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]

Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

It is important to know where your actions are breaking ethical values so that you can decide whether that is what you want your work to do.

3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your creativity or strengthen your creative work?

Restrains creativity [ ] Strengthens the work [ ] Neither [ ] Combination of both [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]

Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

Restricts how far you are able to push the boundaries.
1. Where would you draw the line? Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative
eendeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? If possible please give an example and explain why.

When it puts people in danger.

2. Focus of your current research activity
Mainly practice led [ ] Mainly theory focused [ ] Evenly split between practice and theory [X] Other [ ] (please explain below)

3. Have you ever received training in general research ethics?
Yes [ ] No [ ]

4. Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?
Yes [ ] No [ ]

5. How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline: (please tick one)
   - Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [X]
   - Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Don’t know [ ]

6. Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or
   an ethical checklist?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Don’t know/can’t remember [ ]

7. How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?
   Often [ ] Sometimes [ ] Never [ ] Don’t know [ ]

   Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?

   Health and safety in conceptual work.

8. How would you best define the term 'creative risk'?
   Creative risk are very broad.
13 How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in your work?
Very important [ ] Quite important [ ] Sometimes important [ ] Seldom important [ ] Never important [ ]

14 Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]

Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

15 Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit one's ability to take creative risks in work?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]

Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

16 Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?
Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

Sometimes funding, but can be overcome.

End Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire
Sixteen questions: 
Your views on research ethics within Art, Design and Media

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed. This new process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek student views on ethical appraisal. The study also seeks your thoughts on how research ethics might affect or influence your creative work.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com).

Your views on ethics in Art, Design or Media

1a. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?
   Yes [✓] No [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

1b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?
   Yes [✓] No [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

2. Do you think that research ethics is relevant to researchers in Art, Design and Media?
   Yes [✓] No [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your creativity or strengthen your creative work?
   Restains creativity [ ] Strengthens the work [ ] Neither [ ] Combination of both [✓] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail
4. **Where would you draw the line?** Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? If possible please give an example and explain why.

- Cultural appropriation / representation - anything that would cause it to be offensive without another's permission. This should be left up to the individual to decide.
- Self and censorship.

5. **Focus of your current research activity**

Mainly practice led [x] Mainly theory focused [ ] Evenly split between practice and theory [ ] Other [ ] (please explain below)

*Upcycling products for roof top space - collaborative project.*

6. **Have you ever received training in general research ethics?**

Yes [ ] No [x]

7. **Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?**

Yes [ ] No [x]

8. **How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline?** (please tick one)

- Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Don't know [ ]

9. **Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?**

Yes [ ] No [x] Don't know/can't remember [ ]

10. **How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?**

- Often [ ]
- Sometimes [x]
- Never [ ]
- Don't know [ ]

Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?

- Source / production of materials used - not sure where they are from etc.
- Environmental impact of work/process.

11. **How would you best define the term 'creative risk'?**

- Pushing self out of comfort zone or doing something against the norm to pursue idea / further art work.
1. How often do you take creative risks in your OWN work?
   Very often [ ] Quite often [ ] Sometimes [ ] Seldom [ ] Never [ ]

13 How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in your work?
   Very important [ ] Quite important [ ] Sometimes important [ ] Seldom important [ ] Never important [ ]

14 Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can
   
   Not really - depends what is considered to be unethical/break moral codes
   (ie slightly unsafe is ok)

15 Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit your ability to take creative risks in your work?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

16 Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?
   Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can
   
   Health & Safety
   Preconception about what art should be
   /what would cause offense.

End

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.
Sixteen questions:
Your views on research ethics within Art, Design and Media

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed. This new process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek student views on ethical appraisal. The study also seeks your thoughts on how research ethics might effect or influence your creative work.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com).

Your views on ethics in Art, Design or Media

1a. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

I enjoy creative work that stirs opinion or a reaction, I find it interesting to see how many reactions it can spark up.

1b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

I like to be shocked and shown something new, I like being made to think about something.

2 Do you think that research ethics is relevant to researchers in Art, Design and Media?
Yes [ ] No [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

I think it’s important to get a brief idea on how a piece of work will make someone feel.

3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your creativity or strengthen your creative work?
Restrains creativity [ ] Strengthens the work [ ] Neither [ ] Combination of both [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

In some ways it can restrain creativity and biode boundaries of experimentation, in other ways it can put a limit on that experimentation and keep people safe from
1. Where would you draw the line? Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? If possible please give an example and explain why.

Caring harm to anyone or anything is unacceptable.

5. Focus of your current research activity
Mainly practice led [ ] Mainly theory focused [ ] Evenly split between practice and theory [ ] Other [ ] (please explain below)

6. Have you ever received training in general research ethics?
Yes [ ] No [ ]

7. Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?
Yes [ ] No [ ]

8. How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline: (please tick one)

- Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [✓]
- Don't know [ ]

9. Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?
Yes [ ] No [✓] Don't know/can't remember [ ]

10. How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?

- Often [ ]
- Sometimes [ ]
- Never [✓]
- Don't know [ ]

Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?

11. How would you best define the term 'creative risk'?
Risk taking to create art work, not enough risk to harm or damage people, equipment or other arts.
4. How often do you take creative risks in your OWN work?
   Very often [ ]  Quite often [ ]  Sometimes [ ]  Seldom[ ]  Never [ ]

13. How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in your work?
   Very important [ ]  Quite important [ ]  Sometimes important [✓]  Seldom important [ ]  Never important [ ]

14. Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Sometimes [✓]  Don’t know [ ]  Other [ ]

   Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

   I believe it is ok to make a viewer uncomfortable or react to a piece of work, however I wouldn’t agree with physical risk taking if someone is at risk of injury.

15. Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit your ability to take creative risks in your work?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Sometimes [ ]  Don’t know [✓]  Other [ ]

   Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

16. Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?
   Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

   End

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.
Sixteen questions:
Your views on research ethics within Art, Design and Media

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed. This new process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek student views on ethical appraisal. The study also seeks your thoughts on how research ethics might effect or influence your creative work.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com).

Your views on ethics in Art, Design or Media

1a. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

   Not in some respects. Creative activity could be used to highlight/communicate an ethical issue or problem – something that should create debate or questions from the audience could be much more interesting or inspiring.

1b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

   Again, not in an extent (as explained above).

2. Do you think that research ethics is relevant to researchers in Art, Design and Media?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

   It is important to recognise, highlight, challenge these issues that we can come across within Art, Design & Media and explore their boundaries.

3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your creativity or strengthen your creative work?
   Restrains creativity [ ] Strengthens the work [ ] Neither [ ] Combination of both [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

   It may restrain your creativity or strengthen but the solving of problems and issues like this is so important as an artist or designer that it could actually strengthen your work in the long run.
1. **Where would you draw the line?** Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? *If possible please give an example and explain why.*

   Anything that intended harm rather than be a person or animal or nature.

5. **Focus of your current research activity**
   - Mainly practice led [ ]
   - Mainly theory focused [ ]
   - Evenly split between practice and theory [x]
   - Other [ ] (please explain below)

   Collaborative project using skills learned in my practice while developing the conceptual idea of a sensory experience to how it could affect people.

6. **Have you ever received training in general research ethics?**
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

7. **Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?**
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

8. **How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline:** (please tick one)
   - Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [x]
   - Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Don't know [ ]

9. **Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?**
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]
   - Don't know/can't remember [ ]

10. **How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?**
    - Often [ ]
    - Sometimes [x]
    - Never [ ]
    - Don't know [ ]

   *Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?*

   When producing work based on the uneven spread of wealth in Manchester and was suggested that I photograph in homeless put the exploitation of their private life was a concern - sensitive issue.

11. **How would you best define the term 'creative risk'?**

   Doing something that explores the boundaries between what is seen as right or wrong - or focusing on a sensitive issue.
1. How often do you take creative risks in your OWN work?
   Very often [ ] Quite often [ ] Sometimes [ ] Seldom [ ] Never [ ]

13. How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in your work?
    Very important [ ] Quite important [ ] Sometimes important [ ] Seldom important [ ] Never important [ ]

14. Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
    Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
    Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

15. Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit your ability to take creative risks in your work?
    Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
    Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

16. Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?
    Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

End

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire

Student questionnaire April 201
Sixteen questions:
Your views on research ethics within Art, Design and Media

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed. This new process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek student views on ethical appraisal. The study also seeks your thoughts on how research ethics might effect or influence your creative work.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com).

Your views on ethics in Art, Design or Media

1a. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

   Everyone has different opinions on ethics & its severity

1b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

2. Do you think that research ethics is relevant to researchers in Art, Design and Media?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your creativity or strengthen your creative work?
   Restraints creativity [ ] Strengthens the work [ ] Neither [ ] Combination of both [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

   Might stop you from doing something put push you to do something else, might lead you to other things
4. Where would you draw the line? Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? If possible please give an example and explain why.

- Sexism
- Racism
- Prejudice

5. Focus of your current research activity
   - Mainly practice led [ ]
   - Mainly theory focused [ ]
   - Evenly split between practice and theory [ ]
   - Other [ ] (please explain below)

   - Drawing and responding to an environment

6. Have you ever received training in general research ethics?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

7. Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

8. How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline: (please tick one)
   - Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Don't know [ ]

9. Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]
   - Don’t know/can’t remember [ ]

10. How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?
    - Often [ ]
    - Sometimes [ ]
    - Never [ ]
    - Don’t know [ ]

    Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?

    Materials which I use, recycled? Where they came from.

11. How would you best define the term 'creative risk'?
2. How often do you take creative risks in your OWN work?
   - Very often [ ]
   - Quite often [ ]
   - Sometimes [ ]
   - Seldom [ ]
   - Never [ ]

3. How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in your work?
   - Very important [ ]
   - Quite important [ ]
   - Sometimes important [ ]
   - Seldom important [ ]
   - Never important [ ]

4. Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [X]
   - Sometimes [ ]
   - Don't know [ ]
   - Other [ ]
   *Why? - Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can*

   If someone is thinking about taking a creative risk, their ideas should be checked first. What one person might find unethical, someone else might not.

5. Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit your ability to take creative risks in your work?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [X]
   - Sometimes [ ]
   - Don't know [ ]
   - Other [ ]
   *Why? - Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can*

   Could stop further development of an idea.

6. Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?
   *Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can*

   Tutors
   Safety
   Peers

End

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.
Sixteen questions:
Your views on research ethics within Art, Design and Media

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed. This new process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek student views on ethical appraisal. The study also seeks your thoughts on how research ethics might effect or influence your creative work.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com).

Your views on ethics in Art, Design or Media

1. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [x]
   - Don't know [ ]
   - Other [ ]
   Why? - Please explain your answer in detail

   [Student's response: I think by holding creative activities accountable you will end up sensing things and changing so it is not a clear line any way.]

2. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [x]
   - Don't know [ ]
   - Other [ ]
   Why? - Please explain your answer in detail

   [Student's response: No, I think good art is challenging therefore it can be unethical.]

3. Do you think that research ethics is relevant to researchers in Art, Design and Media?
   - Yes [x]
   - No [ ]
   - Don't know [ ]
   - Other [ ]
   Why? - Please explain your answer in detail

   [Student's response: I think the difference between design research. I think ethics can set context for work and therefore it is relevant to researchers.]

4. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your creativity or strengthen your creative work?
   - Restrains creativity [x]
   - Strengthens the work [ ]
   - Neither [ ]
   - Combination of both [ ]
   - Don't know [ ]
   - Other [ ]
   Why? - Please explain your answer in detail

   [Student's response: Ethical approval could easily end up as a way of sensing work.]
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4. **Where would you draw the line?** Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? If possible please give an example and explain why.

5. **Focus of your current research activity**

Mainly practice led [ ]
Mainly theory focused [ ]
Evenly split between practice and theory [ ]
Other [ ] (please explain below)

6. **Have you ever received training in general research ethics?**

Yes [ ]
No [ ]

7. **Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?**

Yes [ ]
No [ ]

8. **How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline?** (please tick one)

- Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Don’t know [ ]

9. **Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?**

Yes [ ]
No [ ]
Don’t know/can’t remember [ ]

10. **How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?**

Often [ ]
Sometimes [ ]
Never [ ]
Don’t know [ ]

*Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?*

11. **How would you best define the term ‘creative risk’?**

*Write your response here.*
2 How often do you take creative risks in your OWN work?
   Very often [ ] Quite often [ ] Sometimes [✓] Seldom [✓] Never [ ]

13 How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in your work?
   Very important [ ] Quite important [✓] Sometimes important [ ] Seldom important [ ] Never important [ ]

14 Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
   Yes [✓] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can
   What is challenging is society, however generally I don't think art should be that accomodating.

15 Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit the ability to take creative risks in your work?
   Yes [✓] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can
   I could be judged on how ethical my work was and could be damned.

16 Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?
   Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can
   Health & safety

End Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire
Your views on research ethics within Art, Design and Media

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed. This new process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek student views on ethical appraisal. The study also seeks your thoughts on how research ethics might effect or influence your creative work.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com).

Your views on ethics in Art, Design or Media

1a. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?  
Yes [ ] No [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]  
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

1b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?  
Yes [ ] No [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]  
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

2 Do you think that research ethics is relevant to researchers in Art, Design and Media?  
Yes [ ] No [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]  
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your creativity or strengthen your creative work?  
Restrains creativity [ ] Strengthens the work [ ] Neither [ ] Combination of both [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]  
Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

In my opinion, art necessarily isn't created to be insulting or unethical.

I think it depends on what context the art is created in.

...
4. **Where would you draw the line?** Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? If possible please give an example and explain why.

5. **Focus of your current research activity**
   - Mainly practice led [ ]
   - Mainly theory focused [ ]
   - Evenly split between practice and theory [ ]
   - Other [ ] (please explain below)

6. **Have you ever received training in general research ethics?**
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

7. **Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?**
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

8. **How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline?** (please tick one)
   - Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Don’t know [ ]

9. **Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?**
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]
   - Don’t know/can’t remember [ ]

10. **How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?**
    - Often [ ]
    - Sometimes [ ]
    - Never [ ]
    - Don’t know [ ]

    *Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?*

11. **How would you best define the term ‘creative risk’?**
    
    *where there could be negative opinions and reactions to the outcome of your work.*
2. How often do you take creative risks in your OWN work?
   Very often [ ]  Quite often [ ]  Sometimes [ ]  Seldom [ ]  Never [ ]

13. How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in your work?
   Very important [ ]  Quite important [ ]  Sometimes important [ ]  Seldom important [ ]  Never important [ ]

14. Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Sometimes [ ]  Don't know [ ]  Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can
   "Creative risk" is exactly the idea, that in order to determine whether it is successful or not, you have to sometimes do that.

15. Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit your ability to take creative risks in your work?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Sometimes [ ]  Don't know [ ]  Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

16. Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?
   Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can
   - Health and safety
   - Whether your work/project will be offensive

End

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.
Sixteen questions:  
Your views on research ethics within Art, Design and Media

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed. This new process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek student views on ethical appraisal. The study also seeks your thoughts on how research ethics might effect or influence your creative work.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com).

Your views on ethics in Art, Design or Media

1a. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know [x] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

1b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?
   Yes [ ] No [x] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

   Art is only good to the person viewing it - so it's whether they feel it's bad/good especially contemporary art.

2 Do you think that research ethics is relevant to researchers in Art, Design and Media?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know [x] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your creativity or strengthen your creative work?
   Restrains creativity [ ] Strengthens the work [ ] Neither [ ] Combination of both [x] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

   May be restricted from achieving exactly what you want or you may be influenced which further strengthens your work.
1. Where would you draw the line? Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? If possible please give an example and explain why.

- Racism - can offend many people as you don't know how strongly peoples views are on it.
- Religion - same as above!

5. Focus of your current research activity
Mainly practice led [√] Mainly theory focused [ ] Evenly split between practice and theory [ ] Other [ ] (please explain below)

6. Have you ever received training in general research ethics?
Yes [ ] No [ ]

7. Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?
Yes [ ] No [ ]

8. How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline? (please tick one)

Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]

Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]

Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]

Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [√]

No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]

Don’t know [ ]

9. Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?
Yes [ ] No [√] Don’t know/can’t remember [ ]

10. How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?

Often [ ] Sometimes [ ] Never [√] Don’t know [ ]

Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?

11. How would you best define the term 'creative risk'?

Taking risks /precautions, experimenting.
How often do you take creative risks in your OWN work?
Very often [ ] Quite often [X] Sometimes [ ] Seldom[ ] Never [ ]

13 How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in your work?
Very important [ ] Quite important [X] Sometimes important [ ] Seldom important [ ] Never important [ ]

14 Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
Yes [X]  No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]

Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

You have to take risks to find your next step – to better your work.

15 Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit your ability to take creative risks in your work?
Yes [X]  No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]

Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

You can't fully explore or develop work into that area.

16 Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?

Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

- Rules + regulations.
- Views of your peers.

End

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.
Sixteen questions:
Your views on research ethics within Art, Design and Media

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed. This new process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek student views on ethical appraisal. The study also seeks your thoughts on how research ethics might effect or influence your creative work.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com).

Your views on ethics in Art, Design or Media

1a. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?

Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Don’t know [ ]  Other []

Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

In the majority yes, however each individual activity would need to be assessed. Creativity shouldn’t be sacrificed but I don’t think anything harmful should take place unless that person is (concenting for animal).

1b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?

Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Don’t know [ ]  Other [ ]

Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

Sometimes the fact its unethical may communicate its meaning in a more effective manner, I feel this way with all art forms but also maintain emphasis on my previous answer.

2. Do you think that research ethics is relevant to researchers in Art, Design and Media?

Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Don’t know [ ]  Other [ ]

Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

From what we have been told today, that it hasn’t really been looked at in the past 10 years? Hopefully this will make our generation of artists and designers more aware and empathetic to our current society.

3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your creativity or strengthen your creative work?

Restrains creativity [ ]  Strengthens the work [ ]  Neither [ ]  Combination of both [ ]  Don’t know [ ]  Other [ ]

Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

I would like to think of it as a challenge if I believe in a piece enough I will fight for it but it can also act as a guide. As artists we should be constantly questioning ourselves.
5. Focus of your current research activity
Mainly practice led []  Mainly theory focused []  Evenly split between practice and theory [x]  Other [ ] (please explain below)

6. Have you ever received training in general research ethics?
Yes [ ]  No [ ]

7. Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?
Yes [ ]  No [ ]

8. How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline: (please tick one)

- Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
- Don't know [ ]

9. Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?
Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Don't know/can't remember [ ]

10. How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?
Often [ ]  Sometimes [ ]  Never [ ]  Don't know [ ]

Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?

[I reinvented the confessional space and made people's confessions public but with permission, this could of offended but it was taken well.]

11. How would you best define the term 'creative risk'?

Something which challenges the predetermined norm within the creative world.

[The harm of anything or any person or animal without consent, I can think of "unethical" exhibitions but they are only deemed unethical due to our social norms, at the end of the day I think it will always be down to the individual. I don't think anything should be forbidden rather people should consider their actions thoroughly.]
How often do you take creative risks in your OWN work?

- Very often [ ]
- Quite often [ ]
- Sometimes [ ]
- Seldom [ ]
- Never [ ]

13 How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in your work?

- Very important [ ]
- Quite important [ ]
- Sometimes important [ ]
- Seldom important [ ]
- Never important [ ]

14 Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?

- Yes [ ]
- No [ ]
- Sometimes [ ]
- Don’t know [ ]
- Other [ ]

Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

Sometimes these boundaries need to be broken in order to gain a new perspective which could enrich the work.

15 Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit your ability to take creative risks in your work?

- Yes [ ]
- No [ ]
- Sometimes [ ]
- Don’t know [ ]
- Other [ ]

Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

Rather it would act as a guide line a way of keeping your self in check but you could still ignore it.

16 Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?

Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

People may be afraid to try something new however in the past when faced with difficulties people still formed an underground movement and created avant-garde work.

End

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire
Sixteen questions:
Your views on research ethics within Art, Design and Media

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed. This new process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek student views on ethical appraisal. The study also seeks your thoughts on how research ethics might effect or influence your creative work.

Your answers will be treated with **strict confidentiality**. In any research reports all responses will be treated as **anonymous**. If you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com).

**Your views on ethics in Art, Design or Media**

1a. Do you think **ALL** creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?

Yes [✓]  No [ ]  Don't know [ ]  Other [ ]

Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

Everyone who looks at the art produced, shouldn’t have shouldn’t have to be ashamed in anyway.

1b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?

Yes [✓]  No [ ]  Don’t know [ ]  Other [ ]

Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

In order for your work to be liked and to get good reviews...

2. Do you think that research ethics is relevant to researchers in Art, Design and Media?

Yes [✓]  No [ ]  Don’t know [ ]  Other [ ]

Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

In order to find out what could worry yourself viewers, so you know what to do.

3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your creativity or strengthen your creative work?

Restrains creativity [ ]  Strengthens the work [✓]  Neither [ ]  Combination of both [ ]  Don’t know [ ]  Other [ ]

Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

It could be very time consuming but in the end will do your project good.
4. **Where would you draw the line?** Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? If possible please give an example and explain why.

5. **Focus of your current research activity**
   - Mainly practice led [ ]
   - Mainly theory focused [ ]
   - Evenly split between practice and theory [ ]
   - Other [ ] (please explain below)

6. Have you ever received training in general research ethics?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

7. Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]

8. **How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline:** (please tick one)
   - Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Don't know [ ]

9. Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]
   - Don’t know/can’t remember [ ]

10. How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?
    - Often [ ]
    - Sometimes [ ]
    - Never [ ]
    - Don’t know [ ]

   Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?

11. How would you best define the term 'creative risk'?
    - Creating something, unsure what the outcome will be.
    - Without knowing if it will offend anyone.
1. How often do you take creative risks in your OWN work?
   Very often [ ]  Quite often [ ]  Sometimes [ ]  Seldom [ ]  Never [ ]

13 How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in your work?
   Very important [ ]  Quite important [ ]  Sometimes important [ ]  Seldom important [ ]  Never important [ ]

14 Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Sometimes [ ]  Don't know [ ]  Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

15 Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit your ability to take creative risks in your work?
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]  Sometimes [ ]  Don't know [ ]  Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

16 Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?
   Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

   The amount of diverse people'/opinions here at the University.

End  Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire
Sixteen questions:
Your views on research ethics within Art, Design and Media

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed. This new process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek student views on ethical appraisal. The study also seeks your thoughts on how research ethics might effect or influence your creative work.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com).

Your views on ethics in Art, Design or Media

1a. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

1b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

2. Do you think that research ethics is relevant to researchers in Art, Design and Media?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your creativity or strengthen your creative work?
   Restrains creativity [ ] Strengthens the work [ ] Neither [ ] Combination of both [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

As I said above I think how ethical a piece is makes it more powerful to be used.
1. Where would you draw the line? Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative endeavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? If possible please give an example and explain why.

   Random
   Sexism
   Religion

2. Focus of your current research activity
   Mainly practice led [ ]
   Mainly theory focused [ ]
   Evenly split between practice and theory [ ]
   Other [ ] (please explain below)

3. Have you ever received training in general research ethics?
   Yes [ ]
   No [ ]

4. Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?
   Yes [ ]
   No [ ]

5. How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline: (please tick one)
   Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   Don't know [ ]

6. Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?
   Yes [ ]
   No [ ]
   Don't know/can't remember [ ]

7. How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?
   Often [ ]
   Sometimes [ ]
   Never [ ]
   Don't know [ ]

8. Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?

9. How would you best define the term 'creative risk'?
1. How often do you take creative risks in your OWN work?
   - Very often [ ]
   - Quite often [ ]
   - Sometimes [ ]
   - Seldom [ ]
   - Never [ ]

2. How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in your work?
   - Very important [ ]
   - Quite important [ ]
   - Sometimes important [ ]
   - Seldom important [ ]
   - Never important [ ]

3. Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]
   - Sometimes [ ]
   - Don't know [ ]
   - Other [ ]

   Why? — Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can.

   I think it's important to break those boundaries in order to bring new ideas, concepts.

4. Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit your ability to take creative risks in your work?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [ ]
   - Sometimes [ ]
   - Don't know [ ]
   - Other [ ]

   Why? — Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can.

   I don't think there are any really
   students have the freedom usually to research/decide whatever
   they want unless being set a
task.

5. Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?

   Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can.

   I don't think there are any really
   students have the freedom usually to research/decide whatever
   they want unless being set a
task.

End

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.
Sixteen questions:
Your views on research ethics within Art, Design and Media

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MiRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed. This new process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek student views on ethical appraisal. The study also seeks your thoughts on how research ethics might effect or influence your creative work.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com).

Your views on ethics in Art, Design or Media

1a. Do you think ALL creative activity should be ethically justifiable or accountable?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

1b. In your opinion does good contemporary art have to be ethically good?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

2. Do you think that research ethics is relevant to researchers in Art, Design and Media?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

3. Do you think that the process of ethical approval could restrain your creativity or strengthen your creative work?
   Restrains creativity [ ] Strengthens the work [ ] Neither [ ] Combination of both [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail
4. Where would you draw the line? Within the university setting, can you think of any examples of artistic or creative
deavour so ethically problematic or unacceptable that it should be forbidden? If possible please give an example and explain why.

5. Focus of your current research activity
Mainly practice led [ ] Mainly theory focused [ ] Evenly split between practice and theory [ ] Other [ ] (please explain below)

6. Have you ever received training in general research ethics?
Yes [ ] No [ ]

7. Have you ever received training specifically relating to research ethics in Art, Design or Media?
Yes [ ] No [ ]

8. How would you describe your understanding of research ethics in relation to your discipline: (please tick one)
   - Excellent understanding of how research ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Good understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Some basic understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Very little understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - No understanding of how ethics might relate to my discipline [ ]
   - Don’t know [ ]

9. Before this activity have you ever examined in detail a University code of ethics, University ethics website or an ethical checklist?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Don’t know/can’t remember [ ]

10. How often in the past have you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?
    Often [ ] Sometimes [ ] Never [ ] Don’t know [ ]

    Can you give examples of where you felt concerned or worried by ethical aspects of your work?

11. How would you best define the term ‘creative risk’?
    Risk taking, new ideas
12 How often do you take creative risks in your OWN work?
   Very often [ ] Quite often [ ] Sometimes [ ] Seldom [ ] Never [ ]

13 How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in your work?
   Very important [ ] Quite important [ ] Sometimes important [ ] Seldom important [ ] Never important [ ]

14 Is it ever justifiable for a creative person to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? - Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can
   Depends what they need to do in order to get their point across.

15 Do you think the process of ethical appraisal could inhibit the ability to take creative risks in your work?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? - Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

16 Within a university what major factors (if any), restrict the ability for the avant-garde to flourish?
   Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

End Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire
Appendix 8: Convergence questionnaire
Q1. What is the focus of your current research activity

- Mainly practice
- Mainly theory focused
- Evenly split between practice and theory
- Other

Q2. Reflecting on your experience of the assessment criteria in arts education, do you think written theoretical work and practice/craft are held in similar esteem?

- Written work and theory have been more highly valued.
- Craft and practice have been more highly valued.
- Both have been equally valued.
- Unsure/other.

Why? Please explain your answer in detail

Q3. In your opinion does contemporary art need to be ethically justifiable?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
- Other

Why? Please explain your answer in detail

Q4. How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in your work?

- Very important
- Quite important
- Sometimes important
- Seldom important
- Never important
- Unsure

Q5. Do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative or not?

- Yes
- No

Why? Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

Q6. Can you explain what the term 'creative risk' means to you?

Q7. Do you think some people are more likely to take ‘creative risks’ than others?
Q8. What qualities do these people have that enable them to be more likely to take 'creative risks'?

Q9. Do you think the relationship people have to 'creative risk' is fixed or can be developed? (Tick one)

- It is fixed – people are born that way. ☐
- It can be developed or nurtured in an unlimited way ☐
- It can be developed or nurtured but only up to a person's predetermined or natural capacity for 'creative risk'. ☑

Q10. From your experience of education what techniques or circumstances enable students/researchers to be more likely to take 'creative risks'?

Q11. Do you think that a work that demonstrates greater creative risk is more likely to be appraised highly?

Q12. Is it ever justifiable to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?

Yes [✓] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]

Why? Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can.

Q13. Would you ever work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?

Yes [ ] No [✓] Sometimes [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]

Q14. Do you understand by what measure your supervisors or tutors judge or assess creativity in your work?

Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can.

Yes - (explain your answer in as much detail as you can)

Q15. Indicate (tick boxes) if you have ever asked a tutor, supervisor, or lecturer to explain what they mean by?

- Creativity ☐
- Creative risk ☐

Q16. If you could change one aspect of arts education what would it be?

End Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire
Convergence questionnaire 2015: Ethics and creative risk within the visual arts.

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a revised protocol for ethical appraisal was developed. This alternative process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues raised by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek postgraduate views on ethical appraisal and risk.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about research on ethics at MIRIAD or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com)

Q1. What is the focus of your current research activity

Mainly practice led ☐ Mainly theory focused ☑ Evenly split between practice and theory ☐ Other ☐

Q2. Reflecting on your experience of the assessment criteria in arts education; do you think written theoretical work and practice/craft are held in similar esteem?

Written work and theory have been more highly valued. ☑ Craft and practice have been highly valued. ☐
Both have been equally valued. ☐ Unsure/other. ☐

Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

We have a greater respect for the written word in the UK than for other forms of expression. The cultural difference.

Q3. In your opinion does contemporary art need to be ethically justifiable?

Yes ☐ No ☐ Don’t know ☐ Other ☐

Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

Only if the ethical framework employed is suitable for the conditions and contexts in which it will be applied (in usual contemporary art).

Q4. How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in your work?

Very important ☑ Quite important ☐ Sometimes important ☐ Seldom important ☐ Never important ☐ Unsure ☐

Q5. Do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative or not?

Yes ☑ No ☐

Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

The more you risk, the more you (can) fail, and in turn the more likely you are for success.

Q6. Can you explain what the term ‘creative risk’ means to you?

Extending/uncovering perceived or actual boundaries or constraints.

Q7. Do you think some people are more likely to take ‘creative risks’ than others?
Q8. What qualities do these people have that enable them to be more likely to take ‘creative risks’

Q9. Do you think the relationship people have to ‘creative risk’ is fixed or can be developed? (Tick one)
- It is fixed – people are born that way.
- It can be developed or nurtured in an unlimited way
- It can be developed or nurtured but only up to a persons predetermined or natural capacity for ‘creative risk’

Q10. From your experience of education what techniques or circumstances enable students/researchers to be more likely to take ‘creative risks’
- Sometimes I am about to examine myself so I would cut me likely circumstances to include opportunity, encouragement, external conditions.

Q11. Do you think that a work that demonstrates greater creative risk is more likely to be appraised highly?
- depends on whether the creative risk ‘shines through’ or immediately assumable or provokes in-depth examination of some kind.

Q12. Is it ever justifiable to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
- Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

Q13. Would you ever to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?
- Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]

Q14. Do you understand by what measure your supervisors or tutors judge or assess creativity in your work?
- Stronger, longer, higher, underpinning theory or rationale

Q15. Indicate (tick boxes) if you have ever asked a tutor, supervisor or lecturer to explain what they mean by?
- Creativity [ ]
- Creative risk [ ]

Q16. If you could change one aspect of arts education what would it be?
- Improving mid (on or off) because it unit access & cost contribution to be genuinely inequality in society as a whole

End Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire
Convergence questionnaire 2015: Ethics and creative risk within the visual arts.

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a revised protocol for ethical appraisal was developed. This alternative process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues raised by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek postgraduate views on ethical appraisal and risk.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about research on ethics at MIRIAD or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com)

Q1. What is the focus of your current research activity
   Mainly practice led [✓] Mainly theory focused [ ] Evenly split between practice and theory [ ] Other [ ]

Q2. Reflecting on your experience of the assessment criteria in arts education; do you think written theoretical work and practice/craft are held in similar esteem?
   Written work and theory have been more highly valued. [✓] Craft and practice have been highly valued. [ ]
   Both have been equally valued. [ ] Unsure/other. [ ]
   Why? Please explain your answer in detail
   [I think theory within any education system is still viewed as superior due to its historical beginning. Apprenticeships are usually viewed as the best way to teach practice.]

Q3. In your opinion does contemporary art need to be ethically justifiable?
   Yes [✓] No [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]
   Why? Please explain your answer in detail
   [Contemporary art should reflect society which must be ethical at all.]

Q4. How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in your work?
   Very important [✓] Quite important [ ] Sometimes important [ ] Seldom important [ ] Never important [ ] Unsure [ ]

Q5. Do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative or not?
   Yes [✓] No [ ]
   Why? Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can
   [Basic talking is fundamental to creativity.]

Q6. Can you explain what the term ‘creative risk’ means to you?
   [Making work which is outside of my general understanding or my knowledge makes me feel/be vulnerable.]

Q7. Do you think some people are more likely to take ‘creative risks’ than others?
   [ ]
Q8. What qualities do these people have that enable them to be more likely to take ‘creative risks’

confidence, money, backing, knowledge, experience, sometimes less emphasis on consequence.

Q9. Do you think the relationship people have to ‘creative risk’ is fixed or can be developed? (Tick one)

- It is fixed – people are born that way.
- It can be developed or nurtured in an unlimited way
- It can be developed or nurtured but only up to a person’s predetermined or natural capacity for ‘creative risk’.

Q10. From your experience of education what techniques or circumstances enable students/researchers to be more likely to take ‘creative risks’

less emphasis on grades, supportive staff, good peer dynamics, good risk assessment in place.

Q11. Do you think that a work that demonstrates greater creative risk is more likely to be appraised highly?

No, I think often work which is more easily accessible gets higher price (in society).

Q12. Is it ever justifiable to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?

Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]

Why? - Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

Q13. Would you ever to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?

Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]

Q14. Do you understand by what measure your supervisors or tutors judge or assess creativity in your work?

Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

Q15. Indicate (tick boxes) if you have ever asked a tutor, supervisor or lecturer to explain what they mean by?

Creativity [ ]

Creative risk [ ]

Q16. If you could change one aspect of arts education what would it be?

End

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.
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Convergence questionnaire 2015: Ethics and creative risk within the visual arts.

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a revised protocol for ethical appraisal was developed. This alternative process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues raised by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek postgraduate views on ethical appraisal and risk.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about research on ethics at MIRIAD or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com)

Q1. What is the focus of your current research activity
   Mainly practice led ☒Mainly theory focused ☐Evenly split between practice and theory ☐Other ☐

Q2. Reflecting on your experience of the assessment criteria in arts education, do you think written theoretical work and practicecraft are held in similar esteem?
   Written work and theory have been more highly valued. ☐Craft and practice have been highly valued. ☐Both have been equally valued. ☒Unsure/other. ☐
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail
   They are different as the arenas are different and require different skills and understanding.

Q3. In your opinion does contemporary art need to be ethically justifiable?
   Yes ☐No ☒Don’t know ☐Other ☐
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail
   Sometimes art needs to be provocative to raise questions.

Q4. How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in your work?
   Very important ☒Quite important ☐Sometimes important ☐Seldom important ☐Never important ☐Unsure ☐

Q5. Do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative or not?
   Yes ☒No ☐
   Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can
   Because you are willing to completely lose a piece of work in the chance that it could become something greater.

Q6. Can you explain what the term ‘creative risk’ means to you?
   Taking a chance through your practice to enable you to push boundaries or progress.

Q7. Do you think some people are more likely to take ‘creative risks’ than others?
Q8. What qualities do these people have that enable them to be more likely to take 'creative risks'?

More adventurous, questioning, engaged.

Q9. Do you think the relationship people have to 'creative risk' is fixed or can be developed? (Tick one)

- It is fixed – people are born that way.
- It can be developed or nurtured in an unlimited way.
- It can be developed or nurtured but only up to a person's predetermined or natural capacity for 'creative risk'.

Q10. From your experience of education what techniques or circumstances enable students/researchers to be more likely to take 'creative risks'?

Case studies - examples of successes and failures. More freedom, less red tape. Damn at project which isn't assessed.

Q11. Do you think that a work that demonstrates greater creative risk is more likely to be appraised highly?

Yes because of the chance/risk taken paying off.

Q12. Is it ever justifiable to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?

Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]

Why? Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can.

It can lead to develop an alternative to override the unethical element.

Q13. Would you ever to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?

Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]

Q14. Do you understand by what measure your supervisors or tutors judge or assess creativity in your work?

No, as far as I'm aware my creativity isn't being assessed.

Q15. Indicate (tick boxes) if you have ever asked a tutor, supervisor or lecturer to explain what they mean by?

Creativity [ ]

Creative risk [ ]

Q16. If you could change one aspect of arts education what would it be?

Red tape.

End

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.
Q2. Reflecting on your experience of the assessment criteria in arts education; do you think written theoretical work and practice/craft are held in similar esteem?

- Written work and theory have been more highly valued.
- Both have been equally valued.
- Craft and practice have been more highly valued.
- Unsure/other.

Why? — Please explain your answer in detail.

I believe this is due to the shift in post-structuralism - the critic/theorist needing to deconstruct the work. The power of the reader.

Q3. In your opinion does contemporary art need to be ethically justifiable?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know
- Other

Why? — Please explain your answer in detail.

Art should create tension or causing a disturbance. However, is it problematic when it comes to exploitation?

Q4. How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in your work?

- Very important
- Quite important
- Sometimes important
- Seldom important
- Never important
- Unsure

Q5. Do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative or not?

- Yes
- No

Why? — Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can.

A shock culture of the art world - avant-garde as being forward, shock culture of the art world - avant-garde as being moving.

Q6. Can you explain what the term ‘creative risk’ means to you?

Learning from mistakes, making art as art, making works that offend or shock people.

Q7. Do you think some people are more likely to take ‘creative risks’ than others?

Yes

Can you explain what the term 'creative risk' means to you?
Q8. What qualities do these people have that enable them to be more likely to take 'creative risks'?

I think there is a difference between a calculated risk & spontaneous risk taking - one is concerned & judged the other with less known results different people's approach to risk.

Q9. Do you think the relationship people have to 'creative risk' is fixed or can be developed? (Tick one)

- It is fixed - people are born that way.
- It can be developed or nurtured in an unlimited way.
- It can be developed or nurtured but only up to a person's predetermined or natural capacity for 'creative risk'.

Q10. From your experience of education what techniques or circumstances enable students/researchers to be more likely to take 'creative risks'?

Again, idea of 'not to be afraid to make mistakes' - calculated risks often given across in education: relaxing structured teaching methods & outcomes would benefit.

Q11. Do you think that a work that demonstrates greater creative risk is more likely to be appraised highly?

In the art world yes, although socially engaged practices present a challenge.

Q12. Is it ever justifiable to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?

Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]

Why? - Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can.

Moral codes are subjective so what one sees as unethical others don't, therefore one could be hurting at the creativity to make more ethically.

Q13. Would you ever to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?

Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]

Q14. Do you understand by what measure your supervisors or tutors judge or assess creativity in your work?

Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can.

Not really, I think this is also likely to be subjective to the supervisor.

Q15. Indicate (tick boxes) if you have ever asked a tutor, supervisor or lecturer to explain what they mean by?

- Creativity [ ]
- Creative risk [ ]

Q16. If you could change one aspect of arts education what would it be?

Get rid of fixed outcomes, instructional methods of teaching & teaching through technique.

End Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.
Convergence questionnaire 2015: Ethics and creative risk within the visual arts.

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a revised protocol for ethical appraisal was developed. This alternative process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues raised by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek postgraduate views on ethical appraisal and risk.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about research on ethics at MIRIAD or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com)

Q1. What is the focus of your current research activity
   - Mainly practice led
   - Mainly theory focused
   - Evenly split between practice and theory
   - Other

Q2. Reflecting on your experience of the assessment criteria in arts education; do you think written theoretical work and practice/craft are held in similar esteem?
   - Written work and theory have been more highly valued
   - Craft and practice have been highly valued
   - Both have been equally valued
   - Unsure/other

   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail
   Theoretical frameworks should encompass practice – the both inform one another.

Q3. In your opinion does contemporary art need to be ethically justifiable?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don’t know
   - Other

   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail
   Artwork needs to be justified ethically if the content may offend/harm others.

Q4. How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in your work?
   - Very important
   - Quite important
   - Sometimes important
   - Seldom important
   - Never important
   - Unsure

Q5. Do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative or not?
   - Yes
   - No

   Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can
   If the risks aren’t calculated then the consequences/outcomes of these artworks could offend/harm others.
   You can be creative in a number of ways – don’t always have to take massive risks.

Q6. Can you explain what the term ‘creative risk’ means to you?
   Pushing the boundaries of your practice

Q7. Do you think some people are more likely to take ‘creative risks’ than others?
Q8. What qualities do these people have that enable them to be more likely to take 'creative risks'?

Q9. Do you think the relationship people have to 'creative risk' is fixed or can be developed? (Tick one)

- It is fixed – people are born that way.
- It can be developed or nurtured in an unlimited way.
- It can be developed or nurtured but only up to a persons predetermined or natural capacity for 'creative risk'.

Q10. From your experience of education what techniques or circumstances enable students/researchers to be more likely to take 'creative risks'?

New technologies available to practitioners – they can take risks with experimentation and produce works not practical or feasible to produce before using the technology.

Q11. Do you think that a work that demonstrates greater creative risk is more likely to be appraised highly?

No - creative risk is only one component in critically analysing work.

Q12. Is it ever justifiable to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?

Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]

Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

You should have a developed code of conduct within your practice.

Q13. Would you ever to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?

Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]

Q14. Do you understand by what measure your supervisors or tutors judge or assess creativity in your work?

Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

- challenge of processes involved in the work
- if the work fills a gap in knowledge in the field

Q15. Indicate (tick boxes) if you have ever asked a tutor, supervisor or lecturer to explain what they mean by?

Creativity [ ]

Creative risk [ ]

Q16. If you could change one aspect of arts education what would it be?

more art history earlier in programme of study...

End

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.
Convergence questionnaire 2015: Ethics and creative risk within the visual arts.

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a revised protocol for ethical appraisal was developed. This alternative process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues raised by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek postgraduate views on ethical appraisal and risk.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about research on ethics at MIRIAD or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com)

Q1. What is the focus of your current research activity
   Mainly practice led □ Mainly theory focused □ Evenly split between practice and theory □ Other □

Q2. Reflecting on your experience of the assessment criteria in arts education; do you think written theoretical work and practice/craft are held in similar esteem?
   a) Written work and theory have been more highly valued. □
   b) Craft and practice have been more highly valued. □
   Both have been equally valued. □
   Unsure/other. □
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail
   Because (a) is perceived to be more easily defined, quantified and therefore assessed.

Q3. In your opinion does contemporary art need to be ethically justifiable?
   Yes □ No □ Don’t know □ Other □
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail
   Is there a need to be ethically justifiable?
   If we state that it doesn’t need to be ethically justifiable then can it be expected?

Q4. How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in your work?
   Very important □ Quite important □ Sometimes important □ Seldom important □ Never important □ Unsure □

Q5. Do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative or not?
   Yes □ No □
   Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can
   I think they are taking a position of confrontation.

Q6. Can you explain what the term ‘creative risk’ means to you?
   Risk / chance in making.

Q7. Do you think some people are more likely to take ‘creative risks’ than others?
Q8. What qualities do these people have that enable them to be more likely to take ‘creative risks’

Imagination

Q9. Do you think the relationship people have to ‘creative risk’ is fixed or can be developed? (Tick one)

- It is fixed – people are born that way.
- It can be developed or nurtured in an unlimited way
- It can be developed or nurtured but only up to a person’s predetermined or natural capacity for ‘creative risk’.

Q10. From your experience of education what techniques or circumstances enable students/researchers to be more likely to take ‘creative risks’

Open ended learning experiences

Q11. Do you think that a work that demonstrates greater creative risk is more likely to be appraised highly?

Similar to as in that it may provoke greater extremity of responses

Q12. Is it ever justifiable to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?

Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]

Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

Actually no, why should a person have the justification to break moral codes of gender, race, culture.

Q13. Would you ever work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?

Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]

Q14. Do you understand by what measure your supervisors or tutors judge or assess creativity in your work?

Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

Degree/extent of ‘originality’

Q15. Indicate (tick boxes) if you have ever asked a tutor, supervisor or lecturer to explain what they mean by?

Creativity [ ]

Creative risk [ ]

Q16. If you could change one aspect of arts education what would it be?

End

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire
Q1. What is the focus of your current research activity?
   - Mainly practice led [ ]
   - Mainly theory focused [ ]
   - Evenly split between practice and theory [X]
   - Other [ ]

Q2. Reflecting on your experience of the assessment criteria in arts education, do you think written theoretical work and practice/craft are held in similar esteem?
   - Written work and theory have been more highly valued. [ ]
   - Craft and practice have been more highly valued. [X]
   - Both have been equally valued. [ ]
   - Unsure/other. [ ]

   Why? Please explain your answer in detail.
   - Artists can make great work and yet know nothing of theory.

Q3. In your opinion does contemporary art need to be ethically justifiable?
   - Yes [ ]
   - No [X]
   - Don’t know [ ]
   - Other [ ]

   Why? Please explain your answer in detail.
   - Sometimes it’s there to challenge system, even ethics.

Q4. How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in your work?
   - Very important [X]
   - Quite important [ ]
   - Sometimes important [ ]
   - Seldom important [ ]
   - Never important [ ]
   - Unsure [ ]

Q5. Do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative or not?
   - Yes [X]
   - No [ ]

   Why? Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can.
   - They have more options to push forward.

Q6. Can you explain what the term ‘creative risk’ means to you?
   - Risk at the expense of losing something, credibility perhaps.

Q7. Do you think some people are more likely to take ‘creative risks’ than others?
Q8. What qualities do these people have that enable them to be more likely to take ‘creative risks’

Q9. Do you think the relationship people have to ‘creative risk’ is fixed or can be developed? (Tick one)

- It is fixed – people are born that way.
- It can be developed or nurtured in an unlimited way
- It can be developed or nurtured but only up to a persons predetermined or natural capacity for ‘creative risk’.

Q10. From your experience of education what techniques or circumstances enable students/researchers to be more likely to take ‘creative risks’

Q11. Do you think that a work that demonstrates greater creative risk is more likely to be appraised highly?

Q12. Is it ever justifiable to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?

Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]

Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

Q13. Would you ever to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?

Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]

Q14. Do you understand by what measure your supervisors or tutors judge or assess creativity in your work?

Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

Q15. Indicate (tick boxes) if you have ever asked a tutor, supervisor or lecturer to explain what they mean by?

- Creativity
- Creative risk

Q16. If you could change one aspect of arts education what would it be?

Marking System (grading system)

End

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire
Convergence questionnaire 2015: Ethics and creative risk within the visual arts.

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a revised protocol for ethical appraisal was developed. This alternative process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues raised by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek postgraduate views on ethical appraisal and risk.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about research on ethics at MIRIAD or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com)

Q1. What is the focus of your current research activity
   - Mainly practice led
   - Mainly theory focused
   - Evenly split between practice and theory
   - Other

Q2. Reflecting on your experience of the assessment criteria in arts education; do you think written theoretical work and practice/craft are held in similar esteem?
   - Written work and theory have been more highly valued.
   - Craft and practice have been more highly valued.
   - Both have been equally valued.
   - Unsure/other

Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

So new to the field, I think myself there is equal value to both of art, though there is a question as to when to think.

Q3. In your opinion does contemporary art need to be ethically justifiable?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don't know
   - Other

Why? – Please explain your answer in detail

This doesn't mean it has to be morally acceptable but the ethics have to be considered so that there is an overall benefit (sounds safer than voluntary risk).

Q4. How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in your work?
   - Very important
   - Quite important
   - Sometimes important
   - Seldom important
   - Never important
   - Unsure

Q5. Do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative or not?
   - Yes
   - No

Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

Progress/advances come about gradually or in giant leaps. The giant leaps are associated more with risk taking.

Q6. Can you explain what the term 'creative risk' means to you?

A bit like betting on outsiders. The odds are against you and potential rewards more

Q7. Do you think some people are more likely to take 'creative risks' than others?
   - Yes
Convergence questionnaire 2015: Ethics and creative risk within the visual arts.

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a revised protocol for ethical appraisal was developed. This alternative process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues raised by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek postgraduate views on ethical appraisal and risk.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about research on ethics at MIRIAD or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com)

Q1. What is the focus of your current research activity

- Mainly practice led □
- Mainly theory focused □
- Evenly split between practice and theory □
- Other □

Q2. Reflecting on your experience of the assessment criteria in arts education; do you think written theoretical work and practice/craft are held in similar esteem?

- Written work and theory have been more highly valued. □
- Craft and practice have been highly valued. □
- Both have been equally valued. □
- Unsure/other □

Why? - Please explain your answer in detail

I have experience of learning in both arts (practise) and theory - I don't think either was viewed more highly.

Q3. In your opinion does contemporary art need to be ethically justifiable?

- Yes □
- No □
- Don't know □
- Other □

Why? - Please explain your answer in detail

Art should conform to legal regulations in practice and moral/ethical views of society.

Q4. How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in your work?

- Very important □
- Quite important □
- Sometimes important □
- Seldom important □
- Never important □
- Unsure □

Q5. Do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative or not?

- Yes □
- No □

Why? - Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

They are trying to create work outside the norms of society - the status quo + expand knowledge/practice etc.

Q6. Can you explain what the term ‘creative risk’ means to you?

Producing work outside the norm - accepted status quo of society

Q7. Do you think some people are more likely to take ‘creative risks’ than others?
Q8. What qualities do these people have that enable them to be more likely to take 'creative risks'?

- They are willing to stand out from the crowd - challenge the norm.

Q9. Do you think the relationship people have to 'creative risk' is fixed or can be developed? (Tick one)

- It is fixed - people are born that way.
- It can be developed or nurtured in an unlimited way
- It can be developed or nurtured but only up to a person's predetermined or natural capacity for 'creative risk'.

Q10. From your experience of education what techniques or circumstances enable students/researchers to be more likely to take 'creative risks'?

- Depends on the tutor and the ethos of the institution.

Q11. Do you think that a work that demonstrates greater creative risk is more likely to be appraised highly?

- No.

Q12. Is it ever justifiable to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?

Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]

Why? - Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can.

Although it depends what the moral codes are that are being broken...

Q13. Would you ever to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?

Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don't know [ ] Other [ ]

Q14. Do you understand by what measure your supervisors or tutors judge or assess creativity in your work?

I am not completely sure. I understand that will be assessed against learning objectives and assessment criteria.

Q15. Indicate (tick boxes) if you have ever asked a tutor, supervisor or lecturer to explain what they mean by?

- Creativity [ ]
- Creative risk [ ]

Q16. If you could change one aspect of arts education what would it be?

- It should have less rules and regulations and therefore more about the learning experience.

End

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.
Convergence questionnaire 2015: Ethics and creative risk within the visual arts.

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a revised protocol for ethical appraisal was developed. This alternative process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues raised by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek postgraduate views on ethical appraisal and risk.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about research on ethics at MIRIAD or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com)

Q1. What is the focus of your current research activity
   Mainly practice led ☐ Mainly theory focused ☐ Evenly split between practice and theory ☑ Other ☐

Q2. Reflecting on your experience of the assessment criteria in arts education; do you think written theoretical work and practice/craft are held in similar esteem?
   Written work and theory have been more highly valued. ☐ Craft and practice have been highly valued. ☐
   Both have been equally valued. ☐ Unsure/other. ☐
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail
   Written work and theory are highly valued within academia, and craft and practice are held in similar esteem.

Q3. In your opinion does contemporary art need to be ethically justifiable?
   Yes ☑ No ☐ Don’t know ☐ Other ☐
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail
   Yes, as long as it doesn’t involve censorship.

Q4. How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in your work?
   Very important ☑ Quite important ☐ Sometimes important ☐ Seldom important ☐ Never important ☐ Unsure ☐

Q5. Do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative or not?
   Yes ☑ No ☐
   Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can
   I don’t think that this should be the case, but it is, and it is the way we explain creativity after the 70s.

Q6. Can you explain what the term ‘creative risk’ means to you?
   I would say that it is related to new paths and employing new methods or new combinations of methods in your practice.

Q7. Do you think some people are more likely to take ‘creative risks’ than others?
   YES
Q8. What qualities do these people have that enable them to be more likely to take 'creative risks'?


Q9. Do you think the relationship people have to ‘creative risk’ is **fixed or can be developed**? (Tick one)

• It is fixed – people are born that way.  
• It can be developed or nurtured in an unlimited way.  
• It can be developed or nurtured but only up to a person’s predetermined or natural capacity for ‘creative risk’.  

Q10. From your experience of education **what techniques or circumstances** enable students/researchers to be more likely to take ‘creative risks’?

- Working in a more experimental, nomadic way
- Encourage open space / democratic techniques
- Show examples of similar practices / Create aesthetics within institution

Q11. Do you think that a work that demonstrates greater creative risk is more likely to be appraised highly?

YES but not necessarily

Q12. Is it ever justifiable to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?

Yes [✓] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]

Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

I think that the word ethics and moral is problematic and means different things for different people.

Q13. Would you ever to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?

Yes [✓] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]

Q14. Do you understand by what measure your supervisors or tutors judge or assess creativity in your work?

Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

Every person’s judgement derives either from their ethical position or the institution that they work in...

Q15. Indicate (tick boxes) if you have ever asked a tutor, supervisor or lecturer to explain what they mean by?

Creativity [ ] No  
Creative risk [ ] No

Q16. If you could change one aspect of arts education what would it be?

Talk about ethics more philosophically

Analyse different aspects.

End  Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire
Convergence questionnaire 2015: Ethics and creative risk within the visual arts.

Information on the Ethics Research Project at MIRIAD.

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a revised protocol for ethical appraisal was developed. This alternative process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues raised by using a new ethical appraisal exercise.

It is now important to seek postgraduate views on ethical appraisal and risk.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about research on ethics at MIRIAD or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com)

Q1. What is the focus of your current research activity
   Mainly practice led ☐ Mainly theory focused ☐ Evenly split between practice and theory ☐ Other ☐

Q2. Reflecting on your experience of the assessment criteria in arts education; do you think written theoretical work and practice/craft are held in similar esteem?
   Written work and theory have been more highly valued. ☐ Craft and practice have been more highly valued. ☐ Both have been equally valued. ☐ Unsure/other. ☐
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail
   I have found it still a lingering fear that written work and theory is seen as more valuable.
   But that I'm thinking, but not very quickly.

Q3. In your opinion does contemporary art need to be ethically justifiable?
   Yes ☐ No ☐ Don’t know ☐ Other ☐
   Why? – Please explain your answer in detail
   For me it would depend on the art and it’s purpose, maybe it is meant to be a
   challenge to illicit something.

Q4. How important is it for YOU to take creative risks in your work?
   Very important ☐ Quite important ☐ Sometimes important ☐ Seldom important ☐ Never important ☐ Unsure ☐

Q5. Do you think people who take more risks in developing or producing their work are in general viewed as more creative or not?
   Yes ☐ No ☐
   Why? – Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can
   I think that “a general view that more risk equals to more creativity but I do not
   agree that every necessarily are more creative.

Q6. Can you explain what the term ‘creative risk’ means to you?
   To me ‘creative risk’ means that it pushes ethical boundaries or completely
   change them.

Q7. Do you think some people are more likely to take ‘creative risks’ than others?
Q8. What qualities do these people have that enable them to be more likely to take 'creative risks'?

Nonconformist, challenging

Q9. Do you think the relationship people have to 'creative risk' is fixed or can be developed? (Tick one)

- It is fixed – people are born that way.
- It can be developed or nurtured in an unlimited way
- It can be developed or nurtured but only up to a person's predetermined or natural capacity for 'creative risk'.

Q10. From your experience of education what techniques or circumstances enable students/researchers to be more likely to take 'creative risks'?

The most likely circumstance would be a teacher/lecturer who would encourage 'creative risks'.

Q11. Do you think that a work that demonstrates greater creative risk is more likely to be appraised highly?

Not necessarily.

Q12. Is it ever justifiable to work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?

Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]

Why? - Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

Personally I would not break any moral code, but I can see that there may be value in working unethically depending on circumstance.

Q13. Would you ever work unethically or break moral codes when taking a creative risk?

Yes [ ] No [ ] Sometimes [ ] Don’t know [ ] Other [ ]

Q14. Do you understand by what measure your supervisors or tutors judge or assess creativity in your work?

Please explain your answer in as much detail as you can

My supervisors assess creativity in my works through my writing and interpretation making works in new theory-based.

Q15. Indicate (tick boxes) if you have ever asked a tutor, supervisor or lecturer to explain what they mean by?

Creativity [ ]
Creative risk [ ]

Q16. If you could change one aspect of arts education what would it be?

More integration between theory and practice.

End Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire
Appendix 9: The visual representation of data
John Spencer

Ethics and the Academy

The Grosvenor Gallery 9th – 20th May 2016

An exhibition of work connected to the development of a new discipline-specific model for ethical appraisal, within which a student might meaningfully engage with ethical issues inherent in their visual research.
Designing a system of ethical appraisal for visual arts research, within higher education

J Spencer (2016)

Model with reference: Maletzke (1963) and Nowak and Wärneryd (1985)
The incidence of ethical issues within visual arts research. Spencer (2016)
“Doing something outside of the box”
“Designing something that could repel the viewer or cause upset or could harm the creator whilst designing it”
“Creating something in which you do not know how it will be publically received or how it will finish entirely”.
“Pushing self (sic) out of comfort zone or doing something against the norm”
“Risk/chance in making”
“Doing something outside of the box”
“Working in a manner, which could fail”
“Challenging to own skills and capabilities, challenging society and asking difficult questions”.
“Pushing the boat/boundaries to see how far you can take your work.”
“Being unsure of the outcome, pushing yourself to try something new even if you don’t know if it will pay off”

How would you best define the term ‘creative risk’?

“Taking chances”
“Without creative risk you are not being creative, I think of it in practical and theoretical sense (sic)”
“Taking a chance through your practice to enable you to push boundaries or progress”
“Work that might challenge or even offend the viewer”
“The process of investigating factors in a project such that the goals of the project are met without disabling the project”
“Risk taking to create art work, not enough risk to harm or damage people, equipment …”
“Stepping out of the comfort zone, engaging in work that is new territory to the artist”
“We are often asking students to take risks when developing work and probably don’t fully explain what we mean by risk and I expect that each individual tutor might think about risk differently…”
“Creating something that is likely to be misunderstood”
“Producing work outside the norm – accepted status quo of society (the ‘system’)”
“Experimentation needed for originality to flourish”
“Creative risk means that it pushes ethical boundaries or completely crosses them”
“New approaches or interpretations of the defined area of practice”
“A bit like betting on outsiders. The odds are against you but potential rewards are greater”
“Risk at the expense of losing something, credibility perhaps”
“Pushing the boundaries of your practice”
“Working outside the box”

“Open to ideas”
“Taking risks /precautions, experimenting”
“Doing something where you are not sure what the outcome will be”.
“Creating something in which you do not know how it will be publically received or how it will finish entirely”.
“Designing something that could repel the viewer or cause upset or could harm the creator whilst designing it”
“Pushing self (sic) out of comfort zone or doing something against the norm”
“Risk/chance in making”
“Doing something outside of the box”
“Working in a manner, which could fail”
“Challenging to own skills and capabilities, challenging society and asking difficult questions”.
“Pushing the boat/boundaries to see how far you can take your work.”
“Being unsure of the outcome, pushing yourself to try something new even if you don’t know if it will pay off”

How would you best define the term ‘creative risk’?

“Taking chances”
“Without creative risk you are not being creative, I think of it in practical and theoretical sense (sic)”
“Taking a chance through your practice to enable you to push boundaries or progress”
“Work that might challenge or even offend the viewer”
“The process of investigating factors in a project such that the goals of the project are met without disabling the project”
“Risk taking to create art work, not enough risk to harm or damage people, equipment …”
“Stepping out of the comfort zone, engaging in work that is new territory to the artist”
“We are often asking students to take risks when developing work and probably don’t fully explain what we mean by risk and I expect that each individual tutor might think about risk differently…”
“Creating something that is likely to be misunderstood”
“Producing work outside the norm – accepted status quo of society (the ‘system’)”
“Experimentation needed for originality to flourish”
“Creative risk means that it pushes ethical boundaries or completely crosses them”
“New approaches or interpretations of the defined area of practice”
“A bit like betting on outsiders. The odds are against you but potential rewards are greater”
“Risk at the expense of losing something, credibility perhaps”
“Pushing the boundaries of your practice”
“Working outside the box”
Quantifying Ethical Issues in Visual Arts Research
Spencer (2016)
Appendix 10: Buckingham
Appendix

Buckingham and Media education

Whilst this study embraces the broad spectrum of disciplines, in the introduction it acknowledges that specific examples would be drawn from media practice where they have a wider cross-disciplinary purpose. The inclusion here of reflection on the media manifesto initiative is pertinent because several of its contributors work in an interdisciplinary fashion. Furthermore the contributors provide fresh insight into cross-discipline topics such as creativity and the theory/practice balance.

Firstly though, any reflection on media education cannot be complete without reference to the field’s dominant voices. Again several of the arguments presented are apposite in a wider pedagogical sphere.

The thoughtful and considered text *Teaching the Media*, (Masterman, 1990) was highly acclaimed when it was first published and often cited. Its discourse now however feels routed in the early eighties. For example in the book’s last paragraph so redolent of cold war rhetoric, Masterman looks forward and contemplates ‘a future in which all who are concerned to realise the full social and democratic potentialities of the media must cooperate to ensure, people everywhere are liberated rather than enslaved by the new information order’.

For a number of reasons it might be easy to portray Masterman’s book as the backstop, against which a subsequent generation of media educational practitioners have kicked. In the area of media production for example, Masterman clearly asserts his prejudice for ‘primacy of cultural criticism’, stating ‘practical work is not an end in itself, but a necessary means to developing an autonomous critical understanding of the media’. Comments that continue to reemerge in the media teaching debate. Masterman’s discourse leans towards a diminution of the importance of the production artifact by suggesting ‘much less ambitious workshop activities’.

It is perhaps therefore within the media field, in relation to practice that the legacy of Masterman is most acute. In expressing concerns in regarding student imitation of professional products and what Masterman calls the ‘technicist trap’ the author’s argument is perhaps constrained by its ambition. Masterman overlooks the possibility that rather than soullessly replicating professional products the real challenge might be to critically contest accepted media norms via the development of craft skills and be exemplified in the artifact itself.

More recently it is perhaps David Buckingham who has occupied the centre stage of media educational research in the UK. It should be noted that though that like Masterman before, the thrust of his work focuses largely on media education within a school context rather than in its higher education setting. It can be argued however that many of the topics covered have pedagogical resonance within further and higher education.

Buckingham, et al. (1995) postulate that ‘the establishment of media studies as a legitimate academic subject in schools has involved a troubled, almost schizophrenic stance towards practical production’. Practical production work they argue has both come to define the creative or vocational nature of the subject accordingly attracting students across the ability range keen to work with cameras and computers. However the authors suggest within the traditional academic hierarchy ‘this has effectively marked it out as a low status subject for low status kids’.

Helpfully the text describes a demarcation between different forms of practical production ranging from practical work: as self-expression, as a method of learning, as a vocational training and as a deconstruction where codes and conventions are examined. The authors acknowledge that in practice these kinds of approaches often coincide.

Buckingham, et al. (1995) express difficulty with the notion of creativity citing its ‘Romantic baggage’. This is theme that Buckingham will continue to return to in later works. Echoing Masterman, the fear of imitation or unthinking replication within student productions is raised. Concern is expressed that acquisition of technical skills should not be put before critical understanding. The requirement that media production is ‘almost by definition a group process’ is
both acknowledged as a syllabus requirement relating to the complexity of production and in turn questioned. It is this group approach to production the authors’ suggest ‘that has led some more utopian advocates of practical work to argue that media production inevitably challenges the individualistic notions of authorship’. Buckingham, et al. (1995) contest however the assumption that all imitation is unnecessarily or purely mechanical. The comparison with learning a language is advanced as is the opportunity imitation allows for students to rework or parody dominant media texts.

In terms of pedagogy Buckingham, et al. (1995) describe two polarised versions that is, the child centred progressive approach versus a traditional model. The authors characterise these approaches as ‘the progressive approach is condemned for its liberal sloppiness, its lazy celebration of children’s experience, and ultimately for its rejection of teaching’ whilst ‘the traditional approach is depicted as a form of educational terrorism, in which children are drilled and intimidated into acquiring arbitrary, disembodied fragments of information’.

The authors go on to contrast the ‘safety of critical analysis’ with practical work contending ‘It is here that teachers have to hand over the means of production to their students, and to live with the consequences. As we have indicated, media educators’ reluctance to cede this control has led to a widespread suspicion of practical work, and to prescriptions for classroom practice that are often highly reductive’. In terms of group working the authors theorise that ‘the desire to replicate professional practice may well conflict with the need to ensure the effective functioning of a working group – or indeed, with the need to ensure equal access to learning’.

What is fascinating in the work of Buckingham et al (1995). is the reluctance to fully engage with the issue of creativity. The authors seem too easily content in its acceptance of the notion that creativity is no more than a murky unintelligible conception.

Risk is addressed obliquely rather than explicitly and mainly from a teaching and learning perspective where differing pedagogical approaches are discussed and evaluated, for example fears around imitation in student work etc. Mention is also made regarding the futility of policing students’ behaviour ‘in order to ensure they produce politically correct texts’ rather students are encouraged to reflect and evaluate. Within the text the discussion of ethics is also absent from the discourse, yet for many teachers and lecturers ethical concerns are inherently at the centre of pedagogical dilemmas particularly concerning more adventurous and challenging media production. Paradoxically these dilemmas are often to be found at the heart of the sort of critical media production that the book advocates.

Buckingham, et al. concludes with three main recommendations: that students should have a space for experimentation and opportunity to cultivate their own theoretical insights; that practical work should be recursive i.e. there should be lots of opportunity for it across a range of media and finally the importance of student reflection is emphasised.

More recently in his book Media Education: Literacy, Learning and Contemporary Culture (2003) Buckingham goes on to describe some of the issues that have charaterised media production’s growth as a vocational area. It is notable that Buckingham actually favours the term ‘pre-vocational’ citing what the author describes as the difficulty of many courses to realise their promise to equip students with the adequate skills for employment. Buckingham notes that media is often still seen within some schools as a popular yet soft option for underachievers. The text proposes that within secondary education media ‘will ever only occupy a marginal role’ confined mainly to the sixth form. Confronting his earlier published work concerning an apparent academic hostility to media practice, Buckingham states some new courses now appear to offer the potential for integrating theory and practical production. Practical work has now become accepted as an element of media education. However the text also suggests that the legacy of a sense of unease and strain remains. Buckingham reminds us of the political purism of an exclusive focus on academic media theory and reflects on the hostility that greeted early vocational media courses. In assessing the tension between the English and Media curriculum Buckingham summarises; ‘Broadly speaking, ‘literature’ is seen to have humanising effects on the reader: it
encourages the development of sensitivity to language, culture and human relationships. By contrast, the media are often seen to have fundamentally negative effects: they manipulate and deceive readers into accepting false values, in ways which readers may be unable to resist. Thus, if literature teaching is primarily about developing students' responsiveness to something which is seen as fundamentally good for them, media teaching has tended to be defined as a matter of enabling them to resist or 'see through' something which is seen as fundamentally bad'.

Discussing creativity Buckingham notes 'the term seems to serve very different purposes for different users, while acting as a kind of 'magic ingredient' that is assumed to produce all sorts of transformative effects'. Emphasising creativity as 'loosely defined' and sometimes given a Romantic connotation Buckingham also acknowledges the social or collaborative nature of much media production and the need for technical skills. In order to promote exploration and genuine student insight the author calls for teachers to ‘consciously construct - a space for play and experimentation, in which there are genuinely no right and wrong answers’.

Buckingham then describes the resulting pragmatic approach to assessment adopted by many within media education, where emphasis is placed on reflection and self-evaluation. Buckingham states ‘the product should not be seen as the end of the process, but as a stage within it - a starting point for reflection or a basis for redrafting, rather than a summation and a demonstration of what has been learned’. Textual critical analysis is not sufficient, creative production Buckingham argues can also be a route to ‘developing new and more profound critical insights’. Orr, (2011) however points to a more complex appraisal of assessment within higher education offering a series of lenses or filters through which artwork is apprehended and evaluated.

In terms of pedagogy Buckingham places weight on self-evaluation by the student, what is termed the move from 'Situated Practice' towards Critical Framing'. Problems with this approach are discussed. The danger is noted of reflection becoming an exercise in self-justification where the 'most successful students may be simply those who are best at presenting themselves. The risk is raised that student self-evaluation might be viewed as an unrelated or unnecessary component. In placing this pedagogical emphasis on self-evaluation Buckingham advances a series of reflective questions a student might answer. These examine if the student’s intended communication was achieved and how an audience might interpret the finished piece. The questions provide an interesting correlation with Cashell (2006) whose compromise regarding ethics takes in to account both the intended moral response intentioned by the producer and its subsequent appraisal by viewer. In practice however there is a danger that the adoption of this process has resulted in a formulaic process of ‘ring-binders’ and plastic pockets as students amass evidence against grade descriptors with creativity as a casualty.

Buckingham asserts ‘the realities of classroom practice are inevitably much more 'messy' and contradictory than the well-ordered universe of educational theory’. The text acknowledges that the media environment in which young people are growing up in is vastly different from their tutors. It is also not only the media that have changed, it is the way young people participate with it that is different. The author calls for a dynamic approach to media pedagogy ‘in the sense that it entails a constant shifting back and forth between different forms of learning - between action and reflection, between practice and theory and between passionate engagement and distanced analysis’.

Buckingham provides a thorough and interesting introduction to media education whilst at the same time delineating some of the often contentious, yet key themes with which a study in this area will have to engage.
Appendix 11: IASK Teaching and Learning article (2010)
Media Practice and a Safe Curriculum
John Spencer

Abstract — Recent UK legislation has again stimulated an increased awareness of the importance of safe working practices. Within this field, areas of progressive enterprise within the film and television industry provide beacons of best practice. Media students on the growing number of courses the UK are however often echoing the types of projects undertaken by production companies, raising valid questions connected to student competency and their ability to assess risk. Whilst the media education sector within the UK has begun to respond to the need to address this issue more effectively there remains a sense of uncertainty in what is primarily an under theorised area. Work conducted at Liverpool Hope University has sought to determine how the management of risk relates to the nature of practical filmmaking activity. The article sets out to reflect on the school and college experiences of enrolling first year undergraduates. The study draws on a survey conducted in 2008 to discover how enrolling media and film undergraduates perceived risk in relation to filmmaking activity. In this way it was hoped to better understand the underpinning knowledge base of enrolling first year undergraduates. In response to these findings the article concludes with the minimum recommendation for a subject specific health and safety induction, clear production guidelines for students and the discipline of project risk assessment.

Index Terms — Media curriculum, Pedagogy, Practice, Risk

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Review Stage

There is a clear sense of increased concern and new procedures connected to risk management within professional moving image practice. Development of an appropriate pedagogical response presents a unique challenge to media education. The range and scale of possible student film projects is immense. From a pedagogical perspective these might include working in a studio or individual student productions involving location filming in both the UK and occasionally further a field. Activities might embrace filmmaking residential, necessitate individual or group working and cover a range of genres including: documentary, film drama, animation and experimental filmmaking. For those engaged in this area the absence of adequate subject specific, educational guidance, relating to risk management has been problematic.

Work conducted at Liverpool Hope University has sought to determine how the management of risk relates to the nature of practical filmmaking activity. During 2008/9 a literature review and survey of enrolling media and film undergraduates was conducted. The study attempted to better understand the nature of practical film making, determine attitudes towards health and safety and how students perceive risk in relation to filmmaking.

The problem has not gone unrecognised. In the introduction to his book on film and television production safety, Small [1], notes ‘Tutors to the growing legion of media and film students are faced with increasing numbers of productions but with no specific guidance to remedy the potentially dangerous situation’. For teachers and lecturers alike, lack of clarity over questions of responsibility, legal obligations, structures and the role of staff in defining and monitoring risk, create a climate of uncertainty.

Whilst a summary on the Health and Safety Executive website relating to research into education at school level suggests that: ‘teaching staff have difficulty with terms like ‘risk education’ and ‘risk concepts’... feel vulnerable and often inhibited, fearing personal liability and litigation’ [2].

Unlike some classroom or lecture based subjects, practice based media courses require students to work in diverse environments utilising a range of equipment during the course of filmmaking or other media focused activities. Whether filming a short drama on location, producing a documentary or engaged on studio based production, students are presented with a range of potential hazards (fig 1). Implicit in the design of a curriculum should be a consideration of appropriate health and safety measures. The nature of media production therefore presents teachers and lecturers with potential problems, both in the school and university context. Through out the period of this study it has become clear that within significant sections of the industry, health and
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safety is being taken seriously. Legislation has reinforced the point. Large media organisations such as the BBC, Pinewood Studios and Channel 4 for example provide a wealth of guidance for those involved in production. Risk assessment policies and guidelines have been developed. Within an industry however, that relies on a high proportion of freelance workers, outside of these larger companies the picture appears less clear. Rossol [3:1], cautions, ‘Rarely, if ever does this industry allow enough time for any phase of production’.

Fig. 1. The range and scale of student film projects is immense. Students working in public spaces, particularly at night need to consider risk control measures, filming remote from the institution and use of physical effects emphasise the necessity for competency within the risk assessment process.

1.2 Current Approaches

Risk assessment procedures for use by university media production students undertaking film projects appear to vary widely across the sector. Whilst some HE institutions use paper-based systems others like Bournemouth University have developed integrated web based solutions. The QAA communication, media, film and cultural studies benchmark 2008 [4], is the guiding framework for those who develop academic provision at degree level in the UK. There are relevant yet general comments within it, for example encouraging ‘a knowledge of the legal, ethical and regulatory frameworks that affect media and cultural production, manipulation, distribution, circulation, and consumption’ and ‘critically informed competency in the management and operation of production technologies, procedures and processes’.

The statement also acknowledges that students need to have a ‘critical grasp of their responsibilities as practitioners’. However it is perhaps a missed opportunity that given the significance of this guidance, which runs to twenty pages, there isn’t a more explicit encouragement with regards to safe working practices, risk management or health and safety.

1.3 Legislation and Guidance

Within the UK there is a long list of legislation which impacts on this field. Small [1], gives a good description of legislation as it and impacts on film and television production safety, though it should be noted that there have been legislative updates since its publication. Nixon [5: 125], summarises the situation from an education perspective ‘There are three elements to the concept of a teachers’ duty of care: the common law aspect, the statutory consideration and the contractual obligation’. Each of these strands requires a slightly different approach.

The Corporate Manslaughter and Corporate Homicide Act 2007 places increased pressures on those deemed to have a relevant duty of care to the victim. As such, an activity with the inherent risks of filmmaking taking place at a distance from the HE educational institution, often without the presence of a staff member presents a challenge. At a school, sixth form or FE college these problems are complicated further by the responsibility of the institution or staff member discharging a duty of care to those yet to reach adulthood. A phrase which references the term in loco parentis established in a case before the court of Appeal as far back as 1893. In reference to loco parentis Nixon [5:124], asserts ‘Today, a higher expectation of teachers is apparent; an expectation that they will do a better job than some notional parent/carer may do’. In his book ‘Health and Safety in Schools’, Brierley [6:1], reminds us that ‘Reasonableness is the key work’.

There is a range of literature providing employer, union and industry guidance. One such example being Guidance on Safety in Fieldwork [7], published by The University and Colleges Employers Association. Most however fails to address the combined issues around teaching and specific risks associated with media practice.

Government guidance to local education authorities whilst providing general advice also appears to offer little real subject related interpretation.

At the differing academic levels calls for subject specific interpretation are not new; ‘There is a strong case for an amplification of the LEA’s or the employer’s policy statements by each school department’, The National Association of Advisers & Inspectors in
Design and Technology, [8:15]. ‘A policy is only as good as the effect it has on the school – a paper only policy is worthless’, (Purser [9:19]).

Documents such as ‘Health and Safety: Responsibilities and Powers’, which the Department for Education and Skills sent to all schools and local education authorities in December 2001 and which was followed by ‘Standards for LEAs in overseeing educational visits’ at the request of teachers seeking more specific guidance, fail to suitably address issues pertinent to the media teacher such as off site student production. It is also valid to question the extent to which teaching staff are familiar with this guidance. Nixon [5:127], asserts that ‘the need for direct supervision has to be assessed by reference to the risks involved and the activity undertaken’. Bush [10:135], describes a range of formal models of educational leadership and management suggesting in his conclusion that the increased complexity of the school context may appear to lend support to the ambiguity model, where teachers work independently for much of the time. In this way it is easy to see why a media teacher feels both accountable and vulnerable.

One area however where media production specific, health and safety is beginning to be more clearly defined is within the assessment objectives of the qualification specifications themselves. In many aspects these provide an area for some optimism.

2 STUDENT SURVEY

In light of this context, the results from the Liverpool Hope ‘on entry’ survey are presented in brief here. The survey sought to examine experiences and perceptions of risk associated with filmmaking in schools and colleges. In this way it was hoped to better understand the underpinning knowledge base of enrolling first year media and film undergraduates.

2.1 Aims

The primary aim of the survey was threefold: to examine the nature and extent of practical film making activity within UK schools and colleges; to determine attitudes towards health and safety within a pedagogical context and to discover how enrolling media and film students perceive risk in relation to filmmaking activity.

2.2 Methods

The survey took the form of a questionnaire, which comprised of 27 questions. The questionnaire was piloted on a small sample of undergraduates to test its reliability, then revised following feedback prior to distribution.

The survey was conducted at Hope during initial undergraduate induction in early October 2008 and involved questioning 74 first year students in the Department of Media, Communication and Film at Liverpool Hope University. The students’ recent school, or college experience provided the logic for selection of this group. Between them the students in the survey had last attended 62 different educational establishments prior to enrolment at Liverpool Hope. This figure included two students from institutions outside of the UK (Germany and Ireland).

The questionnaire was distributed and completed before the students had the opportunity to undertake a health and safety induction within the film department at Liverpool Hope. Completion of the questionnaire was conducted within a controlled classroom environment to discourage collaboration.

The initial focus of the questionnaire related to the experience of the group within their previous place of study. The sample was questioned about the protocols for course related filmmaking. Did filming occur on or off school or college premises? Was filmmaking normally completed in lesson time or not and what level of supervision took place? The questionnaire also sought to determine if control measures, such as risk assessment prior to filming were commonly used.

The second part of the survey set out to examine how the students understood the concept of risk. Students were asked to imagine they were part of a team who had been asked to film a band playing an outdoor concert in a local park and also asked to consider in a separate question the scenario of an asteroid strike.

For the purposes of this study an exemplar definition of risk would include some reference to likelihood, chance or probability as well as acknowledging the significance of the potential level of impact, harm or injury. For comparison the HSE website [11], defines risk as ‘A risk is the likelihood that a hazard will actually cause its adverse effects, together with a measure of the effect’. A definition of a hazard would indicate that it was something that could cause adverse effects.
2.3 Findings

Out of the 74 students questioned, 50% or 37 confirmed that whilst at school or college they had taken part in the production of a student film as part of course work. A figure which broadly reflects the nature of level three media provision within both A-level and National Diploma media syllabuses where the majority of courses have some element of practical work.

When the students were asked, ‘Did you ever take part in filming during lesson time?’ the majority of these students (36) confirmed that they had.

Of these 36 students who answered the follow up question, ‘Did filming in lesson time take place on school/college premises?’ 7 answered ‘always’ whilst 29 answered ‘sometimes’. This suggests that for the majority of students, film projects within in the school or college context have at times required offsite production.

Question fourteen on the survey was, ‘In lesson time when filming on school or college premises, was a tutor or other member of staff always present?’ This elicited the response ‘no’ from 30 of the 36 students who had taken part in filmmaking activities.

In question fifteen the subject was broadened to consider unsupervised off site production activities. Respondents were asked ‘During lesson time have you ever taken part in filming away from school or college without a parent or member of staff present?’ Out of the 36 students, 67% (24) confirmed that they had.

In an attempt to better understand what from a teaching and learning position might have significant ramifications, students were asked in question sixteen, ‘What percentage of course related filming were you expected to take part in outside of lessons, during you own time and away from school or college without a teacher or member of staff present?’ Of the respondents 64% indicated that approximately half or more of all filming was achieved in this way. Only 17% stated that no filming was achieved in this way.

In question seventeen asked, ‘At school or college how often were you asked to complete a risk assessment form before filming? Given the focus of this study, a significant question to contextualise earlier responses. Over half of the students who took part in production activities, indicated that on no occasion were they asked to complete a risk assessment before filming. Question 18 showed from of those who did complete a risk assessment, less than half (41%) could state that these were always checked before filming commenced.

The second part of the survey set out to examine how the students understood the concept of risk.

In relation to the groups understanding of risk question 19 asked students ‘Can you explain the difference between a risk and a hazard?’ a majority showed a reasonable understanding of ‘risk’ whilst there a slightly smaller group provided acceptable descriptions of the term ‘hazard’. It should be noted that a further sizable group of students partially defined the terms. Examples of common misunderstandings that appeared ranged across a spectrum and included ‘A hazard is there and you can’t avoid it’, and ‘A hazard is when there is (sic) warnings that something might happen’. In several instances students gave answers including examples, such as a wet floor etc.

This finding echoed the students’ apparent confidence in the following question when asked ‘To what extent do you feel confident that you have a clear understanding of the following terms?’ In regards to risk 37 were either confident or very confident of their definition. In relation to the term ‘hazard’, 33 were either confident or very confident of their definition.

In question 21 a scenario was described. Students were asked to imagine they were part of a team who had been asked to film a band playing an outdoor concert in a local park. They were then requested to list as many potential hazards associated with making this short student film as they could. Surprisingly perhaps 32% (24) of the total respondents could only nominate one or two valid potential hazards. 41% (30) of the respondents could describe 4 or more valid points.

When asked ‘When making a film, why do you think it might be important to manage risk?’ 59% or 44 students out of the 74 gave two or more valid reasons with only 9 students providing legal responsibility as an answer.

2.4 Reflection on Findings

Traditionally within the school and college context, a regime of lesson observation, inspection and guidance has supported the principle that during lesson time pupils/students should be observed and supervised by the teacher or college lecturer.

A rationale connected to both assessment and the general well being (health and safety) of the pupil/student support this. Whilst it is now becoming accepted that this might not
always need to be the case e.g. Nixon [5:127], an uncertainty in the minds of many teachers remains. In a school, even accompanied off site activity like a trip to a museum, might first now require a letter home seeking permission for a pupil to participate.

In many ways school or college film projects could feasibly contain the same exposure to hazards that a professional crew might experience. In this scenario the combination of an ill prepared or overly ambitious student production team with limited experience might however suggest increased risk.

It is with this in mind that we consider the findings for the questionnaire, which provides evidence that:

In some schools and colleges during lesson time, students take part in unsupervised on site filming.

In some schools and colleges during lesson time, students take part in unsupervised filming away from the school or college premises.

A high proportion of school and college students undertaking film making activities feel that they are expected to complete at least some production work in their own time, away from the school or college. Consequently there is a clear duty for the educational institution to offer precise guidance on health and safety matters to these students.

A majority of school and college students in the survey, who had undertaken filmmaking activity, had not been asked to complete a risk assessment form before filming. Where risk assessment forms were requested there was a significant possibility they had not been checked by a member of staff before filming commenced, thus negating the potential value of the information. Moreover students’ unviewed risk assessments may well be superficial or inadequate.

A significant number of students in the sample when presented with a filmmaking scenario, were less confident describing what might constitute a hazard, than when they were when presented with the asteroid example. In this second scenario however, there was some evidence of difficulty or confusion in relation to evaluating the perceived level of risk. These findings suggest the need for further work in this area.

However within the sample the inability of a significant number of students, to list more than two potential hazards associated with making a short student film does support the need for a subject specific undergraduate health and safety induction.

3 CONCLUSION

The lack of evidence supporting the widespread and effective use of risk assessment in schools and colleges is of concern.

Whether this relates in the classroom to a lack of training, resources or the time to manage the administrative nature of student risk assessment activity remains unclear. Other contributory pressures might include concerns over what type of filming activities might be appropriate, whilst a teacher’s fear of vulnerability by signing off the risk forms may contribute. Questions remain, such as how can a teacher judge competently whether it is appropriate for student filmmaking activities (often dynamic by nature) to be conducted off site and unsupervised? Subject specific guidelines and risk assessment form part of the solution but how are these to be best implemented?

Senior management in large schools or colleges can be unfamiliar with the details of curriculum delivery, relying instead on teachers, subject heads or curriculum managers to interpret at a course level the protocols for student working. Cross school or college health and safety policies are widespread, but are they communicated, relevant and appropriate at a subject level?

3.1 Importance of Induction, Guidelines and Risk Assessment

In an educational situation, the health and safety concept of what is ‘reasonably practical’ might of course apply. However few would argue with the view that there should be an aspiration, within a discipline attempting to echo professional practice, to provide a designated media health and safety induction, set out a clear set of production guidelines for students and foster the discipline of assessing risk prior to commencement of a project.

Findings from this study clearly support a minimum recommendation for a subject specific health and safety induction, clear production guidelines for students and the discipline of project risk assessment.

3.2 Impact of Study on the Curriculum at Liverpool Hope University

At Liverpool Hope a guideline protocol for student filmmaking has been developed. The study has encouraged us to look afresh at our procedures.
Students specialising in film and television Production now receive and sign for an introductory guide to the production area. The booklet includes rules and regulations for use of the university production spaces and includes guidance for the main areas of student film activity.

Within the first five weeks of the level C introductory semester, there is now a specific safety induction lecture, for all BA (Hons) Film and Television Production students.

An online exercise has been developed using virtual learning environment (VLE) software, where students are questioned on a series of artifacts relating to film health and safety and risk assessment. As part of the weighted assessment for the compulsory 60 credit first year production module, students are required to pass this Health and safety assessment test to progress on the course.

The department has revised the risk assessment paperwork used by student film groups so it more accurately echoes industry best practice.

There have been many examples of smaller developments, like the purchase a stock of high visibility waistcoats issued through the media equipment service to students as required, the building of a proper ventilated battery recharging bay in the equipment store, or procedures for out of hours on-site student working. Importantly the department has supported the time and cost for the training required to adequately implement these new systems.

Whilst these things are immediately tangible, perhaps the biggest shift has been in terms of thinking. The concept of a dynamic approach to risk management, where the subject is integrated within the approach to every day working, has perhaps been the major achievement.

The next stage of the study will compare the experience of teaching staff in relation to media production risk management and examine how this report's recommendation for a minimum of a subject health and safety induction, clear production guidelines for students and the discipline of risk assessment, can best be incorporated into a media specific curriculum.

It is hoped this work will result in better practice within vocational media education. This is important not only to ensure accidents and injuries are prevented but also to recognise that project risk assessment and health and safety management are an essential part of informed media practice.
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Appendix 12: Media and a safe curriculum survey
Thank you for taking part in the Media Risk Research Project

The research is aimed at examining media working practices within education.

The information you contribute will be treated in confidence.

Please complete the following questionnaire. Take your time to consider and respond to the questions.

This is an individual task, please do not confer with others in your group.

When you have finished, your questionnaire will be collected.

Again, thank you for your assistance with this project.

John Spencer
Senior Lecturer
Media
Media Risk Research: Awareness Questionnaire. (All information will be treated as confidential).

Q1 Name

Q2 Date of Birth (i.e. 08 06 88)

Q3 Gender
Male □ Female □

Q4 Name of last educational establishment attended (School/College/HE)
Where was this? (Town/Country)

Q5 Leaving date (Month Year e.g. 06 89)

Q6 Have you in the past studied a Media related course or courses? (e.g. AS/A level Media, AVCE Media, GNVQ Intermediate Media National Diploma or Certificate in Media etc.)? Tick box

Yes □ 1 GO TO Q7
No □ 2 GO TO Q10

Q7 What was the name of the qualification(s) you studied? Tick box(es).

AS level Media □ 1
A level Media □ 2
AVCE/VCE Media (single or double) □ □ 3
National Diploma in Media □ □ 4
National Certificate in Media □ 5
AS Film Studies □ 6
A level Film studies □ 7
GNVQ Intermediate Media □ 8
GCSE Media □ 9
HND/HNC Media □ 10
A Foundation Degree in Media □ 11

Other - Please state (e.g. Nat Dip Multimedia/C&G/NVQ etc.)
(Write name of award in box to right)

Q8 What grade(s) did you get? e.g. C

AS level Media □ 1
A level Media □ 2
AVCE/VCE Media (single or double) □ □ 3
National Diploma in Media □ □ 4
National Certificate in Media □ 5
AS Film Studies □ 6
A level Film studies □ 7
GNVQ Intermediate Media □ 8
GCSE Media □ 9
HND/HNC Media □ 10
Foundation Degree (FdA) in Media □ 11

Other - Please state (e.g. Nat Dip Multimedia/C&G/NVQ etc.)
(Write name of award & grade in box to right)
As part of these media related studies did you ever take part in any activities where you learnt about media specific health and safety or risk control issues? Tick box

Yes □ 1  
No □ 2  

At school or college did you ever take part in any activities (outside of media related studies) where you learnt about general health and safety or risk control issues? Tick box

Yes □ 1  
No □ 2  

If yes please describe (when/in what subject etc.)

At school or college did you ever take part in the production of a student film as part of course work? Tick box

Yes □ 1  GO TO NEXT QUESTION  
No □ 2  GO TO Q19  

Did you ever take part in filming during lesson time? Tick box

Yes □ 1  GO TO NEXT QUESTION  
No □ 2  GO TO Q16  

Did filming in lesson time take place on the school/college premises? Tick box

Always □ 1  
Sometimes □ 2  
Never □ 3  

In lesson time when filming on school or college premises, was a tutor or other member of staff always present? Tick box

Yes □ 1  
No □ 2  

During lesson time have you ever taken part in filming, away from the school/college without a parent or member of staff present? Tick box

Yes □ 1  
No □ 2  

What percentage of course related filming were you expected to take part in outside of lessons, during your own time and away from school or college without a teacher or member of staff present? Tick box

None □ 1  A little filming □ 2  About half of all course filming □ 3  Most of the filming □ 4  All of the filming □ 5  

At school/college how often were you asked to complete a risk assessment form before filming? Tick box

Always □ 1  GO TO NEXT QUESTION  
Sometimes □ 2  GO TO NEXT QUESTION  
Never □ 3  GO TO Q19  

If you completed a risk assessment form did a teacher/member of staff check it before filming commenced? Tick box

Always □ 1  
Sometimes □ 2  
Never □ 3
Q19 Can you explain the difference between a risk and a hazard? (Write in boxes below)

A Risk is: ____________________________

A Hazard is: ____________________________

Q20 To what extent do you feel confident that you have a clear understanding of the following terms? Tick boxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Very little confidence</th>
<th>Little confidence</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Confident</th>
<th>Very Confident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hazard</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Assessment</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk control</td>
<td>□ 1</td>
<td>□ 2</td>
<td>□ 3</td>
<td>□ 4</td>
<td>□ 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q21 Imagine you and a team of colleagues have been asked to film a band playing an outdoor concert in a local park. In the boxes below how many potential hazards associated with making this short student film can you list? (Write in boxes below)

List hazards in the boxes

1 5 10
2 6 11
3 7 12
4 8 13
5 9 14

Q22 When making a film, why do you think it might be important to manage risk? (List reasons in boxes below)

1
2
3
4
5
6

Q23 What do you think are the hazards of an asteroid hitting the earth? (Write in box below)


Q24 NASA scientists calculate on average an asteroid roughly 2km across impacts the earth once or twice per million years. (Source: NASA Ames Research Centre 2008)

What level of risk do you associate with such an asteroid impact? Tick box

- Very high risk □ 1
- High risk □ 2
- Moderate risk □ 3
- Slight risk □ 4
- Negligible risk □ 5

Please explain the reason for your decision: (Write in box below)


Q25 During the film making process who is responsible for health and safety? *(Write in box below)*

Q26 Describe by what process you can control health and safety risks during the film making process?

Q27 Why is it important to an organisation to manage health and safety related risk? *(Write in box below)*

Thank you
Appendix 13: Project X Ethics form questionnaire
Questionnaire: Completion of the Ethics Form. (May 2015)

In 2011 at MMU a project began to explore research ethics in relation to the creative disciplines. This is a relatively new area and building on earlier research, a new protocol was developed. The new process sought to encourage greater reflection on ethical issues by utilising a two-part ethical appraisal form. It is now important to seek your views on this ethical appraisal form.

Your answers will be treated with strict confidentiality and will in no way effect your course work. In any research reports all responses will be treated as anonymous. If you would like to find out more about the research or this questionnaire, please contact PhD researcher John Spencer (communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com).

Q1. Please describe any technical issues you encountered completing the form? (If none write 'none')
   NONE

Q2. How useful did you find the 'rollover examples' and links within the document?
   Excellent – Very useful [ ]  Good – Useful [ ]  Average – of some use [ ]  Poor – of little use [ ]  Very poor - unhelpful [ ]

Q3. Can you think of any improvements to the 'rollover examples' or links? Please describe in detail:
   NONE

Q4. How useful was it to respond on page 3, to the ethical issues you had indicated earlier? Please describe in detail:
   Excellent – Very useful [ ]  Good – Useful [ ]  Average – of some use [ ]  Poor – of little use [ ]  Very poor - unhelpful [ ]

   It forced you to develop a clear understanding of the issue and also how you can overcome it.

Q5. Overall how easy was it for you to complete the ethics form?
   Excellent[ ]  Good[ ]  Average[ ]  Poor[ ]  Very poor[ ]  Don’t know[ ]

Q6. Can you think of anyway the process of completing the form could be improved? Please describe in detail:
   make it an online form

Q7. Did the process of completing the form raise any new ethical considerations for your project?
   If yes please describe in detail:

   it made me consider things in more detail yes.

   How did you deal with these issues? Please describe in detail:

   research and planning

Q8. Can it ever be justifiable to withhold information from an ethics form? For example if it might jeopardise the chance of pursuing a creative idea or project? Please describe in detail:
   No - Never [ ]  Sometimes [ ]  Yes[ ]  Don’t know[ ]

   this is deception so no, however creative projects are normaly more flexible

Q9. Which version of Acrobat did you use to view the form? (i.e. version 11.0.10)
   This information can be found under Top Menu >Acrobat reader > About reader
   11.0.10

End Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire – Please email to Communicatewithjohn@yahoo.com
Appendix 14: Ethics and the Academy publicity
An exhibition of work by John Spencer connected to the development of a new discipline-specific model for the ethical appraisal within the visual arts. The study based at MIRIAO within Manchester School of Art, examines a model where students and researchers might meaningfully engage with ethical issues inherent in their visual research.