

ART HIVES FROM COAST-TO-COAST: WEAVING A COLLECTIVE NARRATIVE

RACHEL CHAINEY

A Research Paper
in
The Department
of
Creative Arts Therapies

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts
Concordia University
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

APRIL 15, 2018

© RACHEL CHAINEY 2018

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY

School of Graduate Studies

This research paper prepared

By: Rachel Chainey

Entitled: Art Hives from Coast-to-Coast: Weaving a Collective Narrative

and submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts (Creative Arts Therapies; Art Therapy Option)

complies with the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality as approved by the research advisor.

Research Co-Advisors:

Stephen Snow, PhD, RDT-BCT

Janis Timm-Bottos, PhD, ATR-BC, PT

Department Chair:

Yehudit Silverman, MA, RDT, DMT-R

April, 2018

ABSTRACT

ART HIVES FROM COAST-TO-COAST: WEAVING A COLLECTIVE NARRATIVE

RACHEL CHAINEY

The purpose of this research project is to document and disseminate the different narratives of leaders of Art Hives projects that are part of the Art Hives Network, across Canada. Research participants have submitted short videos in which they share their story of starting an Art Hive. A thematic analysis of the narrative videos collected has been realized by the researcher, in order to gain deeper insight into what these diverse projects have in common and what makes them stand out as unique. The overarching goals pursued by this study are to increase understanding and awareness that Art Hives have of each other, the visibility of Art Hives as a movement, and to democratize the understanding of this model of arts-based social inclusion for the general public, funders, and policy makers.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As I prepare to come full circle with an academic journey that will have taken eight years, I wish to express deep gratitude to the beings that have accompanied me along the way, starting with the Indigenous territories on which my work and this research project are taking place.

To my mentor Janis, I could never have made it through this program without your continuous support and inspiration, in so many ways. Thank you for being the most incredible teacher, colleague and friend. Meeting you has turned my life around in many wonderful and unexpected ways.

To the circle of strong women that surround me and share the engagement in Art Hives work, you are my tribe and you keep me going.

To the participants of this research study, for sharing your stories so generously. Hearing and seeing you has moved me deeply and kindled my flame.

To my foremothers, the writers of many of the texts cited in this paper and all of those who have beaten the path using the arts for a greater social justice.

To participants in all the Art Hives I have ever been to and those that I haven't, for sharing the dream and your many gifts and innovations with the world.

To the many cohorts of amazing art therapists whom I have met during my time in this program, for the ongoing creative nourishment and solidarity through the harder days.

To the Creative Arts Therapies faculty, for challenging me and supporting my growth with such patience.

To my research advisor, Dr. Stephen Snow, for his encouragements and trust, and for keeping me on track while completing this paper.

Last but not least, my deepest gratitude goes out to my family for their tremendous patience and countless hours of invisible labour *while I was busy being free* (Mitchell, 1968).

Especially:

To my father, Laurent, for his unflinching love and faith in me since the day I was born.

To my daughters, Aude and Estelle, for continuously inspiring me to become a better version of myself and to keep working at building a world of love, courage and care for them and the generations to come. In your eyes glimmers all the hope I could ever need.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT.....	V
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	VI
RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	2
OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS.....	2
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	2
METHODOLOGY.....	5
DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS.....	9
RECRUITMENT OF PARTICIPANTS.....	9
METHOD OF ANALYSIS.....	10
RESULTS.....	11
<i>Figure 1. Concept map produced from data</i>	11
LIMITATIONS.....	18
IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE RECOMMENDATIONS.....	19
APPENDIX A.....	24
APPENDIX B.....	37
LETTER OF INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN THE RESEARCH STUDY.....	37
APPENDIX C CONSENT FORM.....	40

List of Figures

Figure 1. Concept map produced from data

We do not become healers. We came as healers. We are. Some of us are still catching up to what we are. We do not become storytellers. We came as carriers of the stories we and our ancestors actually lived. We are. Some of us are still catching up to what we are. We do not become artists. We came as artists. We are. Some of us are still catching up to what we are.

—Clarissa Pinkola Estés, *Women Who Run with the Wolves: Myths and Stories of the Wild Woman Archetype*

Introduction

An Art Hive is a community art studio that welcomes everyone as an artist and fosters arts-based social inclusion. Also known as ‘public homeplaces,’ these third spaces, create multiple opportunities for dialogue, skill sharing, and art making between people of differing socio-economic backgrounds, cultures, ages and abilities. (www.arthives.org, 2018)

This approach, also referred to as Public Practice Art Therapy, was imagined by Concordia Creative Arts Therapies professor Dr. Janis Timm-Bottos and elaborated over the last 25 years. The Art Hives Initiative was launched in Montreal in 2012. The model is made available for replication in an open source format. Anyone can start an Art Hive, although the movement is largely led by art therapists (Timm-Bottos, 2017). At the time of writing, the Art Hives Network connects 131 projects worldwide, 85 of which are in Canada.

Since 2010, the researcher has been involved in different capacities with different Montreal Art Hives (volunteer, studio facilitator, co-founder and co-director of an Art Hive), and is now the National Coordinator of the Art Hives Network, since 2015. Serving in that role has sparked her curiosity about the breadth and the depth of various reasons art therapists (as well as other professionals) choose to embrace the Art Hives model as their practice (or a part of it), and of the richness of the human stories behind each Art Hive. Geographic distances make it harder to visit and engage with each project when working at a national level. The researcher’s current conceptualization of the ethos of Art Hives, as synthesized in the *Art Hives How-to-Guide* (Timm-Bottos & Chainey, 2015), does not account for the multitude of Art Hives realities that exist, especially outside of Montreal, Quebec, Canada. The narrative she holds is largely based on her own experience working as a facilitator and/or administrator in numerous Montreal Art Hives as well as for the Network, alongside Dr. Timm-Bottos.

This arts-based narrative research project was undertaken with the goal to broaden the researcher’s own perspective on Art Hives, as well as to enhance the knowledge that Art Hives have of each other. Her vision is that sharing our stories will strengthen the existing solidarity between the projects, in spite of distance, while enhancing the visibility of each studio. This project is designed as an online tool to educate the general public, art therapists and others interested in starting an Art Hive, as well as funders, community partners and policy makers, about the essence of this initiative and of the movement that is emerging from it. Furthermore, the researcher hopes that this study can serve as a cornerstone to develop

evaluation tools, training programs and further research, in response to the themes that emerge as important for the people engaged in the Art Hives Network, building on the values they reflect as important and the various impacts that they observe.

Research Questions

The research questions for this research project are: (1) How can multiple narratives inform a shared ethos of Art Hives as a network? (2) What are the motivations of Art Hives leaders and the perceived individual and collective effects of these projects? (3) What are some common themes and values that can be identified?

Operational Definitions

Art Hive. This is a community art studio that is open to all for non-directed art making free of charge, and that is listed as part of the Art Hives Network on www.arthives.org.

Art Hive Leader. This is the title for an individual responsible for holding an Art Hive's vision and keeping its mission going. They could be a founder, director, or even a very involved staff member.

Third Space. A third space is in between the home (first space) and the workplace (second space). Using Oldenburg's definition, third spaces are "anchors of community life and facilitate and foster broader, more creative interactions." (as cited in Hammouda et al., 2012, p. 107). More information on third spaces can be found in the literature review below.

Literature Review

This paper acts as a complement to the collection of participatory videos that have been submitted to the researcher and can be viewed on the Art Hives website: www.arthives.org. The literature review to follow seeks to provide an overview of the theoretical foundations of the Art Hives and Public Practice Art Therapy approaches.

"An Art Hive is a community art studio that welcomes everyone as an artist" (Timm-Bottos & Chainey, 2015, p. 2). It is a "public homeplace" (Belenky, Bond & Weinstock, 1997, p. 155), "a special type of third place, a protected and safe space, both psychologically and physically, which invites community members to develop their unique voices, express themselves openly, engage with each other, and nurture participants' leadership potential, especially those considered vulnerable and marginalized in their communities" (Timm-Bottos, 2014, p.6). In this space-between, "mixing with members of the mainstream can occur, as a means to enliven both and to create opportunities for a true sense of community and a shared purpose to grow" (Allen, 2008, p.11). Oldenburg (1989, in Myers, 2012) defines

a third place by the eight following elements: (1) a neutral ground, accessible for free and without pressure or obligation; (2) a more level playing field where social hierarchies and power is less marked than in other areas of society; (3) friendly conversation is a key activity; (4) the space is unprogrammed and connected to the needs of its users; (5) there are “regular” participants who contribute to creating the mood of the space and a sense of familiarity; (6) the space is wholesome, unpretentious; (7) it conveys an inviting and playful atmosphere; (8) it feels like a home away from home, a shared place of belonging .

Belenky et al. (1997) coined the term “Public Homeplaces” as a specific type of third place, which they describe as “an unseen and unheard leadership tradition rooted in maternal practice and maternal thinking” (p.282) as well as spaces “triggering constant discussions, mostly of a moral nature; these in turn spurring the development of individual members and the group as a whole” (p.282). The homeplace women reject the notion that “conflict, competition and dominance are the key to social progress” (Belenky et al., 1997, p.286). Instead, “they are optimists who believe that human beings are fully capable of creating a loving and nurturing society, however “when the homeplace women put their ideas into action, they also learn to take a critical stance towards themselves and their own work” (p.283). Belenky et al. (1997) describe these women leaders as “connected teachers” (p. 62) who help draw out each other’s thinking, cultivate the development of new ideas, and affirming strengths rather than focusing on flaws.

In the Art Hive, “every citizen has the right to be involved in the creation of culture, not merely to be the passive recipient of cultural forms created by an elite” (Adams and Goldbard, 2001, p. 24). “and art-making is considered as a basic human right, in which the “artist in each of us” (Cane, 1951) comes alive for the betterment not only of one’s self but of one’s community as well (Allen, 2008). According to Allen (2008), the community art studio practitioner, by stepping out of the world of art therapy and its language of ‘treatment,’ ‘therapy,’ and ‘diagnosis,’ is making an essentially political statement that creativity is more closely aligned to an individual’s health than to any disease process. The art therapist, in such as setting, becomes a “fellow traveler” (Allen, 2008, p.11) with the other participants, the healing aspects of art making arise from the making and doing, the trying and failing, the experimenting and succeeding, alongside others. The healing occurs as a natural unfolding of the artist’s truth as expressed through the images; the more fully these artists come to know themselves, the more they are able to authentically participate in life and community (Allen, 2005). Howard, (in Mendel, 2015) describes the process of creating something as more

important than the product in community arts, the product really being the experience, relationships and transformations which are created for each person participating to the process. Hocooy (in Kaplan, 2007) suggests that social action community art therapy might have one invariable endpoint or *telos* in mind, that of achieving just and peaceful human communities. He depicts that desired *state* (as in both “condition” and “republic”) as a society where exists no monolithic, dominant voice that is impregnable to alternative voices, but, rather, a communal space where multiple voices, equal in status, are continually in dialogue and permeable to reciprocal influence. Timm-Bottos (2006) evokes the need for safe public space that assists all of us in reclaiming our collective power to create the world we want to live in. She suggests that:

Therapeutic and political community art making can be become both the method or practice and the goal. People come together with a desire for community and at the same time create it. This ongoing participatory public art process leads to enhanced personal and public health, healthier families and a provocative borderland, a community, in which individuals practice participating in the decisions that affect their lives. (...) I like to think of community studio based on the human attributes we each bring to it, rather than our trained or untrained status. We are each artists, teachers and students for each other. When we allow ourselves to see each other as equal players, each in need of healing and leading, we discover amazing new ways of working. We become a group of interdisciplinary and interdependent human beings, a group of eccentric bricoleurs, who reach for things at hand, trusting in lived experiences, and using this knowledge to come up with something new (Timm-Bottos, 2006, p. 12-13).

This innovative way of using the arts as a means of social inclusion and healing not only with individuals, but within the social context in which they live, is related to psychologies of liberation, which assert that the current way of practicing psychology, consisting of “helping individuals and families adapt to the status quo,” is erroneous (Watkins & Shulman, 2008, p.13). These authors argue that “lost rituals, social networks, beliefs and trust are not only individual but collective issues and cannot be rebuilt in private spaces alone” (p.14), but rather in “milieus where people can recognize that their suffering has common roots and is shared” (p.14). Timm-Bottos (2017b) defines Public Practice Art Therapy as an arts-based community-generated response to collective problems that affect our communities (climate change, racism, gendered violence, effects of colonialism, etc.).

This approach takes the unidirectional, individual therapeutic relationship outside the therapist's office and into the community to become a multi-directional, communal relationship with each other and the world, unfolding in multiple "small and sustainable third spaces across North America" which she also calls "enabling spaces" (Timm-Bottos, 2017b, p. 94). Tallman (2015) establishes the link between facilitating in an Art Hive and the Circle of Courage developed by Brendtro, Brokenleg and Van Bockern (2002), an approach to creating "reclaiming spaces" in their work with at-risk youth. Such spaces, rooted in psychology, youth work, and Indigenous child-rearing philosophies offer a supportive milieu for youth to experience autonomy, attachment, achievement, and altruism. Tallman suggests that the four human needs at the core of the Circle of Courage approach (mastery, independence and generosity, and she replaced *sense of belonging* with *inclusion*) are reciprocal actions, occurring in back-and-forth, multi-directional circles between all involved in an Art Hive, which as a result fosters a sense of belonging to a greater whole in these individuals and allows for the creation of a community.

Chapter 3. Methodology

The researcher chose a narrative methodology to give space for multiple voices to come forward and tell their stories in their own words, with as little interference from the researcher as possible. The harvest of these stories serves to diversify, enrich and amplify the understanding that the researcher, participants, and the audience have of the concept and functions of Art Hives. The researcher's vision is for the people working on the ground to be able to contribute their unique voices to the theories listed above. Patton (2002), describes narratives as "a quality of lived experience and a form by which people construct their identities and locate themselves in what is happening around them, at micro and macro levels" (p. 156). Patton also states, that narratives are "the story-like form through which people subjectively experience and give meaning to their daily lives and their actions in the world. A narrative organizes information, events, and experiences that flow across time, providing a storyline or plot from a particular point of view" (p. 157). He describes six core aspects that constitute a narrative: "(1) telling a story or a tale," (2) a sense of movement or process, (3) interrelations or connections within a complex, detailed context, (4) an involved individual or collectivity that engages in action and makes choices, (5) coherence or the whole holds together, and (6) the temporal sequencing of a chain of events (p. 156). Collecting narratives from Art Hives leaders that looked at these six key elements provided a

multi-layered account of what Art Hives leaders' motivations and journeys with this work have been so far.

The researcher believes that quantitative methods, or qualitative inquiry compiled in the form of static data on paper isn't adequate or sufficient to account for the complex, and visually and humanly rich nature of arts-based work such as that of a community art studio. Arts-based research appeared like a more connected way to represent the work of Art Hives. Kapitan (2010) calls arts-based research a form of "holistic communication" (p. 165). She also speaks of "canonical generalization," "why and how the study of one person can resonate in the lives of many" (Kapitan, 2010, p. 165). She defines "the nature of generalization in arts-based research as concerned with illuminating what is unique in time and space while simultaneously conveying insights that extend beyond the limits of the situation" (Kapitan, 2010, p.165). This is what the present research project strives to do. Kapitan (2010) also points out that the arts bring out "new ways of seeing something" and that "such forms of inquiry may be more accessible to the researcher and the study's audiences than the usual academic language of research" (p. 165). Lastly, and importantly for this project, Kapitan (2010) points out that "artistic inquiry makes the person social and the private public, and therefore may incorporate an activist stance," and that "a common feature of art is to create an impact on the awareness of the viewer or audiences" (p. 165).

Specifically, for this project, my hypothesis is that film is a medium that lends itself well to representing the stories of the different Art Hives told in their leaders' voices, while also letting the viewer see their expressions, including their non-verbal communication, and the multiple visual elements present in their Art Hive. Cohen, Salazar and Barkat (2008) define participatory video as "a tool for individual, group and community development" (p. 348) and as an "iterative process, whereby community members use video to document innovation and ideas, or to focus on issues that affect their environment" (p. 349). High, Singh, Petheram and Nemes (2012) say that the participatory video process opens "opportunities for further skill-sharing" between the participants, and that it "highlights the troublesome issue of sustainability and capacity building" (p.38) and "opportunities for innovation and change created by a break from an organization's everyday concerns" (p. 39). High et al.'s (2012) observations support the researcher's hypothesis that this participatory video project can help enhance the group cohesion between members of the Art Hives network and generate opportunities for further collaborations and research, including across geographical distances.

Plush (2012) offers a specific conceptual framework for participatory video research, based on the participatory action research framework, comprising these three elements:

- (1) Awareness and knowledge: using participatory video as a means to raise awareness to help build knowledge as power;
- (2) Capacity for action: building on the strengths of local actors in using participatory video with communities to ensure that knowledge not often heard in wider dialogue can be generated in a participatory manner;
- (3) People-centered advocacy: using participatory video as a strategic process to communicate the knowledge generated by communities to influence decision makers at local, national and global levels (p.69).

Waite and Conn (2012) state that: “the notion of reclaiming and validating women’s experiences through listening to women’s voices” (Kitzinger, 2007, p.125) has shaped feminism since its beginnings, countering the dominance of male voices in traditional social research” (Harding, 2004, p. 125). Until now, women’s self-reports in whatever form (through interviews, oral histories, narratives, focus groups) remain the most popular approaches in feminist method (Kitzinger, as cited by Waite & Conn, 2012).

Smith (1999, in Chilisa, 2012) has defined decolonization strategies in research, one of which states that “social justice research is achieved when research gives voice to the researched and moves from a deficit-based orientation... to reinforcing the practices that have sustained the lives of the researched” (p. 17). Chilisa (2012) describes her “postcolonial indigenous research paradigm as a framework of belief systems that emanate from the lived experiences, values and history of those belittled and marginalized by Euro-Western Research paradigms” (p. 19). Both Waite & Conn’s (2012) and Chilisa’s (2012) approaches echo and expand on Belenky, Clinchy, Golderberger and Tarules’s (1986) “Women’s Ways of Knowing” which examined the different ways in which women (understood as a marginalized and silenced group) “view reality, build their knowledge, and how they struggle to claim the power of their own minds” (p. 19). This was done through listening to the life narratives of over a hundred women in order to obtain a diverse and detail-rich account of their realities. Macleod and Bhatia (2008, in Chilisa 2012) describe the “liberatory and transformative aim of postcolonial research” as “placing greater importance on people’s existential realities, lived experiences, discursive practices, emotions, and cultural sensitivities, and examine how these elements can contribute to community development and ongoing community action” (p. 51). Timm-Bottos and Reilly (2014) suggest taking into consideration “multiple ways of seeing (and producing knowledge), thereby reducing the

possibility of replicating patterns of social inequity and oppression. These methods were designed to sow seeds of awareness and increase the capacity for compassion for one's self and empathy for each other" (p.10). Drawing on the participatory narrative video design from Miller's (2011) "Mapping Memories" project, this research project hopes to offer an opportunity for Art Hives leaders to "reflect on their unique experiences, to learn new media skills, to work in collaboration with each other, to strengthen peer networks, and to express themselves creatively as they shape their narratives using different sorts of media" (p. 10).

Ethical considerations with narrative, arts-based and participatory methods can be similar, revolving around caring for the preservation of the authenticity of the participants' voices and expressions and being mindful of one's researchers' bias. Yang (2012) stresses the importance of shared authorship as a "way of providing participants with a means to critically reflect upon their lives on their own, without imposing researchers' views or obstructing participants' reflexivity with technical barriers that may accompany video production" (p.103). She suggests that participants should be given minimal, but "meticulous and thorough instructions" to video production (p.103). "Through such instruction, participants can become researchers' true collaborators and take shared authorship of video as a content provider while researchers provide a vessel to hold the content" (p.104). Additionally, Yang (2012) states that in participatory video, "the quality of the video is not as important the process itself" (p.104), which allow for letting the participants have increased control and ownership of their video segment. Therefore, the reflexivity process, usually researcher centered, needs to shift to the participants, so that they can "investigate their own experiences while making videos related to their lives" (p.104) but that also, the researcher should "make both research processes and their epistemological viewpoints transparent" (p.104) to keep the dialogue as horizontal as possible. This said, she warns that while "video is an accessible medium that participants can use rather easily and often enjoyably to express their experiences and ideas" (p.104), it can be challenging for participants who have limited training in video production to "cope with technical difficulties while simultaneously being reflective about their lives" (p. 104). Chilisa (2012) recommends paying attention to the ways in which the researched are "otherized" (whether it is based on gender, ethnicity, social class, ability, etc.), and how their ways of knowing are dismissed by the dominant discourse. She warns against "the sameness error," or universalism, which "blurs differences in the researched Other" and has as an effect the "silencing of the less powerful," rendering their uniqueness invisible (Chilisa, 2012, p. 9). Low, Rose, Salvio, and Palacios, 2012) also

highlight “the intricate dynamics of representation, which are political—as in who speaks for whom—and aesthetic or formal, both of which emerge as helping to both complicate and elucidate experiences of participation” (p. 56). Additional concerns include the appearance of other people or their artwork in any of the videos. The researcher has secured informed consent (Appendix C) from the participants, as well as ensured that each of them has obtained written consent and handed it to the researcher for any other person and/or their artwork appearing in the video that they produce.

The data created using this specific combination of narrative participatory video research is in the form of subjective stories linking the personal to the social realities of Art Hives leaders, told in their own voices, in video form. Each video is a minimum of two minutes and a maximum of three. All videos have been produced, edited and are owned by their author. The researcher did not edit the data in order to preserve the integrity of participant’s voice. Each video submitted is posted as an “episode” on the Art Hives website. Participants unable or unwilling to produce a video for any reason were offered the opportunity to have their story included in the form of still images (photos) and written text and/or recorded audio.

Data Collection and Analysis

Steps to this research project have been: (1) Reviewing the existing literature on the research topic and methodology; (2) Securing ethical clearance for research involving human participants (Appendix A); (3) Sending out an open call for participation to potential participants; (4) Providing research context, questions, and instructions to interested participants; Receiving their feedback and adapting accordingly; (5) Remaining available for technical support and clarification about the research project throughout the production and edition period; (6) Receiving the data and drawing out themes, using the continuous thematization method (Paille & Mucchielli, 2016); (7) Doing further research and reviewing additional literature based on the emerging themes from the data; (8) Broadcasting the data (without editing the contents); (9) Producing a reflexive and theoretical written component and; (10) Disseminating the findings.

Recruitment of Participants

After she obtained the Certificate of Ethical Acceptability for this research project in September 2016 (Appendix A), the researcher posted an open call to the Art Hives Network website and shared to the Network’s social media accounts on Facebook and Twitter. A letter of invitation (Appendix B) was then sent by email to Canadian Art Hives who expressed

interest following the public posting. As indicated in the consent form (Appendix C), participants were offered different options for protecting their identity as they preferred. Twelve Art Hives initially consented to producing a video. At the time of writing, seven videos have been received by the researcher. Others are still in production and will be diffused but not analyzed due to the timeframe for the production of this paper. Some other Art Hives leaders have not been able to participate due to organizational capacity constraints. Each participating Art Hive leader(s) and their team have produced and edited their own video. The researcher has remained available to offer technical support as needed throughout the data collection phase. In three cases, she did some visual video editing to help the participant but has not altered the narrative content to preserve the integrity of the storyteller's voice. Videos and consent forms were collected and stored in a password protected Dropbox folder, to which only each participant and the researcher had access. Completed videos have been released for public viewing on the Art Hives website beginning in December 2017.

Method of Analysis

Transcripts of the videos submitted were analyzed according to Paille & Mucchielli's (2016) continuous thematization method. This method draws from in vivo data-driven coding (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996) in which themes, or codes, are generated from the data, using the language utilized by participants. In vivo coding places itself in contrast with predetermined, theory-driven codes. In the continuous thematization method proposed by Paille & Mucchielli (2016), themes are identified and noted in an uninterrupted method while listening to the videos and/or reading the transcripts, and then grouped, fused, and hierarchized as needed. The word theme is understood here as "capturing something important about the data in relation to the research question and represents some level of patterned response or meaning within the data set" (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 83). Themes were noted for each interview and then statements that expressed a similar idea or feeling were grouped together under a heading coming from the interviews, chosen because of the significant frequency at which it was used. This was completed using the concept mapping idea which Butler-Kisber (2010) describes as "using hand-drawn sketches or virtual tools in a non-linear and visual format... to show the thinking as it emerges" (p. 38). She explains that cartographic mapping is a process that helps translate "field text material onto some form of map or schematic in order to get a more holistic and conceptual understanding of it" (Butler-Kisber, 2010, p. 42).

Producing such a map of the harvested data can help make the information more accessible to the general public, as well as serve as a building block for further investigation.

Results

Seven Art Hives submitted a video: The AATQ Art Hive, The Donald Berman Maimonides (DBM) Art Hive, Nextdoor Art Hive, Alternative Creations Studio, Eastmain Art Hive, La Ruche d'Art Yelema, and The McGill Art Hive Initiative (formerly McGill Education Art Hive). All seven videos were transcribed and coded using the method described above. The concept map produced from the data (Figure 1) allowed to extract nine key themes. Those fundamental concepts were then hierarchized from most significant to less significant, according to the number of statements and interviews falling under each. All of the statements expressing the participants' subjective views were coded under one of the nine themes, however, subthemes were then developed and also hierarchized, to avoid neglecting subtle variations on a theme, as well as to highlight the prevalence of key nuances of a specific theme.



Figure 1. Concept map produced from data

Theme 1: Connection

(7 Art Hives, 31 statements)

- A welcoming meeting place, coming together, the idea of a shared home (AATQ, Nextdoor, DBM Art Hive, Eastmain Art Hive, Alternative Creations Studio, Ruche d'Art Yelema, McGill Art Hive).
- A safe space for healing and receiving support when vulnerable (Nextdoor, Eastmain Art Hive, Alternative Creations Studio).
- Practicing caring and kindness with each other (Nextdoor, Eastmain Art Hive).
- Connection to cultural values of the community or of the speaker's culture of origin (Eastmain Art Hive, McGill Art Hive).

Theme 2: Sharing

(7 Art Hives, 27 statements)

- Getting to know each other through teaching skills (Eastmain Art Hive, Alternative Creations Studio, Ruche d'Art Yelema, McGill Art Hive).
- Sharing a passion for Art (Nextdoor, Eastmain Art Hive, Alternative Creations Studio).
- Connection to a diversity of perspectives, discovering each other (AATQ, Nextdoor, Alternative Creations Studio).
- Sharing stories (Nextdoor, DBM Art Hive, Eastmain Art Hive).
- Shared leadership, by and for the community (AATQ, Nextdoor, Ruche d'Art Yelema).
- Exchange of art forms (AATQ, Nextdoor, McGill Art Hive).
- Sharing traditional knowledge and materials (Eastmain Art Hive).
- Intergenerational exchanges (DBM Art Hive, Eastmain Art Hive).
- Networking with colleagues, spreading awareness of the Art Therapy profession (AATQ).
- Reuse of materials (Ruche d'Art Yelema).

Theme 3: Accessibility

(7 Art Hives, 26 statements)

- Give free access to art materials and studio spaces (AATQ, Nextdoor, DBM Art Hive, Eastmain Art Hive, Alternative Creations Studio, Ruche d'Art Yelema, McGill Art Hive).
- Wish for more spaces like this or more frequent hours (Nextdoor, Eastmain Art Hive, Alternative Creations Studio, McGill Art Hive).

- Inclusion of diversity (AATQ, Nextdoor, Ruche d'Art Yelema, McGill Art Hive).
- Providing an opportunity for marginalized voices (seniors, persons with differing abilities) to come forward (DBM Art Hive, Alternative Creations Studio).
- Breaking down preconceived ideas about who can call themselves an artist (Alternative Creations Studio).

Theme 4: Experimentation

(5 Art Hives, 13 statements)

- A space for exploring, trying new things out and creative play (AATQ, DBM Art Hive, Eastmain Art Hive, Alternative Creations Studio, McGill Art Hive).
- Stepping outside one's comfort zone, opening up, becoming comfortable with vulnerability and making mistakes (DBM Art Hive, Alternative Creations Studio).

Theme 5: Capacities

(6 Art Hives, 11 statements)

- Everyone is an artist, everyone is creative, honouring each person's potential (Nextdoor, DBM Art Hive, Eastmain Art Hive, Alternative Creations Studio, Ruche d'Art Yelema, McGill Art Hive).
- Changing the perception of self and other, beyond disabilities or age (DBM Art Hive, Eastmain Art Hive, Alternative Creations Studio).

Theme 6: Expression

(6 Art Hives, 10 statements)

- Creative freedom, without judgement or direction (AATQ, Nextdoor, Eastmain Art Hive, Ruche d'Art Yelema, McGill Art Hive).
- Expressing one's sensations, feelings and identity; practicing being oneself (AATQ, Nextdoor, DBM Art Hive, Eastmain Art Hive).
- Art tells about the land, the culture (Eastmain Art Hive).

Theme 7: Joy

(4 Art Hives, 7 statements)

- Joy, happiness, enjoyment (AATQ, Nextdoor, DBM Art Hive, Alternative Creations Studio).
- Pleasure, fun, play (AATQ, Nextdoor, Alternative Creations Studio).

Theme 8: Inspiration from the Art Hives Network

(4 Art Hives, 7 statements)

- Inspiration from Dr. Timm-Bottos and the Montreal Art Hives (AATQ, Eastmain Art Hive, Alternative Creations Studio, McGill Art Hive).
- Belonging to a network (AATQ, Alternative Creations Studio).

Theme 9: Mindfulness

(3 Art Hives, 6 statements)

- Creative flow, meditative quality of art making (Nextdoor, DBM Art Hive).
- Making time, being in the moment (AATQ, DBM Art Hive).

Chapter 5. Discussion

Connection

The theme that was most salient in the data was that of connection. Specifically, the notion of a welcoming meeting place was common to all seven videos. The wholesome, welcoming, warm, friendly, unprogrammed and unprescribed qualities of a third space were named as significant aspects of the Art Hive experience by each of the speakers. The leadership style of the “homeplace women” (Belenky, 1996) characterized by an empathic, caring and nurturing approach to relationships, was reflected explicitly in three of the videos. The idea of a “safe space” named in three videos that allows for vulnerability echoes what Turner (1969) has called “liminal space,” an ambiguous space of transition and transformation which creates an equal and unstructured community. Watkins and Shulman (2008) have spoken of intentionally creating liminal spaces in community “that can allow individuals carrying different narrative frameworks to encounter each other in cooperative efforts” (p. 155). A connection to culture was named as especially important in two of the videos, in the case of a Northern Indigenous community and in another case in which the speaker has immigrated here from Mexico and had felt out of touch with her culture of origin. Timm-Bottos (2017) states that “enabling spaces” (*such as Art Hives*) are necessary in healing relational divides. It is important for settlers to take time to uncover and question layers of racism and hegemony and witness the resulting pain in order to disrupt colonization practices that continue to play out today” (p. 97). Watkins and Shulman (2008) speak of the importance of “identifying, supporting, and nurturing the psychological attempts of individuals and groups to re-author their own sense of identity,” through “a critical analysis of oppressive power relations and a focus on the well-being and self-determination of people and their communities” (p. 5). Unprogrammed third spaces facilitated by “those who can hold and protect without interfering, intruding and controlling” (Watkins & Shulman, 2008, p. 156) can allow for cultural identities that are marginalized by the dominant discourse to

reclaim their place to flourish, fostering a shared feeling of “belonging to something greater than oneself” (Timm-Bottos, 2006, p).

Sharing

Nearly as well represented and in close alignment with the theme of connection is the idea of sharing. Sharing skills, resources, ideas, materials, art forms, and more, is something which happens in each of the seven hives, and often between different generations and cultures. The model of Art Hives allows for each person to contribute how they can and for the leadership to be shared by the multiple people involved, including those that may not habitually be invited to teach, lead or share. As expressed by Timm-Bottos (2006) “When we allow ourselves to see each other as equal players, each in need of healing and leading, we discover amazing new ways of working” (p. 14). She suggests that in such a scenario, the facilitator is “leading from behind” creating the conditions for the emergence and sharing of everyone’s creative capacity (Timm-Bottos, 2006, p.)

Accessibility

The element of accessibility (to art making, space, materials, and opportunities for expression) was a third and last theme that was unanimously mentioned in all of the seven videos. In an Art Hive, everyone can wear an artist's identity regardless of whether or not they identify as such outside the community art studio (Timm-Bottos & Chaaney, 2015). Public Practice Art Therapy, as developed by Timm-Bottos (2017), is rooted in Cheal’s (1988) mandate of gift economies which imply that goods, services and ideas are offered without an expectation of reciprocation (monetary or even trading), and that each person is filled with gifts that they could contribute. Art Hives offer free access to all, so that abundance is generated by the whole, and in return sustains the whole (Rogat-Loeb, 1999). Art is viewed as a human need, behaviour and right shared by all humans rather than as a fancy privilege of the talented, educated, or wealthy (Dissanayake, 1995). This perspective was shared by all of the seven participating Art Hives.

Experimentation

Five of the videos spoke of the Art Hive as a site for experimentation and creative play. One of them specifically highlighted the importance of a space in which mistakes and vulnerability are allowed. Watkins and Shulman (2008) confirm this function of liminal spaces, in saying that in such environments “the old and new, expected and unexpected begin to collide and form new patterns. Different roles can be tried on and new identities

experimented with as solidarities and alliances are slowly built” (p. 157). Brown (2013) affirms that “vulnerability is the birthplace of innovation, creativity and change” . Playfulness is a quality that Art Hives leaders can cultivate and model, as it is said to “allow adults to approach activities with the same openness of mind with which the child approaches play; the beginning is known and a precise end is anticipated but the unfolding may vary” (Guitard, Ferland, & Dutil, 2005, p.21). These authors also note that “playfulness, difficult situations are perceived as challenges to be raised, occasions to learn, and possibilities to increase one’s competence and skills” (Guitard et al., 2005, p. 21). Purvis, Cross, and Sunshine (2007) claim that “as we lower our guards and heighten our senses, we all learn and grow” (p. 142).

Capacities

Six out of seven Art Hives have expressed believing that everyone is an artist, born full of creative capacities. In the spirit of the “connected teachers” of the Public Homeplaces, they seek to get “to know each person, what they care about, and where they are trying to go” (Belenky et al. 1997, p. 62). These Art Hives also work to articulate the goals that people in the group have in common. They look for each person’s strong points, for the things already in place upon which the person could build. They also look for the strengths in the people’s culture as a building foundation for the whole community” (Belenky et al. 1997, p.14). Cowger & Snively (2006) suggest that the facilitator’s role in such an approach is “to nourish, encourage, assist, enable, support, stimulate, and unleash the strengths within people; to illuminate the strengths available to people in their own environments” (p. 110). Guo and Tsui (2010) bring an important nuance, and stipulate that a strengths-based “approach differs from the empowerment approach because it does not consider service users to be initially powerless” (p. 235). This would hereby imply that “professionals are in the privileged position to empower powerless people,” which “results in the ‘dilemma of difference,’ that is, the question ‘how is it possible to identify and provide services to a group without, at the same time, labeling and stigmatizing that group?’” (Guo and Tsui, 2010, p. 235). Art Hives provide an answer to that dilemma by completely stepping out of the service paradigm to create a solidarity model in which externally attributed labels become irrelevant, boundaries are blurred between therapist and client and, according to Timm-Bottos (2006), everyone involved contributes to healing themselves and each other.

Expression

Six of the participating Art Hives have highlighted the crucial role that creative freedom and self-expression, play in the Art Hives. Winnicott (1971) believed that it is in

playing and only in playing that the individual child or adult is able to be creative and to use the whole personality, and it is only in being creative that the individual discovers the self. Watkins and Shulman (2008) explain that “communities need pollination by images that bring one into creative relationship with the limit situations of one's time, that nourish the sense of the possible, refresh spirits and renew hope” (p. 219). Art making with others in public settings allows participants to mobilize the creative resources latent within their own personalities, creating an ‘enabling space’ to develop one’s own voice and strengths (Stevens, 1990 as cited in Timm-Bottos, 2017). It was also stated in one of the videos that art spoke of the community’s culture and land. As affirmed by Neufeld and Burrows (2017), participatory art projects bring people together around causes, commemoration, and “have the capacity to raise awareness of pressing community issues” (p. 1). Such public practices help build communities as participants bond over creative collaboration and negotiate their sense of self in relation to others while using the shared language of art to connect across socio-political divides and differing abilities and ways of knowing (Timm-Bottos, 2017).

Joy

According to Meadows (2014), psychoanalytic thought has been focusing almost exclusively on unpleasant emotions. Despite this, it is evident from the data collected in this research project that the cultivation of positive emotions is significant in the Art Hives. Four of the research participants have cited feelings such as joy, happiness, pleasure, and fun as important driving forces in their Art Hive. Meadows (2014) explains Fromm’s humanistic views on joy, a result of a human being “having fully developed (their) productiveness is that they can realize their potentialities” (p.8). Along with this notion of joy and fun, play was also named in the videos as an important function of the Art Hives. Winnicott (1971) believed play to be essential to human health and well-being throughout life. Guitard et al. (2005) found out that children (and adults) who, despite certain incapacities, are encouraged to develop their playfulness may potentially have more facility to adapt to their environment and deal with everyday living. Étienne (1982) believes that, by its power of de-dramatization, a playful attitude helps a client to gain distance from a problem in a healthy way and find meaning in the face of disability or illness. Similarly, Eckler-Hart (1987) states that a playful attitude is necessary for accessing the profound creativity of our true self.

Inspiration from the Art Hives Network

Four of the participating Art Hives have mentioned the importance of the influence, inspiration, and mentorship provided by Dr. Timm-Bottos at Concordia University and La

Ruche d'Art St-Henri, and/or from the Montreal Art Hives at large, as a motivation for them to engage in Art Hives work. Practitioners, whether they are art therapists, art educators or community organizers, are deeply influenced by Timm-Bottos's (2017) teaching of the methods of Public Practice Art Therapy, positioning the discipline as central and permeating every aspect of the movement that results from her work. This also shows that in spite of desiring a horizontal, decentralized network, the Art Hives Network is still very much revolving around its epicenter of Concordia University in Montreal, Quebec.

Mindfulness

Three of the participating Art Hives leaders evoked the meditative qualities of art making, the silence that fills the room when the group gets into a creative flow, and the presence in the moment while people create. While the researcher hadn't imagined that this would come out as a recurring theme, it doesn't come as a surprise as flow and art making has previously been studied (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996; Reynolds, 2006). Another study by Kaimal, Ray & Muniz (2016) demonstrated that participating in open-ended art making reduced cortisol levels in 75% of the research participants. The same participants also had expressed that art making provided relaxation, enjoyment, fostered learning and problem-solving, as well as a sense of freedom and flow, which echoes what is expressed in the videos of the Art Hives leaders.

Limitations

There are multiple limitations to this study. First, the sample of participants is limited (Seven Art Hives in a group of 131), which cannot possibly account for a representative panorama of Art Hives realities. While focusing on the narrative of leaders was a choice made for simplifying the ethics of the project (given the time constraints of realizing this study) the researcher was also aware that in doing this, she was privileging certain voices over others in the space. People might find themselves leading a project as the result of having benefited from a greater amount of cumulative privilege (economic, education, racial, gender, etc.) than other members of society. Benefiting from a lesser amount of privileges may also have acted as a barrier to participating in the study (lack of time, money, organizational capacity, etc.). On the other hand, it seems to make sense to begin with investigating why and how projects get started before we study how others engage with those spaces. Another limitation of this study was the geographical scope: while three provinces are represented, five of the Art Hives studied are located in Quebec, four of which are in the

Montreal area. It seemed that it was easier for Art Hives leaders who knew the researcher personally and already interacted with her at least occasionally, to commit to participate.

Implications and Future Recommendations

Holstein & Gubrium (2012) suggest that “life-narrative data can be used to build a provisional theoretical model” (p. 29) and be used as an “organizational scheme and catalyst for future studies” (p. 30). They also mention that, of narrative research, any ending “is necessary provisional... given the commitment to unfinalizability” (Holstein & Gubrium, 2012, p. 49). This humble inquiry into the narrative of Canadian Art Hives does not have the pretention to be a complete work, but it aims to be a beginning place and a building block for furthering a collection of narratives for this movement. “Narrative analysis gives increased audibility to some stories, recasts how other stories are understood, and necessarily neglects many stories. But one analyst’s neglect is another’s possibility-less cause for criticism than for appreciation. The dialogue always continues” (Frank, in Holstein & Gubrium, 2012, p. 50). As such, the researcher hopes that these videos and the present document will inspire and act as a pathway for herself and others to continue to tell and harvest Art Hives stories with each other, documenting the origins, growth and intentions of this approach. The diversity of settings and professionals who embrace the Art Hives’ model contributes to create a transdisciplinary framework that keeps expanding as we learn from one another’s experiences and has begun to shape a new strength-based and community-informed area of the Creative Arts Therapies.

References

- Adams, D., & Goldbard, A. (2001). *Creative community: The art of cultural development*. New York, NY: Rockefeller Foundation.
- Allen, P. (2005). *Art is a spiritual path*. Boston, MA: Shambhala.
- Allen, P. (2008). Commentary on community-based art studios: Underlying principles. *Art Therapy: Journal of the American Art Therapy Association*, 25(1), 11-12.
- Brendtro, L., Brokenleg, M., Van Bockern, S. (2002). *Reclaiming Youth at Risk: Our Hope for the Future*. Solution Tree, Bloomington, IN.
- Belenky, M.F., Clinchy, B.M., Goldberger, N.R., & Tarule, J.M. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing*. New York: Basic Books.
- Belenky, M. F. (1996). Public homeplaces: Nurturing the development of people, families, and communities. In N. Goldberger, J. Tarule, B. Clinchy & M. Belenky (Eds.), *Knowledge, difference and power: Essays inspired by women's ways of knowing* (pp. 393-430). New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Belenky, M. F., Bond, L. A., & Weinstock, J. S. (1997). *A tradition that has no name*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Brown, B. (2013) *The Power of Vulnerability*. [Video file]. Retrieved from https://www.ted.com/talks/brene_brown_the_power_of_vulnerability.
- Butler-Kisber, L. (2010). *Qualitative inquiry: Thematic, narrative and arts-informed perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Inc..
- Cane, F. (1951). *The artist in each of us*. New York: Pantheon.
- Chilisa, B. (2012). *Indigenous research methodologies*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Cowger, C.D., & Snively, C. A. (2006). Assessing client strengths: Individual, family, and community empowerment. In D. Saleebey (Ed.), *The Strengths Perspective in Social Work* (3rd ed, pp. 106–23). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1996). *Creativity: Flow and the psychology of discovery and invention*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Eckler-Hart, A. H. (1987). *True and false self in the development of the psychotherapist*. *Psychotherapy*, 24(4), 683-692.

- Étienne, A. (1982). Le jeu et ses recommencements dans la vie adulte. *Le Transfert*, 6(3), 4-8
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Herder and Herder.
- Gore, J. (1993). *The struggle for pedagogies: critical and feminist discourses as regimes of truth*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Guitard, P., Ferland, F. & Dutil, E. (2005). Toward a better understanding of playfulness in adults. *OTJR: Occupation, Participation and Health*. 25(1), 9-22.
- Guo, W. and Tsui, M. (2010). From resilience to resistance: A reconstruction of the strengths perspective in social work practice. *International Social Work*, 53(2), 233–245.
- Hammouda, I., Lundell, B., Mikkonen, T., Scacchi, W. (2012). Open Source Systems: Long-Term Sustainability - 8th IFIP WG 2.13 International Conference Proceedings, OSS 2012, September 10-13, 2012. Proceedings, Hammamet, Tunisia.
- High, C., Singh, N., Petheram, L. and Nemes, G. (2012). Defining Participatory Video from Practice, In Milne, E.J., Mitchell, C., & De Lange, N. (2012). *Handbook of participatory video* (pp. 35-48). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Kaimal, G., Ray, K. & Muniz, J. (2016). Reduction of cortisol levels and participants' responses following art making. *Art Therapy: Journal of the American Art Therapy Association*, 33(2): 74-80.
- Kaplan, F. (2007). *Art therapy and social action*. London, UK: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Low, B. Rose, C.B., Salvio, P.M., and Palacios, L. (2012). (Re)framing the Scholarship on Participatory Video: From Celebration to Critical Engagement, In Milne, E.J., Mitchell, C., & De Lange, N. (2012). *Handbook of participatory video* (pp. 49-66). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Macleod, C., & Bhatia, S. (2008). *Postcolonialism and psychology*. London, UK: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Meadows, C. (2014). *A psychological perspective on joy and emotional fulfillment*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Mendel, T. (2015). *Using the creative arts for transformational learning*. Victoria, BC: Frisen Press.
- Miller, L. (2011). *Mapping memories: Participatory media, place-based stories & refugee youth*. Montreal, QC: Marquis Book Printing Inc.
- Milne, E.J., Mitchell, C., & De Lange, N. (2012). *Handbook of participatory video* (pp. 35-48). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

- Mitchell, J. (1968). *Cactus Tree. On Songs to a Seagull* [Vinyl record]. Hollywood, CA: Reprise Records.
- Neufeld, M., & Burrows, M.A. (2017, June 30). Creating art together builds community. *Delta Optimist*. Retrieved from: <http://www.delta-optimist.com/news/creating-art-together-builds-community-1.20860038>
- Paillé, P. & Mucchielli, A. (2016). *L'Analyse qualitative en sciences humaines et sociales* (4e ed). Malakoff: Armand Collin.
- Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Plush, T. (2012). Fostering Social Change through Participatory Video: A Conceptual Framework, In Milne, E.J., Mitchell, C., & De Lange, N. (2012). *Handbook of participatory video* (pp. 67-84). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Purvis, K.B., Cross, D.R., & Sunshine, W.L. (2007). *The connected child*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Reynolds, F. (2006). Creative adventures and flow in art-making: A qualitative study of women living with cancer. *British Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 69(6). ##-##.
- Rogat-Loeb, P. (1999). *Soul of a citizen: Living with conviction in challenging times*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Shulman, H. & Watkins, M. (2008). *Towards psychologies of liberation*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Smith, L.T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous people*. London, UK: Zed Books.
- Timm-Bottos, J. (2017). Public Practice Art Therapy: Enabling spaces across North America (La pratique publique de l'art-thérapie: des espaces habilitants partout en Amérique du Nord). *Canadian Art Therapy Association Journal*, 30(2), 94-99.
- Timm-Bottos, J. (2016). Beyond counseling and psychotherapy, there is a field. I'll meet you there. *Art Therapy*, 33(3), 160-162.
- Timm-Bottos, J. & Chainey, R. (2015). *Art Hives How-to-Guide*. Montreal, QC: authors.
- Timm-Bottos, J. & Reilly, R.C. (2014). Learning in third spaces: Community art studio as storefront university classroom. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 55, 102-114.
- Timm-Bottos, J. (2006). Constructing creative community: Reviving health and justice through community arts. *Canadian Art Therapy Association Journal*, 19(2), 12-26.

- Turner, V. W. (1969). *The ritual process: Structure and anti-structure*. Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing. Co.
- Waite, L. and Conn, C.P. (2012). Participatory Video: A Feminist Way of Seeing? In Milne, E.J., Mitchell, C., & De Lange, N. (2012). *Handbook of participatory video* (pp. 85-99). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Winnicott, D.W. (1971). *Playing and reality*. London, UK: Tavistock Publications.
- Yalom, I. D. (1980). *Existential psychotherapy*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Youell, B. (2008). The importance of play and playfulness. *European Journal of Psychotherapy and Counselling*, 10(2), 121-129.

Appendix A

Summary Protocol Form and Certificate of Ethical Acceptability

SUMMARY PROTOCOL FORM (SPF)

Office of Research – Research Ethics Unit – GM 900 – 514-848-2424 ext. 7481 – oor.ethics@concordia.ca – www.concordia.ca/offices/oor.html

IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR ALL RESEARCHERS

Please take note of the following before completing this form:

- You must not conduct research involving human participants until you have received your Certification of Ethical Acceptability for Research Involving Human Subjects (Certificate).
- In order to obtain your Certificate, your study must receive approval from the appropriate committee:
 - Faculty research, and student research involving greater than minimal risk is reviewed by the University Human Research Ethics Committee (UHREC).
 - Minimal risk student research is reviewed by the College of Ethics Reviewers (CER; formerly the "Disciplinary College"), except as stated below.
 - Minimal risk student research conducted exclusively for pedagogical purposes is reviewed at the departmental level. **Do not use this form for such research.** Please use the Abbreviated Summary Protocol Form, available on the Office of Research (OOR) website referenced above, and consult with your academic department for review procedures.
- Research funding will not be released until your Certificate has been issued, and any other required certification (e.g. biohazard, radiation safety) has been obtained. For information about your research funding, please consult:
 - Faculty and staff: OOR
 - Graduate students: School of Graduate Studies
 - Undergraduate students: Financial Aid and Awards Office or the Faculty or Department
- Faculty members are encouraged to submit studies for ethics by uploading this form, as well as all supporting documentation, to ConRAD, which can be found in the MyConcordia portal.
- If necessary, faculty members may complete this form and submit it by e-mail to oor.ethics@concordia.ca along with all supporting documentation. Student researchers are asked to submit this form and all supporting documentation by e-mail, except for departmental review. Please note:
 - Handwritten forms will not be accepted.
 - Incomplete or omitted responses may result in delays.
 - This form expands to accommodate your responses.
- Please allow the appropriate amount of time for your study to be reviewed:
 - UHREC reviews greater than minimal risk research when it meets on the second Thursday of each month. You must submit your study 10 days before the meeting where it is to be reviewed. You will normally receive a response within one week of the meeting. Please confirm the deadline and date of the meeting with the staff of the Research Ethics Unit.
 - CER reviews, and delegated reviews conducted by UHREC require 2 to 4 weeks.

- Research must comply with all applicable laws, regulations, and guidelines, including:
 - o The [Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans](#)
 - o The policies and guidelines of the funding/award agency
 - o The [Official Policies of Concordia University](#), including the *Policy for the Ethical Review of Research Involving Human Participants, VPRGS-3*.
- The Certificate is valid for one year. In order to maintain your approval and renew your Certificate, please submit an Annual Report Form one month before the expiry date that appears on the Certificate. You must not conduct research under an expired Certificate.
- Please contact the Manager, Research Ethics at 514-848-2424 ext. 7481 if you need more information on the ethics review process or the ethical requirements that apply to your study.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR STUDENT RESEARCHERS

- If your research is part of your faculty supervisor's research, as approved, please have him or her inform the Research Ethics Unit via e-mail that you will be working on the study.
- If your research is an addition to your faculty supervisor's study, please have him or her submit an amendment request, and any revised documents via e-mail. You must not begin your research until the amendment has been approved.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THIS FORM

- Please make sure that you are using the most recent version of the SPF by checking the OOR website.
- Please answer each question on the form; if you believe the question is not applicable, enter not applicable.
- Do not alter the questions on this form or delete any material. Where questions are followed by a checklist, please answer by checking the applicable boxes.
- The form can be signed and submitted as follows:
 - o Faculty research submitted on ConRAD will be considered as signed as per section 16.
 - o SPFs for faculty research submitted via the faculty member's official Concordia e-mail address will also be considered as signed as per section 16.
 - o Both faculty and student researchers may submit a scanned pdf of the signature page by e-mail. In this case, the full SPF should also be submitted by e-mail in Word or pdf format (not scanned).
 - o If you do not have access to a scanner, the signature page may be submitted on paper to the OOR.

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS

Please submit any additional documents as separate files in Word or PDF format.

I. BASIC INFORMATION

Study Title: Art Hives: a video harvest of the threads hat weave our stories together

Principal Investigator: Rachel Chainey

Principal Investigator's Status:

- Concordia faculty or staff
- Visiting scholar
- Affiliate researcher
- Postdoctoral fellow
- PhD Student
- Master's student
- Undergraduate student
- Other (please specify):

Type of submission:

- New study
- Modification or an update of an approved study.
Approved study number (e.g. 30001234):

Where will the research be conducted?

- Canada
- Another jurisdiction: UNITED STATES, EUROPE

2. STUDY TEAM AND CONTACT INFORMATION*

Role	Name	Institution [†] / Department / Address [‡]	Phone #	e-mail address
Principal Investigator	Rachel Chainey	Creative Art Therapies	514-433-8499	Rachel.chainey@gmail.com
Faculty supervisor	Janis Timm-Bottos	Creative Art Therapies	514-848-2424 ex. 7763	Janis.timm-bottos@concordia.ca
Committee member	Stephen Snow	Creative Art Therapies	514-848-2424 ex. 4641	Stephen.snow@concordia.ca
Committee member	N/A			

Additional Team Members ^o				
N/A				

Notes:

* If additional space is required, please submit a list of team members as a separate document. †For team members who are external to Concordia only.

‡For individuals based at Concordia, please provide only the building and room number, e.g. GM-910.03.

§For student research only.

‡For research conducted by PhD and Master's students only.

^oPlease include all co-investigators and research assistants.

3. PROJECT AND FUNDING SOURCES

Please list all sources of funds that will be used for the research. Please note that fellowships or scholarships are not considered research funding for the purposes of this section.

Funding Source	Project Title*	Grant Number [†]	Award Period	
			Start	End
N/A				

Notes:

* Please provide the project title as it appears on the Notice of Award or equivalent documentation.

† If you have applied for funding, and the decision is still pending, please enter "applied".

4. OTHER CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

Does the research involve any of the following (check all that apply):

- Controlled goods or technology
- Hazardous materials or explosives
- Biohazardous materials
- Human biological specimens
- Radioisotopes, lasers, x-ray equipment or magnetic fields
- Protected acts (requiring professional certification)
- A medical intervention, healthcare intervention or invasive procedures

Please submit any certification or authorization documents that may be relevant to ethics review for research involving human participants.

5. LAY SUMMARY

Please provide a brief description of the research in everyday language. The summary should make sense to a person with no discipline -specific training, and it should not use overly technical terms. Please do not submit your thesis proposal or grant application.

This participatory video project will invite people using the Art Hives (<http://www.arthives.org>) model (community art studios that foster social inclusion and community building), to share their story, motivations and values as an Art Hive leader. The goal of this project is to expand the researcher's, the network's and the general public's knowledge of this movement through hearing its stakeholders' stories.

Questions:

- How can multiple art hive narratives inform a shared ethos of Art Hives to strengthen a network?
- What are the motivations of Art Hives leaders and the perceived individual and collective effects of these projects, and can common themes and values be identified?

6. SCHOLARLY REVIEW

As part of the research, will participants be exposed to risk that is greater than minimal?

Minimal risk means that the probability and magnitude of the risks are greater than those to which participants would be exposed in those aspects of their daily lives that are pertinent to the research.

- Yes
- No

Has this research received favorable review for scholarly merit?

For faculty research, funding from a granting agency such as CIHR, FQRSC, or CINO is considered evidence of such review. Please provide the name of the agency.

For student research, a successful defense of a thesis or dissertation proposal is considered evidence of such review. Please provide the date of your proposal defense. Scholarly review is not required for minimal risk student research.

- Yes (Proposal Approved by Department October 22nd, 2015)
- No

(Please see attached document 1)

If you answered no, please submit a Scholarly Review Form, available on the OOR website. For studies to be conducted at the PERFORM Centre, please submit the Scientific Review Evaluator Worksheet.

7. RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

Will any of the participants be part of the following categories?

- Minors (individuals under 18 years old)
- Individuals with diminished mental capacity
- Individuals with diminished physical capacity
- Members of Canada's First Nations, Inuit, or Métis peoples
- Vulnerable individuals or groups (vulnerability may be caused by limited capacity, or limited access to social goods, such as rights, opportunities and power, and includes individuals or groups whose situation or circumstances make them vulnerable in the context of the research project, or those who live with relatively high levels of risk on a daily basis)

a) Please describe potential participants, including any inclusion or exclusion criteria.

Potential participants will be Art Hives' leaders: a person who has founded or currently runs an Art Hive which has joined the national Art Hives network (see: www.arthives.org).

There is not a maximum number of participants. The target number is 10, and if there are more than 10 who volunteer to participate, multiple video "episodes" will be created in order to showcase all the submissions while not making a film that is too lengthy. Videos will appear in the final film in the order that they were received.

b) Please describe in detail how potential participants will be identified, and invited to participate. Please submit any recruitment materials to be used, for example, advertisements or letters to participants.

There will be an invitation email sent to all the Art Hives currently belonging to the network as well as a post on the Art Hives website (www.arthives.org). (Please see appendix 1).

c) Please describe in detail what participants will be asked to do as part of the research, and any procedures they will be asked to undergo. Please submit any instruments to be used to gather data, for example questionnaires or interview guides.

Participants will be asked to produce a 2 to 3 minutes video presenting their story as a self-identified Art Hive leader, using the equipment at their disposal (digital camera, smartphone, tablet, etc.)

d) Do any of the research procedures require special training, such as medical procedures or conducting interviews on sensitive topics or with vulnerable populations? If so, please indicate who will conduct the procedures and what their qualifications are.

No special training is required.

8. INFORMED CONSENT

a) Please explain how you will solicit informed consent from potential participants. Please submit your written consent form. In certain circumstances, oral consent may be appropriate. If you intend to use an oral consent procedure, please submit a consent script containing the same elements as the template, and describe how consent will be documented.

Please note: written consent forms and oral consent scripts should follow the consent form template available on the OOR website. Please include all of the information shown in the sample, adapting it as necessary for your research.

A written consent form will be sent by email to participants, which they will print, sign, scan and return to the researcher by email. (Please see Appendix 2).

b) Does your research involve individuals belonging to cultural traditions in which individualized consent may not be appropriate, or in which additional consent, such as group consent or consent from community leaders, may be required? If so, please describe the appropriate format of consent, and how you will solicit it.

No, not that I know of.

9. DECEPTION

Does your research involve any form of deception of participants? If so, please describe the deception, explain why the deception is necessary, and explain how participants will be de-briefed at the end of their participation. If applicable, please submit a debriefing script.

Please note that deception includes giving participants false information, withholding relevant information, and providing information designed to mislead.

This research does not involve any form of deception.

10. PARTICIPANT WITHDRAWAL

a) Please explain how participants will be informed that they are free to discontinue at any time, and describe any limitations on this freedom that may result from the nature of the research.

This is explicitly stated in the consent form.(Please see appendix 1).

b) Please explain what will happen to the information obtained from a participant if he or she withdraws. For example, will their information be destroyed or excluded from analysis if the participant requests it? Please describe any limits on withdrawing a participant's data, such as a deadline related to publishing data.

If participants choose to withdraw, their information will be destroyed and excluded from analysis.

11. RISKS AND BENEFITS

a) Please identify any foreseeable benefits to participants.

Visibility for their project, increased understanding of the Art Hives concept by the general public, funders and policy makers, inclusion of their voice in the broader Art Hives' narrative.

b) Please identify any foreseeable risks to participants, including any physical or psychological discomfort, and risks to their relationships with others, or to their financial well-being.

Participants will have to be mindful of disclosing only information that they are comfortable for the general public to know about, and which will not cause them or their organization harm, and to not disclose identifiable information about Art Hives users.

c) Please describe how the risks identified above will be minimized. For example, if individuals who are particularly susceptible to these risks will be excluded from participating, please describe how they will be identified. Furthermore, if there is a chance that researchers will discontinue participants' involvement for their own well-being, please state the criteria that will be used.

Participants will edit their own video to make sure they are fully comfortable with what they send the researcher, and can resend a new edition or their video, or choose to withdraw, at any moment (until the end of the data collection period).

d) Please describe how you will manage the situation if the risks described above are realized. For example, if referrals to appropriate resources are available, please provide a list. If there is a chance that participants will need first aid or medical attention, please describe what arrangements have been made.

If harm to self or the organization is perceived, researcher will seek supervision and follow the ethical guidelines of the American Art Therapy Association and Association des Art Thérapeutes du Québec.

12. REPORTABLE SITUATIONS AND INCIDENTAL FINDINGS

a) Is there a chance that the research might reveal a situation that would have to be reported to appropriate authorities, such as child abuse or an imminent threat of serious harm to specific individuals? If so, please describe the situation, and how it would be handled.

Please note that legal requirements apply in such situations. It is the researcher's responsibility to be familiar with the laws in force in the jurisdiction where the research is being conducted.

There is no foreseeable risk of reportable situations.

b) Is there a chance that the research might reveal a material incidental finding? If so, please describe how it would be handled.

There is no foreseeable risk of incidental findings.

Please note that a material incidental finding is an unanticipated discovery made in the course of research but that is outside the scope of the research, such as a previously undiagnosed medical or psychiatric condition that has significant welfare implications for the participant or others.

13. CONFIDENTIALITY, ACCESS, AND STORAGE

a) Please describe the path of your data from collection to storage to its eventual archiving or disposal, including details on short and long-term storage (format, duration, and location), measures taken to prevent unauthorized access, who will have access, and final destination (including archiving, or destruction).

Participants will put their video segment once it's finished inside a private Dropbox. They will have continual access to their digital file and only the researcher will have access to all the videos. The Dropbox is password protected. The final film (compiling all the videos received) will be edited on a password protected computer in an office in the EV building of Concordia University, to which access is protected by a non-duplicable key. The raw data from the project will be destroyed after a maximum period of 5 years after the end of this research project.

b) Please identify the access that the research team will have to participants' identity:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Anonymous	The information provided never had identifiers associated with it, and the risk of identification of individuals is low, or very low.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Anonymous results, but identify who participated	The information provided never had identifiers associated with it. The research team knows participants' identity, but it would be impossible to link the information provided to link the participant's identity.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Pseudonym	Information provided will be linked to an individual, but that individual will only provide a fictitious name. The research team will not know the real identity of the participant.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Coded	Direct identifiers will be removed and replaced with a code on the information provided. Only specific individuals have access to the code, meaning that they can re-identify the participant if necessary.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Indirectly identified	The information provided is not associated with direct identifiers (such as the participant's name), but it is associated with information that can reasonably be expected to identify an individual through a combination of indirect identifiers (such as place of residence, or unique personal characteristics).
<input type="checkbox"/>	Confidential	The research team will know the participants' real identity, but it will not be disclosed.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Disclosed	The research team will know the participants' real identity, and it will be revealed in accordance with their consent.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Participant Choice	Participants will be able to choose which level of disclosure they wish for their real identity.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (please describe)	

c) Please describe what access research participants will have to study results, and any debriefing information that will be provided to participants post-participation.

Participants will have full access their film, the final film produced by the researcher, and the final research paper (in the research's project dropbox as well as on Spectrum repository, for the research paper component).

d) Would the revelation of participants' identity be particularly sensitive, for example, because they belong to a stigmatized group? If so, please describe any special measures that you will take to respect the wishes of your participants regarding the disclosure of their identity.

No. If participants do not want their name or image disclosed, they could still participate by providing an audio recording of their voice and/or written text to be displayed on the screen and photographs that do not show their face, to be included in the film. They can choose to use a pseudonym whether their face appears or not.

e) In some research traditions, such as action research, and research of a socio-political nature, there can be concerns about giving participant groups a "voice". This is especially the case with groups that have been oppressed or whose views have been suppressed in their cultural location. If these concerns are relevant for your participant group, please describe how you will address them in your project.

N/A. Participants will speak in their own voice and do not belong to an identifiable oppressed group, that I know of.

14. MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL RESEARCH

Does your research involve researchers affiliated with an institution other than Concordia? If so, please complete the following table, including the Concordia researcher's role and activities to be conducted at Concordia. If researchers have multiple institutional affiliations, please include a line for each institution.

Researcher's Name	Institutional Affiliation	Role in the research (e.g. principal investigator, co-investigator, collaborator)	What research activities will be conducted at each institution?
N/A			

15. ADDITIONAL ISSUES

Bearing in mind the ethical guidelines of your academic or professional association, please comment on any other ethical concerns which may arise in the conduct of this research. For example, are there responsibilities to participants beyond the purposes of this study?

There are no foreseeable ethical concerns or responsibilities to participants with this research project.



CERTIFICATION OF ETHICAL ACCEPTABILITY
FOR RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS

Name of Applicant: Rachel Chainey
Department: Faculty of Fine Arts\ Creative Arts Therapies
Agency: N/A
Title of Project: Art Hives: a video harvest of the threads that
weave our stories together

Certification Number: 30005660

Valid From: September 12, 2016 to: September 11, 2017

The members of the University Human Research Ethics Committee have examined the application for a grant to support the above-named project, and consider the experimental procedures, as outlined by the applicant, to be acceptable on ethical grounds for research involving human subjects.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. Pfaus".

Dr. James Pfaus, Chair, University Human Research Ethics Committee



**CERTIFICATION OF ETHICAL ACCEPTABILITY
FOR RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS**

Name of Applicant: Rachel Chainey
Department: Faculty of Fine Arts\Creative Arts Therapies
Agency: N/A
Title of Project: Art Hives: a video harvest of the threads that weave our stories together
Certification Number: 30005660

Valid From: September 12, 2017 To: September 11, 2018

The members of the University Human Research Ethics Committee have examined the application for a grant to support the above-named project, and consider the experimental procedures, as outlined by the applicant, to be acceptable on ethical grounds for research involving human subjects.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. Pfau".

Dr. James Pfau, Chair, University Human Research Ethics Committee

Appendix B

Letter of Invitation to Participate in the Research Study



Dear _____,

You are invited to contribute in the creation of a film presenting a collective narrative for the Art Hives Network, in the context of a research project for my Masters in Creative Art Therapies at Concordia University in Montreal, QC, titled: Art Hives: a video harvest of the threads that weave our stories together, for which I am collecting stories of Art Hives leaders in the form of participatory videos.

If you decide to participate, you will have to create yourself a video segment (of a maximum of 3 minutes) in which you will share your story as an Art Hive leader, considering the following aspects:

- What are the motivations and values that drove you to start your project and/or to keep it going?
- What is important to you in your Art Hive? What is important to others?
- What do you believe the Art Hive changes in yourself, in those participating, and in the larger community?
- Your video can include images of yourself, your Art Hive and your artwork. It could also include images of others and/or their artwork, in which case I will need to obtain written consent from them.
- You can use any technological tool at your disposal to produce your video, such as a smartphone, digital camera or tablet.
- You can use the help of community members to make or edit your film, in which case you need to make sure to credit them appropriately.

- There will be a Dropbox created for the research project in which you will be able to upload and access your video at all times (until December 1st), as well as free user-friendly video editing software.
- If you cannot make a video, you can still participate by submitting your choice of audio recordings/written text, which will be integrated in the film.
- You have different options regarding confidentiality, please see the attached information and consent form.
- The timeframe to create and submit your video is September 15th to December 1st 2016.
- **IMPORTANT:** please note that participation is entirely voluntary and that your choice to not participate or to withdraw during the project will not impact in any way your standing within the Art Hives Network.
- Please find more background information about my research project on the next page.

Study Title: Art Hives: a video harvest of the threads that weave our stories together

Researcher's name: Rachel Chainey

Researcher's Contact Information: rachel.chainey@concordia.ca

Faculty Supervisors: Janis Timm-Bottos / Stephen Snow Faculty

Supervisors's Contact Information:

janis.timm-bottos@concordia.ca / stephen.snow@concordia.ca

Researcher's standpoint:

I am hoping that this participatory video narrative project will broaden my own perspective on Art Hives, as well as enhance the knowledge that Hives have of each other, and strengthen the existing solidarity between the projects, in spite of geographic distance, while enhancing the visibility of each project. I want this project to be an online tool for the general public, art therapists and others interested in starting an Art Hive, as well as funders and community partners, to understand the essence of this initiative and of the movement that is starting to emerge from it. Furthermore, I hope it can help me in my role as Coordinator, to provide more targeted support to the Hives, based on discoveries made through this research project, and that it can serve as a cornerstone for further research on the sustainability of the Art Hives, which I plan to undertake later.

Primary Research question and/or the main purpose of the project:

How can multiple art hive narratives inform a shared ethos of Art Hives as a network?

Subsidiary question:

What are the motivations of Art Hives leaders and the perceived individual and collective effects of these projects, and can common themes and values be identified?

Research Methodology:

This research will combine Narrative and Arts Based Methods. Both these methods have been chosen from the researcher's standpoint that human stories are what matters most in this work, and that arts-based methods, in this case film (or images with text), are what translates best the complexity of an arts-based experience like the Art Hive.

I thank you very warmly for your interest and look forward to discuss your participation in this research project,

Best regards,

Rachel Chainey

rachel.chainey@concordia.ca

514-433-8499

MA Student, Concordia University

Faculty of Fine Arts Department of Creative Art Therapies / Art Hives

1455 De Maisonneuve Blvd. West, EV8.573 Montreal, Quebec, Canada H3G 1M8

Appendix C Consent Form



INFORMATION AND CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY

Study Title: Art Hives: a video harvest of the threads that weave our stories together

Researcher's name: Rachel Chainey

Researcher's Contact Information: rachel.chainey@gmail.com

Faculty Supervisor: Janis Timm-Bottos / Stephen Snow

Faculty Supervisor's Contact Information:

janis.timm-bottos@concordia.ca / stephen.snow@concordia.ca

You are being invited to participate in the research study mentioned above, conducted by Rachel Chainey, Masters Student in Creative Art Therapies at Concordia University in Montreal, QC. Please understand that the researcher also serves as the Art Hives Network Coordinator. This form provides information about what participating would mean. Please read it carefully before deciding if you want to participate or not. If there is anything you do not understand, or if you want more information, please ask the researcher.

A. PURPOSE

The purpose of this research is to expand and disseminate knowledge of the different narratives of the leaders of Art Hives projects that belong to the Network. Secondary purposes include increasing the visibility of Art Hives individually and as a network, and increasing the understanding of this model of arts-based social inclusion by the general public, funders, and policy makers.

B. PROCEDURES

If you choose to participate, you will be asked to produce, autonomously, a video segment of a maximum of 3 minutes, in which you will tell your story as an Art Hives leader. You can use any equipment at your disposal to make that video, including but not limited to digital cameras, smartphones and tablets. The researcher will provide you with free editing software if you need it, and you are responsible for editing your own video (or finding someone in your community who can help you edit it). You are responsible to ensure that you are comfortable with anything you say or show about your organization and yourself in your video, and agree to be mindful about not disclosing identifiable information about Art Hive users. If images of other people than yourself, or their artwork, appear in your video, you are responsible for providing such individuals with my contact information in order for us to explain the study and obtain written consent. The narrative elements from your video will be coded and analyzed by the researcher, and a film will be created including your video and others. If it is impossible for you to film yourself or find someone to film you, you can still participate by providing audio recordings of your voice, written text

and/or photographs of yourself, your artwork and/or your Art Hive, which will be included in the film created by the researcher. Please note that this film will be used for academic and promotional purposes by the researcher and by the Art Hives Network.

C. RISKS AND BENEFITS

Your organization or yourself may experience benefits to participating in this research, including but not limited to increased visibility for your Art Hive, increased connection to other Art Hives in the Network, and increased understanding of the concept by the general public, funders, and policy makers. Please note that no foreseeable risks to your participation in this research have been identified, and that this research is not intended to benefit you personally.

D. CONFIDENTIALITY

Anything you say or show in your video will be distributed publicly. If you do not want to show your face in your video, you can participate without showing it. You can decide what you want to disclose about your identity (full name/partial name/pseudonym) and about your role/job position in the Art Hive.

We will not allow anyone to access the information, except people directly involved in conducting the research, and except as described in this form. We will only use the information for the purposes of the research described in this form.

The information gathered will be identifiable. That means it will have your name directly on it.

We will protect the information by removing all raw data uploaded on Dropbox and storing on a password-protected computer located in an office locked with an unduplicatable key. All videos uploaded by you on Dropbox will be coded, analyzed and included in the researcher's film. If multiple copies of the same video exist on Dropbox, the most recent version uploaded will be used. We will not edit the video at any point in order to preserve the integrity of your voice. If you submit a video that exceeds 3 minutes, it will be returned to you to edit.

We intend to publish (broadcast) the results of this research. Please indicate below whether you accept to be identified in the publications:

I accept that my name and the information I provide appear in publications of the results of the research.

Please do not publish my name as part of the results of the research.

Please use the following pseudonym as part of the results of the research:

We will destroy the information five years after the end of the study.

E. CONDITIONS OF PARTICIPATION

You do not have to participate in this research. It is purely your decision. If you do participate, you can stop at any time. You can also ask that the information you provided not be used, and your choice will be respected. If you decide that you don't want us to use your information, you must tell the researcher and remove your video or any other data from Dropbox before December 1, 2016.

There are no negative consequences for not participating, stopping in the middle, or asking us not to use your information.

F. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

By participating in this study, you agree to share the intellectual property of your video segment with the researcher. You can use your video segment however you want, but the researcher's film remains her intellectual property. The researcher will credit your contribution appropriately in her film, as well as in any presentations, publications and in the paper posted on the online research repository Spectrum, according to the way in which you have chosen to be identified in section D above.

NAME (please print)

SIGNATURE

DATE

If you have questions about the scientific or scholarly aspects of this research, please contact the researcher. Their contact information is on page 1. You may also contact their faculty supervisor.

If you have concerns about ethical issues in this research, please contact the Manager, Research Ethics, Concordia University, 514.848.2424 ex. 7481 or oor.ethics@concordia.ca.