

Chapter 3: METHODS

Chapter 3 is divided into four main parts, with parts 1-3 sub-divided into several sections.

- 1) A synthesis of methods
- [2\) The Scholarly Self](#)
- 3) Interpretation, limitations and the future
- 4) Summary

Part 1: A synthesis of methods

Part 1 is divided into seven sections.

- 1) Overview
- 2) Various methods of inquiry
- 3) Dual roles
- 4) Qualitative and quantitative methods
- 5) Methods and the use of literature
- 6) The survey and the recruitment of participants
- 7) Borrowing from grounded and action-oriented research methods

1) Overview

I approached this inquiry with an understanding that scholarship can emerge from all of Boyer's four domains (Boyer, 1990), hypothesizing that change in the process of evaluation of faculty scholarship (the problem situation) is long overdue. My choice of methods was focused upon building knowledge and finding ways to explain and improve the process of performance evaluation for artistic, creative, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media.

2) Various methods of inquiry

From a conventional perspective, scholarly method is a crucial factor in any judgment made about the integrity, quality, or professionalism of research and its output. Methods of inquiry can vary vastly from each other, yet it is arguable that many qualitative and quantitative

research methods are doing essentially the same things, albeit in different ways (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000). Just as pedagogy cannot be narrowly reduced according to a specific discipline, for example, psychology, sociology, theology, or history---and must not be subservient to social, cultural, political, corporate or social sectors of society---I have taken a holistic view of research methods and the approach to my work. My intention has been to exercise relative autonomy as I move forward, therefore, by choice I have not succumbed to the temptation of a singular method in my inquiry, nor am I intending to describe or implicitly defend the status quo through reductive discourse, as might be the case in a more conventional approach.

Most researchers who are working within the broad spectrum of conventional or alternative research methods, like myself, are motivated by a confidence that they know something worth telling to others, and they use a variety of methods and means to discover and communicate their ideas and findings. My research writing emerges from systematic observation, personal reflection and integrative analysis about the problem situation and the emergent data, including the placement of value upon my own perceptions that emerge from *self*, in tandem with phenomenological data gathered from multiple other perspectives. I have used a multi-method approach, prioritizing individual experience (my own and others) as fundamental to the scope and nature of the research problem and research question. My inquiry has taken place over time, in various stages, using what I have determined to be the most appropriate methods and tools for the purpose at hand. In my opinion, the research question that frames this dissertation has determined what methods are appropriate; and I have borrowed from various methods and theoretical approaches, to varying degrees at different times depending on the context. I have engaged in various stages of research as follows, not in any particular order:

- Identification and recognition of the problem situation

- Reading many kinds of literature to contextualize the problem situation---before, during and after I commenced work for this formal project
- Formulation of the research problem and research question
- The recruitment and in-depth interview of participants for the survey
- Data analysis and synthesis
- Formulation of themes and theoretical conclusion(s) that emerge from data
- Formulation of recommendations and theoretical conclusions to be used by others during evaluation of faculty scholarship and professional work in the field of film and digital media
- Seeking considered input from my dissertation chair and committee members as I write/edit/re-write/finalize this dissertation

The above-listed stages of research in which I engaged did occur simultaneously and in random order---it was not imperative that one stage necessarily occurs before another. The process of writing for me was non-linear in nature. For example, during the process of writing/editing/re-writing/finalizing I found a need to re-formulate the research problem or research question; through reading I found the need to re-write or edit my written work; and so on. The first step was a certain awareness that a problem situation existed, and from that point the reticulated stages of research inquiry commenced---and a re-formulation of what I imagined to be the first step also did occur. Each step and stage of inquiry shared a frame of reference with all of the others. My intention was to achieve a deep understanding of substantive issues in the problem situation, to take time and reflect upon my new understanding and then make

connections is disparate and creative ways with other knowledge that emerged. My search was for implicit and explicit meaning occurred within a reticulum of values, feelings, actions and purposes that are objectified in text based artifacts, beliefs and institutional value systems. My exploration was open to the possibility that problem solving action and informed change are needed and could occur at individual and macro levels within educational institutions.

Specifically, I have borrowed and relied upon the following methods:

- Auto/ethnographic writing: my reflections are largely a part of my personal story as it relates to this topic;
- Quantitative surveys: this data will help illuminate the degree and extent to which the problem exists;
- Phenomenological interviews: in depth written interviewing in which I hope to unveil the conscious feelings and ideas about this issue in ways that will help me reflect upon my own;
- Qualitative analysis: many of my interpretations and conclusions about theory and phenomenon emerge from literature that is directly or indirectly related to this topic.

As I have borrowed, applied and integrated the various methods above listed, I have also relied upon Bloom's (1956) taxonomy of learning, with its various key verbs/words to depict the different levels of action and thinking that are used during research (Appendix F). Bloom (1956) has been recommended by Levy and Ellis (2006) as a useful framework for developing and structuring the entire process of research inquiry. Bloom (1956) facilitates an understanding of the sequential nature of learning through a series of domains and steps---for example, from knowledge recall to comprehension of meaning, from application to analysis, from synthesis and

pattern making to judgments and appraisals (Appendix F). In the context of this dissertation, Bloom (1956) facilitates a systematic approach to the process of inquiry that makes discernment of key and relevant ideas more tangible, and helps to highlight gaps in knowledge that the dissertation research aims to fill (Levy and Ellis, 2006).

3) Dual roles

I have worked in dual roles on this dissertation, as a participant and as an observer. I have been a participant as I researched and wrote this dissertation, while working as a faculty member at a university in the field of film and digital media and simultaneously applying for promotion of rank, from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor. I applied for promotion of rank on the basis of my artistic, scholarly and professional work in the field of film and digital media, instead of meeting the conventional expectation for faculty to submit peer-reviewed publications for their performance evaluation. I am also a participant through my use of an auto/ethnographic writing approach, wherein I reflect upon the personal experiences and circumstances that relate to the ongoing problem and question under inquiry.

Aside from gathering and evaluating data from others and reflecting upon my own journey as an applicant for promotion in academe, I am a participant in this auto-ethnographic doctoral dissertation based the following aspects of my background:

- I have been an undergraduate (B.A, Film and Television Production) and graduate student (M.F.A., Film and Television Production) at UCLA's School of Film and Television, and this has given me first-hand pedagogical, theoretical and practical experience in a prestigious film school;

- I am a professional filmmaker with more than 25 years of international experience in documentary, commercial and experimental filmmaking; and with a resume of recognized, award-winning creative work to my credit;
- I have been a professional consultant in media production for social development in many countries worldwide;
- I am an educator with more than 12 years of full time teaching experience at the university and College levels in the knowledge-and-practice areas of film/TV production, electronic/digital media production, multimedia design and other related areas of fine arts and design practice.

In addition to my role as a participant, I have also been an observer. I have experienced and have observed the scope and nature of actual performance evaluation processes in higher education, and in other hierarchical systems. I am also an observer of alternative and indigenous worldviews that are non-hierarchical, for the sake of learning what may once have been useful but now ignored or forgotten in the mainstream of contemporary institutions of higher learning--- but of potentially great value if renewed and revisited at this time. In my role as observer, I have recruited faculty to respond to a Survey (Appendix C) to determine and compare the nature of their/our perceptions and experiences with performance evaluation on the basis of creative scholarship and professional work in the field of film and digital media. While filmmaking and digital media production are relatively new domains of knowledge and practice in the bastions of academic institutions, in the data I have observed the idea that change in the existing institutional paradigm about scholarship is overdue but slowly emerging in some corners (Boyer, 1990). In sum, as a participant and an observer I am seeking to build a deeper theoretical and practical

understanding of the research problem and research question, and to facilitate and develop a useful model for change.

4) Qualitative and quantitative methods

By definition, qualitative research and qualitative research are fields of inquiry in their own rights. My first interest was to compare qualitative with quantitative methodology in relation to creative work in the arts (including work in the field of film and digital media), to discern differences and similarities, and to determine applicability in the case of the my evolving understanding of the research problem. Quantitative methods emphasize the measurement and analysis of causal relationships between variables. Quantitative researchers argue that their work is done within a value-free framework. I do not consider quantitative methods to be the most useful way to inform this inquiry, nor is this method been a major factor in my research approach, but I have made use of this approach in a survey (described below, Appendix C) to facilitate the emergence of unanticipated data. The process of knowledge building through quantitative methods is considered to be an accumulation of accurate facts that represent *what is*--and what is infers to that which exists outside or independent of *self*. Accordingly, by employing and adhering to quantitative methods it is presumed that subjectivity---opinions, ideologies, biases---are constrained and the knower (myself) thereby gains an accurate and objective description of reality. As I quantify and compare particular aspects of the participant responses from the survey, I am borrowing from quantitative methods.

In contrast, qualitative researchers are encouraged to use (for example) ethnographic prose, historical narratives, first-person accounts, still photographs, life histories, fictionalized facts, certain kinds of films and other media elements, autobiographical materials, in addition to

more conventional writings, as preferred sources---for the purposes of representation, interpretation, establishment of trustworthiness, and (*self-*) evaluation; while quantitative researchers commonly rely upon mathematical models, statistical tables, and graphs---and they usually write about their research in impersonal, third person prose (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000). Qualitative research is usually committed to a naturalistic, interpretive approach to subject matter, emphasizing the qualities of entities; and on processes and meanings that are not intended to be experimentally examined or measured (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000). There is an intimate and value-laden relationship between the qualitative researcher and what is studied, with situational constraints continuously shaping the scope and nature of inquiry. Qualitative research has separate histories in education, social science, communication, psychology, history, organizational studies, medical sciences, anthropology, sociology and the arts, so qualitative research methods are not a homogenous whole, and their variant forms constitute many different things to many people.

Although both quantitative and qualitative methods have focused upon the search for empirical truth, the broad range of methods that comprise the qualitative approach are more oriented toward commentary and interpretation; for the purpose of exploring, studying and answering questions about attitudes, behaviors, values, concerns, motivations, aspirations, experiences. Qualitative research methods are concerned with what people do, say, desire and experience. A qualitative approach reflects the scope and nature of my pursuit as a researcher, and it generally reflects the underlying purpose(s) of most work (artistic, scholarly and professional) in the field of film and digital media. I acknowledge that defining precisely what constitutes qualitative research is a vast and complex challenge, particularly in the specific, unique and qualitative field of film and digital media.

This dissertation can be generally described as partially quantitative, but mostly qualitative and personalized in its approach to inquiry. I have considered a fairly broad range of data sources in my inquiry, including my *self*, and I collected data mainly through the use of qualitative methods. My inquiry was a strategic process that generally moved from collection and thinking about the data, to description and analysis in relation to the problem, to self-reflective writing about the problem and question, to theory building. A process of data sampling followed my description of the problem, and the data included text-based literature, a survey and interviews. The collection of qualitative and quantitative data was theoretically based, rather than random---although serendipitous good fortune was never discounted or ruled out. Sources were identified, gathered, and selected for further analysis according to my perception(s) about their relevance to the research problem and research question; and upon their impact and influence upon the theoretical conclusions that were constantly emerging and re-emerging. Over time I observed, defined and analyzed the problem from many perspectives, over and over again, without knowing how or when I was going to reach a point of finality.

5) Methods and the use of literature

In my reading, I was able to identify a vast array of many important variables with significant implications. As I read, I began to perceive multiple possibilities and systemic connections---theoretical, political, sociological, psychological, and historical---that were relevant to the process of performance evaluation in academic settings, reified and reinforced by what I was experiencing in my own workplace; and through what I was gleaning from interviews with project participants. The possibilities and systemic connections that emerged from my reading began to clarify the scope and nature of the problem that was negatively impacting my

own career, and the careers of others like myself who are faculty members in the field of film and digital media---those of us on the borders who have faced the gauntlet of performance evaluation.

In some ways, my search for relevant literature and data sources relates to my background with the method of grounded theory and grounded action (Glaser and Strauss, 1967), yet in other ways it clearly does not. The approach of grounded theory and grounded action are framed consistently by systems theory and systems thinking. Throughout my inquiry I have been guided by an underlying belief that everything is data (Glaser, 1978; 1998), so I have searched through a broad range of emergent bits and pieces of information and other evidence to build and achieve a better understanding, leading to my writing with a hopeful aspiration that change can occur. My approach is also similar to GTGA because I did not seek to verify or refute an already established theory, and I subjected the data that was gathered to rigorous inferential and deductive analyses (Glaser, 1978). In a subsequent section of this chapter I further discuss the role of GTGA in this project.

Critical reading of what has already been established and known, as conveyed in the literature, has facilitated my ability to build an integrated awareness of what is *not* known---as I have expressed in the research problem and the research questions. By establishing the state of the previous research, it is more possible to establish how new research can advance previous research (Gall, Borg and Gall, 1996). Critical reading of the literature is necessary for building a bridge between the controversies, discrepancies, assumptions, gaps and alternative perspectives that have emerged from my inquiry. Inquiry and examination of a range of conventional, traditional and alternative views of scholarship has helped to contextualize and enhance meaning about the present-day ontology and practice of performance evaluation of faculty work in

institutions of higher learning, and has also facilitated my ability to build a tool for use in performance evaluation of artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in film and digital media. These are the benefits of what constitutes my methodological approach to the literature for this dissertation.

My interest and approach has been to read literature from historical and contemporary perspectives, framing my analysis in the form of a problem and related questions that are posed by this dissertation. My motivation is driven by curiosity and courage, but my purpose constitutes a reflection upon issues that reach to the heart of what it means to be a faculty scholar and professional in higher education---specifically asking, as a faculty member, what am I expected to do and how am I expected to spend my time?

6) The survey and the recruitment of participants

In an effort to improve its scope and nature as I commenced my work, I developed the survey after review of some other surveys. I looked closely at previous sampling, measurement and other questionnaires for ways to improve and enhance the scope and nature of this quantitative and qualitative tool. My goal was to recruit and interview professors (through the Survey) who rely upon filmmaking as an important aspect of their intellectual and professional work, and who have successfully (or unsuccessfully) undergone a process of evaluation for promotion of rank at an academic institution. As described in Chapter 4, I have been particularly interested to learn about the experience of faculty members who rely upon the alternative forms of scholarship in a performance evaluation setting, specifically in the field of film and digital media. The Survey is included as Appendix C. From this group of faculty members who responded to the survey, I solicited further participation from three individuals for personal interviews. My

goal has been to discover or affirm a range of ideas, problems or solutions that emerge from data gathered in response to the survey, analyzed in the context of my own experiences and critical reading of literature.

The survey sought to solicit, measure and form the basis for interpreting the experience of others with direct knowledge with performance evaluation processes in the field of film and digital media. I recruited participants for this purpose from various professional organizations such as the University Film and Video Association (UFVA), CILECT, International Documentary Association, Explorer's Club of New York City, Broadcast Education Association (BEA), and others. In total, I contacted more than 300 professors (assistant, associate and full) in the United States, Canada, Europe and other parts of the world, faculty in the field of film and digital media who have previously applied or are planning to apply for promotion of rank, presumably including those who have been denied promotion of rank. While it was disappointing that only 13 of the 300 faculty members took the time to take the survey, there is likely some data to be discerned in the friendly notices of regret that I received. One professor wrote:

Dear Anthony...no way I will get to this in near future. I apologize. I am way behind my own work on top of which I have several interviews to address. Good luck with it
Best, xxx (email message to me from a colleague)

My feeling of dejection due to the low level of response can be summed up in stoic terms: All circumstances will eventually be transformed in their time in accordance with their inner nature. Alternatively, it can also be argued that people get the government, situation, relationship, and life that they deserve for themselves. Faculty are overworked and in many cases, as illustrated in

Chapter 4, de-motivated to the point that pondering of theoretical issues concerning faculty advancement is not prioritized.

The quantity and quality of response to the survey (Appendix C) prompted my decision to conduct more in-depth one-on-one interviews with particular participants. My intention was to know more about their first hand experiences, opinions and feelings as faculty members who have gone through the process of administrative and peer evaluation of their creative scholarship output. This data is described in Chapter 4 and integrated into the recommendations of Chapter 5.

First, I sent an email message to the above-listed organizations to solicit their cooperation by allowing me to contact their membership (Appendix A). That effort was less than successful and I basically received words of encouragement but no direct assistance from any organization. Second, I contacted and recruited the members of the University Film and Video Association (UFVA), using the UFVA's 2009 membership catalog, selecting from the membership roster all the full time faculty that were accessible by email, seeking their informed consent (Appendix B) and completion of the Survey (Appendix C). Specifically, I sent each of them an email message with a hyperlink to the online survey. The survey was sent electronically to a wide range of faculty members in the United States and other countries worldwide, targeting those who have submitted creative scholarship or professional work in an educational institution setting for the purpose of achieving some form of institutional reward in an academic setting, including but not limited to promotion of rank, tenure review, contractual renewal, and more. The majority of faculty members who participated in this project are practitioner-filmmakers, and those who are creatively producing film and digital media for various reasons, in any style (or combination of styles) of filmmaking---commercial, experimental, documentary, industrial, dramatic, etc. In

other words, the project participants are filmmakers, artists or digital media producers who also work simultaneously as full time as faculty members at an institution of higher learning. I sought project participants with successful and/or unsuccessful personal experience in the process of evaluation of scholarship in an academic setting, including those who may not have had such experience(s) because they have found that creative scholarship is discouraged or disallowed from the evaluation process in their particular setting. I also sought and considered the perspectives of academic administrators as project participants, those persons who make final decisions at the University level about the evaluation and acceptance of creative research in the context of rewards. I also have sought out the perspectives of other faculty members who advocate conventional notions of research output, to represent a full range of perspectives as I collect data, develop grounded conclusions and formulate a theory. It was unnecessary, in my view, to interview those who advocate the traditional template and the trilogy of faculty work because this perspective is well articulated in the mainstream literature. At this time I believe there is a broad and accessible body of scholarly literature that adequately summarizes the conventional paradigm that is in place in most academic settings.

As data emerged in the initial stages from the survey, I decided to modify my approach and ask participants to write about their personal experience(s). Based upon my new knowledge about the importance of experiential narrative in inquiry I have modified Section II of my Questionnaire (Appendix C) to read as follows:

Please write a direct account of your personal experience with the academic faculty promotion process as you lived through it. Describe the experience from the inside, as it were-almost like a state of mind: the feelings, the mood, the emotions, etc. Focus on a particular example or incident as your object in that experience: for example, describe a

specific event in the process as a particular experience. Recall and write about how you felt and sensed during the process of that experienced.

It is not of great concern to me whether the participants conveyed their experience exactly as it literally may have happened. I am less concerned with factual accuracy than with the plausibility of their account---whether it reveals a living sense of it was experienced, or not. In the survey and in interview situations, I asked participants to write vignettes in a free association style (Freud, 1995)---where the participant is encouraged to talk with little or no guidance from the researcher (myself). Chapter 4 provides a detailed analysis of what was expressed and learned through the process of surveying and interviewing project participants, and the cumulative results are interpreted within the recommendations and analysis of Chapter 5.

7) Borrowing from grounded and action-oriented research methods

This dissertation includes elements of grounded theory and action-oriented research methods that I have borrowed, when appropriate. Grounded theory is a highly systematic research approach and method for the development of theory to explain basic patterns that are common in social life, and there are many aspects in its practice that are useful in this research project. Grounded theory research is similar to other research methodologies in that it is a rigorous process of data comparison, collection and analysis, but there are many other important differences. I share the view set forth by Chenitz and Swanson (1986) who argue that grounded theory is complimentary with other methods, not as a replacement, where my job is “to take the role of the other, to discover all of the variation and perspectives in the situation, determining levels of symbolic and behavioral meaning wherever the problem occurs” (Chenitz and Swanson, 1986, p. 46). For example, a grounded approach is very appropriate as I code the

interview responses, being sensitive to the data that emerges without regard to my own preconceptions and expectations, and as my data reaches a point of saturation that enables the generation of theory and the possibility of theoretical fit (Glaser, 1978; Glaser and Strauss, 1967).

Grounded theory methods were useful to me as I posed a question in my mind throughout the process of my research inquiry---how long must I continue and how I will when/where to end? The methods and approach of grounded theory research recommend that data be gathered until all categories are saturated, so the theory that is developed will be dense and precise (Levy and Ellis, 2006). Glaser (1978) wrote: "In trying to reach saturation he maximizes differences in his groups in order to maximize the varieties of data bearing on the category, and thereby develops as many diverse properties of the category as possible" (p. 62). The conventional method and approach would be to compare data from one institution that does not deviate from the expectations of the trilogy and the traditional template in the recognition, evaluation and rewarding of faculty work in the field of film and digital media, then to compare that institution with another (more supportive) institution; and then seek to make recommendations (regulations) with regard to how the first institution manage their staff and running a further analysis as to whether this may be linked with improving faculty satisfaction, etc. While this type of investigation may yield short-term solutions, a lot of theoretically relevant data could be ignored and many important questions do not get addressed (Haig, 1995).

My approach to literature, in some ways, contradicts the GTGA approach. According to method and approach of GTGA, the review of literature should be conducted after the emergence of substantive theory; it is then, and not before, that data from literature contributes to a study (Glaser, 1978). But, in my research I did my reading(s) before, during, and after the time of

determining the research problem and research question; and before, during, and after doing of my investigative search through surveying and interviewing of project participants. I did read for the specific purpose of building broader knowledge, regardless whether or not it would be directly or indirectly relevant to my purpose of building a theoretical understanding; always hoping that connections would emerge, but with no guarantee of results.

The approach of reading the literature first (or during), with the objective of identifying gaps and relevant theories, is opposite to the role that literature serves in GTGA. Glaser (1978) is specific in recommending not to do a literature review in the substantive area and related areas where the research is done; waiting until the grounded theory is nearly completed, during the processes of sorting and writing. Only then is a literature search in the substantive area to be accomplished and woven into the theory, itself becoming just one more source of data for constant comparison (Glaser and Strauss, 1967, p. 360-67). Some observers might construe this approach as a neglect of the literature, but I perceive that the purpose is to keep the researcher as free as possible of influences that could restrict the freedom required for theoretical discovery, not to ignore current and relevant knowledge (Glaser, 1978). I have no regrets about my approach, and I am aware of its (partial) inconsistency with GT.

Saturation is an important concept that is borrowed from grounded theorists (Glaser, 1978). Saturation is the intended end result, after the process of gathering, organizing and preliminary analysis of incoming categories of data, that affirms that my research has reached a point that I can quit my search because an appropriate number of groups have been surveyed and no additional data can be found (Glaser, 1978). Saturation means that I have continued my inquiry until (a) no new or relevant data seem to emerge regarding a category, (b) the conceptual categories are well developed in terms of properties and dimensions that demonstrate variation,

(c) the relationships among categories are well established and validated. Categorical saturation means that one category is saturated. Theoretical saturation means all categories are saturated, but core theoretical categories should be saturated more than peripheral ones. Strauss and Corbin (1990) wrote:

A category is considered saturated when no new information seems to emerge during coding, that is, when no new properties, dimensions, conditions, actions/interactions, or consequences are seen in the data... In trying to reach saturation he maximizes differences in his groups in order to maximize the varieties of data bearing on the category, and thereby develops as many diverse properties of the category as possible (p. 62, 136).

I also have borrowed from the approach of action-oriented research methods. Action-oriented research does resemble certain methods and ideals found in conventional approaches to research, but it is fundamentally different in many other ways (Reason and Bradbury, 2001). Although my dissertation will not directly develop or implement the cycles of a pure action-research project, what I do can be considered a first step in data gathering and reflection upon my hypothesis with interested parties, including my own reflection. Action research cycles involve reflection on data, participant ownership of organizational change and implementation of actions based on research conclusions, and I view these cycles as ideal for my research. Although I will not address the action-research cycles of organizational change in this dissertation *per se*, it is my intention to reflect upon data for the purpose of finding a grounded theoretical basis for implementation of actions based upon research conclusions. In these ways my research borrows from action research. This dissertation is also borrowing from the philosophical purpose of action-oriented research as I am intentionally seeking to find ways to facilitate intrinsically-

motivated autonomy, enhancement of competence, and career advancement for creative faculty in academe that seek a fair and considered evaluation of their creative research with film and digital media as a communicative means for expression (Reason and Bradbury, 2001; McNiff, Lomax and Whitehead, 1996).

Part 2: The Scholarly Self

Part 2 consists of five parts:

- 1) Introduction
- 2) Curiosity and courage
- 3) An auto/ethnographic approach to inquiry
- 4) Doubts about auto/ethnography
- 5) Reflecting upon auto/ethnography as a method of writing

Part 2 examines the scope and nature of personalized methods for research inquiry in response to the research problem and research question.

1) Introduction

The ways that research findings and interpretations are communicated has been undergoing significant changes in recent decades as a result of the postmodern critique of the representational neutrality of social science research; epistemological challenges to traditional dissemination forms; and the broadening social, cultural, political, and pedagogical concerns of education researchers, among other factors (Voithofer, 2005). As a result of these changes, the discourses that define what it means to be a scholar, educator, student, or researcher have shifted and continue to be in motion. According to Voithofer (2005):

the portrayal of this movement demands evolving forms of representation...Arts-based researchers in education have worked at the borders of academic, aesthetic, and representational design resources in order to connect the embodied and emotional experiences of learning with larger social and cultural contexts...One illustration of this can be seen in developing theories about how to design the representation of voice through multiple media. Voice can be described as a channel of communication that personalizes and contextualizes the representation of verbal, textual, and mediated information in space and time (i.e., embodies it). Using descriptors such as tone, volume,

pitch, silence, cadence, rhythm, inflection, expressiveness, and emotion, the design of the representation of voice presents a unique opportunity for new media researchers (p. 9-10).

Auto/ethnography and performance offer illustrations of how the approach in research and the scope and nature of research resources can guide the design of voice in new media. With its origins in the crisis of representation in anthropology, auto/ethnography is attentive to situating the researcher's voice among those that are relevant to the evolution of a study, including participant, reviewer, editor, and reader voices (Voithofer, 2005). Informed by "research on oral and personal narratives in performance and communication studies, situating the socio-politically inscribed body as a central site of meaning" (Spry, 2001, p. 710), auto/ethnography is one way for new media researchers to situate technotexts in time and space (Voithofer, 2005).

1) Curiosity and courage

My mindset has prioritized *curiosity* as I have collected and read a wide range of literature and other data during the process of inquiry. I have always been asking---what's out there, and what's in here? Curiosity is what best describes the nature of my approach to literature in the scholarly domain. But, the selection, inclusion, and use of literary and other sources data in my inquiry are not necessarily random, nor are my impressions or decisions determined *a priori*. My approach has given no preconceived or predetermined position of privilege to a text-based or any other source; each artifact and idea is initially treated as a source of data, with all sources being considered as equals at the outset. This approach recognizes that

important connections can emerge by surprise, and that resonant meaning is not necessarily guaranteed by strategic planning. This is an emergent study, one that does not set out to test an existing theory *per se*; so it is not known at the outset which sources of data will eventually (or will not) turn out to be relevant to the inquiry. In some cases, an important connection and meaning can be drawn upon from a first reading or encounter; in other cases, tiny or substantive yet rich systemic connections and meanings emerge over time; while in other cases there will be promising sources that make no significant impact upon my emerging understanding about the problem and therefore are not further considered. I consider this to be an open approach to inquiry.

As *curiosity* describes my approach to the collection and interpretation of data (described in further detail in Chapter 2), *courage* describes my methodological approach to this dissertation. Courage is a personal, psychological, spiritual, and essential virtue that guides my method of inquiry, including my willingness to be informed through systemic connections that are not imitative of conventional understanding. Expressed in a personalized way, I submit my thoughts in prose:

Courage (by Anthony Collins)

Forward movement through an onslaught of obfuscation, resistance and doubt

Overcoming the anxious ambience of existential nothingness

Thriving in an uncharted forest where there are no well-worn paths.

This chapter describes my methods and methodology, including my courageous commitment to inquiry through auto/ethnographic writing has facilitated expression in its many forms--- physical, moral, social, creative. The assertion of courage is what makes possible the emergence

of other virtues such as honesty, integrity, commitment, and diligence (May, 1975). The word, courage, comes from the same stem as the French word, 'coeur', that signifies 'heart'. Courage is not necessarily the absence of fear, but is a heartfelt action in the face of adversity, based upon one's beliefs, values, principles, or morals. Curiosity and courage are two virtues that describe my approach and method of inquiry.

2) An auto/ethnographic approach to inquiry

I am a participant and observer in this research, seeking to understand the convergence of personal experience with explanatory context that emerges from others. Systemic connections, sources of fact, truth, aesthetic beauty, or any other descriptive category of data are non-predictable in their origin and can emerge from anywhere, including the *self*. Quantum physics teaches about the impossibility of separating the manner in which a phenomenon is explained from the personal equation of the experimenter, the *self*, who has informed the explanation (Wheatley, 1999). Denzin and Lincoln (2000) write:

various labels define the qualitative research process including theory, analysis, ontology, epistemology, and methodology. Behind these terms stands the personal biography of the researcher, who (knowingly or unknowingly) speaks from a particular class, gender, racial, cultural, and ethnic community perspective (p. 29).

Using the *self* as the central or sole point of inquiry can be described as an alternative perspective about scholarly inquiry, an approach that is diametrically opposite to conventional norms (Tierney, 1998, p. 66).

Scholars are regularly advised to keep *self* and any trace of emotions out of their scholarly work because this is viewed as compromising the credibility of the work and the scholar. Up to the present time, the conventional approach is to present a logical progression of knowledge and opinions through evidence and systematic thought, carefully following an introduction-body-conclusion template, albeit without any expression of emotion. In this light, Charmaz and Mitchell (1997) argue that scholarly writers are expected to stay on the sidelines and keep their voices out of their writings----“the proper voice is no voice at all” (p. 194). From the alternative perspective, scholars argue that the techniques and criteria used in the conventional approach to ensure reliability, validity and other verification measures should be questioned; and that judgment about alternative forms of scholarship activity, including work in the field of film and digital media, should not necessarily be based upon traditional criteria used to judge qualitative investigations (Holt, 2003; Garratt and Hodkinson, 1999; Sparks, 2000; Morse, Barrett, Mayan, Olson and Spiers, 2002).

Auto/ethnography is a method and philosophical perspective that prioritizes knowing about *self*, while also allowing for the recognition of other people's thoughts and experiences. Reed-Danahay (1997) explains the interconnection and meaning of auto/ethnography as a composite term: auto (*self*), ethno (culture), graphy (the research process), and suggests that auto/ethnography transcends the dichotomy of *self* and social group, the *self*/society split, and constitutes a form of writing that is simultaneously about one's societal group and one's *self*. Auto/ethnography is a qualitative approach to research inquiry that synthesizes ethnography and autobiography, reflecting a postmodern tendency to position the *self* and subjectivity in relation to what is being studied. Auto/ethnography calls into question the purported objectivity of conventional methods because it enables a confrontation with dominant forms of representation

and power in an attempt to reclaim, through self-reflective response, representational spaces that have marginalized those of us at the borders (Reed-Danahay, 1997, Chang, 2008; Van Maanen, 1988). Auto/ethnography is a personalized, evocative and first-person form of scholarly writing that connects, represents and uses the dual aspects of person/*self* within a cultural and social context, but also allows for an array of emotions and self-conscious reflections to emerge and be revealed (Holt, 2003). Auto/ethnography is an authentic, boundary-crossing approach for conveying the multiple natures of *self*-hood and opens up a new way of writing about social life, one that is based upon the assumption that the insider's voice and perspective is more true than that of the outsider (Reed-Danahay, 1997, Chang, 2008; Van Maanen, 1988).

I am writing from my personal perspective as I locate my *self* within a social, cultural and intellectual milieu. Richardson (1995) has given a special name to the specific approach of writing and inquiry that I intend to use---a 'writing story'. What has motivated me to expend so much effort toward a writing story, writing with the use of proprioceptive methods (Metcalf and Tobin, 2002), confessional, impressionistic, auto/ethnographic way? Of what value or merit or difference is this personalized approach to my scholarly activities, in contrast to any other approach? Knowledge and reflection about *self* as the sole source of data remains an off limits and no-go area for inquiry in academic contexts, with scant chance of recognition---and very likely to generate skepticism and controversy---so why bother taking such a risk when recognition and reward are unlikely? Is the intrinsic reward guaranteed and enticing? On the other hand, what is so offensive, un-scholarly and problematic about using self as the focal point for inquiry? How is it possible to move forward by writing in a scholarly way while remaining true to an introspective *self*? Can scholarly writing be meaningful, expressive and defiant in the face of the hegemonic ethic to conform, verify, and assent to the status quo? As is now obvious,

I am keen to follow a problem-posing model as my mind is bursting with thoughts and lines of inquiry (Freire, 1998). Therefore, I have followed an auto/ethnographic approach for inquiry and expression, through my own writing story.

I am not intending to denigrate the value of conventional scholarship with its various approaches and methods; but I do intend to clear a pathway that facilitates the recognition of a new approach and method for scholarly work. In contrast to the traditional and conventional approach that emphasizes empirical truth, I have employed a personalized and *self*-reflective approach in my scholarly writing. I am imagining and seeking a form of expressive writing that is open to more than one authority, one that is not so reliant upon claims of absolute correctness or insistent upon canonical subservience to authority in order to justify its interpretive stance. I have sought a way to articulate my knowledge and awareness through a form of storytelling, in a semi-formal way that would be expected of a doctoral dissertation, yet in a way that also reflects or expresses my thoughts, feelings and perceptions. I am seeking and am requiring a new form of writing, one that is less reliant upon the hegemony of conventional expectations (van Maanen, 1988, 1990).

As a painter uses various materials---oils, brushes and a canvas---to convey what is known, seen, heard, sensed, or felt, I intend to express myself through words, metaphors, phrasing, imagery, and most critically, the expansive recall of personal experiences (Van Maanen, 1988). Van Maanen (1988) has shown that “confessional and impressionistic tales” are comparative with the “necessarily imaginative” form of highly personalized, innovative, unposed and figurative paintings labeled as “impressionist” that emerged in the West during the late 19th and early 20th centuries (p. 101-102). Using this analogy, as an auto/ethnographic writer and through my use of an auto/ethnographic approach, I am producing an impressionistic and

confessional writing story that personalizes and represents my perceptions, interpretations, and recollections while extending the scope of inquiry and reflection to include various other methods for critical analysis and qualitative scholarly inquiry as the need and circumstance arises---phenomenological, semiotic, symbolic, linguistic, semantic, literary, grounded, textual, philosophical, and hermeneutic (van Maanen, 1988).

A personalized work can be considered valid as a form of scholarship if it evokes in the reader a feeling that the experience is authentic, believable, and possible (Ellis, 1995). An auto/ethnographic approach to scholarly writing and reflection, one method within a myriad of personalized approaches and methods, is intended for the building of knowledge and the conveyance of understanding. The approach of auto/ethnography has provided a means to address the scope and nature of issues relating to my inquiry in this dissertation, but magnifies the potential for problems that can be expected when one shifts research methods away from convention and more towards a personalized approach. The traditional and conventional expectation for objectivity is perceived to be unmet because auto/ethnography is a value-laden approach located a zenith point away from such the norm. Auto/ethnography can be loosely, yet accurately, labeled as a qualitative research method, and I have opted to tell my story by using a qualitative and personalized approach, distinct from quantitative methods because it requires a close look at everyday life of the *self*, as I inhabit the borders within my social and professional milieu.

3) Doubts about auto/ethnography

Doubts have been raised about auto/ethnography, including whether or not it is a proper form of scholarship action, and whether or not it is convincingly authentic or worthwhile (van

Maanen, 1988). Auto/ethnographies have been described as being touchy-feely, self-indulgent, too introspective, too narcissistic, insufficiently theoretical, and not properly grounded to be credibly considered as a form of scholarly writing (Holt, 2003; Coffey, 1999; Sparkes, 2002). The ethnographic approach has been characterized by intellectual restlessness, uncertainty and discomfort as the practitioner occupies:

...a literary borderland somewhere between writers who reach for very general audiences and those who reach for a specialized few. To the generalists, ethnography often seems pinched and inelegant, its standards stiff and restrictive. To the specialists, the same writing may seem imprecise and unfocused, its standards loose and unfathomable. Versions of these borderland skirmishes are played out within ethnographic circles as well (van Maanen, 1988 pp. ix-xi).

These criticisms provide political justification for the marginalization of auto-ethnographic writing and other forms of unconventional scholarship.

Even within the general field of ethnography itself, its own practitioners have represented themselves as marginal natives (Freilich, 1970), or professional strangers (Agar, 1980) who, as self-reliant loners (Lofland, 1974) or self-denying emissaries (Boon, 1982) who work to bring forth their ethnographic accounts in writing (von Maanen, 1988). Doubts have been raised in what has been regarded as the:

...excess of anti-methodological, 'anything goes', romantic postmodernism that is associated with qualitative research methods such as auto-ethnographic writing, with assertions that the results are more fiction than fact, not in accord with facts, low quality, stereotypical and too close to common sense to be constituted as credible research (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000 p. 13).

Holt (2003) has written an auto/ethnographic essay that illustrates the problems facing auto/ethnographic writing in an academic setting. Some sections of his paper include a dialogue between himself and two reviewers of a research paper that he has written in auto/ethnographic style---the reviewer is actually a composite version of several reviewers of his work as he attempted to get his work published (excerpted):

Reviewer: It is generally not wise to conduct a study of self...It would be difficult to classify this manuscript as 'true' research even after a revision.

Holt: The genre of auto/ethnography is based on, and designed for, the use of self. Without the self there could be no auto/ethnography. You are dismissing the entire methodology rather than critiquing this particular investigation...

Reviewer: Certain scientific tenets must be adhered to. The manuscript should be grounded within a theoretical framework. We cannot publish good stories in an academic journal.

Methodological procedures and data analysis must be clearly explained and supported with references. You failed to comply with these demands in such a manner that your work could be replicated.

Holt: How could someone else replicate work based upon my personal experience?

Reviewer: That is exactly why this material is not of publishable quality!

The dialogue sequence by Holt (2003) demonstrates the gap that exists in traditional academia, between acceptance and alienation, for the practice and practitioners of auto/ethnographic writing. The gap is rooted in the perception that theoretical concepts are not reliably emergent or apparent in a writing story of self, and that auto/ethnographic writing does not enhance the rigor of qualitative investigation (Holt, 2003).

4) Reflecting upon auto/ethnography as a method of writing

As an auto/ethnographic writer I am engaged in a process of remembering, reflecting, and expressing. As discussed in Chapter 1, perceptions and memories of phenomena in my life are the outcomes of pattern recognition by the brain. Auto/ethnographic writing is a form of creative expression from a scholarly perspective, albeit with a different point of view and unique form of representation than a conventional qualitative and quantitative approach. What is auto/ethnographic is original, personal and arguably categorized as scholarly; but it also must be asked, why is artistic, scholarly or professional, by faculty in the field of film and digital media not openly recognized and accepted as scholarly work in higher education? What does creativity have to do with scholarly work, if anything? The common view is that creativity is antithetical to traditional conventional notions of what is expected in the process and output of scientific research, representing a perilous venture into the realm of subjectivity. Creativity is commonly perceived as a mysterious gift that is only bestowed to a chosen few, like Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Mark Twain, or Pablo Picasso, and not a characteristic of the neo-realist ontology. I hold a different view, one that advocates creativity can be related to scholarly work, and is skill that can be learned, nurtured and improved.

All written descriptions can be described as forms of interpretation about what is known, and in this way my auto/ethnographic writing can be described as a way that I write, interpret and express what I have learned in a scholarly yet personalized way. Auto/ethnographic writing is used primarily when research inquiry intends to discern the primacy of self, personal feelings, attitudes and perceptions within the contexts of an external phenomenon or situation. In the case of my dissertation, the phenomenon or situation is the process of evaluating faculty performance that appears film and digital media. My use of an auto/ethnographic approach in writing is

descriptive, fictional and experiential. It is a written gathering of observations, conversations or written interviews; and an artistic work that constitutes the basis of my inquiry and research. It has always been done with a primary aim to determine what is the meaning and essence of involvement for the individual who is experiencing the situation under study. The main assumption in auto/ethnography is that writing is a philosophical approach and method that contains an essence of truth, and that reflective writing and its emerging meaning are the data. From the perspective of auto/ethnographic inquiry, my intention is to learn from my first-hand experiences as I have faced the power structures and linear systems of academic institutions. Participants in this project have also undergone the process of applying for promotion of academic rank on the basis of creative work in film, video and/or digital media---and my work describes and analyzes the significance of our experiences, prejudices, historical contexts, and other understandings that are emergent.

My auto/ethnographic writing story is intended to demonstrate to myself, and to any reader with an inclination to read my work, that I am able to produce, in writing, an evocative auto/ethnographic account about my personal knowledge, understanding, experiences, perceptions, feelings and inclinations that are emerging and present in my life at this time---as a doctoral student deeply immersed in the process of dissertation research and writing, as a practicing filmmaker and artist working on the margins of the profession, and as a full-time professor in a college of fine arts and design in the Arabian Gulf, not to mention a husband and father of three children, ages 16, 14, and 6. In essence, I am a person experiencing the push and pull of life forces while seeking deeper levels of knowledge and awareness, hoping to facilitate greater intrinsic motivation for future action. As a professional in higher education, I seek meaningful acknowledgement and recognition in my workplace; as an artist-filmmaker-scholar I

seek more knowledge, skill and understanding that empowers productivity, change, future action and new possibilities for creative expression; and as a man I seek seeking a lasting sense of well being in life. Such a tall order cannot be realized or satisfied with just one project, but I am focusing this paper upon my interest in auto/ethnographic writing and exploring its relevance and usefulness as I complete my writing story and the process of work on my doctoral dissertation.

The conventional expected outcome for scholarly research is the discovery of empirical evidence that supports a conclusion. Empiricism as a value indicator does not fit or rightly describe my theoretical and personal intermix of postmodern sensibilities, is not consistent with my personal approach to the literature (and the topic), nor does it accurately describe the scope and nature of how artistic, scholarly or professional work in the field of film and digital media is realized. “Modern empirical methods in the social and educational sciences are largely predicated on the eye as giving truth” (Popkewitz, 1997, p. 20). And yet, as Fischman (2001) notes, education research has, by and large, eschewed the study (and corresponding epistemological debates) surrounding visual culture. This paradox has led to research methodologies that translate visuals into text (e.g., through coding), while generally avoiding the study of the perception and reception of visual culture and downplaying the epistemological consequences of word–image relationships in both the collection of data and the reporting of research results (Voithofer, 2005). As quantitative methods make perceptions, opinions, attitudes, and thoughts visible through statistics, and qualitative methods engage in naturalistic studies of human processes that are directly visible through the eye, “looking, seeing and knowing have become perilously intertwined” (Jenks, 1995, p. 1).

In contrast to empiricism, as a filmmaker and a doctoral dissertation scholar, or scholarly scriptor (Barthes, 1977), I openly strive to imagine alternative conclusions and unstructured

perspectives, a diversity of conclusions, departing from the tautologies of circular logic that are inherent to the traditions and conventions of empiricism. I do not automatically assume the future will be like the past, nor do I believe that what was known yesterday will be the same as I what I know today, or what I will know tomorrow will mirror what I knew before. When watching a film or any time-based work in digital media, as in other expressive form of output, the viewer is not just a consumer of a pre-determined, unilateral message. Meaning is connoted and denoted in the mind of each viewer/audience member, and the film adds or detracts from the notions that the viewer has created (Barthes, 1977; Moriarty, 1991). My writing expects that the reader will make meanings that diverge from mine---a writerly approach, in contrast to writing that is intended to be a unilateral voice---a readerly approach (Barthes, 1977). My approach in this inquiry has been qualitative rather than quantitative, deductive rather than empirical, *writerly* rather than *readerly*.

Part 3: Interpretation, limitations and the future

Part 3 is divided into three main sections:

- 1) Data Analysis and Synthesis
- 2) Limitations
- 3) Future possibilities

1) Data Analysis and Synthesis

Upon receiving consent from participants (Appendix B), I transcribed data from the survey (Appendix C), then proceeded to code, describe, analyze and interpret the emergent data. Data from the initial and subsequent interviews was transcribed and coded into themes that described my understanding of the data. Data was transcribed from the questionnaires and was used to determine the need and scope that informs subsequent in person interview questions. Subsequently, new and better questions continued to emerge from the response(s) given in the survey, and when that happened the respondent was re-contacted for their further input. Through a synthesis of data by means of various research methods, I integrated and accounted for diverse views, with the intention of improving the existing systems for evaluating diverse forms of research---for my personal benefit and the improvement of the problem situation (McNiff, Lomax and Whitehead, 1996).

2) Limitations

There are some obvious limitations in this study.

- First, I am limiting the interviews (Survey, Appendix C) for this study to faculty members who have sought or will seek promotion of rank and other rewards at institutions of higher learning. I have no ability to contact every single academic faculty member worldwide in the field of film and digital media, past and present, so I have to

believe that the 300+ faculty members I did contact, with 13 respondents, suffices as a representative number for a useful analysis.

- Second, I have chosen to focus upon faculty in the field of film and digital media at academic institutions of higher learning. An opportunity for future research exists, perhaps motivated by this dissertation, to examine the process, problems and challenges of performance evaluation in other disciplines in fine arts such as painting, musical performance, performance art, creative writing and poetry, theater arts and many other fields where faculty may be producing scholarly work that is not text-based in nature; but in this dissertation I am focused only upon the problem of performance evaluation for faculty in the field of film and digital media.
- Third, I have chosen to focus upon faculty who submit films, videos and/or digital media work in their dossier for performance evaluation in teaching, research or service.
- A fourth problem that affected the way research was conducted is the fact that I am located in the United Arab Emirates, far away from most of the participants in this project. I have had to rely upon email as my primary means of information gathering and communication. Therefore, a limitation could be perceived that my access to a pool of potential respondents was limited to asynchronous contact in writing, and determined by the respondent's (un-) willingness to access/respond to email messages and apply their internet skills to respond to the survey. I reasonably assumed that a representative high percentage of the specific population that I was studying (faculty in the field of film and digital media) have adequate access to a computer with email capability, and that a reasonable number would take the time to check their email and provide an online response to the survey.

- The use of asynchronous internet-email based electronic interviewing as the sole means of information gathering might be perceived in a traditional and conventional context as a limitation, although I view it as a relatively quick and low-cost option. It does eliminate the dimension of face-to-face interaction with the nuanced reading of non-verbal behavior and expression. The rapport and emergent relationship that is formed through electronic means is arguably and potentially more superficial and difficult to establish, in comparison with personal contact, and there is an ever-present risk of misunderstanding, mendacity, or misrepresentation by all concerned parties, plus electronic interviewing can not fully ensure that anonymity will not be breached. On the other hand, Schaefer and Dillman (1998) found that email surveys achieved response rates similar to those of mail surveys but yielded better quality data in terms of completion and more detailed response to open-ended questions.

The focus of my dissertation is a restricted one, tied to a problem situation that has been framed in the opening paragraphs as the research problem and research question, and limited in the ways that are above-listed, with the particular problem more or less resolved by the conclusion. As described at the outset of this chapter, this notion of a conclusion reflects a conventional realist practice of textual organization. By framing the representation in such a fashion, closure of the materials can be claimed. Closure is itself an argument that subsumes knowledge to be verifiable, replicable and certain. Yet if I leave the issues raised in this dissertation without a determined resolution, up in the air, ambiguous, or in some other state of uncertainty, the reader would probably be disturbed and such an approach might undermine the authority of my work (Van Maanen, 1993).

Traditionally, shorthand terminologies such as validity, reliability, trustworthiness, and triangulation have been used in support of parsimony in the reporting of research. But as I have reflected and integrated multiple (media) data sources and mixed methodologies into this project, I have needed to be more explicit than reflective in reporting the process of data abstraction in the transition to text-based dissemination. Pink's (2001) call for new discourses to represent visual data raises the question of how to develop non-reductive languages for the abstraction of multiple media data that do not conflate seeing with knowing (Voithofer, 2005; Jenks, 1995). Exploring the limits of visual culture through aesthetic techniques such as video editing is one possible response to this question. Another possibility would be to develop a vocabulary of metaphors related to new media characteristics.

3) Future possibilities

After publication of this completed dissertation, I will be able to follow-up on program implementation possibilities in many universities, using appropriate action-oriented approaches for participant ownership and organizational change. Further, it is my intention to demonstrate how the process of documentary filmmaking and digital media production for social development, a particular kind of filmmaking practice, can exemplify all of the action research cycles to a credible degree that should be recognized during faculty performance evaluation.

Part 4: Summary

When compelled to label the approach of my inquiry, I argue that it falls under the umbrella of qualitative methods, in comparison with quantitative methods. I would also argue that faculty work in film and digital media should also be labeled as a form of qualitative inquiry. The output is not text-based publication, but the approach to inquiry is relatively consistent with a qualitative approach.

I have used a range of relevant methods for inquiry and analysis, enabling me to move forward to develop a new theory and tangible written model that can be used to improve existing practice. Also, I have deconstructed conventional notions of what constitutes scholarship and professional work, for the purpose of locating artistic, scholarly and professional work by faculty in the field of film and digital media within the continuum of academic scholarship. My overarching purpose is to benefit faculty members in the field of film and digital media in academic institutions of higher learning, facilitating change in the ways that artistic, scholarly, and professional work is recognized and evaluated during a performance evaluation.