

#1 Making Images

Practising ethics guides to built environment research

David Roberts

When planning

1. Will it be possible to identify someone from my images?
2. Will I ask for consent to take images of others?
3. Will I need permission to make images of this site and situation?
4. Will I collaborate with others to make images?

While recording

5. Am I making anyone feel uncomfortable?
6. Am I mindful of local tensions and cultural sensitivities?
7. Am I alert to the history and power of this medium?

Before displaying

8. Have I invited the subjects or owners of the images to have a say in their use?
9. Have I considered how audiences might make alternative interpretations?
10. Have I protected information that might compromise dignity or safety?

These guides, curated by the [Bartlett's Ethics Commission](#) in collaboration with [KNOW \(Knowledge in Action for Urban Equality\)](#), and edited by Jane Rendell, (Director of the Bartlett Ethics Commission 2015-20), offer insights by experienced researchers into how to negotiate the ethical dilemmas that can arise during a research project. The aim is to help you practise built environment research ethically. David Roberts (Bartlett Ethics Fellow 2015-20) devised the format and structure of these guides to follow the ethical issues that arise during the development of a research process – from planning, to conducting, to communicating and producing outcomes – and Ariana Markowitz wrote some of the introductory text that runs across all guides. The guides focus on the different kinds of ethical issues you might encounter as a result of using specific processes or methods, and pay attention to the particular contexts and ways in which these methods are practised. Because when practising research, methods and context inform one another, we consider this series of guides as embedded in a mode of applied ethics called **situated** or **relational ethics**. Where you see words that are highlighted, they refer back to our definitions of key **ethical** principles and to terms contained in institutional protocols as found on [Practising Ethics](#).

1. *Making Images* (David Roberts)
2. *Asking Questions* (Yael Padan)
3. *Co-producing Knowledge* (Yael Padan)
4. *Staging Research* (David Roberts)
5. *Researching, Risk, and Wellbeing* (Ariana Markowitz)
6. *Researching Internationally* (Emmanuel Osuteye)

Acknowledgements

The Bartlett Ethics Commission worked alongside the Bartlett Ethics Working Group from 2015-8, and so benefitted greatly from the input of Martin Austwick, Claire Colomb, Helen Dougal, Helen Fisher, Efrosyni Konstaninou, Rowena Lamb, James O'Leary, Niamh Murtagh, Hedley Smyth, and Steve Ridge, but in particular Jens Kandt, Mike Raco, Michelle Shipworth, and Michael Walls. The project was supported educationally and economically by the Bartlett Faculty, and specifically its former Dean, Alan Penn.

'A picture is said to be worth a thousand words because of its ability to hold as much meaning in one frame as can only otherwise be expressed in that many words. However, the 'thousand words' do not always remain the same for a single image. Depending on the audience and the context in which the image is being viewed, the interpretations can be different. Further, through a matrix of editing, captioning and juxtaposing, the image can be made to 'mean' a thousand different words for particular audiences. Central to the ethics of representation, then, is the understanding that all photos and films are made not 'taken,' and their meanings are temporally and culturally contingent constructions. The constructed nature of visual representations is then subject to potential manipulations by the creator's biases and agendas, which can lead to damaging misrepresentations. As well, the setting and manner in which the representations are viewed can accomplish similar negative ends... [E]thical dilemmas such as how to avoid creating misrepresentations and preventing harms, while still making engaging representations, need to be balanced and negotiated with personal and professional ethics, the ethics of the community, and the moment in which the image is being made. This is a process that is not unproblematic.'

Sonya de Laat, 'Picture perfect: Ethical considerations in visual representation,' *Nexus* 17 (2004), 123.

About this guide: why and how built environment researchers make images

Built environment research is as much about people as it is about places: the people who use and inhabit the places you are researching, the people who engage with those places emotionally or spiritually even if they are not physically present, the people who build them, and the people who own or manage them. In addition, you the researcher are necessarily a key actor: you devise the research approach, become a participant in the place where you gather data, and you determine how to interpret that data and what to do with it. Because people are unpredictable, research can also be unpredictable,

and you are likely to encounter unexpected **situations** that require you to think on your feet whilst navigating high expectations with limited time. Even the best-laid plans often go awry when they come into contact with reality and real people and you will need systems in place to support you throughout that process, minimising **harm** to those participating in your research as well as to yourself. **Ethics** concerns the kind of lives we lead, the qualities of character we seek to develop, and the **responsibilities** we have for each other and our social and ecological system. To conduct research **ethically**, it is important to consider the **benefits, risks, and harms** to all connected with and affected by it

Why make images?

In built environment research and practice we use still and moving images to communicate our perspectives and ideas in many different ways. We draw plans, sections and axonometric cut-aways to explain aspects of a building, take photos on field trips, make infrared images to measure building performance, map patterns of spatial configuration, film users at site visits and design new structures entirely, all to better conceive, understand, analyse and transform our built environment.

The ethics of making images

Visual research methods are a highly effective and engaging means to explore and portray aspects of the built environment, opening up new ways of seeing, sharing lived experiences and galvanising social action on pressing issues. This power of still and moving images brings with it an array of ethical considerations. In your fieldwork, it is important to consider how you depict inhabitants or users on site as it may not be appropriate or possible to take images without individuals' awareness, to film in a seemingly public space or even invite participants to take images which document their own relationship with the built environment. In your design, as architectural historian Iain Borden explains, the socio-spatial-temporal condition of the built environment as something we inhabit and make our own, presents problems and opportunities in terms of how to represent these multidimensional experiences.¹ In your analysis, you may have to negotiate the problematic history of some forms of representation such as the colonial uses of mapping in subjugating, enclosing and excluding. In your dissemination, you may crop, edit, caption and photoshop images to highlight certain ideas and perspectives which will have an impact on how audiences interpret and understand the built environment.

How to use this guide

These guides to *Practising Ethics* define appropriate ways to engage **ethically** in research. *Making Images* aims to assist you in recognising the **ethical** dilemmas which arise from making images and to address and **reflect** on these with confidence. It is designed to be a point of reference at any stage of your research – from planning your project, to conducting activities in the field, to communicating what you have learned through the production of particular research outputs.

Making Images contains *principles, questions, guidelines* and *resources*. The *principles* in the next section inform best practice. These are not just regulatory hurdles for you to jump through at the beginning stages of your research but concepts that ground **ethical** inquiry throughout. They help you develop and refine an approach that it is **sensitive** to the physical and emotional challenges that may arise in the research process, enabling you to be a more effective researcher. The series of guiding *questions* act as prompts for you to **reflect** on the potential **ethical** considerations which emerge throughout a project, before, during, and after you conduct your research. The *guidelines* expand on the questions, illuminate the different **ethical** concerns they raise, and recommend actions which embody these principles. The *resources* section provides additional information.

These guides are not exhaustive and cannot address all the possible **situations** you will face, particularly for research on **sensitive** topics or in places experiencing violence or instability. But learning from the experiences of others, will help you gain the ability to **reflect** on what you encounter, and to make informed judgements about the best way to practise your research **ethically**. Insightful and imaginative research encompasses a range of sites, cultural contexts, and people and there will always be a need for flexibility and **care**.

Questions

When planning: *Act honestly and openly*

1. Will it be possible to identify someone from my images?
2. Will I ask for consent to take images of others?
3. Will I need permission to make images of this site and situation?
4. Will I collaborate with others to make images?

While recording: *Engage responsibly and reflexively*

5. Am I making anyone feel uncomfortable?
6. Am I mindful of local tensions and cultural sensitivities?
7. Am I alert to the history and power of this medium?

Before displaying: *Share carefully and generously*

8. Have I invited the subjects or owners of the images to have a say in their use?
9. Have I considered how audiences might make alternative interpretations?
10. Have I protected information that might compromise dignity or safety?

Principles

The people, places, and research methods you use and the contexts in which they are practised will each raise their own **ethical** considerations related to a common set of principles that encourage **ethical** conduct and promote interaction based on good faith and mutual **respect**.

Benefit not harm: Your research should have a **benefit** to society and any **risks** that participants could face must be minimised, balanced against the potential **benefit** to the overall community, and clearly explained to participants before they give their **consent**.

Informed consent: You need to inform your participants about the study and what is being asked of them, including any potential **risks** or **benefits**, in order for them to make an informed and voluntary decision about whether or not to participate in the research.

Confidentiality: You need to inform participants of the extent to which **confidentiality** can be assured and **respect** their right to remain **anonymous** in dissemination and display.

Guideline 1 When planning: *Act honestly and openly*

Making images of the built environment presents a unique means to discover, design and display aspects of space and society. Whether you choose to take photos, make films, produce maps or renders of sites and **situations**, **ethicists** and artists Susan Cox, Sarah Drew, Marilys Guillemain, Catherine Howell, Deborah Warr and Jenny Waycott explain graphic representations of any kind can produce detailed and intimate portraits of individuals, which can be shared instantaneously and globally beyond your control. This engages with a number of interrelated ethical principles raising knotty issues.

In terms of **confidentiality**, it may be impossible to guarantee **anonymity** to those who may feature in your images. In terms of **benefit** not **harm**, it is important to carefully consider whether anyone could be identified from your still and moving images and may feel exposed or **vulnerable** to criticism when these are shared with audiences. In both instances it is vital to consider how you accommodate informed **consent** and enable individuals to make decisions about their involvement in your research.

As anthropologist Carolyn Fluehr-Lobban explains, the 'spirit' of informed **consent** encourages research based on 'openness and disclosure' whereby the researcher discusses the goals, processes, possible outcomes, and **harms** and **benefits**.² This is particularly important with visual methods as it is possible for researchers to hide from public view when photographing or filming. Such covert or clandestine approaches are considered to be unethical and intellectually limiting, preventing the opportunity to share views and experiences. Open and collaborative relationships instead can allow for the building of mutual **trust** with participants and for images to be jointly owned as you discuss why images will be taken and collectively agree on how best to do so.³

The participants of your research will be the active or passive subjects of your images. They may create the photographs you use, participate in your filmed interview, or simply be in a site you are observing. The most obvious time to ask for **consent** is before you take an image but it may also be suitable to do so at key junctures throughout your research before you present, publish or exhibit your work. When taking images of identifiable individuals or of people in private spaces, researchers Rose Wiles, Jon Prosser, Anna Bagnoli, Andrew Clark, Katherine Davies, Sally Holland and Emma Renold advise it is courteous and good ethical practice to seek **consent** through a verbal request before recording and, ideally, by signing a **consent** form afterwards.⁴ In public spaces or at public events it may not be practical for you to obtain **consent**. But you can be prepared with an information sheet and **consent** forms if someone does approach you to inform them about the research, the nature of their participation and possible **risks** and **benefits** in plain language and to enable them to give their informed **consent**. In other **situations**, for example when working closely with a community, it is best practice to get written, filmed or audio-recorded **consent** to take images. However, the process of seeking informed **consent** is by no means simple, complicated by questions of language, literacy or cultural factors such as a wariness of legal procedures. A public health project in rural Nepal by Joanna Morrison, Abriti Aryal, Awantika Priyadarshani, Satish Sah and Sushil Baral used pictorial **consent** in the form of explanatory diagrams which illustrate the nature of the research, time commitments, dissemination and **consent**.⁵

Guideline 2 While recording: *Engage responsively and reflexively*

Your research make take you to an array of different spaces, from city streets to office foyers to online forums to participants' homes. It is important to consider whether you have a right to make images in this site and of this **situation** as **ethical** considerations can overlap with legal issues. Even though UK law permits taking photos and film of people and places in a public place, including photos of private properties, Rose Wiles and her co-authors warn 'photographing someone in a place where they have a reasonable expectation of **privacy** might be considered to be an invasion of **privacy**'.⁶ This is particularly the case when there are unclear definitions or public space or blurred boundaries in semi-private and pseudo-public spaces, for example in a shopping mall or the privately owned public spaces such as newly developed parks and squares that operate under private security guards. It may, however, be particularly important for you to examine and expose to such contentious spaces and issues. Anthropologists Philippe Bougois and Noel Dyck remind us of the **risk** to cultures and communities in remaining silent and of our ethical duty to report controversial **situations** in order to inform others.⁷ As such, it is worth careful research and planning into the **situation** in advance, to bring along an information sheet and present ID cards to reassure any officials or users as to the value of your research and **ethical** rigour of your approach, but to stop if asked or if you are concerned that you may be making others feel uncomfortable.

Visual methods provide a wonderful opportunity to work with others on the conception, production and dissemination of images. As Susan Cox and her co-authors celebrate, still and moving images 'can enable participants to begin to articulate what otherwise may have been unsayable... presenting new possibilities for **reflecting**, describing and sharing their experiences'.⁸ Researchers have increasingly invited participants to take images or record films of their lives and communities to shape their own representation, allowing access to spaces that may otherwise remain unseen. This does, however, carry the same *ethical* considerations so you may need to consider how best to brief participants about seeking permission, explaining the purpose and future publishing of images taken.⁹ It also brings a further consideration concerning the authorship and ownership of these images.¹⁰

In her long-term research on the spatial practices of mixed-use markets run by immigrants, refugees, and asylum seekers in Cape Town, architectural designer and historian Huda Tayob embodies **responsive** and **reflexive** ethical built environment research.¹¹ Tayob initially intended to document the markets using photography, but interviewees were uncomfortable or unwilling because of cultural sensitivities, a fear of being documented and photographed, and general suspicion of researchers. Rather than abandon the research, Tayob adapted her approach by turning to the work of postcolonial and subaltern theorists who point to the importance of recognizing the unequal power relations between the researcher and researched. Gayatri Spivak argues the subaltern cannot speak, but proposes researchers should learn to 'speak to' as opposed to 'speak for' the subaltern, in an active gesture that involves building a relationship between speaker and listener.¹² Tayob instead began to sketch and annotate plans and sections of market stalls on site as a mode to engage in conversations about her research with inhabitants, a method to record contingent everyday architectures in ways that protect the **privacy** of interviewees and inhabitants, a mechanism to **position** herself in the research through drawings that are **situated** and representative of the particular relationship between researcher and researched, and a means to demonstrate the importance of paying close attention these spaces as sites of spatial studies.¹³ Tayob's work exemplifies the need for built environment researchers and practitioners to make images in a way that is **responsive** to **situation** and **reflexive** in approach and forms of representation.

When making images, it is important to critically appraise the sites and **situations** in which you are working and the effects these images may have. A site is never neutral ground, there are always other claims on the space, its ownership, function and symbolism. As such, whether intentional or not, your work will have an impact: celebrating, criticising or ignoring architecture, ecologies, histories and uses.¹⁴ In this contested space, a site analysis will allow you to understand the impact your work may have on social, cultural and ecological environments. This might concern a site's colonial history and indigenous peoples' land-rights, or a **situation** such as an urban regeneration scheme. In any case, it is important to be mindful of local tensions and cultural **sensitivities**

and to think carefully whether images made could unintentionally reinforce negative stereotypes or expose **confidential** and personal material. Understandings and needs for **privacy** may differ between researchers and participants when taking photos or working with cultural material. The Australian Council for the Arts remind us how visual arts are central to identity, place and belonging of Indigenous cultures, as an expression of a unique and continuing tradition and with an important place in the continuing survival of Indigenous cultures.¹⁵ As primary guardians and interpreters of their cultures, Indigenous groups have well-established protocols for interacting with their cultural material, for example the reproduction of secret and sacred images may be a transgression of Indigenous law. As such, if you plan to depict an identifiable individual or body of material, it is vital to ask permission from the individual, community or relatives, and to observe close consultation and **consent** throughout.¹⁶

As well as the **situation**, it is vital to consider the form of representation you choose and its history and power in built environment research and practice. Ahmed Ansari, Danah Abdulla, Ece Canli, Mahmoud Keshavarz, Matthew Kiem, Pedro Oliveira, Luiza Prado and Tristan Schultz of the group Decolonising Design expose how Anglocentric and Eurocentric design technologies, techniques, ways of seeing and acting in the world can flatten and eradicate ontological and epistemological difference and produce and exert colonial power.¹⁷ Decolonising Design asserts the importance in finding new hybrid, derivative, and syncretic practices and discourses: 'We should aim to have many diverse forms of design practice in the world – each specific to its region and its biosphere, each rooted in the cosmologies and mythos of its culture, each concerned with defining its own aims and identifying and addressing its own problems and opportunities.'¹⁸

One of the most common methods in built environment research and practice is photography. For critic Susan Sontag, 'to photograph is to appropriate the thing photographed,' whereby the camera controls subject and viewing to limit audience interpretation as well as perpetuate distance and power imbalances.¹⁹ Such criticisms remind us how our images are made not taken, and of our **responsibility** to redress this in our approach.

Health ethicist Sonya de Laat advocates methods such as collaboration, multivocality and **reflexivity**, encouraging researchers to get to know those you seek to represent by speaking with communities and fostering relationships, adding new dimensions to your research.²⁰ Multivocality is a term in documentary filmmaking which seeks

include as many voices and perspectives of participants as possible alongside that of the maker in order to reduce hierarchies and make explicit constructed and negotiated elements.²¹ In still images, this multivocality can be sought in the process of writing image captions by including the voices of those who appear or are part of the community or research.²² **Reflexivity** involves dispelling the myth of reality by demonstrating to the viewer how the production is a cultural construct, and including authoritative voices of those being represented.²³ In architectural photography, Borden explores strategies of dialectical imagery and temporality, using the capacity of captions to 'question and to supplement, reinforce and destabilise the visual image' and to show buildings in use, with people in them, to demonstrate how the built environment is not static and isolated but '**relational** entities, encountered in differing sequences, glances and memories.'²⁴

One of the most contested forms of representation used in built environment research and practice is mapping. Mishuana Goeman, Tonawanda Band of Seneca, reminds us how 'maps, in their most traditional sense as a representation of authority, have incredible power and have been essential to colonial and imperial projects.'²⁵ As a tool to survey lands and render space as a plan, every aspect of a map carries great bias and import: its orientation and projection, languages used and political borders drawn.

There are a number of initiatives that expose these issues and seek to embody alternative power relations. *The Decolonial Atlas* is a growing collection of maps which challenge our relationships with the land, people, and state.²⁶ *Queering the Map* is a community-generated mapping project that geo-locates queer moments, memories and histories in relation to physical space.²⁷ *On Circulations And The African Imagination Of A Borderless World* by pan-African publisher and broadcaster Chimurenga, seeks to map and pay tribute to works that articulate histories of circulation from an African perspective.²⁸ Architectural designer Aissata Balde's maps of migrant journeys challenge notions of state, boundary and space by exploring the fluid notions of territory, charting displacement, limbo and escape and blurring techniques of hand and machine to embody her own **position**.²⁹ And Dallas Hunt and Shaun A. Stevenson draw our attention to how Indigenous peoples within the boundaries of Canada have historically and contemporaneously created alternative representational strategies, repurposing technology to represent their own experiences of land and territory.³⁰

Drawing is another key medium in the research and production of the built environment. This usually takes the form of plans, sections and axonometric cut-aways to explain aspects of a building and design new structures and spaces altogether. Further to Tayob's work questioning whether orthographic drawings can tell a different story of marginal and subaltern populations, architectural designer Dan Innes' project *Disobedient Drawing* critiques 'the sanitised and impersonal aspect of contemporary architectural drawings, which often forget the people who inhabit them', and interrogates some of the binaries conventionally used in drawings, 'such as line/page, inside/outside, solid/void, black/white, in order to uncover the biases resting within it'.³¹ Innes' work removes monochrome linework and foregrounds more diverse human experiences within the design process, allowing for difference, subjectivity, and ambiguity.³²

As designer and researcher Sayan Skandarajah summarises, 'contemporary technology has familiarized us with the possibility of representation techniques that show us everything as a "whole." Three-dimensional scanning, drone photography and virtual reality, with their supposed connotations of precision, completeness and objectivity, have become part of everyday practice within visual documentation'.³³ Skandarajah's drawings challenge the nature of these urban representations in capturing 'the whole', by employing non-perspectival East Asian axonometric spatial representations to incorporate temporality, movement and a continually shifting viewpoint, 'which allows the viewer to be an enhanced and engaged participator in the city, rather than a passive spectator'.³⁴

A final form of representation to consider concerns the digital models that illustrate structures, buildings and spaces. These visualisations or renders are powerful tools of communication, presenting visions as if they were already real. 'As the images become more realistic,' Graham McKay warns, 'their content becomes more fictional'.³⁵ Mark Minkjan agrees, describing how 'the social implications, political dynamics and internal problems of architecture and spatial production are conveniently left out of the picture'.³⁶ As built environment researchers and practitioners you have a **responsibility** in how to use such powerful forms of representation and how to complicate or subvert these curated, edited and sanitised images disseminated widely online.

Guideline 3 Before displaying: *Share carefully and generously*

Displaying your images marks a joyful and important moment when you open up your research to others. This may come at an end of year show, film screening or public exhibition when your work will be presented alongside that of your peers, it may take more conventional forms such as conference presentations, book or journal publications, or it may come at an earlier stage in your project at which point engaging with audiences is a key aspect in the research process. The urge to make your work public may be driven by a **moral** argument to share resources with communities and organisations or to add your voice to struggles for equality and **justice**, fostering public interest and galvanising social action.³⁷

'The creation of images,' Cox et. al. explain, 'has the potential to tap into powerful emotions, memories, or beliefs that may result in discomfort or potential emotional **harm** for participants'.³⁸ Images that enter and remain in the public domain may be easily copied and reproduced globally online in new contexts. This carries with it an important set of **responsibilities** as these images may have unexpected negative or **harmful** consequences, ranging from anxiety or embarrassment to considerable 'political, economic and physical **harms** depending on the **situations** and circumstances in which they exist'.³⁹

Design ethicist Sarah Pink reminds us how images are often seen as representative of social reality, rather than constructions of reality influenced by both researcher and subject. This requires attention to three related issues: the context in which the image is produced; the content and internal meanings of the image; and the contexts and subjectivities through which the images are viewed and made meaningful by audiences.⁴⁰ She advises researchers to think carefully about which forms of dissemination are the most appropriate, to seek to understand the political, social and cultural contexts in which images will be viewed and interpreted, and where possible, to allow participants to comment on images at pre-identified points prior to wider publication or exhibition.⁴¹ In such instances it is important that you explain the possible implications of making these images public to participants and, when it might prove difficult to fully appreciate contexts and outcomes, to take initiative and **responsibility** yourself.⁴² It is also worth identifying at which point in making public images it will not be

possible for participants to withdraw their **consent**. As well as avoiding stigmatising or distressing participants, it is also important to consider how audience members may find images of certain **situations** confronting, and to minimise potential **harm** to them by including trigger warnings of content.⁴³ As such, **consent** not only applies to the collection of images but in their presentation and dissemination too.

There are further challenges of **consent** when working with archival images, other creative works and internet sources. The International Visual Sociology Association advises making attribution and giving credit wherever possible and to ensure that images produced by others are never claimed as your own.⁴⁴ To include publicly available social media images in their research, Oliver Haimson, Nazanin Andalibi and Jessica Pater used an opt-out strategy, contacting those who made the images and explaining the nature of the research project and their right to opt out of their post being presented. If the social media image features identifiable individuals, they advise seeking explicit **consent** as, although the post is publicly available, they would otherwise have the **agency** to delete their posts at their discretion but which is not possible when embedded in a research paper.⁴⁵

The Australia Council for the Arts remind researchers about the rights of Indigenous artists and their communities to own and control their cultural heritage and how it is presented. This requires careful communication, consultation and **consent** especially on giving clearances of traditionally and collectively owned material and any proposed alterations of work through adapting, cutting and editing which may affect the original intention of the work and infringe on the artist's **moral** rights.⁴⁶ These questions of ownership and intellectual property extend to collaboratively produced works, requiring some planning to agree on who owns the images produced and who decides how they are to be used and represented.⁴⁷

All of these concerns intersect with ethical questions of **privacy** and **confidentiality**. As Cox et. al. explain: 'Reconstructing stories on sensitive topics, particularly through the use of evocative imagery, holds the danger that participants might suffer emotional **harm** from reliving upsetting events. There is potential for personal disclosures to create discomfort for participants when faced with the images they have produced; having a visual record of one's feelings could prove unexpectedly confronting for some participants.'⁴⁸ It is important to consider whether it is right to share your images in all contexts or whether they should be apportioned or adapted for different audiences.⁴⁹

To **anonymise** individuals, some researchers blur, block out or pixelate distinguishing facial features but these **risk** altering the nature of the images and dehumanising participants by objectifying them and disregarding their right to make an informed choice about revealing their identity.⁵⁰ You may instead choose to crop to remove identifying features or ask participants to take metaphorical photos such as of hands or movement to depict experiences. To preserve **anonymity** in her research exploring the extractive agendas driving the urban development of Lusaka, architectural designer and researcher Thandi Loewenson fictionalised names and omitted sites as required 'to maintain the **confidentiality** agreements which were a condition of collecting these observations.'⁵¹

In terms of identifiable information, it is also important to recognise that communities may be able to recognise individuals from jewellery, clothes or gestures, and that digital files such as mobile phone photographs often include GPS location coordinates. This 'EXIF metadata' can be turned off on your phone beforehand or removed from images afterwards.⁵²

Finally, it is important to think carefully about how you are storing and with whom you are sharing your images. As IDEO explain, 'long after a project has ended, the information we hold about participants may still have implications for their well-being. Participants often can't foresee all the possible outcomes of giving us their personal information, and granting us the freedom to use it for our work. Managing this information appropriately builds **trust**.'⁵³ There is detailed data protection advice available on the most secure forms of managing and storing data advising the **anonymisation**, encryption and deletion of images at different stages of the research process.⁵⁴ If you choose to share your work online, you may decide to issue a copyright notice, which is a form of legal protection that provides information about uses that are acceptable and includes details about contacting the copyright owners for **consent** to use in other material.⁵⁵ Or you may collectively decide on a creative commons license that enables the free distribution of your work, to give other people the right to share, use, and build upon your work.

Resources

- Ansari, Ahmed, Danah Abdulla, Ece Canli, Mahmoud Keshavarz, Matthew Kiem, Pedro Oliveira, Luiza Prado and Tristan Schultz. [*Decolonising Design*](#). 2016.
- Australia Council for the Arts. [*Protocols for producing Indigenous Australian performing arts: Visual Arts*](#). 2007.
- Berger, John and Jean Mohr. [*Another Way of Telling*](#). London: Vintage, 1982.
- Borden, Iain, 'Imaging architecture: the uses of photography in the practice of architectural history.' [*The Journal of Architecture* 12:1 \(2007\): 57–77](#).
- Chimurenga. [*On Circulations And The African Imagination Of A Borderless World*](#). 2018.
- Cox, Susan, Sarah Drew, Marilyns Guillemain, Catherine Howell, Deborah Warr, Jenny Waycott. [*Guidelines for Ethical Visual Research Methods*](#). 2014.
- [The Decolonial Atlas](#).
- Economic and Social Science Research Council. [*The Research Ethics Guidebook: a resource for social scientists*](#). 2010.
- Goeman, Mishuana. [*Mark My Words: Native Women Mapping Our Nations*](#). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013.
- Hunt, Dallas and Shaun A. Stevenson. 'Decolonizing geographies of power: indigenous digital counter-mapping practices on turtle Island.' [*Settler Colonial Studies* 7:3 \(2017\): 372–92](#).
- Innes, Dan. 'Disobedient Drawing: [un]charting a space of sexuality.' [*RCA Architecture Blog*](#). 2020.
- IDEO. [*The Little Book of Design Research Ethics*](#). 2015.
- International Visual Sociology Association. [*Code of Research Ethics and Guidelines*](#). 2009.
- de Laat, Sonya. 'Picture perfect: Ethical considerations in visual representation.' [*Nexus* 17 \(2004\): 122–49](#).
- Loewenson, Thandi. [*Field Notes*](#). 2016.
- Lokko, Lesley. 'The Past is a Foreign Country.' [*African Mobilities*](#). 2018.
- Markham, Annette and Elizabeth Buchanan. [*Ethical Decision-Making and Internet Research: Recommendations from the AoIR Ethics Working Committee*](#). 2012.
- Morrison, Joanna, Abriti Aryal, Awantika Priyadarshani, Satish Sah, Sushil Baral, [*Pictorial consent process for participatory research about type 2 diabetes in rural Nepal*](#). Part of the *Jeevan Shakti Mela - Festival for Life force*.
- Pink, Sarah. [*Doing Visual Ethnography: Images, Media and Representation in Research*](#). London, Sage, 2007.
- [Queering the Map](#).
- Ruby, Jay. 'Speaking For, Speaking About, Speaking With, or Speaking Alongside - An Anthropological and Documentary Dilemma.' [*Visual Anthropology Review* 7:2 \(1991\): 50–67](#).
- Skandarajah, Sayan. 'Into the Clouds of Rakuchu Rakugai Zu: Eastern > Western Drawing Tolerance Critiqued through Speculative Drawing Practices.' [*Architecture and Culture* 7:1 \(2019\): 129–47](#)
- Sontag, Susan. [*On Photography*](#). New York: Anchor Books, 1989.
- Tayob, Huda. 'Subaltern Architectures: Can Drawing "Tell" a Different Story?' [*Architecture and Culture* 6:1 \(2018\): 203–22](#)
- UCL Library Services. [*Handling sensitive, personal & special category information*](#). UCL.
- Wiles, Rose, Jon Prosser, Anna Bagnoli, Andrew Clark, Katherine Davies, Sally Holland, Emma Renold. [*Visual Ethics: Ethical Issues in Visual Research*](#). Southampton: ESRC National Centre for Research Method, 2008.

Endnotes

- 1 Iain Borden, 'Imaging architecture: the uses of photography in the practice of architectural history,' *The Journal of Architecture*, 12:1 (2007): 57–77, DOI: 10.1080/3602360701217989
- 2 Carolyn Fluehr-Lobban, 'Ethics,' in *Handbook of Methods in Cultural Anthropology*, ed. H. Russell Bernard (Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press, 1998).
- 3 Rose Wiles, Jon Prosser, Anna Bagnoli, Andrew Clark, Katherine Davies, Sally Holland, Emma Renold, *Visual Ethics: Ethical Issues in Visual Research* (Southampton: ESRC National Centre for Research Method, 2008), 14.
- 4 Wiles et al., *Visual Ethics*, 14.
- 5 Joanna Morrison, Abriti Aryal, Awantika Priyadarshani, Satish Sah, Sushil Baral, *Pictorial consent process for participatory research about type 2 diabetes in rural Nepal*. Part of the Jeevan Shakti Mela – Festival for LifeForce, (2018).
- 6 Wiles et al., *Visual Ethics*, 11.
- 7 Philippe Bourgois, "'They exploited us, but we didn't feel it': Hegemony, Ethnic Militancy, and the Miskitu-Sandinista Conflict,' in *Decolonising Anthropology: Moving Further Toward an Anthropology of Liberation*, ed. Faye Harrison (Washington: Association of Black Anthropologists, American Anthropological Association, 1991); Noel Dyck, "'Telling it like it is": Some Dilemmas of Fourth World Ethnography and Advocacy,' in *Anthropology. Public Policy. and Native Peoples in Canada*, eds N. Dyck and J. Waldram (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1993).
- 8 Susan Cox, Sarah Drew, Marilyns Guillemain, Catherine Howell, Deborah Warr, Jenny Waycott, *Guidelines for Ethical Visual Research Methods*, (2014), 4.
- 9 Wiles et al., *Visual Ethics*, 19.
- 10 Cox et al., *Guidelines for Ethical Visual Research Methods*, 17.
- 11 Huda Tayob, 'Subaltern Architectures: Can Drawing "Tell" a Different Story?' *Architecture and Culture*, 6:1, (2018): 203–22. DOI: 10.1080/20507828.2017.1417071
- 12 Tayob, 'Subaltern Architectures', 210.
- 13 Tayob, 'Subaltern Architectures', 213.
- 14 Mike Pearson, *Site-Specific Performance*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).
- 15 Australia Council for the Arts, *Protocols for producing Indigenous Australian performing arts: Visual Arts*, (2007), 4.
- 16 Australia Council for the Arts, *Protocols for producing Indigenous Australian performing arts*, 21.
- 17 Ahmed Ansari, Danah Abdulla, Ece Canli, Mahmoud Keshavarz, Matthew Kiem, Pedro Oliveira, Luiza Prado and Tristan Schultz, 'Editorial Statement,' *Decolonising Design*, (2016). <http://www.decolonisingdesign.com/statements/2016/editorial/>
- 18 Ahmed Ansari, 'What a Decolonisation of Design Involves: Two Programmes for Emancipation,' *Decolonising Design*, (2018). <https://www.decolonisingdesign.com/actions-and-interventions/publications/2018/what-a-decolonisation-of-design-involves-by-ahmed-ansari/>. See also Carla Jackson Bell, ed., *Space Unveiled: Invisible Cultures in the Design Studio* (New York: Routledge, 2014).
- 19 Susan Sontag, *On Photography* (New York: Anchor Books, 1989), 4, 12.
- 20 Sonya de Laat, 'Picture perfect: Ethical considerations in visual representation,' *Nexus* 17 (2004), 122–49, 133.
- 21 See the work of filmmakers Barbara Meyerhoff and David MacDougall.
- 22 de Laat, 'Picture perfect,' 137.
- 23 de Laat, 'Picture perfect,' 143–4.
- 24 Borden, 'Imaging architecture,' 66–8.
- 25 Mishuana Goeman, *Mark My Words: Native Women Mapping Our Nations* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013), 10.
- 26 The Decolonial Atlas. <https://decolonialatlas.wordpress.com>
- 27 Queering the Map. <https://www.queeringthemap.com>
- 28 Chimurenga, *On Circulations And The African Imagination Of A Borderless World* (2018).
- 29 See Lesley Lokko's beautiful summary of Aissata Balde's work: Lesley Lokko, 'The Past is a Foreign Country,' *African Mobilities* (2018). <https://archive.africanmobilities.org/discourse/2018/05/the-past-is-a-foreign-country/>
- 30 Dallas Hunt and Shaun A. Stevenson, 'Decolonizing geographies of power: indigenous digital counter-mapping practices on turtle Island,' *Settler Colonial Studies*, 7:3 (2017): 372-392, 376. DOI: 10.1080/2201473X.2016.1186311
- 31 Dan Innes, 'Disobedient Drawing: [un]charting a space of sexuality,' *RCA Architecture Blog* (2020). <https://rcaarchitecture.wpcomstaging.com/2020/06/06/disobedient-drawing/>
- 32 Innes, 'Disobedient Drawing.'
- 33 Sayan Skandarajah. 'Into the Clouds of Rakuchu Rakugai Zu: Eastern >Western Drawing Tolerance Critiqued through Speculative Drawing Practices,' *Architecture and Culture*. 7:1 (2019): 129-147, 130. DOI: 10.1080/20507828.2019.1558771
- 34 Skandarajah, 'Into the Clouds of Rakuchu Rakugai Zu,' 143.
- 35 Graham McKay, 'The Ethics of Rendering: Permissible Lies When Anything is Possible,' *Common Edge* (2016). <https://commonedge.org/the-ethics-of-rendering-permissible-lies-when-everything-is-possible/>

- 36 Mark Minkjan, 'What this MVRDV Rendering Says About Architecture and the Media?' *Failed Architecture* (2016). <https://failedarchitecture.com/what-this-mvrdv-rendering-says-about-architecture-and-media/>
- 37 Cox et al., *Guidelines for Ethical Visual Research Methods*, 4.
- 38 Cox et al., *Guidelines for Ethical Visual Research Methods*, 12.
- 39 de Laat. 'Picture perfect', 124.
- 40 Sarah Pink, *Doing Visual Ethnography: Images, Media and Representation in Research* (London, Sage, 2007).
- 41 Pink, *Doing Visual Ethnography*.
- 42 Wiles et al., *Visual Ethics*, 28.
- 43 Cox et al., *Guidelines for Ethical Visual Research Methods*, 11.
- 44 International Visual Sociology Association. 2009. *Code of Research Ethics and Guidelines*.
- 45 Oliver Haimson, Nazanin Andalibi and Jessica Pater, 'Ethical use of visual social media content in research publications,' *Research Ethics Monthly* (2016). <https://ahrecs.com/uncategorized/ethical-use-visual-social-media-content-research-publications>
- 46 Australia Council for the Arts, *Protocols for producing Indigenous Australian performing arts*, 13–14.
- 47 Cox et al., *Guidelines for Ethical Visual Research Methods*, 16.
- 48 Cox et al., *Guidelines for Ethical Visual Research Methods*, 11.
- 49 Cox et al., *Guidelines for Ethical Visual Research Methods*, 10.
- 50 Cox et al., *Guidelines for Ethical Visual Research Methods*, 20; Wiles et al., *Visual Ethics*, 23–4.
- 51 Thandi Loewenson. *Field Notes* (2016). <http://thandiloewenson.com/conversations-about-detritus/>
- 52 Wiles et al., *Visual Ethics*, 22.
- 53 IDEO, *The Little Book of Design Research Ethics* (2015), 40.
- 54 UCL Library Services, *Handling sensitive, personal & 'special category' information*. <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/library/research-support/research-data-management/best-practices/how-guides/handling-sensitive-personal>
- 55 Henry Lydiate, *Public Art Liabilities*, (Artlaw, 2010).

Bio

Dr David Roberts is a Lecturer in Architecture at the [Bartlett School of Architecture](#), and Research Ethics Fellow for the [Bartlett Ethics Commission](#) led by Professor Jane Rendell, seeking to raise awareness, expand understanding, and collectively develop approaches of ethical practice specific to built environment researchers and practitioners.

Contact David at david.roberts@ucl.ac.uk