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This thesis focuses on three major themes in documentary filmmaking: ethical representation, dramatization, and filmmaker-participant relationships. Each one of these themes is heavily influential in the outcome of a documentary. Ethical representation refers to the portrayal of participants on film. This first theme embodies the core of documentary films. How participants are portrayed on film determines the message an audience will receive. Dramatization is the creative aspect of documentary film. The incorporation of reenactments gives filmmakers the ability to capture the past and future. Finally, the filmmaker-participant relationship is the interaction that takes place behind the camera. Through a thorough analysis, these themes are dissected and explored, giving readers a clear perspective on the importance of these themes in filmmaking.

In order to put these themes into a real world application, the researcher traveled to Quito, Ecuador to produce a documentary. This trip served as the basis of the case study this thesis is centered on. Throughout her journey, the researcher was exposed to all three themes simultaneously during the production process. The researcher recorded the details of the production process, from both her memory, and some documented notes. Also, in order to add depth to her study, the researcher measured audience opinion as well as the input from her former film crew using survey analysis.

Overall, it was determined that the three themes have a critical impact on audience perception. Specifically, the representation of the participants in the researcher’s film, *Sigo Adelante*, was perceived as ethical. Also, the dramatization
used in the film mostly had a positive impact on those who noticed the reenacted scenes. Additionally, it was determined that the filmmaker-participant relationship is extremely valued in the eyes of both the audience members and the film crewmembers that participated in this study. It was concluded that the genre of documentary filmmaking is largely complex. There are many different layers, practices, and themes to the classification of nonfiction film. Each of the themes examined in this thesis each play a significant role all the way through to the final film. Through research and the case study, the researcher determined that, aside from thorough research, the best way to begin to understand the complexities of documentary filmmaking is to apply the practices through real world experience.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

“Documentaries have the capacity to harness and focus emotions in ways that have a unique bearing on the social world and individuals they represent”

(Smaill, 2010, p. 6)

Since the early 18th century, documentaries have been one of the most truthful forms of representation in the media. One of the main goals for filmmakers is to represent a true and compelling depiction of the subject of the film. Honesty, accuracy, and trustworthiness are some of the core qualities audiences expect from a documentary (Aufderheide, 2007). What makes documentaries significant in today’s society is their unique ability to share with others different perspectives of the world. Unlike fictional films, documentaries aim to persuade audiences of the actual world, not the imaginable world (Nichols, 2001). Part of what makes them appealing is the fact that they are reflections of the real world; and that allows them to connect emotionally with their audiences. Documentaries gather emotional responses from their audiences by connecting their storylines to individuals who can relate to them (Smaill, 2010).

Although documentaries work to harness accuracy and truthfulness, it is necessary to know they are not 100 percent raw depictions of our world, but rather reflect multiple representations of it. There has been tension between the actual reality and the representation of the real world as depicted through documentary filmmaking (Aufderheide, 2007). For example, there has been debate over whether it is ethically responsible to claim to present accurate representations while using artistic license to dramatize certain aspects of the film.
This thin line between reality and fiction brings up questions about the influence of a documentary that utilizes artistic license for dramatic effect. Aspects of reenacted scenes, overall representation, and the relationship between participant and filmmaker all play key roles in the production process. These factors, along with other technical aspects of production, were explored in the making of the researcher’s film.

In May 2014, the researcher traveled to Quito, Ecuador to produce a documentary with a small film crew on an organization that fostered social change within the local community. The researcher took on the role of director. Within a month’s time, the researcher and film crew had to examine the organization, establish relationships with the natives, discover a compelling story, document the events surrounding the story, and edit the footage into one final cohesive film. All duties within pre-production, production, and post-production were carried out and carried out by the director and film crew within the time restrictions of one month. The completed film was about the life of Silvia Margarita; a single mother who has faced multiple obstacles, yet still has perseverance and strength to provide a better life for her two children. Throughout the process of producing the documentary, the researcher was faced with many of the issues/themes filmmakers handle during the production process including: ethical responsibility, dramatization, and the relationship between she and Silvia.

It is important to grasp the concepts of these major themes in documentary filmmaking. Therefore, the researcher conducted a case study on her full production experience in Quito, Ecuador. Through a detailed analysis of each
theme, the researcher will make accurate connections to her encounters in Quito, as well as what decisions were made during the production and post-production processes. This study will also explore the influence of these themes on viewers of the researcher’s film. For clarification, this case study was conducted in order to grasp the major themes behind artistic non-fiction filmmaking, rather than filmmaking in general.

Statement of the Problem

Ethical Representation

Ethics is perhaps one of the most common themes that occur in documentary filmmaking. Decisions specifically concerning ethical representation commonly present themselves when filming non-fiction content. These forms of representation must be accurately portrayed in a way that is socially and responsibly ethical (Maccarone, 2010); however, the question is according to whom? Unlike their fiction narrative counterpart, documentaries have a certain responsibility to uphold standards of truthfulness and accuracy in their films. The execution process of a non-fiction film has no concrete boundaries as to what constitutes as an “honest” representation. The filmmaker ultimately decides the direction the film will go in terms of honest portrayal. The choices they make are what determine up the film’s final depiction (Aufderheide, 2007). Therefore, it can be assumed that the definition of ethics, as it pertains to non-fiction filmmaking, is inexact.

The director had to define ethics in her own way during the production process. Everything from receiving consent from participants to filming Silvia’s
children was all put into careful consideration. Questions of how to “ethically” represent Silvia’s life and how to work with filming restrictions of the organization arose during the entire production process. According to Nichols (2001), representation in a film can be done in many ways. He gives several variations of how filmmakers choose to represent others in their films. All of the variations combine a three-way relationship between the “filmmaker, subjects, and the audience” (p. 13). Not only does the filmmaker have to consider all three relationships, but it is also their responsibility to ensure their subjects are portrayed in a way that is ethically acceptable (Maccarone, 2010). Along with ethical responsibility, filmmakers are to be clear about the intent for their film and the message it depicts (Lewis, 2007). This is significant to what audiences will take away from the film, and what will ultimately be shared with others. Ethics, intent, and messages portrayed all greatly influenced the director’s decisions.

*Dramatization in Documentary*

Not only do filmmakers need to carefully examine their representation style, but also how they portray the scenes in their films. Dramatization of scenes are often used in documentary in order to convey the reality of situations (Bruzzi, 2006). Documentaries that use this form of representation do so in order to depict a message that could not otherwise be filmed authentically (p. 185). This brings about an entire new category for the documentary genre: the performative documentary. According to Bruzzi, there are two forms of performative documentaries. The first is one that features actors or actresses. The second is one
that features the inherent presence of the filmmaker. The form related to the case study is a mixture of both.

In more ways than one, the documentary in this case study used performative measures to capture on screen what could not be captured in real time. In her film, the director implemented a few scenes that portrayed past events. The purpose for using these cinematic elements was to bring the audience deeper into the life of the main participant, Silvia. The goal of the dramatized scenes was to give the film a more emotional pull. In order to accurately portray the various life events in Silvia’s life, the director saw fit to create scenes that would accurately portray the real events. Not only did the director use dramatization for past events, but also for references regarding the future of the Silvia’s children. These scenes portrayed perceived future events, such as Silvia’s 8–year-old son wanting to become a doctor.

Filmmaker-Participant Relationship

Another element that also has an effect on the production process of a nonfiction film is the relationship between the filmmaker and the participant. Building a relationship with a participant in the film is something that takes time, commitment, and trust. According to Piotrowska (2012), little is known about what kind of relationship forms behind the camera between filmmaker and participant. Before this article was written, there was another that described the relationship between filmmaker and participant as a power struggle (Nash, 2010). It was also determined that a documentary could reveal a lot about this
relationship. It has been previously perceived that the power of the documentary and what it will represent solely lies with the filmmaker. In other words, the filmmaker is the power holder in the relationship (Nash, 2010).

Both power and trust serve as a fundamental foundation for every filmmaker-participant relationship. In the case study, the director had a first hand experience on what roles power and trust played during the production of the documentary. Everything from establishing an equal understanding to having intimate interviews with the participant was explored throughout the film’s production. Although the director had a good relationship with the participant, elements of power and trust still arose throughout the filming of the documentary. This led the director and film crew to come across multiple barriers during the pre-production and filming process. Details regarding the dynamics of the relationship will be disclosed in Chapter 4.

Background and Need

Each documentary serves the purpose to reveal and portray the actual world. There are many different elements that, when combined, tell a story. According to Nichols (2001), every documentary intertwines three stories: the filmmaker’s, the film’s, and the audience’s (p. 61). The themes that were previously mentioned play key roles in how these stories are represented and how they are perceived. All three stories directly link to the themes of ethical representation, dramatization, and the filmmaker-participant relationship.
In the case study, the director faced a number of ethical decisions regarding representation of the participants. The director had a large amount of responsibility to dictate what was ethical and what wasn’t. It is very difficult to measure ethical representation quantitatively; however, it is possible to use audience feedback in order to gauge perceived views on ethical representation. In the case study, the researcher used audience feedback in order to determine whether or not the goal of the film was reached. Perhaps one of the most important parts of producing a documentary is its affect on the audience it is delivered to. Therefore, it is important to receive audience feedback to measure opinions on the messages delivered and also the perceived level of ethical representation of the participants. This will reveal to the researcher whether or not she was responsible in her presentation of the life of the participant.

During the case study, the director used elements of dramatic performance in the film. The reason for these particular scenes to be dramatized was to portray the past of the participant. Dramatized scenes were also used to create a visual for events the participant referenced for the future. Dramatic performance in the documentary was used in order to enhance viewers’ emotions and to also capture past and future events on camera to fit into the story arc. The goal in the decisions made was to increase audience emotional level and to further immerse the audience into the life of the participant. In order to fully understand the concepts behind the usage of dramatic performance, the director provided a personal log of which scenes were dramatized and the reasoning behind each one. More research
is needed to understand exactly why filmmakers choose to use dramatized scenes and the ethical dilemmas that need to be considered before doing so.

The final component that affects the production process of a documentary is the filmmaker-participant relationship. Without a solid establishment of trust between both parties, the production process is difficult. In Ecuador, the director only had one month to establish a healthy relationship with the participants. There are many factors that can play a role in how this relationship develops and is maintained. Thomas (2012) examined the ethics behind building relationships with participants. Using Aufderheide’s book *Honest Truths* Thomas concluded that various constraints during filmmaking affect the relationship with participants. In his article, Thomas used a personal example of how time constraints affected his relationship with his participants. This constraint restricted Thomas from showing the film to the participant until it was fully completed (Thomas, 2012). In the director’s experience, time was also a large factor that affected the relationship between she and her participants. Also, similar to Thomas’ experience, the director and film crew could not show the participant the film until it was fully completed. This made it difficult to establish a sense of trust and honesty with the participants.

With documentary relationships also comes the perceived power that the filmmaker has over the participant (Thomas, 2012). This power essentially symbolizes the vulnerability of the participant during the filming and editing process. Since the participant has no say in the final product of the film, there is a perceived level of power the filmmaker possesses over the participant. According
to Nash (2010), the final product of a film serves as an accurate way to analyze the relationship between filmmaker and participant. In the analysis, Nash explores the “problem of power” that occurs during documentary film production. The director came into close contact with these different elements of the filmmaker-participant relationship. Several of the articles dedicated to examining this further are fairly recent, and therefore, need additional experiences to add to the analysis of documentary relationships.

*Purpose of Study*

This case study was conducted to further analyze the elements of three of the most common themes in documentary filmmaking: ethical representation, dramatization, and relationships. The experiences of the director correlate closely with research that has been previously conducted on the subject; and will provide professionals with a first hand experience into each of the themes. Previous research on the subject has used third party sources in order to analyze these main themes in documentary filmmaking. Therefore, there is a need for more first-hand studies and experiences in order to provide more accurate information on the subject. Documentary filmmaking has changed over the past few years due to technological development, more modern equipment, and adequate resources. The questions of ethics, dramatization, and relationships have changed throughout the years as the film industry has undergone these changes in development. This case study will provide a fresh perspective into the world of modern documentary filmmaking, while answering the historical questions related to the major themes.
As previously stated, the researcher spent one month in Quito, Ecuador, where she and her film crew underwent pre-production, production, and post-production processes. Apart from documented personal experience, the methods used in this study were audience and crew survey analyses. In order to accurately determine whether or not the director’s goals were reached, a survey was sent out via email to 52 participants along with the link to the 8-minute film. After viewing the film, participants were asked to answer survey questions related to the themes. There was no age restriction on the audience for this film; therefore, the survey was sent to participants of varying ages. An additional survey was sent to the members of the director’s film crew. The purpose of the survey was to capture the crewmembers’ different perspectives on the film’s production and also the relationships with the participants in the film.

The benefits of this study include: a first hand experience from a filmmaker, direct audience feedback on major components of documentary filmmaking, insight from additional filmmakers who experienced the production process, information on modern documentary filmmaking, a recent analysis of the production process, and additional research for the three most common themes in documentary filmmaking. There are a number of sources that analyze at least one of the three main themes in documentary filmmaking; however, there are very few who analyze all three themes together. This case study seeks to examine major aspects of documentary filmmaking in a way that is relevant and applicable manner.
**Research Questions**

The research questions asked in this study were:

- Was the participant in the film portrayed in an ethical manner?
- What was the perceived impact of the dramatization used in the film?
- What elements influenced the filmmaker-participant relationship the most?

**Significance to the Field**

This case study holds a high level of importance for the field of documentary filmmaking. First, the researcher conducted detailed research on the most common themes in modern documentary filmmaking. It is through this research that filmmakers will be able to better understand what the major themes are and also how they have potentially used the same tactics in their own films. In addition to the research on the themes, the researcher used a unique observational method to add application to the research she conducted. Her case study incorporates the three themes and how they all fall into the production process. This incorporation of the research through participant observation will give past and future filmmakers insight on how the research is relevant and applicable to documentary filmmaking.

Thirdly, perhaps the most important thing that this study reveals is how audience members react to certain methods used in documentary filmmaking. This case study asks audiences about the ethical representation of participants, the use of dramatization, and how important they believe the filmmaker-participant
relationship to be. Knowing the opinions of the audience will further advance movements and studies in documentary filmmaking. If filmmakers have a sense of how audiences react to these practices, they will be better prepared and equipped to please those who will watch their film.

Definitions

There are a few terms in which the director will define more finitely in order to ensure clarity throughout the analysis. First, the terms “researcher” and “director” will be referring to the same person. Whenever speaking of data analysis and research methods, the term “researcher” will be used. Whenever the researcher is speaking about her role and duties as a director the term “director” will be used. Secondly, when speaking of ethical representation the researcher is referring to the physical and social appropriateness of the participants’ portrayal on film. This refers to the way in which the participants are displayed on camera. Additionally, dramatization refers to the incorporation of reenacted scenes into nonfictional content. In the case of documentaries, dramatization is used to capture past or future events that cannot be filmed in real time. Also, when referring to the audience of the film, the researcher is speaking specifically about those who she sent her film to via email.

Ethical Considerations

Throughout this study, many ethical considerations were made. First, the personal documentation of making the director’s film was done without
manipulation. The researcher did not conduct any research on the filmmaking themes until she returned from filming abroad. This ensured that the researcher did not in any way manipulate her observational data. Also, she made sure to eliminate all bias from the data results. Specifically, the researcher surveyed the other film crewmembers for additional opinions. She also surveyed audience members to determine her level of ethical responsibility in making the film. Also, the researcher took into consideration exposure of participants’ names. Therefore, the names of people who appear in this thesis were previously approved. In addition, the names of the audience members who took part in the survey will remain anonymous.

Along with eliminating bias and abiding by privacy rights of participants, the researcher also took into consideration the research she conducted for the literature review. As to not research only what would support her personal experience, the researcher explored all relevant sources to the major themes. This research will be discussed further in Chapter 2.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

“Documentaries are about real life; they are not real life. They are not even windows into real life. They are portraits of real life, using real life as their raw material, constructed by artists and technicians who make myriad decisions about what story to tell to whom, and for what purpose”
(Aufderheide, 2007, p.2)

In studying documentary filmmaking, it is important to recognize the major themes surrounding the subject. Through careful research, the researcher found three common themes related to documentary filmmaking. These themes are essential to the film industry and require further research and analysis. The first major theme is ethical representation. This refers to how the filmmaker portrays the participants in the film; and also the level of truthfulness and fairness used towards the participants in the production and post-production processes. Since documentaries are considered to be one of the most truthful and raw forms of media (Aufderheide, 2007), ethical representation is significant to the reputation of the documentary genre. The second major theme on this subject is the use of dramatization in documentary films. Dramatized scenes can be described as scenes that are staged or reenacted in order to portray events in the film that could not be captured in real time. This includes events from the past, visuals of personal anecdotes given by the participant, and also perceived future events. The third and final theme is the filmmaker-participant relationship. According to varying sources, the relationship between the filmmaker and participant has a large impact on the production of the film. These themes, along with other ethical implications will be discussed in more detail in the following review.
Ethical Representation

Ethics is a broad theme that focuses on protecting the rights of the individuals who are represented in the film (Butchart, 2006). Individual rights, when combined with a filmmaker’s rights to artistic expression, can potentially lead to many ethical considerations. These considerations vary depending on what kind of representation is exhibited in the film. Nichols (1991) listed four main types of documentary: expository, observational, interactive, and reflexive. The documentary for this case study, *Sigo Adelante*, harnessed a cinematic structure rather than a “raw” structure, making it most relatable to the interactive representation mode. According to Nichols, interactive modes of representation use imagery and dialogue to emphasize certain viewpoints (Nichols, 1991). This brings up many ethical considerations when it comes to representation.

As stated by Maccarone (2010), documentary filmmakers have certain obligations to the participants in their films. These obligations not only cover initial consent, but also the representation of participants in the film. Filmmakers are the creators of the final product; therefore, they have the ability to tell the story the way they deem acceptable. This leaves a lot of room for unethical practices in representation. Although it is clear that filmmakers need consent from participants, they also need to protect their participants by truthful storytelling (Butchart, 2006). There are common elements that are related to the theme of ethical representation. As stated by Butchart (2006), these elements include: participant consent, an individual’s right to know, and objectivity in documentary.
First, it is concluded that while filmmakers are legally allowed artistic freedom while filming, it is also important for them to keep in mind the rights of the individual. In other words, artistic freedom has the ability to stretch the truth, or misconceive reality. In order to avoid this, filmmakers normally disclose their intentions upon receiving participant consent (Butchart, 2006). Secondly, Butchart concludes that filmmakers need to remain “socially responsible” while representing participants in film. This practice stems from journalism ethics about fairness in representation (p.2). Lastly, the element of objectivity plays a key role in ethical portrayal of participants. Although journalism ethics can be applied to documentary, it is difficult to place documentary under journalism. This is because filmmakers have power in how they chose to represent their participants. For Butchart,

“The problem of objectivity in the context of documentary in one sense or another concerns the idea that the camera does not lie, that there is some kind of essence to any scene that unfolds, and that it is the documentarian’s role to capture this scene and bring it to the screen in an unbiased, unfiltered, and truthful a form as possible” (p.3)

Butchart suggests that documentary film is, in fact, more subjective when it comes to context. Although filmmakers do have power when it comes to representation, they still have a responsibility to be knowledgeable about the effects their actions may have on those involved (Nichols, 2010). In other words,
it is recommended they film their participants and portray them in a way that is not unnecessarily exploiting them (Rosenthal, 1988). Documentaries are used as vessels for messages, and often embody different priorities (Corner, 2008).

According to Corner, more modern documentaries contain elements of “pictorial creativity” (p. 21) and “various modes of narrative” (p. 22). Pictorialism, as stated by Corner, refers to the visual and audible design of the documentary. This includes the way scenes are shot, musical accompaniment, and also the overall structure of the film. This element serves as the foundation for creative illustration. The second element, creative narrative, refers to how the story is told. This element focuses more on the content and how it is portrayed throughout the film (Corner, 2008). Both of these components draw relation to the issue of ethical representation in documentary film, especially those produced in modern times.

Navarro and Spence (2010) compare documentary film to photography. Using a 1968 essay on photography by John Berger, the authors were able to assess the major differences in how both forms portray truth. It was stated that unlike film, photos capture truth in one moment of time, leaving little to no room for manipulation. Since cameras capture moments in time, the photos are considered to be an “authentic record” (p. 11). This authenticity was valued by theorists and soon made its way into film (p. 12). However, film is very much different from photographs. Unlike general photographs, film catches time as it passes. Therefore, it has the ability to be transformed into a different entity. The truthfulness of the representation of photographs is what allowed audiences to
view documentaries as portrayals of truth (Navarro & Spence, 2010). These findings explain why documentary film is upheld as truthful forms of reality. This plays a major role in how documentary representation ethics evolved, and why it is so significant to the craft.

Ethics have always come into question in regards to documentary filmmaking. Representation is at the center of filming a documentary (Nichols, 2001). Therefore, doing it in an ethical manner is a major responsibility for the filmmaker (Maccarone, 2010). Representation plays a key role in the message that is delivered to audiences, as well as depicting the lives of participants in the film. It is through this representation that people learn the perceived truths and actualities of the real world. Documentaries have one common goal: to capture events from a true story and put it together to bring the audience into another world (Maccarone, 2010).

**Dramatization**

The subject of ethical representation often points to a filmmaker’s artistic freedom during the production process. This freedom includes the ability to create dramatized scenes throughout the film. According to Saunders (2010), using factual information along with creative and “poetic” license is one of documentary’s largest staples. Documentaries not only capture factual events, they tell stories to their audiences, often in creative and colorful manners. As stated by Aufderheide (2007):
“A shared convention of most documentaries is the narrative structure. They are stories, they have beginnings, middles, and ends; they invest viewers in their characters, they take viewers on emotional journeys” (p. 12).

Like all stories, documentaries have an arc. The story arc is what allows the story to flow smoothly from beginning to end. According to Bernard (2011), finished films will have a “compelling beginning, an unexpected middle” (also know as the climax), and a “satisfying end”. In order to employ an engaging story arc, filmmakers often use creative elements for enhancement. If used effectively, dramatization can be a very useful tool for documentary films.

It is a commonly adopted notion that non-fiction films should not employ aspects of fictional content (Saunders, 2010); however, a majority of filmmakers in this genre fully utilize their creative licenses. This license isn’t used for trickery or false storytelling, but rather for a more creative illustration of the truth. Creative methods such as dramatization and other visual creations appeal more to audiences (Bernard, 2011). According to Bernard, documentaries that use these methods grab the largest audience. When using creative elements, non-fiction films are “more than documentaries, they’re movies” (p.1). Although documentaries are portrayals of truth, the way in which the truth is presented is what sets them apart from each other. Documentary filmmakers have one main target in mind: to engage the audience. By presenting the truth in more ways than pure documentation, documentaries allow viewers to have brand new experiences (p. 2). Because of this, documentaries are more than documented footage. They are stories; and the filmmaker is the storyteller who “investigates a subject that
fascinates them” (Govaert, 2007, p. 246). Similar to traditional fictional stories, documentaries often utilize tools of performance and acting to convey messages.

Documentaries in modern times, especially those focused on historical events, sometimes use actors to recreate events from the past. Recreations are used primarily to increase the audience’s understanding of past events (Pettitt, 2000). This better understanding makes it easier for the audience to connect the past and present. The actors in film are usually made aware of the intent of the messages and serve as visual aids in representation (Sutherland, 2010). When filmmakers are unable to capture events from the past, actors are used to fill the void. Using actors in documentary film is just one mode of creative visualization for documentary film. The new digital age has allowed for there to be many forms of visual creativity, which leaves room for many different audience perceptions.

This notion can be further explored through examining the “constitutive condition” that often occurs in filmmaking (Coover, 2012). Using historical theories on audience reception and perception of films, Coover determined that during the production of a documentary, filmmakers go through a period of “intense spectatorship” in which they analyze specifics of cuts and scenes they want to capture. With new technological advances, this analysis of visualization allows for more creative freedom than ever before. This, inevitably, affects the representation and portrayal of events throughout the film (Coover, 2012). Coover’s exploration of visual creation in documentary film may explain the exponential rise in creative expression in documentary film, especially regarding dramatized scenes in order to fulfill a vision.
Perhaps this advancement in visual creation is part of the reason documentaries are argued to be mere representations of truth, rather than actual truth. Since documentary film has the ability to be manipulated throughout its production, scholars are curious as to how true documentaries that use dramatization really are. Similar to Butchart (2006), Dormehl (2012) suggests that the definition of documentary lies within the lines of subjectivity and objectivity. According to Dormehl, documentary is expected to be “subjectively objective” (p. 16). In other words, documentary films are perceived to be creative in production; however, still portraying truth. This suggests that while the production of the film may be done subjectively, the finished product is expected to be an accurate representation of truth.

Not only does performance in documentary involve actors and visual reenactments, but also the participants in the film. Citing the works of Bill Nichols and John Corner, Marquis (2009) wrote an intellectual dissertation regarding documentary performance. Within her analysis of dramatization in nonfiction film, Marquis argued that the subject of documentary performance is a complex one. Marquis explains this argument by using a three-tiered process in which to better understand the subject. As stated by Marquis, “Self-presentation is (1) shaped by the camera (2) within specific nonfiction film frameworks (3)” (p. 79). This model reflects creative choices made by filmmakers and also the participants involved. It is within this model that expression is enlarged or restricted during the production process. Performance in documentary, argued by Marquis, “…helps to construct and communicate the personalities being recorded,
revealed or preserved in nonfiction films” (p. 87). This eludes to the further consideration that awareness of self-performance aids in character development and the definition of truth in nonfiction film. Marquis concluded this analysis by emphasizing that performance in documentary permits audiences more freedom to interpret complex meanings in nonfiction film.

In a later work, Marquis (2013) defines the previously mentioned tiers within performance documentary with different terms. In this analysis, Marquis implies that performance is crucial to the message that is portrayed to audiences and also to the story the filmmaker wants to tell. Using a different perspective on performance, Marquis defines the tiers as: everyday performance, filmic performance, and documentary performance. Everyday performance refers to the daily communication that is shared with participants. Filmic performance refers to a change or modification in routine behavior as a result of the presence of the camera. Lastly, documentary performance refers to individuals in the film who present themselves within the documentary text (Marquis, 2013).

As determined by the previous analysis, it is made clear that although heavily criticized by traditional-minded nonfiction scholars, documentary performance opens doors for filmmakers to be creative, illustrative, and impactful in delivering powerful messages to audiences. Performance techniques used in documentary filmmakers are beginning to be accepted by audiences and critics (Arthur, 2005). Documentaries represent the actual world, and in more recent years, filmmakers have been increasingly using a cinematic style for their nonfiction films. Additionally, documentary films can use the main participants,
not just actors, in order to create dramatized scenes. According to Marquis (2013), an individual is considered a film performer as soon as he or she steps in front of the camera. The actions of the participant will not only stem from his or her immediate environment, but also the spectators that will later view the film. Everyday behaviors and actions turn into expressive activity that is much like a screen performance. Documentaries that use performative techniques often affect viewers’ interpretations (Marquis, 2013). This refers to the idea that no two viewers interpret a nonfiction film the same way. In fact, as claimed by Saunders (2010), realness in a documentary film is partly defined by how an audience watches it. Depending on how the messages are delivered, the audience may interpret them in many ways (p. 14). This suggests that there is no concrete definition of “real” and “truth” regarding documentaries, allowing there to be room for dramatization. Perhaps what is the most important is how dramatization is used, and the intent of the messages delivered to audiences.

**Filmmaker-Participant Relationship**

Alongside representation and dramatization lies the foundation of a documentary film: the relationship between filmmaker and participant. Without a healthy relationship between filmmaker and participant, many aspects of the production process would not flow smoothly in accordance to plan. One of the main things that impact this relationship is power. There is a perceived issue of a power struggle between those in the relationship. According to Nash (2010) all power regarding representation and the production process belongs to the
filmmaker. It is believed that since the participant has no right to manipulate the film’s final product, they are considered “powerless” (p. 2). Part of what gives the filmmaker this perceived position of control is the fact that they do not appear on camera (Nichols, 1991). The absence of the filmmaker in the film creates the notion that they are in control of what the audience sees. The filmmaker has creative license for the film, editing power, and ultimate access to the media, essentially giving them the right to all power (Nash, 2010).

Nichols (1991) further analyzes this perspective and has his own ideas about what constitutes power in a filmmaker-participant relationship. His idea of power is similar to that of a puppet performance in which the one who is in control shapes the image he wants as the puppet performs. In this scenario, the puppet master is the filmmaker and the puppet is the participant. Power, in this sense, means that the filmmaker has the ability to manipulate the story (Nash, 2010). This notion makes the filmmaker-participant relationship seem like a dictatorship, in which the participant has no input on how they are represented.

With this idea comes an issue that stems from power: trust.

According to Nash (2010), the participant has to build trust with the filmmaker that they will portray accurate representations, while the filmmaker has to trust that the participant will be committed to the entire process without resigning. Trust is perhaps the main factor in establishing a healthy relationship between filmmaker and participant. Without trust, the filmmaker will not have an honest effort from the participant to reveal the story of their life, and the
participant will become skeptical of how they will be represented in the final product.

As stated by Nash (2010) trust, as it pertains to documentary filmmaking, involves not only the participant trusting the filmmaker to produce an ethically acceptable film, but also vice versa. The filmmaker “trusts the participant not to undermine the documentary once completed by casting doubt on its truth claims” (p. 8). Therefore, both individuals must trust the other to continue with the production process. Etherington (2007) explored this definition of trust, and related it directly to power using personal experiences from a case study. The analysis included detailed recordings of conversations with participants, along with commentary debunking the dialogue. It was determined that issues in power are inevitable in most cases.

According to Etherington, “Power issues permeate every aspect of research relationships” (p. 615). As an added conclusion, Etherington added a few main guidelines for developing ethical relationships between filmmaker and participant. The first is to always remain aware of any power imbalances in the relationship. This especially includes awareness of any cultural differences. The second guideline refers to negotiating terms with each other. This will help foster a healthy relationship and balance any power issues. Thirdly, the filmmaker must provide information regarding intent, and also updates during the production process. By keeping the participant informed, the more trust they admit to the filmmaker (p. 615). Finally, the researcher must write about any dilemmas that occur. This helps the research keep track of how the dilemmas were resolved.
Sanders (2007) disagreed with Ethrington's third guideline, in regards to participant consent. In fact, Sanders claims that most filmmakers do not offer complete openness about intent and consent to their subjects. In fact, it was determined that in most cases “filmmakers can’t tell the whole truth” (p. 10) in regards to the production process. In other words, filmmakers are often unable to disclose uncertain information to their participants. This is mainly because the filmmaker cannot predict the outcome of the film nor possible consequences that may occur. Another reason filmmakers choose not to inform their participant fully is because the participant may start to “worry about if their performance is good enough” (p. 11). Explained differently, the filmmaker does not inform the participant of anything that may discourage them from being a part of the film. Perhaps this withholding of information contributes to the issue of trust between filmmaker and participant. Not only does it affect trust, but also presents power imbalances between filmmaker and participant.

In fact, Winston (1995) argued that unbalanced power struggle is one of documentary’s toughest challenges. It is a delicate issue that must be approached with sensitivity on the part of the filmmaker (p. 240). If done correctly, there should be a balanced level of power between both filmmaker and participant, making for a more healthy and balanced relationship. Part of what makes the relationship balanced is the fact that both parties fill in the other’s gaps. In a sense, the investment of both parties neutralizes any power imbalance. Nash (2009) discovered that both the filmmaker and participant have input that the other does not. In the hands of the filmmaker lies the power to represent the
participant through creative vision. In the hands of the participant lies the commitment and voice needed to complete the project. Nash refers to this as “a kind of negotiated collaboration” (p. 220). This idea may lead one to question why filmmakers and participants have the issues of trust and power if both can simply negotiate. The answer is that the idea of negotiation is one more complex than its surface reveals. In fact, the difficulty in Nash’s idea of “negotiated collaboration” may lie in the economic and cultural differences between filmmaker and participant.

Aufderheide, Jaszi, & Chandra (2009) found that a lot of filmmakers found there to be a lot of cultural and economic differences between themselves and their participants. Thomas (2012) explored this idea further by comparing it to his own experience as a filmmaker. Thomas focused mainly on the idea that there are many economic changes in the TV industry, which hinders the relationship between filmmaker and participant. Thomas determined that many filmmakers believe that the “industrial and economic changes within the TV industry” have affected their relationships with participants in some form (p. 80). More specifically, these differences were claimed to affect trust in a relationship. Referring to a personal experience, Thomas (2012) faced time and economic pressures which prohibited “showing the film to its participants for comment until after it was completed” (p. 80). This restraint relates specifically to the issues of informed consent and trust.

One of the main issues most filmmakers faced in their relationship with their participants was struggling with how to “maintain a humane working
relationship” (p. 6). In an attempt to do this, some filmmakers sought to eliminate power imbalances by opting for more “informal commitments” instead of giving formal informed consent (p. 6). This was done in the efforts to achieve a more friendly relationship with participants, rather than one that is strictly professional.

Nash (2009) said that trust in a documentary relationship requires full vulnerability on both parts. In other words, both the filmmaker and the participant are recommended to be openly honest with each other throughout the production process. Therefore, being unable to show the film until completion is what most likely strained Thomas’ relationship with his participant. In a previous work, Thomas (2010) explored the implications of creating a mutually beneficial relationship between filmmaker and participant. Using his documentary Hope as a case study, Thomas referenced methods described by Etherington (2007), Nash (2009), and also Winston (1995). Despite the many challenges that were encountered throughout the production of this film, including participant withdrawal, cultural differences, and the pre-mature death of his participant, Amal, Thomas was able to build a healthy relationship. The case study ended with the words, “I thought I was going to make a film about her, but I ended up making a film with her” (p. 73).

Since all filmmakers are directors in their own right, there are many different perspectives regarding the vital relationship between filmmaker and participant. Although most of the scholars in this analysis agreed on the crucial aspects regarding awareness of power (Etherington, 2007, Nichols, 1991, & Nash, 2010), there were some areas in which all scholars approached with different
angles. These included informed consent (Sanders 2007), the definition of trust (Nash, 2009), and elements that affected relationships (Thomas, 2012). What many can draw from these analyses is the fact that relationships in documentary film are crucial to both the production process and final product.

In this chapter, the topics covered were those major to the practice of documentary filmmaking: ethical representation, dramatization, and filmmaker-participant relationships. By examining the works of scholars Maccarone, 2010, Butchart, 2006, Nichols, 1991 & 2010, and others, the researcher analyzed the definition of truth in documentary, while also touching on a filmmaker’s responsibility to portray their participants ethically. Secondly, the topic of dramatization was dissected using the works of Bernard, 2010, Arthur, 2005, Marquis, 2013, and others. In this section, the researcher expanded upon the issue of using fictional elements in nonfiction film, including dramatization, story manipulation, and other artistic narrative structures. Lastly, this chapter covered the implications of the relationship between filmmaker and participant. The intelligible ideas of Nash, 2010, Thomas, 2012, Aufderheide, 2009, and others we utilized to explore some of the most controversial topics of power and trust in a filmmaker-participant relationship.

In Chapter 3, the researcher will reveal all aspects of the production process while filming *Sigo Adelante* in Quito, Ecuador. She will correlate the themes presented in Chapter 2 with her experience in documentary filmmaking. Finally, the researcher will discuss the methods used in order to uncover the answers to the research questions given in Chapter 1.
CHAPTER THREE: PROCEDURES & METHODS

“For every documentary there are at least three stories that intertwine: the filmmaker’s, the film’s, and the audience’s”
*(Nichols, 2010, p.61)*

As mentioned in the preceding chapter, this case study focuses on three major themes in documentary filmmaking, and relates the director’s experience to those themes. The purpose of the case study was to combine all three themes (ethical representation, dramatization, and filmmaker-participant relationships) into one cohesive analysis. The main tool that will be used in this case study is the researcher’s personal experience and documentary, titled *Sigo Adelante*. After a brief discussion of the researcher’s involvement with studying abroad, this chapter will explore the researcher’s personal filming experience in Ecuador in three key areas: pre-production, production, and post-production. Following the description of the production process, the researcher will discuss the methods used to collect the data from the film’s audience, which will be followed by ethical considerations for the participants. In order to further specify the focus of the analysis, the researcher previously proposed three research questions to be answered through this observational and audience survey data:

- Was the participant in the film portrayed in an ethical manner?
- What was the perceived impact of the dramatization used in the film?
- What elements influenced the filmmaker-participant relationship?
The themes in this case study will be prevalent throughout the description of the researcher’s experience. Unlike the previous two chapters, the themes will not be presented in an orderly fashion, but rather as they occurred during the production process. In a later chapter, the researcher will connect previous research with her personal experience to study the application of the research provided in Chapter 2. This approach aims to validate the research previously conducted, while also providing a fresh perspective on how the themes intertwine with one another.

**Involvement**

In the winter of 2013, the researcher became involved with Actuality Media, a program that takes students around the world to produce short documentaries on change makers in the community.

“It’s our mission to connect media makers and change makers, we tell stories that matter.” – Actuality Media

Anybody interested in filmmaking is able to participate in the efforts of Actuality Media. The branches of their program include Study Abroad Outreach, Media Impact Internship, and Pro-Expedition. Each branch caters to different experience and interest levels of filmmakers. The branch that the researcher became involved with was the Study Abroad Outreach program. Out of the three
locations (Kenya, Cambodia, and Ecuador) the researcher chose Ecuador to conduct her case study.

**Pre-Production**

**Week One**

From May 24th – June 22nd, 2014, I traveled to Quito, the capital of Ecuador, to work with a film crew to produce an 8-10 minute documentary on change makers in the local community. There were 12 students total who were chosen to take this journey. We were then split into three small film crews of four. Each crew consisted of a producer, director, cinematographer, and editor. With only four weeks to complete the project, our production schedule was tight, and broken down week by week. During the first week, we were to research the organization that we were going to film. This week gave us time to find out more about the organization, while also giving us an overall observation opportunity. The first week was where we were supposed to find the story we wanted to tell. The second week was reserved for creating a story outline, shot list, and for interviewing our participants. The actual filming took place during the third week. Finally, the editing process was executed during the fourth week.

During the first week, my crew and I were observing our surroundings within our organization. The organization was titled “CENIT: Centro de la Niña Trabajadora” or “Center for the Working Girl” in English. Although its emphasis is on young girls, CENIT works with all children who are in need of additional assistance with their workloads, both familial and educational. This includes family duties, schoolwork, and other responsibilities. Through diverse and
influential programs for children and families, CENIT impacts the lives of those who are in need of additional assistance. As stated by Tania Reinoso in the documentary, “Here we offer them security, love, and protection.” My crew and I expected to be welcomed and accepted at CENIT, however, this was not the case. During the first three days of observing the various programs and the people involved, we had numerous trust issues coming from those heading the organization. Unfortunately, this is where our problems began. As foreigners, we created unintentional discordance with the Ecuadorian natives. After all, we weren’t proficient in their language, our faces were brand new, and we were carrying cameras. This cultural difference hindered the observation process.

Their main concern was that we would exploit the organization in a negative manner in our film. There was fear that the organization, as well as the country of Ecuador, would be portrayed in an unethical or incorrect manner. With culture and language barriers, it was difficult for our crew to put the leaders of CENIT at ease with our purpose and intent for our film. The remainder of our first week was spent in meetings with the heads of CENIT, instead of observing programs and people for our story. The meetings consisted of our crew and manager negotiating with the CENIT leaders. These encounters were long and unpleasant for both parties. Although we clearly explained our intent for the film, the Ecuadorians were still unsure of our presence and the usage of video cameras. We assured them that the video was to be an inspirational and educational film about CENIT and its programs. However, despite our efforts to explain the details of our intentions, the leaders of CENIT were hesitant to let us continue freely. They put
us under very strict guidelines regarding our filming. We couldn’t film the faces of children, we couldn’t film any child whose clothes were dirty or ripped, and we couldn’t film any child under the age of 18 without parent consent. Along with these restrictions and negotiations came unwritten rules about what we could film and how it could be shown. Additionally, the leaders wanted access to the film’s progress, and a say in the final product, something that was very difficult for our film crew to agree with. Our crew decided that we could not allow the leaders a say in our final film, or else our film would most likely be distorted and artificial. Part of the purpose for our film was to capture the raw essence of Ecuador and CENIT. With the CENIT leaders over our shoulders the entire time it would lead to the film looking very staged and insincere. The negotiation process took nearly a week, which caused a major setback in the production process.

**Week Two**

Although we agreed to the film restrictions given to us, there was still a presence of suspicion coming from the heads of CENIT. It was almost as if we were being followed to ensure we obeyed the strict guidelines. Since CENIT is not very large, everybody was aware of our presence, and we suddenly felt as if everyone was watching us. Since we missed out on a few days of observation during the first week, we used two days to finish up. During this time, we were very stressed because we had to find a story and get our participants to agree to being in our film before the end of the week was over. If we didn’t reach this goal, we would be behind in the actual filming of the documentary.
Around the middle of our second week we found Silvia, a hard-working Ecuadorian woman who was fiercely independent and also loving towards her two children. We first met in a sewing class she taught for older women. She was diligent in the way she taught, and had a very shy and warm vibe. Aside from first impressions, the main thing that drew us to Silvia was the fact that she used to be a student at CENIT when she was a young girl, and now she was a teacher there. After considering the potentially inspirational story of Silvia, we knew she was the one we wanted to feature in our documentary. Not only could we film her story, but we could also film her children if her consent was given. The only question still lingering was if she wanted to be a part of the film.

With a clear idea that we wanted to feature Silvia, we also had to find supporting participants for additional interviews about the organization. We wanted people with knowledge of CENIT’s purpose, as well as those who knew Silvia personally. This would connect everyone in the film in a cohesive manner. While trying to find supporting participants, we befriended a woman named Ali, an English woman who had been living in Ecuador for over a year. She was perhaps our biggest supporter and also served as our translator. Ali helped us to find supporting features for our story. Including Ali, we had one other person willing to conduct an interview with us, and that was Silvia’s former teacher, Tania Reinoso. All that was left to do was convince Silvia to be our main feature.

After approaching Silvia with the idea that we wanted to create a film based on her life experiences outside and inside CENIT, she was a bit reluctant to concur. We clearly defined our intentions for our film and ensured her that her
story would be told in the most positive way possible. We also gave her a consent form, which, unfortunately, did more harm than good. The formality of a consent form made Silvia more hesitant to agree. The fact that it seemed so formal made her feel like she did not know what exactly she was agreeing to. After another day passed, Silvia informed us that she would agree to be the main character in our film if we could tell her what was in it for her. Having dreams of opening her own bag shop, we assured her that this film, if distributed properly throughout Quito, would give her the exposure she needed in order to start her own business. After careful consideration, she was sold.

**Production**

*Week Three*

This week is where our crew and Silvia really made a connection. We all became very comfortable around each other. Although this was perhaps the most difficult week, it was also the most fun because we were able to film our story. Not only did we get a chance to conduct all three interviews, but also capture additional B-roll and other supporting scenes to help illustrate Silvia’s story. The first couple of days were devoted to conducting our interviews. The interview process ran smoothly for the most part. Out of all three, Ali’s was the easiest, since she spoke English. For Silvia and Tania, we had to match up our schedules along with Ali so she could translate for us. Tania’s interview flowed well and did not take more than 10 minutes to film. Filming Silvia’s interviews, on the other hand, was a long process. We did multiple interviews with Silvia. Due to her
schedule and our time, we had to break up her interview into segments.
Furthermore, Silvia wasn’t answering our questions in the way that we had hoped. Her answers were rather short, and we had to find a way to get her to open up more. This factor is also what caused us to conduct multiple interviews. Despite our challenges, we finally got Silvia to be very descriptive in her answers.

The rest of the filming process was going according to plan; however, during the middle of the week, my crew and I ran into another roadblock. We felt as though we did not have enough footage to fully portray Silvia’s story. Although we had all of our interviews and footage of CENIT, we didn’t have enough footage of Silvia’s past. Understandably so, we couldn’t travel through time to film her past; so we decided that it was time to get creative. In an effort to accurately portray Silvia’s past, we decided to incorporate fictional scenes throughout our film. For example, when Silvia spoke of how she used to work in a restaurant when she was eight years old, we found a young girl willing to portray a young version of Silvia. With the consent of the young girl’s mother, we filmed the young girl sweeping a broom across a dirty floor. Some of the other scenes, including Silvia in a sick bed and the dreams of her son becoming a doctor, were also dramatized. Our crew thought the incorporation of these scenes added depth and value to Silvia’s interview.

After gathering the most important footage that we needed, our crew used the last filming day to capture the essence of the city of Quito. We filmed busy streets, vendors, nature, the markets, and a picturesque view of the city from our hotel’s rooftop. During this time, we had many natives asking us about what we
were filming, and it wasn’t because they were interested. The natives were actually disdainful towards our filming the city. We actually had one woman interrupt one of our scenes to scold us on taking advantage of people. It was hard to confront these people, mostly because none of us were fully fluent in the language. Although our filming brought us attention we didn’t want, we managed to film all the scenes we needed. The purpose of filming the city of Quito itself was to provide our audience with a sense of where we were, the culture, and overall environment.

**Post-Production**

*Week Four*

The final week of our production process was where the editor and I had the most impact on the film’s voice and message. We both wanted to ensure that we portrayed Silvia in a way that was both ethical and memorable. It was our job to use the footage our crew collected to tell a story that consisted of a logical beginning, middle, and end. Along with story editing came the translations of all our interviews. Translating the interviews word for word into English was the most tedious task we had to do. The entire process took us two days. The rest of the week included sound editing and final story detailing. We finished editing on Friday night at 2 a.m.

The next day, all three crews presented their films to their participants at a local restaurant. This gave everyone a chance to see our hard work and what it produced after one month. As Silvia watched our documentary, she cried tears of
joy. She was overall impressed with the way we told her story. As filmmakers, nothing made my crew and I more elated.

Data Collection Methods

This study used a mixture of both quantitative and qualitative methods in an effort to achieve maximum results. Although the majority of this case study uses qualitative methods through participant observational experience, it also used quantitative data in the form of a survey analysis. In order to avoid a biased opinion in answering the first two research questions, the researcher conducted a survey for the audience of the film. By gathering the opinions of those who watched the film, the researcher was able to better determine the ethical appropriateness of her film as well as the effect of the dramatization that was used. A total of 50 people participated in the survey analysis. Those who took part in the audience survey did so voluntarily. The documentary and survey links were sent out through electronic mail. The audience for the film was for a wide variety of ages; therefore, there was no specific age range used to gather the data. For the final research question, the researcher conducted a second survey specifically for those who were in her film crew in Ecuador. The purpose of the crew survey was to provide more insight on the filmmaker-participant relationship from a filmmaker’s perspective.

For the purposes of this study, the researcher used Qualtrics survey software to gather the data. Audience members were asked to watch the 8-minute documentary, and afterwards take the survey. Viewers were asked a detailed set
of multiple-choice questions pertaining to the three themes: ethical representation, dramatization, and filmmaker-participant relationships. The survey measured the opinions of the audience in terms of:

- How ethically the main participant (Silvia) was portrayed
- The personal affect of the dramatization
- The perceived affect the dramatization had on the film
- Opinions on the importance of the filmmaker-participant relationship

For the crew survey, crewmembers were asked a set of open-ended questions, which focused mainly on the establishment of trust in the relationship, barriers that affected the relationship, and overall thoughts on the goal of the film and the message they wanted audiences to receive. Furthermore, this survey asked crewmembers questions about the specifics of the production process as well as personal views on the filmmaker-participant relationship with Silvia. The data collected from both the audience and crewmembers were used to further analyze the audience and filmmaker viewpoint of the modern documentary practices used for *Sigo Adelante*. The audience survey yielded the ethical opinions of those who watched the film, and also the viewpoints of the effectiveness of the dramatization. The survey given to the crewmembers determined the importance of the filmmaker-participant relationship and its effects on the production process.
The researcher’s observational experience will be used to validate previous research on the major themes in documentary filmmaking. It will also be used as an illustrative tool for application of the three themes in a production process. The data collection for the researcher’s experience was gathered through careful note taking following her trip. After traveling, the researcher reflected on all the events and recorded her experience.

There were some ethical considerations in conducting this study. The first was to ensure the participants remained anonymous in their answers. Another consideration was to ask the questions in a basic manner in an effort not to sway or influence participants into answering a certain way. Thirdly, the researcher refrained from writing the questions in first person. Throughout the survey, participants were spoken to in third person, to limit any personal connection the participants may have had with the researcher. For example, instead of asking, “Do you believe I was socially responsible in representing Silvia in an ethical manner?” viewers were asked, “Do you believe the director was socially responsible in representing Silvia in an ethical manner?”

In Chapter 4, the researcher will evaluate the findings from her study. The researcher will organize the observational and survey results by each theme. First, each theme will be reintroduced and discussed briefly. Afterwards, an overview of the methods used will be presented. This will include some of the specific questions audience members were asked, as well as the means of gathering the observatory data. Following these descriptions will be the survey data. Depending on the theme, the survey data will be categorized into illustrative tables. The
observational data will be explained in detail using common patterns. After detailing the results, the researcher will summarize her findings.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

“Viewers certainly shape the meaning of any documentary by combining our own knowledge of and interest in the world and how the filmmaker shows it to us”
(Aufderheide, 2007, p.2)

In Chapter 3, we discussed the methods used for data collection. As stated previously, the methods were a mix of quantitative and qualitative methods. The researcher used personal participant-observation methods to describe her experience in Quito, Ecuador. She also used quantitative methods to conduct a survey for the audience members of the film to measure the overall effectiveness of the most common themes in documentary filmmaking.

For the collection of this data, the researcher surveyed 52 participants (ages 16-65) to serve as the audience for the film. The participants consisted of Drexel University’s cinema department, former classmates, and numerous coworkers of the researcher’s parents. Participants were sent an email that briefly described the focal point of the research study, gave a short description of the film, the link to the film from Vimeo.com, and finally directions on how to complete the process. They were told to first watch the 8-minute film, and then to take the survey. Participants were not given details about the film’s production process prior to watching Sigo Adelante. Therefore, their answers to the survey questions are based solely off of their own perceptions. The researcher also surveyed her crewmembers that worked with her during the production of the film. These members were not asked questions about the ethical representation;
However, they were asked to answer several inquiries about the dramatization in the film as well as the filmmaker-participant relationship with Silvia.

This chapter will cover the data results as they relate to each of the major themes: ethical representation, dramatization, and filmmaker-participant relationships. After reviewing each research question, the researcher will reveal the findings using a mixture of tables and descriptive analyses.

**Ethical Representation (RQ 1)**

The theme of ethical representation is one of the most common in the practice of documentary filmmaking. It is a subject so complex that it has no concrete definition. The topic of ethics itself is one that is very fluid, in that its definition changes depending on personal opinion. In this study, I had to use my own definition of ethics when filming *Sigo Adelante*. With various forms of restrictions coming from the CENIT management team, my crew and I had to not only work with CENIT’s definition of ethics, but also find a way to incorporate our own without creating discordance. What may have been ethically responsible in the United States was not necessarily so in South America. Filming *Sigo Adelante* was a challenge for my film crew and I, especially regarding the representation of the country and its people. The subject of ethical representation is one that is extremely critical, especially when filming nonfiction content. Not only do filmmakers have to consider what they have in mind for a film, but they also have other people’s lives to consider, and cultural norms that differ from their own.
If there is one way a filmmaker can reveal the responsibility of his/her ethical decision, it is to ask the audience themselves. A director’s number one goal is to please the audience, to create something that viewers will receive positively and accept. In an effort to study the audience opinion, I created an audience survey. One of the purposes of the survey was to analyze the audience opinion concerning the ethical representation of the film’s main participant, Silvia Margarita. The research question for this theme was, “Was the participant in the film portrayed in an ethical manner?” I wanted to explore the audience view on how Silvia was portrayed in Sigo Adelante. What did they think of the scenes that were used? How was Silvia portrayed in their eyes? These are the kinds of questions that led me to formulate survey questions based upon ethical representation. In addition to inquiring about Silvia’s representation, audience members were also asked about their opinion of how socially responsible I was in portraying Silvia. Since the audience had no knowledge of my physical actions, their answers to these questions were based solely on what they saw on the screen.

The first question regarding ethical representation was as follows: “During the production of this film, the main participant, Silvia, was informed of the intent of the film. Knowing this, do you believe the director was socially responsible in representing Silvia?” The majority of participants (92 percent) responded with “yes”. The remaining 8 percent responded with “no”. In the survey, participants who responded with “no” were given a follow-up question asking them to explain their decision. The answers varied. One participant believed that it was hard to
define ethics since “every person acts a certain way”. Another participant felt as though no director “ever has to be ethically or socially responsible” in making his or her films. For this viewer, what was more important was that the participants were not manipulated during the editing process, as to take what they said in an interview out of context. Overall, the majority of respondents believed that I was socially responsible in representing Silvia (M=1.08, SD=0.27).

Participants were also asked, “On a scale of 1-5, please rate how ethically you believe Silvia and her children were represented (1 meaning unethically, 5 meaning ethically). From the answers given, it can be determined that the audience believed Silvia and her children were represented in an ethical manner (M=4.64, SD=0.57, 1= “very unethically, 2= “very ethically”). According to the viewers’ personal definitions of ethical representation, they found the film’s context to be ethical. This data also shows that the majority of participants believed Silvia and her children were portrayed ethically.

In the third and final question regarding ethical representation, participants were asked to “grade the director on performance in ethical representation of Silvia”. The participants were given a grade scale of A-F; A=Excellent, B=Above Average, C=Average, D=Below Average, and F=Fail. Out of all the responses, 86 percent gave me an “A”, and the other 14 percent gave me a “B”. The letter grades were paired with numbers, to calculate the average grade. For this study, A=5, B=4, C=3, D=2, and F=1. Based on the numerical grade scale, I was given an average grade of (M=4.86, SD=0.35).
This data shows that, as the director of the film, I acted responsibly in representing Silvia and her children. Through careful consideration of the individual rights of my participants and through truthful storytelling, I was able to capture meaningful footage in an ethical manner. Although I exercised my right to artistic creativity, I never altered or manipulated the context of the film.

**Dramatization (RQ 2)**

The theme of dramatization stems from more modern practices in documentary filmmaking. Dramatization refers to fictional elements in nonfictional content. In documentary film, dramatization is used mostly when the real life event is unable to be captured on camera. An example would be the participant’s past or future dreams. In order to paint a picture of past or future life events, filmmakers often implement dramatized scenes. In *Sigo Adelante*, my crew and I decided to use this technique in order to capture the essence of Silvia’s story. During her interviews, Silvia mentioned a lot about her childhood, and her children’s dreams. Therefore, we decided to re-create the scenes she described, in order to put imagery to her words. According to the cinematographer of the film, the purpose of these scenes was to capture “imagery we couldn’t capture in real life that would support the story and create emotional impact.” The goal of our crew was to put visuals to what was being said about the past or future, in order for the audience to visualize what couldn’t be filmed in real time. The film had three dramatized scenes. They included: Silvia working in a restaurant as a young girl, Silvia laying in her sick bed, and the portrayal of her son’s dream to become
a doctor. For the first scene, we found a young girl to portray Silvia at a young age. For the second scene, one of our crewmembers portrayed Silvia in her sick bed as a young adult. In the doctor dream scene, we dressed a child in a white doctor’s coat and stethoscope and proceeded to direct the movements and expressions.

There is often controversy in the film industry when it comes to the usage of dramatized scenes. Some believe it is the same as falsifying information while others think of it as a creative tool for a film’s enhancement. Since dramatization is something that is becoming more common in nonfiction film, I decided to form a research question centered on it. I wanted to discover what my audience thought of my usage of dramatized scenes in my film. The question that was asked was, “What was the perceived impact of the dramatization used in the film?” Would my audience think I was abusing my creative license? Would they find it powerful and inspirational? These inquiries and others were addressed in the audience survey. Viewers were asked a series of questions regarding personal impact of the scenes, whether or not the scenes enhanced the film, and whether or not I properly used dramatization.

Before being asked these questions, viewers were asked first if they actually noticed the use of dramatization throughout the film. The majority (83 percent) responded with “yes” while the remaining 17 percent claimed they did not notice the dramatized scenes (M=1.17, SD=0.38). Those who answered “yes” were then given a short series of questions regarding the use of the scenes to enhance the film. While 92 percent of viewers found the scenes to enhance the
film, the remaining 8 percent were not convinced. Amongst their responses, they felt as though the scenes were “manipulative and not very well done”. One viewer responded saying, “I feel like the scenes took me out of the film”. Another explained that they didn’t understand how the dramatized scenes “fit in” with the film. Overall, there were some mixed responses as to why some viewers believed the scenes did not enhance the film.

Based on their personal opinions, viewers were then asked to rate the level of positive impact the scenes had on them (M=4.03, SD=0.79, 1= “low positive impact, 5= high positive impact). Figure 1 represents the amount of respondents who gave each rating. The Y-axis measures the number of respondents while the X-axis lists the rating numbers. The majority of viewers (68 percent) rated the positive impact as “4”. For some, the scenes had low positive impact; 6 percent gave the rating of “1” or “2” while 5 percent rated the positive impact as a “3”. The highest rating of “5” was given by the remaining 21 percent of viewers. This data show that over half of the viewers found the dramatized scenes to have a relatively positive personal impact.
After rating the positive impact, viewers were then asked to rate the level of negative impact the dramatized scenes had on them (M=2.05, SD=1.21, 1= “low negative impact, 5= “high negative impact”). Figure 2 shows that most viewers (42 percent) rated the negative impact as a “1”. The second lowest negative rating of “2” was given by 32 percent of viewers. The remaining 27 percent rated the negative impact as a “3”, “4”, or “5”. This data showed that the majority of viewers found there to be a low negative personal impact of the dramatized scenes.
Ultimately, viewers were asked to grade me on how properly I used dramatized scenes in my film. Just like the ethical representation grading scale, this scale used numbers to represent each letter grade (A=5, B=4, C=3, D=2, F=1). Figure 3 shows that a high percentage of viewers (81 percent) gave me an “A”, 14 percent gave me a “B”, 3 percent gave me a “C”, and 3 percent gave me a “D” (M=4.72, SD=0.66). This data show that although most viewers thought I properly use the technique of dramatization correctly, some thought I did an average or below average job. This speaks to the varying opinions of the use of dramatization in nonfiction film.
Filmmaker-Participant Relationship (RQ 3)

Out of all the elements that impact the outcome of a film, the relationship between the filmmaker and participant is perhaps the most important determining factor. All filmmaker-participant relationships are a significant part of the film’s final outcome. In Chapter 2, it was determined that trust is essential to establish a good relationship with your participant (Nash, 2010). How the filmmaker and participant interact with each other has an impact on the message your film portrays. As stated in Chapter 2, both parties in a healthy relationship have to establish a sense of vulnerability in that both of them are open and honest with one another (Nash, 2009). During my stay in Ecuador, trust played a crucial role in all three aspects of the production process. It was the main element that helped my crew and I establish a healthy relationship with Silvia. The question I had regarding this theme was, “What elements influenced the filmmaker/participant relationship the most?”
Although we eventually built a relationship with Silvia and the other participants, it did not start that way. In the beginning there were many hesitations. My crew and I were from a different country, we weren’t proficient in their language, and we had video cameras on hand, all which intimidated them. As stated in Chapter 3, this made it extremely difficult to build trust with the CENIT management as well as Silvia. I asked members in my crew what they thought about building trust in a relationship, and how the process was with Silvia. The cinematographer said that “we established trust eventually, but not as soon as we would have liked”. When prompted to talk about the key elements that affected our relationship with Silvia, he responded, “I think time, kindness, and providing incentive are the keys for establishing trust”. Going into the production process, I knew it would take time to build trust at CENIT. Since our trip was only a month long, time was not on our side in terms of establishing a sincere and honest relationship with our participants. Clearly defining our intentions for the film helped our participants understand our presence; therefore, they were more accepting of us filming. As the weeks went by, our participants felt more comfortable around us and vice versa.

I also asked my crew about their views on other elements in a filmmaker-participant relationship. One member felt that “there was a power struggle, but there shouldn’t have been”. The notion that our crew had dominance over our participants was very apparent during our meetings with CENIT management as well as when we first introduced our film idea to Silvia. Although our crew wasn’t in complete control of the production process, it was hard to relay that to
our participants. As a film crew, we had to instruct our participants on what to do when interviewing by saying things like, “Look this way”, or “Make sure to keep your head up when answering questions.” As the director of the film, I especially had to ensure that I was being personable in my instruction, and not dictatorial. Part of the struggle was trying to be friends with our participants, while also trying to instruct and direct them. Our overall relationship with our participants was one built on honesty, sincerity, and open communication. Other than language, there were no outstanding barriers that hindered our performance as filmmakers.

Based on my crew and my personal experiences, it is clear that the elements that played the biggest role in our relationship with Silvia were trust and power. Despite all of our challenges in these areas, we were able to produce a film in which the participants were open and honest in their interviews. Establishing trust was the most difficult in during this experience; and controlling our perceived power was a challenge in itself. However, if implemented in an effective and responsible manner, trust and power in a filmmaker-participant relationship can produce great outcomes in the final film.

Earlier in Chapter 2, it was said that an audience could often tell by the film what the relationship was like behind the camera. In an effort to explore this further, I included a question in my audience survey about what the audience thought about my relationship with Silvia based on the film. Viewers were asked what impact they thought the filmmaker-participant relationship had on the final film. Figure 4 represents the responses to this inquiry (M=3.98, SD=0.53, 1= “low
impact”, 5= “high impact”). The majority of viewers (78 percent) rated the impact of the relationship as a “4” or “5” while the remaining viewers (22 percent) did not think the relationship had much impact on the film.

Figure 4: Impact of Filmmaker-Participant Relationship

In addition to answering what the impact they believed the relationship had on the final film, viewers were also asked to rate what they believed the actual relationship was like between the participants and myself. Figure 5 depicts that the majority of viewers believed our relationship to be excellent (M=4.55, SD=0.59, 1= “poor”, 5= “Excellent”).
Finally, viewers were asked to grade the overall impact the entire film had on them personally. Figure 6 shows us that most viewers found the film to be very impactful (M=4.64, SD=0.65, 1= “low impact”, 5= “high impact”).

Figure 5: Filmmaker-Participant Relationship Level

Figure 6: Overall Impact of Sigo Adelante
Figures 4-6 show that a large percentage of viewers are aware of the impact of the filmmaker-participant relationship on the final film. In addition to this awareness, 95 percent of viewers were correct in their rating my relationship with Silvia. It was a relationship in which we communicated well with each other. This honesty carried over into our film. Since she was comfortable around my crew and I, she was very open in her responses during her interviews. This, in turn, allowed the film to have more depth and emotion. Without building that relationship with Silvia, it can be assumed that the film would not have been as impactful.

In this chapter, the data results from both the audience and crew surveys were revealed. Overall, it was determined that the director was socially responsible in portraying Silvia in an ethical manner. Most viewers found Silvia and her children to be represented in a way that was ethical. Additionally, the dramatization in the film had more of a positive than negative impact on viewers. While some found the scenes to be forced or manipulated, the majority thought the scenes enhanced the film’s overall presentation. Based on the grading scale, the director was responsible in how she used the technique of dramatization in her film. This chapter also explored the main elements that affected the filmmaker-participant relationship as well as the final film. It was determined that trust and power played the two biggest roles in establishing the relationship. Finally, the impact of the filmmaker-participant relationship was supported. The audience survey data supported that the filmmaker-participant relationship had a significant impact on the final film. The audience also perceived the filmmaker-participant
relationship for *Sigo Adelante* to be excellent. As a result, the majority of viewers rated the film to have an overall high impact on their personal lives.

In Chapter 5, the researcher will provide an overall interpretation of this case study and its results. Following a brief overview of the research, the researcher will reflect on the research questions, the methods used to answer them, and the final results of the study. Chapter 5 will be a comprehensive overview of the study, the research, and the results.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

“Documentaries are part of the media that help us understand not only our world but our role in it, that shape us as public actors. The importance of documentaries is thus linked to a notion of the public as a social phenomenon”

(Aufderheide, 2007, p. 5)

Throughout the years, the practices of documentary filmmaking have changed substantially. Along with a natural evolution of filmmaking, creative innovation in the film industry has especially influenced the production processes for nonfiction film. For this study, I heavily researched the history, practice, and culture of documentary filmmaking. While conducting this research, I found the three most common themes in today’s modern documentary filmmaking. They are: ethical representation, dramatization, and filmmaker-participant relationships. Through a detailed case study, the themes were combined and put into practice. The purpose of this study was to provide a fresh perspective on all three themes, to apply them to a real world experience, and to explore how the themes blended together during the production process.

The first theme we discussed was ethical representation. This theme mainly focused on how participants in film are portrayed on screen, and the intentions of the filmmaker. The main question concerning ethical representation in this study was whether or not Silvia (the film’s main participant) was portrayed in an ethical manner. Through my own experience, it was determined that, due to personal definitions of the term, it was challenging to behave ethically in a way that pleased both my crew and the CENIT (Centro de la Niña Trabajadora/Center for the Working Girl) management team. It is a slippery topic with many different
aspects. What is considered ethical to one person may not be to another, especially when it involves nonfiction film. In my opinion, this is why it was important to also ask viewers about their perspective on the ethics of the film.

It was determined that the majority of viewers felt as though Silvia was portrayed ethically. It was also confirmed that I did well in portraying Silvia on film. These results captured the essence of the main goal of filmmakers, which is to satisfy the audience. As a director, the audience is the most important component in the success of your film. Honest representations of the participants are crucial not only for the film itself, but also the reputation of the filmmaker. Through these results, we can infer that viewers have the ability to fully determine, using their own perspectives, how ethically a filmmaker behaved behind the camera, and also how ethically the participants were represented.

The second theme was dramatization. In Chapter 2 it was determined that using creative tools like dramatization draws in greater audiences (Bernard, 2011), making it a popular method. For the purposes of documentaries, dramatization is mostly used to recreate events that could not be captured on film. In a majority of cases, these events include a person’s past, memories, or perceived future. While some believe the tool is unethical and not truthful, others view it as an opportunity to be creative and tell a more detailed and intricate story. During my experience, the use of dramatization was viewed as a way to add imagery to dialogue. Whenever Silvia was speaking about her childhood, we wanted to be able to portray that on film. The question surrounding this topic was how would the audience perceive the use of dramatization in the film? The results
implied that a majority of viewers thought it enhanced the film, and also had more of a positive than negative impact on them personally.

These results may help to understand how documentary filmmaking is becoming more personal and communicative. Through the use of dramatization, a viewer can see through another person’s eyes. Viewers have the ability to place themselves in the situation, which would allow them to connect more emotionally. Another likely inference to be made from this data is that dramatization is a creative tool for filmmakers to better connect with their viewers, and to also capture each story fully and completely.

The final topic was the filmmaker-participant relationship. We discussed the major components that influence the relationship with the participant. The two main ones were trust and power. During the case study, I realized that filming a documentary is more than just telling someone’s story. It is also about building a relationship with the person you are filming. During my time in Quito, my crew and I established a trusting relationship with Silvia. Though there were moments when she questioned our integrity, we all soon became very close. The main question that sprung from this topic was “What elements influenced the filmmaker-participant relationship the most?” According to the film crew survey, the two components that influenced the relationship the most were the same ones discussed in the literature review: trust and power. During the first couple of weeks, there was clear tension in those two areas. I also asked viewers about their perception of how our relationship with Silvia was. The majority of viewers felt
as though the filmmaker-participant relationship was important, and that our crew had a positive relationship with Silvia behind the scenes.

This data gives insight on how important and influential the filmmaker-participant relationship is while filming. It highlights the importance of mutual trust between the filmmaker and the participants. What occurs behind the camera certainly has the ability to shape the final outcome. This is something that may very well continue to impact the practice of documentary filmmaking.

**Limitations**

Although this case study had a solid structure, there were some limitations that occurred during the process. The first limitation was that I started and ended my trip to Ecuador before conducting extensive research on documentary filmmaking. Therefore, my immersion into the case study was raw. Because of this, I was not observing every single detail that occurred, but rather took notes on daily activities. I found patterns in my notes and memories that resurfaced through my research after returning home. This may have impacted my observation of the specifics of what happened during the production process. For instance, I could’ve missed something since not every detail was recorded.

Another limitation was that the main participant, Silvia, was nearly impossible to connect with after returning to the United States. Her computer access was extremely limited, and so getting direct feedback from her concerning these themes was not possible. If there were some way to keep in contact with her, I could have also included data on her perspective on how she was portrayed,
and also her view of my relationship with her. Her input would have added more
depth to the results and perspectives.

Thirdly, the program that I used to take this abroad trip only lasted for one
month. Therefore, the entire production process was slightly rushed. If given more
time, there may have been more opportunity to build a more solid relationship
with Silvia in terms of trust. Establishing trust in a relationship is not likely done
within such short periods of time. This case study took place over a span of four
weeks. A longer production schedule may have yielded different results in the
observations and data results.

Other limitations involved gathering the data from the audience members.
The survey was sent out via email and Facebook, making it difficult to gain
volunteers and responses. Fortunately, I gathered enough data for my results;
however, having more participants may have increased the credibility of this
study.

**Suggestions for Further Research**

There are a few things that one could do to expand research on this topic
of modern documentary filmmaking. First, I would suggest a more extensive case
study, in which the researcher spends more time in the production process, and
carefully critiques common occurrences. The time I spent in Ecuador was short-
lived. A case study that extends anywhere from 3-12 months would greatly add to
what has been concluded in this case study. Also, another suggestion would be to
solely focus on dramatization in documentary. There are not many sources that
expand on this topic. Something that would prove very interesting is comparing

dramatization between theatrical film and documentary, and how both affect the

audience.

Finally, as time goes on, it is likely that more modern themes will be

introduced into the practice of documentary filmmaking. Therefore, more research on current, or even predicted trends in documentary would be a

significant addition to current research.

**Conclusions**

There are a few conclusions that may be drawn from this study. The first

is that, though the field of documentary filmmaking may seem like a simple one,
it is very much complex, with numerous layers. Because of its nonfictional
culture, it is set apart from the rest of the film industry. It has its own set of rules,
perspectives, and practices. The three themes discussed in this thesis only touch
the surface of the complexity of documentary filmmaking. Much more research
needs to be done in order to fully grasp this multi-faceted industry.

Secondly, each of the three themes plays a significant role in reaching the

audience. Every theme discussed in this thesis can be related back to the viewers.
The topics of ethics, dramatization, and relationships all have an impact on the
film and the viewers. Furthermore, these themes may play an integral role in the
perspectives of viewers of this world. From representation of the participants to
the behind-the-scenes relationships, audience members are affected in countless
ways.
Lastly, perhaps the most effective way to understand the practice of documentary filmmaking is to practice it. Applying the rules and common actions to a real-world scenario is an effective way to learn about the industry. Although conducting research is also heavily influential to one’s understanding, I have found that in order to have a highly credible account of this industry, you have to experience it. Being immersed in the research you conduct is possibly one of the best ways to increase your knowledge.
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Appendix A: CENIT Film Production Schedule

“SILVIA’S STORY” (working title)
Production Schedule
11-Jun-14

THURSDAY JUNE 5
10:30 AM Interview with Silvia in CENIT office
*Translator: Ali Pickard
12:00 PM Lunch and Pre-Interview with Ali Pickard, Coordinator of Recycle Design program at CENIT
1:30 PM Brief meeting with Cristina of CENIT on working women conditions.
*Translator: Ali Pickard
2:00 PM Silvia’s sewing class. Interviews & B-roll with the ladies.
*Translator: Ali Pickard
4:00 PM Debrief at Base Camp

FRIDAY JUNE 6
9:00 AM Meet at Base Camp - offload previous footage, create shot list, update story outline
11:00 AM Head out to CENIT
11:30 AM Arrive at CENIT. Follow Silvia until end of her shift.
*Translator: Matt Barwick
12:00 PM Film Silvia as she leaves CENIT to pick up her kids
1:30 PM Head back to base camp to offload footage

SUNDAY JUNE 8
8:00 AM “Day of the Family” celebration.
2:00 PM Head to Pichincha for time lapse shots

MONDAY JUNE 9
3:00 PM Interview with Ali Pickard, CENIT Coordinator “SILVIA’S STORY” (working title)
Production Schedule
11-Jun-14

TUESDAY JUNE 10
9:00 AM Interview with Tania (Silvia’s Professor)
*Translator needed for the day
10:00 AM Footage of girls in CENIT college program
11:00 AM Head back to base camp to offload footage
3:00 PM Complete shot list for rest of the week.

WEDNESDAY JUNE 11
10:30 AM Dailies with group at hostel
11:15 AM B-Roll shots of Quito – Old Town
   NOTE: Pick up bracelet prop.
2:00 PM Jewelry workshop with CENIT women + Silvia
   NOTE: Get Silvia to ask about workplace.+ name of factory
3:30 PM Scout Park/other locations for Silvia interview tomorrow
4:30 PM Head back to hostel to offload footage
5:30 PM Film Time-lapse Sunset
   NOTE: Follow up with Zayra on contract translation + confirm hours.

THURSDAY JUNE 12
10:00 AM Arrive at CENIT. Start setting up night sequence scene.
   11:00 AM Film ending slo mo with Silvia locking up.
   12:00 PM Break for lunch. Meet Translator.
   12:30 PM Camera and Sound set up for Silvia interview.
   1:00 PM Silvia’s Interview Part 1
   *Translator required.
   2:00 PM Ladies sewing class. B-Roll of Silvia teaching.“SILVIA’S STORY”
      (working title)
   Production Schedule
   11-Jun-14 3

FRIDAY JUNE 13
11:00 AM Meet Silvia at CENIT. Get any outstanding shots.
   12:00 PM Break for lunch. Meet translator.
   12:30 PM Camera and Sound set up for Silvia interview. Location TBD.
   1:00 PM Silvia’s Interview Part 2. Location TBD.
   *Translator required.
   2:00 PM Silvia’s children’s’ interview. Location TBD.
   *Translator required.
   3:00 PM Head back to base camp to offload footage.
   5:30 PM Film Time-lapse Sunset

SATURDAY JUNE 14
9:00 AM Silvia at her factory job. Shoot TBD.
   *Translator possibly required.
11:30 AM Break for lunch.
12:00 PM Head to San Roque market for b-roll sequence.
2:00 PM Head back to base camp to offload footage
SUNDAY JUNE 15
11:00 AM Shoot Restaurant sequence.

Appendix B: Scene Shot List

SEQUENCE 1 – Establishing Quito & Silvia’s Goal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXT. CITY OF QUITO/ PANECILLO - DUSK</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wide</td>
<td>Sunset, daytime smog – from top of buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Street shots – beggars, salesmen, dogs, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Close</td>
<td>Faces of vendors, beggars, street trash, cars etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*INT. SILVIA’S HOUSE - NIGHT |

| 1 | Wide | Light turns on to illuminate desk |
| 2 | Medium | Light turns on to illuminate desk |
| 3 | Close up | Hands working, sewing stuff |
| 4 | ECU | Hands working, sewing stuff |
| 5 | Close up | Silvia face |
| 6 | Medium – side, head on w/ movement | Silvia holding up a completed item |
| 7 | Wide | Behind Silvia’s back |

EXT. SAN ROQUE MARKET - DAY

| 1 | Match the same bag that she made in previous scene – same shot | Same shot, but in market place. It hasn’t sold. |
| 2 | Wide | Silvia at her stall. Or Silvia selling stuff, people passing by |
| 3 | Medium | Silvia watching people pass |
| 4 | CU | Silvia watching people pass |
| 5 | Medium | People examining her bags, but not purchasing |
| 6 | Wide | Other people selling the same things |
| 7 | Medium | Other people selling the same things |
| 8 | Medium | Children running down the street |

SEQUENCE 2 – Introduce Change maker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INT. ALI’S HOUSE W/ ARTWORK - DUSK</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Interview: Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Interview: CU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Assortment</td>
<td>Staged shots of Ali at her house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wide, Medium,</td>
<td>Street vendors selling the same thing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wide, Medium,</td>
<td>Hardship shots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Sign in store asking for women 18-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More… Discuss later</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEQUENCE 3 – Silvia’s History**

**INT. CENIT HQ – GIRLS’ COLLEGE - TANIA’S INTERVIEW - DAY**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Courtyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wide</td>
<td>Tania teaching class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Hands raising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CU and Medium</td>
<td>Faces of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CU (Slow mo &amp; reg mo)</td>
<td>Hands working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Girls standing facing the camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Tania facing camera</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INT. CENIT HQ – SEWING CLASS - DAY**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Show’s CENIT sign from the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wide</td>
<td>Establishing shot – The first intro to CENIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INT. CENIT HQ – JEWELRY CLASS - DAY**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wide</td>
<td>Women working on jewelry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>Ali in jewelry class with women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>Hands/faces making jewelry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Med Pan</td>
<td>Finished jewelry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Show’s CENIT sign from the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wide</td>
<td>Establishing shot – The first intro to CENIT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEQUENCE 4 – Silvia’s Perspective, Climax**

**INT. SILVIA’S HOUSE - DAY**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>Silvia looking out window</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wide</td>
<td>Silvia on a rooftop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SEQUENCE 5 – Silvia’s Resolution, Family Time

### EXT. CENIT HQ – DIA DE LA FAMILIA – KIDS’ INTERVIEWS - DAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Medium Slo-Mo</th>
<th>Kids in foreground out of focus, Silvia watching alone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>Silvia’s children’s faces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wide</td>
<td>Kids playing (blurred in post for end)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>*Medium &amp; Wide</td>
<td>Silvia and kids against wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Low ground shot</td>
<td>Feet of kids playing, running</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Over shoulder</td>
<td>Of Silvia: shot of kids from her perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ECU</td>
<td>Kid grabbing Silvia’s hand – stage it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Wide</td>
<td>Silvia with CENIT sign in background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Medium Pan</td>
<td>From kids playing to CENIT sign</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INT. CENIT HQ – SILVIA’S OFFICE - DAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Slow mo: CU</th>
<th>Locking office door</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wide slow mo</td>
<td>Silvia walking away</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXT/INT. AL MESENAS ESPINOSA (SILVIA’S SHOP) - DAY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Wide</th>
<th>Establishing shot of store</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Silvia through window</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>Silvia with her bags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>Silvia selling bags – her face</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>