<http://www.diva-portal.org>

This is the published version of a paper published in *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*.

Citation for the original published paper (version of record):

Wilinska, M., Bülow, P. (2016)

“We are on air now”: the emotionality of video-recording in the institutional setting.

International Journal of Social Research Methodology

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2016.1176315>

Access to the published version may require subscription.

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published paper.

Permanent link to this version:

<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:hj:diva-29841>

Introduction

<i>Social Insurance Officer</i>	shall I run the meeting as usual or will you say action or will you?
<i>Researcher</i>	no no. *haha*
	[((laughter coming from the group))
<i>Social Insurance Officer</i>	[no (.) I run it as usual, yeah (.) that's good. *haha*

The excerpt above comes from a larger corpus of data created through the video recording of institutional meetings, which included health and welfare professionals, employers and sick-listed persons involved in the work rehabilitation process. In addition to making an excellent case for Denzin and Lincoln's (2005:3) definition of qualitative research as "*a situated activity that locates the observer in the world. It consists of a set of interpretive, material practices that make the world visible. These practices transform the world*", this excerpt illustrates the role of emotions in the research process. More specifically, it draws attention to the way various emotions emerge in response to ongoing institutional and research practices. Further, it exposes the power dimension embedded in these different practices that merge and are negotiated within the situational context. Finally, it introduces a new cinematic frame that is mobilised to address potential power imbalances. In Collins' (2004) words, this seconds-long situation allows the observation of participants who display different forms of cultural capital (understood as conversational resources, e.g., styles and topics of conversation) and emotional energy. The cinematic frame emerges within this context as shared cultural capital that allows the leader of the meeting (SSIA) to emphasize her position and alter the emotional charge of two different activities—research and institutional meeting— that may change due to the presence of a video camera.

This paper uses several interaction sequences to explore the emotionality of video recording within institutional meetings. We are interested in exploring the creative ways that the video camera is appropriated by the participants when two different activities occur simultaneously. In this, we make use of Collin's (2004) theory of interaction ritual that accounts for the process of constructing cultural symbols that unite people. Symbols are

emotionally charged to motivate people in various ways. Therefore, a close examination of the symbols created in the course of various interactions enables us to observe what is happening and how it is possible. Our aim is to demonstrate the role of emotions in mobilising video cameras to serve other than originally intended research purposes.

Video recording in research

Images produced during a research process are always situated and their role is not to provide a documentary account of a given phenomenon but to reflect upon the situation that contributes to the production and creation of such images (Sparrman, 2005). Büscher (2005) discusses here the possibility of 'seeing with' that rests on the notion of video cameras as useful resources that are mobilised by both researchers and researched persons. How we see and how others want to be seen is highly contextual and situated (Lomax and Casey, 1998; Luff and Heath, 2012; Monahan and Fisher, 2010; Mondada, 2006; Sparrman, 2006). In this, the observer effect ceases to be a problem; it becomes a resource allowing us to draw conclusions about the socio-cultural context (Monahan and Fisher, 2006).

Viewing cameras as resources enables us to get a glimpse into the process of being researched on. For example, video recorders can be seen as a burden, data collector, stand-in-researcher, an audience or a spy (Gordon, 2013); they may also trigger some forms of behaviour that would not otherwise occur (Lomax and Casey, 1998). Their use seems to open up a creative space for co-constructing the research scene and situation at hand. More than that, used in a highly sensitive context of family therapy, video cameras were found to be beneficial for the therapeutic process, which was acknowledged by the session members (Hutchby et al., 2012).

However, video cameras may be perceived as more than resources, being an intrinsic part of a research, their role may become more active. For example, in a study of children and their spaces, Änggård (2013) observes the various ways in which cameras prompted children to explore certain places and people while at the same time preventing them from exploring other sites. Similarly, Aarsand and Forsberg (2010) demonstrate the active role of video cameras in producing children's privacy within the family context. In this, video cameras and

other recording devices are approached as material-discursive practices that actively contribute to the production of meaning (Nordstrom, 2015).

Video recording can therefore illuminate not only the researched phenomenon but the research participants' orientation to research and to the topic and a situation at hand; it may also enable us to observe how cameras themselves become animated to do things in the field. Consequently, in addition to acknowledging that we use technology in research, we must also recognise that technology affects us and the entire research process. This not only entails a development of audio visual imagination as Eriksson (2011) aptly proposes, but it also sensitizes us to the emotional features of social research. Following Gordon's (2013) advice, in this paper we focus on "conversational moments" during which research participants openly interact with technology to delve into the various emotions that emerge and are constructed at the research site. This proposition echoes Speer and Hutchby's (2003) contention that research participants negotiating the presence of technological devices demonstrate the interactional potential of these devices for the conduit of talk. The perspective of emotions and emotional energy applied in this study allows us to trace the unfolding dynamism of the observed situations that leads to the creation of new symbols and to understand how it relates to the relationships among the situation participants.

Emotional energy and interaction rituals

We use emotional energy and the interaction ritual chains theory introduced by Collins to reveal the emotionality of video recording in social research. The particular focus on "the human body and its emotions as the principal materials from which social relations and institutions are constructed" that Barbalet (2009:447) from Collins' theory fits very well with our purpose of exploring the ways researchers and research participants negotiate the presence of a video camera in the context of both a research and an institutional setting, to construct new ways of assuming control.

Interaction rituals and emotional energy are the key concepts underlying Collins' theory, which uses micro-sociological focus to explain macro-sociological phenomena. Interaction rituals are composed of the following elements: bodily assembly, barrier to outsiders, mutual

focus of attention and shared mood. Notably, it is the mutual/shared focus that is essential in making a situation an interaction ritual (cf. Goffman's concept of focused interaction) as opposed to an event that lacks such a focus and becomes instead an instance of pure formality. In the course of interaction, participants may experience the following as an outcome of the ritual if successful: group solidarity, emotional energy, symbols of social relationships and standards of morality. In this, interaction rituals are conceived of as "essentially a bodily process" (2004:53) that are dependent on various bodily experiences and expressions of shared emotions. Accordingly, the rituals underlying different situations are far from being static and they imply the process of transforming various emotions. Interaction rituals change and are in a process of constant (re)creation to reflect the changing circumstances and variety of the human bodies involved in them.

The concept of emotional energy clarifies the relationship between the emotional propensities of interacting participants and the outcome of the interaction, and can be described as "an overall level of being 'up' or 'down'" (Collins, 2004:118). In this, emotional energy becomes the main motivational force. Individuals who enter different situations assess them in relation to emotional energy; they seek situations that increase their emotional energy level and avoid those that would reduce their emotional energy. This however occurs within the context of existing social and power relations, which means that each interaction ritual has power and status effects. While power rituals focus on the giving or taking of orders, status rituals focus on belonging. Different sources of emotional energy are therefore distinguishable. Those in power positions are more likely to experience higher emotional energy levels than those in subordinate positions, hence powerful participants will be interested in sustaining unequal power relations (and their position as order-givers) and hierarchical interactions to maximise their own positive emotional effects. In status rituals, it is group solidarity that becomes the source of emotional energy. People experience higher levels of emotional energy when they feel attached and connected to other group members. In this respect, emotional energy involves creating a sense of 'we', which is synonymous with belonging.

Frameworks and keys

We also draw heavily on Goffman's (1983) concept of interaction order which explains the rules and norms that regulate people's interactions, according to his concept of frameworks (1974). According to Goffman (1974:38), "we can hardly glance at anything without applying a primary framework", and we are likely to apply several frameworks at any one time during an ongoing activity. Primary frameworks help us understand what is happening in our daily lives and find meaning in situations that would otherwise be confusing and meaningless. These frameworks also involve rules about how we are expected to behave in certain situations (i.e., "guided doings"). However, as various activities proceed, primary frameworks might shift or transform into something which is "closely patterned after something that already has a meaning in its own terms" (Goffman, 1974:40). This process of transformation is referred to as keying and may not change the main activity, but it may alter the way participants interpret the situation.

One of the basic keys used to transform the primary frame is what Goffman (1974:48) calls make-believe – an "activity that participants treat as an avowed, ostensible imitation or running through of a less transformed activity". Make-believe provides participants with immediate satisfaction through a moment of "pastime" or "entertainment" within the context of the main activity. Playfulness is one of the main forms of make-believe. As with any type of play, playfulness introduces a moment of relief and a "brief intrusion of unserious mimicry" (Goffman, 1974:48) that is based on the understanding that the playful activity is just for fun and should not be interpreted literally. When such make-believe is recognised as just for fun, it seems to have superiority over other frames and activities. Goffman also posits that focusing on when playfulness occurs in the course of an interaction will reveal when and why such forms of activity are introduced. Importantly, the situational context limits the types of playful activities that are accepted.

Research setting

Between January and April 2013, we video recorded eight statutory meetings (312 minutes) and conducted 40 follow-up interviews with the meeting participants with the purpose of researching user participation in institutional talk pertaining to the concept of workability and

the work rehabilitation process of sick-listed people. Statutory meetings were introduced in Sweden in 2003 with the purpose of gathering the various parties participating in the work rehabilitation process for a sick-listed person to assess her workability and to make decisions regarding future rehabilitation and/or return-to-work plans. According to the law, for a status meeting to occur, at least three parties must be present, including the sick-listed person. The other parties are typically social insurance officers, medical doctors, occupational therapists and employers.

Our project was conducted in the second phase of a larger endeavour by the local branch of the Swedish Social Insurance Agency (SSIA) that began with outlining a new model for organising status meetings. The main focus of that model was to improve the information flow between various parties participating in the meetings to assure that each person enters the meeting room with the same clear messages regarding the purpose of the meeting and has an understanding of her/his own role and other participants' roles. The new working model was tested at four different municipalities, and we were invited to video- record the statutory meetings in those different locations.

This research was approved by the regional ethics committee board in Sweden. Our access to the research site was limited. We had no direct contact with either the individuals listed as sick or their employers prior to the recorded meetings. We prepared separate information letters for all the parties involved, and SSIA officers or rehabilitation coordinators distributed them and discussed participation in the research project with everyone invited. During and after the recorded meeting, we confirmed participants' awareness of the ongoing research project and reminded them of the opportunity to withdraw. None of the participants withdrew, and during follow-up interviews, they all signed consent forms.

On the day, we¹ would arrive 15-20 minutes in advance to set up a digital video camera. The video camera we used was designed for everyday use by non-professional users (Canon Model Legria HFS200). The height and focus of the video camera were adjusted to capture all participants, who typically sat around a round table. We decided to stay while recording was occurring; we sat either next to or behind the camera making notes and monitoring the

¹ Each of the researchers video recorded different meetings.

recording. To avoid disturbing the meeting, we used a camera stand and did not move the video camera while recording. Thus our method obviously did not shield the camera and our research team from becoming part of what we studied.

Our analytical approach was grounded in theories of institutional talk (e.g., Drew & Heritage, 1992). In the process of analysis it was therefore important to demonstrate the type of institutional rules and identities that were created during the meetings (Arminen, 2005). Without taking the institutional context for granted, we demonstrate the ways in which the institutional settings became relevant to the situation at hand. The analysis is arranged according to three theoretical points of departure: creating symbols, focusing the situation and bodily presence.

Analysis

“What is mutually focused upon becomes a symbol of the group” (Collins, 2005:37).

To reconstruct the process of producing new symbols, we began with a group of researchers who made the video camera their main symbol in the ongoing project and transformed a research situation into a power ritual where researchers became order-givers, and research participants became order-takers.

Prior to the first recording, we tested the camera. Initially, we came together to assemble it, to peruse the manual and to observe how it was working. We were excited to ask our colleagues from the department to allow us to record their conversation. During that trial recording, the video camera in our hands became a symbol that began evoking various emotions or rather as Collins (2005) explains the video camera became a representation of our own emotions. Clearly, as researchers, we gave special meaning to the video camera; we treated it with respect and did not view it the same as the other devices that we used, such as a notebook or tape recorder. We were concerned with the process and outcome of our recordings; each time we monitored the setting, we breathed a sense of relief when noticing that the meeting that we observed had been recorded, and realising that the recording was safely stored on our hard drive. Our expectations regarding the research process also changed. As experienced and committed qualitative researchers, we suddenly viewed the research process as completely under our control. Our attitude towards research changed

from a focus on co-constructing empirical material with research participants to an emphasis on collecting the data that is 'out there'. In addition, we unconsciously began drawing boundaries between the researched persons and ourselves.

Approaching the video camera with care, we also established rules regarding who could operate it and when. For example, we were often the first to arrive at the meetings' venue. Our goal was to arrange the camera prior the beginning of each meeting to reduce the influence of our and the camera's' presence. We hoped that such a strategy would create a sense of ease about the situation and direct the participants' attention away from the video camera. However, we were ultimately identifying ourselves with the video camera and as typical order-givers we saw it as a scared object that should be respected by others as well.

The research and meeting participants did notice the camera; in fact, it was the first thing that they noticed when entering the room. The video camera was fixed on a tripod in one place, typically the smallest or tightest corner of the room, which meant that some parts of the room were more visible than others. This situation created an opportunity for the participants to choose their places according to their desire to be or not be recorded by the video camera. In several instances, research participants asked us about the seating arrangement and submitted themselves to "our orders". Although we did not point towards concrete places, we did suggest which part of the room was more visible. On several occasions, participants did not obey "orders" and made obvious efforts to avoid being seen by the video camera. The placement of the video camera created non-visible zones that some "subservient order-takers" (Collins, 2004) used as backstage space.

Those who decided not be seen explained in follow-up interviews that it was enough that their voice was heard; they did not have to be seen. In those instances, only the visual aspect of the research process was displayed. Interestingly, there were no objections to or efforts to avoid sound recording. Reading emotional energy as "a readiness for action" (Collins, 2005:118), we can understand how the video camera intruded upon research participants' view of the research process. The importance and value of the particular research project was

openly acknowledged and embraced by all research participants.² It was only the visual aspect that changed the attitudes of some. The use of the video camera as a symbol for emotional energy triggered different reactions. The desire to remain unrecorded could be interpreted as resistance to becoming part of the group that is recorded, or as a way of distancing oneself from others and exercising some power by not agreeing to participate. This could also be interpreted as a willingness to participate in the primary frame, the status meeting, but not to participate in the recording activity - a secondary frame. According to Goffman (1974), participation in the frame implied a certain amount of involvement. One way of handling the situational tension was to avoid that particular aspect of the situation. Another was to make a joke.

Excerpt 1³

Meeting No 2. Participants: SSIA, SL, Phy, Emp, HR-specialist (HR), relative (Re)

- 70 SSIA but is it OK that we have this meeting?
- 71 SL yeah yeah yeah
- 72 SSIA that's good. and it's OK that we=
- 73 SL yes
- 74 SSIA =help with the study?
- 75 SL yes I think so.
- 76 SSIA it's actually about your experience of the meeting.
- 77 SL mm. you have explained it already, and I got information
- 78 about that at home.
- 79 SSIA exactly, and the employer was also informed.
- 80 SL I have also told you personally
- 81 that it would be recorded?
- 82 Emp yes yes yeah yeah, I am ready for that.
- 83 HR he has been to the hairdresser.
- 84 ((everyone laughs))

² Some of the professionals were also involved in planning and approving the project we were commissioned to conduct.

³ The following abbreviations are used: sick-listed person (SL), officer from the Swedish Social Insurance Agency (SSIA), employer (EMP), rehabilitation coordinator (RC), occupational therapist (OT) and researcher (R).

85 HR so it is not a problem.
86 Emp one needs to do one's best.
87 SSIA exactly yes.

The excerpt above is a good example of micro-structural shifts that change the shared focus and allow for different emotional energies. Initially, care and concern seem to be expressed for the sick-listed person whose case is being discussed at the meeting. However, the first lines actually refer to the concern and uncertainty that the participants have about the video recording rather than their concern about the sick-listed person. This is clarified in lines 81-82 where the situational meaning of "this meeting" is revealed to "be recorded". The positive attitude of the employer and the HR person relieve the tension and introduce positive energy that spreads across the meeting room. "Doing one's best" in line 86 is, in this context, an affirmation of the video recording situation and the expression of a desire to look good. Again, it is not the research situation per se but the video camera that prompts such reactions. Interestingly, all research participants, regardless of their occupational or hierarchical position, draw on the same cultural resources and view the video camera as a body scrutinizing device. The few seconds of playfulness introduces positive emotional energy, unites the participants and emphasises the status effect of the situation, temporarily concealing its power effects.

In Excerpt 1, institutional actors (SSIA officer and employer) are still participating and they initiate changes in emotional energy. Excerpt 2, however, demonstrates the charismatic role of a sick-listed person who resists the power effects of the situation and becomes a central participant.

Excerpt 2

Meeting No. 4. Participants: SL, SSIA, Phy, RC, R

09 RC this is all new to us. so that you do not need to feel
10 SL no I do not [feel (any)
11 RC *heh*
12 SSIA [(xx) it is you who like the camera best

13 because you agreed to do this.

14 *you should sit [closer to the camera Xxx*

15 SL [*my name is Xxx* ((SL waves to the camera))

16 ((everyone laughs)

17 Phy ((turning to the RC)) no there is no make-up.

18 RC what's that?

18 Phy no make up

19 RC mm ((touching her face))

20 ((Everyone turns to the camera))

Similar to excerpt 1, the situation begins with concern being expressed by an institutional actor (rehabilitation officer in this case) for the sick-listed person. This has clear power effects, as order-takers acknowledge “the sacred object” that should be feared. However, while the SSIA explains that RC misread the situation, the sick-listed person takes the lead and turns to the video camera to express his enthusiasm and readiness to the video camera. Other meeting’s participants join in, with comments regarding the lack of make-up, which are an indirect recognition of their lack of preparation for the video recording. The sick-listed person dominates this excerpt, while the others are relegated to the role of spectators. The sick-listed person as the energy-leader was confirmed in follow-up interviews with all institutional actors (SSIA, Phy, RC) who recognised his drive as something outstanding that greatly contributed to their positive experience in the meeting. With a high level of emotional energy, the sick-listed person manages to take a substantial communicative space during the meeting and in the research process. Although he does not have institutional power over the meeting, he uses positive energy to close the video recording. Evoking what could be referred to as the cinematic frame, he is the one to make the final cut.

Excerpt 3

Meeting No. 4. Participants: SL, SSIA, Phy, RC, R

350 SSIA shall we proclaim the meeting finished?

 (5s) ((The SL, Phy and RC nod their heads one after another))

351 SSIA ((nods his head and turns to the researcher)) so you can

352 switch off the camera.

(1 s)

353 SL tchin::↑

((SL makes a cut sign with two fingers of his right hand))

The use of the cinematic frame in excerpts 1 (lines 83-87), 2 (lines 12-19) and 3 (line 353) becomes key to transforming the primary framework (the institutional meeting). The frame shift observed here is of make-believe and of playfulness, which provide momentary relief and shift focus either prior to or immediately following the main activity.

The situations above reveal that the research participants note the importance of bodywork, such as hairdressing and make up, by calling attention to the visual context emphasised by the video camera. On the one hand, drawing on the generalised cultural capital of societal fixation on bodily appearances, the participants turned the video camera into a judge who brings the “must look good” frame into the context of an institutional meeting. This moment revealed the vulnerability of the institutional and non-institutional actors whose bodies are being exposed to an external audience. On the other hand, those situations exposed the commonality and popularity of video recording in everyday life and the ease with which the cinematic frame is introduced by different participants. Interestingly, we note that when concern or worry was expressed by one person, other meeting participants were silent. Only when the cinematic frame was evoked, did different participants begin contributing. This reminds us of Goffman’s (1974:48) words about how playfulness “tends to take precedence” over ongoing activities. Here, because of playfulness, everyone was keen to join the conversation that produced high energy levels. In the contemporary cultural context, the idea of being video recorded, of taking part in a movie, and of being famous and popular appears to be attractive. In the context of the situations observed above, these ideas may explain why the cinematic frame was highly charged and had such great appeal.

As Forsyth, Carroll and Reitano (2009) contend, video recording has implications for how we perceive the relationships between the video camera and research participants. Video recording does not need to be viewed as a potential threat but could be an invitation to tell your story or engage in meaningful production. Our examples demonstrate that interaction,

which focuses on the video camera creates different emotions and allows different actors to emerge in new roles. However, the shifts observed here indicates two interaction rituals occurring simultaneously. Though there is some confusion about what is really going on, that confusion is a consequence of the power effects of those rituals. Research participants' responses are analysed below.

"(...) in order to get the situation focused, it is usually necessary to start it off with an act that explicitly notes the existence of such a situation and that defines what kind of situation it is" (Collins, 2004:18).

We began this paper with the following excerpt that accentuates the complex situation created by the presence of a video camera:

Excerpt 4

Meeting No. 5. Participants: SL, SSIA, Phy, Emp, RC, OT, R

13 SSIA shall I run the meeting as usual or will you say
14 action or will you?
15 R no no. *haha*
16 [((laughter coming from the group))
17 SSIA [no (.) I run it as usual, yeah (.) that's good. *haha*

When two different interaction rituals occur simultaneously, there might be confusion about what exactly is happening and which framework is primary and which is secondary. This is particularly relevant to power situations, where leaders from each interaction ritual meet. In Excerpt 4, the behaviour of an institutional meeting leader (SSIA) could be interpreted as a reaction to a potential loss of power that could imply a loss of emotional energy. Accustomed to a leadership role, the SSIA openly challenges the researcher, whom she identifies as the research leader. The use of the cinematic frame helps her to joke about the situation, but she does not hide her pleasure at the researcher's withdrawal from a leadership position. She re-

establishes the meeting rules and her position as an order-giver. In that moment, the video camera serves as a material resource, which she appropriates to achieve her goals. Symbolically, taking the video camera from the researcher gives the SSIA control of both interaction rituals and subverts the research process to the intuitional meeting. Following Collins (2004) reasoning regarding the interaction market, we observe that the SSIA's actions yield individual emotional energy gain.

Excerpt 5 illustrates a similar situation, but in contrast to Excerpt 4, it clearly produces both status and power effects and distinguishes between the two interaction rituals:

Excerpt 5

Meeting No. 4. Participants: SL, SSIA, Phy, RC, R

```
((SSIA looking straight into the camera, saying something about the light
flashing as a sign of a camera working))

18    SSIA  we are on air now.
19    (1.5)
20    SSIA  hello and welcome. it is the SSIA that invited us to this
21          meeting. ((turns to the researcher))
22          and you would like to have name in the camera as well
23          and who we are.
```

In this case, the meeting began as soon as the SSIA officer, who had been looking straight into the video camera, noticed that something “has beeped over there”. The researcher discreetly confirmed this observation, which prompted the SSIA officer to turn to the other meeting participants and say “we are on air now”. This way of beginning the meeting recognises that video recording is occurring and makes it central to the given situation (the primary framework). What follows is a momentary lapse of the SSIA, most likely due to the realisation of the consequences of the cinematic frame. If the situation is about video recording, then what's the position of SSIA? These new circumstances confuse the SSIA officer and make him momentarily disengage from the activity. However, because, as Goffman (1974) indicates, the SSIA officer is the one who defines the situation, he is also the one who establishes the shaken

order (broken frame). Soon thereafter, he reasserts control and makes it clear that there are two separate activities occurring simultaneously. Moreover, he clearly classifies video recording as the secondary activity, which gives him back his power position. As a result, his behaviour has opposing effects on different situational participants.

On the one hand, he portrays the image of a leader interested in group solidarity (status effect) but only with regard to other research participants. On the other hand, he creates a power effect with the researcher by claiming the right to dominate the situation. This effect becomes clearly visible in excerpt 3 from the same meeting, when the SSIA uses his order-giving power to instruct the researcher to take several actions, which she takes. As in a typical power situation, in the short exchange, the SSIA gains emotional energy, while the researcher loses it. When describing the situation subsequently, the researcher mentioned the 'unusual' behaviour of the SSIA officer and complained to her co-investigator about the SSIA officer's domineering style. The emotional uneasiness felt by the researcher was caused by the realisation that the symbol she had created was by no means scarce at that point, and effectively she had no power over the situation.

Excerpts 4 and 5 demonstrate the ways institutional meeting leaders emerge as situational leaders: they take responsibility for the recording and the meeting. This defence mechanism is resistance to the unequal power relationship between the participant and the researcher. Extending Collin's theory, Summers-Effler (2002) suggests that people in subordinate positions seek ways to increase their emotional energy, such as redirecting their emotional energy and drawing on emotional resources from other subordinate positions. In our examples, the research participants acting as appointed leaders of the meeting used their position to overcome and resist the subordinate position of a research participant. Importantly, it was the video camera that served as the material resource that increased their power and, in this way, immobilized the researchers.

The final example in this section demonstrates a situation where the researcher takes the leading role in creating and focusing the situation:

Excerpt 6

Meeting No. 8. Participants: SL, SSIA, Phy, RC, Researcher (R)

01 R now. I have switched it on. (.) and now I am recording the
02 sound. (.) and so I begin,
03 (.)
04 Phy ((quiet mumbling is heard))
05 (.)
06 R °let's see now°
07 Phy (yeah hehe)
08 R let's see now. like that. (.) everything should be on. so I
09 am sneaking away to sit down here.
10 SSIA welcome to this meeting.

The opening line by the researcher clearly contributes to the creation of a special emotional mood. The researcher gradually reveals the tension and mystery of video recording, thus creating certain expectations and evoking certain emotions among the research participants. Using Collins' vocabulary, the researcher emerges here as the dominant figure that sets the rhythm of the situation. She becomes the focus of attention, while others begin with observing her activity and then gradually join in. The researcher's charisma attracts others to follow her line of thought and action. Enthusiasm and excitement can be discerned from the situation. On the other hand, we observe that all other action is suspended and instead of the institutional meeting, the research situation that becomes the primary framework. It is only when the researcher steps back from the front stage that the institutional meeting can begin. Her use of the video camera as a material resource makes her dominant in this situation, and her position is revealed by her dominance over the first few seconds. Interestingly, that dominance also has an intense bodily element, which is the key concern of the ensuing section.

"Without bodily presence, it is hard to convey participation in the group and to confirm one's identity as member of the group." (Collins, 2004:54)

Collins (1981:985) adheres to the perspective of microsociology, which assists our explanations of macro-social phenomena through the use of “ultradetailed empirical analysis”. According to Collins, the proper focus of microsociology is a process that influences individuals and their actions. These situations produce individuals rather than the reverse. However, without the bodily presence of individuals, the interaction rituals lose their intensity and their ‘ritual’ element.

The excerpts below demonstrate the ways in which situational leaders emerge using material resources (like the video camera) and bodily presence to their advantage. However, each of them uses these elements in a different way.

Excerpt 7

Meeting No. 4. Participants: Sick-listed Person (SL), Swedish Social Insurance Agency officer (SSIA), Physician (Phy), Rehabilitation-Coordinator (RC)

01 RC ((giggle)) it [is very new f-
02 SSIA [I think the doctor should doctor should sit
03 there,
04 Phy like this.
05 SSIA so all of us will be in the picture
06 SL so we could not sit where we wanted

The SSIA, as an institutional leader in the above excerpt, also takes on a role of the video recording leader. In this new role, he is interested in creating the sense of ‘us’ among those who are being recorded. His emphasis on ‘us’ contributes to the sense of situational equality and belonging. Using the view of the video camera, he arranges others’ bodies to ensure that all can be seen and that the purpose of having a video camera is achieved. In that short moment, he changes the structure of the situation by becoming an institutional leader and a researcher. The effect of this is similar to E-power, as discussed by Collins (2005), who described it as efficacy power that is usually executed at macro-levels and has long-standing and trans-institutional character. Other research participants listen to the SSIA and take their seats according to his instructions. The dominance of the leading person is therefore exhibited

over other bodies besides his own. Bodily rearrangement in this situation confirms group participation and belonging to the group of researched persons, but it clearly separates participants from the observing researcher.

In Excerpt 8, there is a similar effect of an emerging situational leader, but the power and status effects are different here.

Excerpt 8

Meeting no. 5. Participants: SL, SSIA, Phy, RC, Employers (Emp), Occupational therapist (OT)

01 SSIA I think it will be a bit weird if I sit in the corner.
02 it is so difficult to talk when people sit next to each
03 other, I think.

((in the background the meeting participants talk and introduce themselves))
04 SL yes it is. otherwise I can move.
05 SSIA no no no. (xx) I do not want to complicate this.

The SSIA officer, formally responsible for the meeting, was the last to arrive at the meeting. She quickly examined the room, and after seeing that the other participants were sitting on both sides of an oval-shaped table, she identified a place at the head of the table that was facing the video camera directly. Although other places were available on both sides of the table, she made her way to that spot while forcing other participants to move their chairs to enable her to pass. Concurrently, she rejected an offer made by the sick-listed person, who suggested that he could move one seat forward to allow a space for her.

The seat at the head of the table ensured the central position of the SSIA officer and placed her in the centre of the video camera and other participants focus. Formal rituals are characterised by a number of rules regarding the status and position of various participants. Notably, none of the meeting's participants attempted to sit at the head of the table. The behaviour exhibited by the SSIA officer accentuated the bodily nature of such rituals. The SSIA officer would not only lead the conversation, but her body would also dominate over other bodies gathered in the room. Her sitting in the corner would have potentially "complicated

this”, because she would not be in the centre of attention. In this manner, the video camera was used to emphasize the situational stratification of both rituals: an institutional meeting and a research process. However, this emphasis was not easy to achieve. The SSIA officer’s clear voice in considering which seat she should take did not address anyone in particular; in fact, other meeting participants were engaged in presenting themselves to one other at that time. This type of self-talk (Goffman, 1981) as performed by the SSIA indicates that she considered her own action unusual and in need of legitimising, and it might have been influenced by the fact that the video camera momentarily threatened her position as a leader of the situation.

Discussion

The aim of this paper was to explore the emotionality of video recording within the setting of institutional meetings. We were interested in exploring the creative ways the video camera was appropriated by participants when two different activities were occurring simultaneously. Through a number of examples, we showed that the video camera in this project became a symbol that evoked various emotions. Notably, these emotions refer to both the research participants and researchers. Thus, we revisit Lomax and Casey’s (1998) contention that attending to the use of technology in research may provide insights into the experiences of being researched and being a researcher. We add to this finding by emphasising the emotional aspect of responding to and negotiating the presence of video cameras in research. In this manner, both those who are in front of and behind the video camera may experience high and low levels of emotional energy depending on how they envision their own position among the other participants.

The key finding of this paper is that research participants used the cinematic frame to negotiate a new situation. On the one hand, the playfulness of several moments indicated a shared sense of joy. On the other hand, the situations revealed clear power and status effects that affected institutional participants, non-institutional participants and researchers differently. For example, in excerpts 1, 5 and 7 we observed an emerging sense of unity between the institutional and non-institutional meeting participants. The excerpts evidenced high levels of emotional energy and engagement: the research participants (representing both institutional and non-institutional actors) appeared to be in a rhythm, their turns were

often just on the beat, and there was generally no struggle for communicative space that can be found when talk is replete with gaps and silences. The meeting participants appeared to be attuned to one another in these short moments. Excerpts 4 and 8 demonstrate a clear power effect whereby institutional leaders adopt a dominant leadership style to manage both the meeting and the research process. Finally, all excerpts discussed in this paper point to the struggle between the two interaction rituals and their leaders. Most often, institutional leaders viewed researchers as potentially threatening. The symbolic grasp of the video camera as depicted in excerpts 3, 4 and 5 helped institutional leaders regain and reaffirm their dominant position. Excerpt 6 stands out as the only example where a researcher and her work with the video camera became the focus of attention to the extent that the institutional meeting, which was the original purpose of gathering, was suspended.

The excerpts presented in this paper illustrate moments when the presence of a video camera was explicitly acknowledged by researchers and research participants. Our study extends the existing debate on the use of video cameras in social research by drawing attention to the emotional aspects of negotiating and reacting to this type of technology in research. The use of Collins' interaction ritual theory allowed us to trace emotional energy during micro-situations, which lasted no more than a few seconds each. This, above all else, magnified power relations and the stratification of the interaction rituals, which should be guided by the rules of democracy and full, egalitarian participation. We observed several split-second moments when clear attempts were made to break the boundaries of both the rituals (frameworks). In particular, several institutional leaders exhibited a desire to be on the other side of the research ritual. This, as we argue, was likely triggered by the presence of the video camera that significantly changed the situation. As a material resource, the video camera became a visible object of power and controlling it meant controlling the situation.

Our focus on short excerpts during which research participants and researchers negotiated the presence of the video camera allowed us to explore the ultra-detailed aspects of the ongoing activities, the creation of symbols, and the flow of emotional energy. Our use of Collins and Goffman's concepts framed our focus on the human interaction and viewed the video cameras as objects. However, our examples indicate that video cameras affect researchers and research participants, which stresses the relevance of the view of the video

camera as an active subject, consistent with scholars who have studied the material turn (e.g., Änggård 2013; Aarsand & Forsberg 2010; Nordstrom 2015).

References:

Aarsand, P., & Forsberg, L. (2010). Producing children's corporeal privacy: Ethnographic video recording as material-discursive practice. *Qualitative Research*, 10(2), 249–268.

Arminen, I. (2005). *Institutional interaction: Studies of talk at work*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Änggård, E. (2015). Digital cameras: Agents in research with children. *Children's Geographies*, 13(1), 1-13.

Barbalet, J. (Ed.)(2002). *Emotions and Sociology*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Büscher, M. (2005). Social life under the microscope?. *Sociological Research Online*, 10(1),
Retrieved from <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/10/1/buscher.html>

Collins, R. (1981). On the Microfoundations of Macrosociology. *American Journal of Sociology*, 86(5), 984-1014.

Collins, R. (2004). *Interaction Ritual Chains*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. (2005). Introduction. In N. K. Denzin & N. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of Qualitative research* (3d), pp. 1.32). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (eds.) (1992). *Talk at work. Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Erickson, F. (2011). Uses of video in social research: A brief history. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 14(3), 179-189.
- Fele, G. (2012). The use of video to document tacit participation in an emergency operations centre. *Qualitative Research*, 12(3), 280–303.
- Forsyth, R. (2009). Distance versus dialogue: Modes of engagement of two professional groups participating in a hospital based video ethnographic study. *International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches*, 3(3), 276-289.
- Forsyth, R., Carroll, K., & Reitano, P. (2009). Introduction: Illuminating everyday realities: The significance of video methods for social science and health research. *International journal of multiple research approaches*, 3(3), 214-217.
- Gauntlett, D., & Holzwarth, P. (2006). Creative and visual methods for exploring identities. *Visual Studies*, 21(1), 82-91.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame Analysis*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Goffman, E. (1983). The Interaction Order. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 1-17.
- Gordon, C. (2013). Beyond the observer's paradox: The audio-recorder as a resource for the display of identity. *Qualitative Research*, 13(3), 299–31.
- Haakana, M. (2001). Laughter as a patient's resource: Dealing with delicate aspects of medical interaction. *Text & Talk* 21(1/2), 187-219.

Harrison, B. (2002). Seeing health and illness worlds – using visual methodologies in a sociology of health and illness: A methodological review. *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 24(6), 856–872.

Heath, Ch., Hindmarsh, J., & Luff, P. (2010). *Video in qualitative research: Analysing social interaction in everyday life*. London: Sage.

Heller, M. (2006). Discourse and interaction. In D. Shiffrin, D. Tannen & H. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 250-264). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Hutchby, I., O'Reilly, M., & Parker, N. (2012). Ethics in praxis: Negotiating the presence and functions of a video camera in family therapy. *Discourse Studies* 14(6), 675–690.

Laurier, E., & Philo, C. (2006). Natural problems of naturalistic video data. In H. Knoblauch, B. Schnettler, J. Raab and H.-G. Soeffner (Eds.), *Video analysis. methodology and methods* (pp.183-192). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Lomax, H., & Casey, N. (1998). Recording social life: Reflexivity and video methodology. *Sociological Research Online*, 3(2), Retrieved from <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/3/2/1.html>

Luff, P., & Heath, C. (2012). Some 'technical challenges' of video analysis: Social actions, objects, material realities and the problems of perspective. *Qualitative Research*, 12(3), 255–279.

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

- Mondada, L. (2006). Video recording as the reflexive preservation and configuration of phenomenal features for analysis. In: Knoblauch, H., Raab, J., Soeffner, H.-G., Schnettler, B. (Eds.). *Video Analysis. Methodology and Methods* (pp. 51-68). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Monahan, T., & Fisher, R.J. (2010). Benefits of 'observer effects': Lessons from the field. *Qualitative Research*, 10(3), 357–376.
- Nordstrom, S. N. (2015). Not so innocent anymore: Making recording devices matter in qualitative interviews. *Qualitative Inquiry*, DOI: 10.1177/1077800414563804
- Sparrman, A. (2005). Video recording as interaction: Participant observation of children's everyday life. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 2(3), 241-255.
- Sparrman, A., & Lindgren, A. L. (2010). Visual Documentation as a normalizing practice: A new discourse of visibility in preschool. *Surveillance & Society*, 7(3/4), 248-261.
- Speer, S., & Hutchby, I. (2003). From ethics to analytics: Aspects of participants' orientations to the presence and relevance of recording devices. *Sociology*, 37(2), 315–337.
- Summers-Effler, E. (2002). The micro potential for social change: Emotion, consciousness, and social movement formation. *Sociological Theory*, 20(1), 41-60.