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Abstract

This practice-led research project examines the role of electronic lens-based documentary practices within contemporary arts to determine the extent to which the documenter and the artist might work together to create new artworks. The outcome of the study is a virtual exhibition of three video works that considers the artist-documentarian as ‘produser’ in the ‘produsage’ age, and how wearable and spherical technologies play an important role in contemporary art practices.

In 2006, Axel Bruns wrote about the continuous loop of producing, feeding, and viewing daily habitual documenting practice in the virtual world. In the article, Bruns coined the term ‘produser’, a combined of ‘producer’ and ‘user’, as a depiction of a person not only as a passive receiver of information, but as an active producer of information and content. In the ‘produsage’ culture, Bruns suggests the habitual circulate action in feeding and receiving user-led content in the virtual world is a collaborative and participatory process (Brun 2006: 276), as the content the produser feeds and receives open a new form of dialogue that welcome participatory actions from other produser in the virtual community.

The practice of visual documentary has often been viewed as the conventional method for recording and preserving artworks. As innovation in technology has grown, art documentary has changed substantially from static imagery to moving imagery in adapting to the rise of electronic art forms such as video art, installation, performance art and participatory art practices. By shifting the traditional function of documentary practice from a photographic trace to a richer record of visual experiences, this research explores the interplay between selected artistic functions and documentary practices (from traditional photography to video and digital footage), and evaluates the defining artist-documentarian role within contemporary art and networked culture. From consideration of the documentary from the 1950s to the present, this research establishes a series of creative ways for utilising documentary practice to generate a body of documenting works for the produsage culture.

As an artist and emerging researcher in lens-based and documentary practices, I am positioning myself as an artist-documentarian. Through the making and practicing of photography and video media, this research explores the altered function of art documentary practice through the development of computer-mediated and consumer technologies. It contributes to the body of knowledge in the fields of contemporary art and documentary-making.
Chapter 1: Project Plan

The research project culminates in the virtual exhibition of *Artist-Documentarian*, an exhibition consisted of three video works presented on the consumer video-sharing site YouTube in 2017. With the artist-documentarian as the central theme for this exhibition, this practice-led research covers traditional documentary practice, the history of documentary, experimental art practices and exploration of the produsage age. The research aims to foreground the artist-documentarian in the position of a produser, and explores emergent themes and ideas connected to networks, flow and digital imaging.

The views within the current technocratic culture situate us within an explosion of consumer/prosumer gadgets (Bruns, 2006:275). In contemporary Western society, technocratic culture offers “abundance [of] commodity” (Debord in Beller 2006:88), luring and developing an apparent craving for imagery to be view and share via virtual community. The affordability and user-friendliness of consumer technologies allow the exposure of everyday visual imagery that’s according to Larry Law (2009), a situationist writer, as a culture that’s “surrounded by an immense accumulation of spectacles”. In his view, common people uses the intermeshing of consumer technologies and concept of documentary practices to produce imagery that substitute what is considered as real and organic experiences, the constant craving of viewing and sharing turn its practice into a spectacle of manipulated and altered experience. This research sought to discover and explore the methods of documentary practices with an array of lens-based technologies in order to articulate emergent practices in documentary-making. In contrast to Law’s view, this research argues that the new wave of technologies does not substitute for experience, but rather adds to visual experience.

Objective

The objective of this research project is to build on artistic practices in documentary-making, and the research briefly covers the chronology of documentary, specifically, contemporary art documentary. It compares observational and participatory techniques use in documentary, as well as investigating the artist-documentarian position through experimentation with various recording technologies. Central to this research project is art documentary, and its main discovery is a body of video works that creatively interpret and portray the artist-documentarian’s position in the produsage culture.

Aims

The project aim is to build on the traditions, functions and techniques of art documentary by exploring consumer and computer-mediated technologies.

The project also aims to propose viewing the practice of art documentary as a form of performative collaboration between the subject and the documenter.
Research Questions

The project addresses two research questions:

1) How have technologies changed the practice of art documentary?
   This question frames the historical perspective of Chapter 3 in this dissertation. By way of studying the development of audiovisual technologies from film photography to digital and computer-mediated applications, this research investigates the technological development in documentary practice, art documentary and artistic documentary practices within contemporary art.

2) Who is the artist-documentarian in the electronic age?
   This question frames the trial of experimentations conducted in chapter 4 in this dissertation. Through an investigation into consumer technologies and documentary practices, a series of creative video works will be constructed to illustrates how the collaborative nature between the subject and the documenter helps to produce the artist-documentarian.

About this Dissertation

As the project plan provided the framework for this research project, Chapter 2 explains the methodology for this practice-led research. By looking at various technologies, experiments and the results that have guided the experimentation for the research, this chapter looks into the selection process of the subject and the set-up of the experiment. The research findings, data collection, experimental construction and reflective analysis of the creative outcomes provide a portrayal of the artist-documentarian in the produsage age.

Chapter 3 will chronologically explore the technological development in documentary practice through technological innovation, documentary-making and contemporary art. This community of knowledge works as the catalyst for the questions in this practice-led research.

In Chapter 4, a trial of experiments conducted through exploration of various lens-based audiovisual technologies is explained. In working through the evaluation of these experiments, a selection of creative video concepts for the final series of works will emerge as reflections of this exploration. In Chapter 5, the three videos constructed for the Artist-Documentarian virtual exhibition is elaborated.

Finally, a reflective summary of this practice-led research is discussed in Chapter 6. It evaluates the technological development in documentation practice, collaborative production and the artist-documentarian position through the findings from the six experiments conducted. The amalgamation of technologies, emerging collaborative production through the documentary process and the conclusion of this research together define the artist-documentarian position.
Chapter 2: Methodology – Practice-led Experimental Research

This practice-led research has sought to generate a body of creative work produced in a series of short moving sequences presented in interactive, photographic and video formats. Central to this research is exploration of how contemporary art experiences can be adequately documented and embodied given the rich content of emerging and recent technologies. By creating a series of experimental documentaries using consumer and computer-mediated technologies, these experimentations function to explore how art documentary practices have changed through technological innovation.

Below is the set of criteria used to guide this practice-led research:

Criterion 1. Equipment – Explaining the suitability of the material chosen for each of the experiments.
Criterion 2. Experiment – Exploring the key themes of documentary practice.
Criterion 3. Findings – Examining the outcomes derived from the experiments. The results look into answering the two research questions about the changes in art documentary practice through the development of technology, and the creative exploration of the artist-documentarian position in the produsage culture.

By experimenting with consumer and computer-mediated technologies, such as DSLR cameras, mobile phones, tablets, wearable recording devices such as the Go Pro and 360-degree spherical recording devices such as the Ricoh Theta S, this research explores emergent methods of art documentary practice.

Figure 3: Research Resources

Equipment

In exploring art documentary practice through consumer technologies, one aim of the research was locating suitable techniques for the experiments. As the selected equipment been used by both the subject and the documenter, the equipment needed to be user-friendly and unobtrusive. The equipment needed to be usable in various types of light conditions, and it also needed to be lightweight to accommodate the comfort requirements of both the subject and the documentarian. The usability of the selected equipment was also important, as technical faults, time restrictions and user skill could affect the outcome of the final creative video works. The selected technologies are central to the research theme, as it is examining how current
computer-mediated and consumer technologies change art documentary practice and the artist-documentarian position.

Experimentation
The six experiments conducted for this research have used the following three themes as a framework for the research findings.

1. Examination of how consumer technologies alter documentation practice.
2. Investigate collaborative production between the subject and the documentarian.
3. Exploration of the artist-documentarian position in the produsage age.

The Subjects
For research into art documentary practices, six artists were chosen from various disciplines as the subjects for these experiments. As wearable video recorders and spherical recorders have been used to capture these practices, art disciplines such as painting, sculpture, and installation disciplines which favors body movements have been chosen.

The five selected artists have different levels of acquaintance with the researcher: one subject is an artist documented by the researcher previously; one is an art collaborator; one is a former study supervisor; and two subjects were part of the study cohort from the current research program.

As in traditional anthropological documentary practice, the need to build rapport with the subject before documentation is vital. The differences in the amounts of data collected from these five artists depended upon the amounts of time the researcher spent to make the subjects feel comfortable before the documentary sessions. This preparation helps to determine the willingness of the subjects to open up their private lives for public viewing. Due to the short duration of this research, the commonality shared amongst these participating artists are the relationship with the researcher has already been established.
The Set-Up

Due to the limitations of time, location and availability of the artists, each of the six experiments was set-up to accommodate multiple devices recording.

With limited access before each documenting session, there was no mapping to guide the setting up of the equipment. As each experiment was conducted in various areas of the artists’ studios and outdoor spaces, the equipment had to be de/mountable when required. The wearability of the equipment was another important consideration, as part of the experiments required the artists to self-document and so the equipment needed to be lightweight and comfortable to wear. The wearable equipment also needed to be adjustable, as the subjects’ focus was intended to remain on their own work and practices, and well-adjusted equipment helped to determine the quality of images and clips this research has generated.

Data Collection

Visual data including photographs and video recordings was collected in the series of experimental studies. The data was transferred directly from the device to the memory storage; the types of storage used were electronic flash (flash) memory cards; secure digital (SD) memory cards; and internal memory with access via universal serial bus (USB) cable. From the initial transfer, the visual data was manually downloaded onto the computer hard drive (HD) and then copied to an external HD for storage and back-up.

The processes of filtering, selecting, deleting and editing occurred during the initial download from the memory and storage devices to the external HD. The aim of this process was to eliminate any poor-quality images (i.e. with reduced resolution) from the large amount of data collected. The transferred pictures and videos clips were edited through a wide range of computer-mediated applications and software programs.

Experimental Constructions

By experimenting with various computer-mediated technologies, such as computer editing software (Final Cut Pro, Premiere, iMovie, Illustrators, Photoshop) and publishing applications (Instagram and YouTube) I wanted to construct a series of creative works that represented the artist-documentarian position within network culture.

By pushing the boundary with various editing software and computer-mediated applications, a series of experimental video works were created in a variety of formats. These formats include: photos; photo triptych; photo time-lapse; photo collage; video time-lapse; video overlay; video collage; vertical and horizontal multi-screen display; and 360-degree interactive video. Using a careful collection process, the practice of editing the clips and images took on a role in ‘meaning-making’. In narrating and interpreting the findings of the six experiments, various editing software and computer-mediated technologies were used to assist with the placement, composition and colouration, which were traditionally manual processes in early documentary practice.
**Creative Outcomes and Reflective Analysis**

By experimenting, constructing, and analysing particular experimental video works, a virtual exhibition has been created to explore the artist-documentarian position within the produsage culture. By exhibiting through open video-sharing platforms such as YouTube and WordPress, the final creative works has foregrounded the artist-documentarian as a produser in produsage culture.

By collecting visual data through experimentation and then answering the research questions via reflection on the experimental construction, the reflective analysis examines how current consumer and computer-mediated technologies have changed the practice of art documentary; how collaborative production is emerging through these experimental documentary practices; and the role that the artist-documentarian plays in the produsage culture.

In the next chapter, the research traces the chronology of documentary, specifically moving image documentary. It investigates the issues associated with observational documentary by examining the value of collaborative production in art documentary. It also considers how documentary practice is interpreted creatively by artists in various art disciplines as well as discusses the artist-documentarian position within the electronic age.
Chapter 3: Historical Context

(Art) Documentary via Technology

The earlier practices of visual documentary were used by archivists to record artefacts and events. The role of a documentarian is exclusive and resides primarily within the fields of anthropology and museology. As the cumbersome and less user-friendly audiovisual equipment of the time made the process of creating accurate recordings challenging, their production required highly trained operators with well-developed equipment-handling skills. Through technology innovation, the development of lighter weight technology allowed easier documentation of historical activities and events. From the beginning of film photography in 1889, the static images of recording and archivist practices has slowly transformed into richer and more multilayered motion-picture recording through video and digital imaging innovation.

This chapter is divided into three sections. It firstly provides a brief chronological development of documentary forms, discussing the practices of observational and participatory documentary through technological advances. Secondly, it presents five art documentaries that question the idea of collaborative production between the subject and the documenter. Finally, by combining both documentary practice and artistic practices, the third section discusses how documentary traditions are interpreted in contemporary art.

The following table provides descriptions of the six main forms of documentary-making.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Documentary</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Techniques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Long Form Journalism/ Expository | In-depth articles that include both creative non-fiction and narrative journalism, including: docufiction; mockumentary; docudrama; pseudo-documentary; and scripted reality. Recent popularised via Buzzfeed, the New York Times, Longform and blogs. | • Large amount of content  
• Narrative-driven  
• Multi-medium  
• Objective – Subjective  
• Assembly  
• Directive |
| Biopic or Profile | It’s known as a biographical motion picture; this is a film where an actor depicts the life of a non-fictional or historically based person. An auto-biopic, in contrast, is the actual person depicting themselves in a film (i.e. narrative documentary). | • Fictional depiction of a significant person.  
• Film-based |
| Observational Documentary | With the development of mobile audio and video technologies, this type of documentary captures the intimacy and immediacy of ordinary life situations. The key element is that this kind of recording requires little to no interference by the documenter, as they are seen as ‘a fly on the wall’ (e.g. reality television and backstage documentary). In the 1950s the UK Free Cinema movement aimed to capture everyday life without the interference by the documenter. | • Location footage  
• Portable equipment  
• Intimacy and immediacy  
• No voiceover  
• No interview  
• Invisible presence  
• Long takes |
Participatory Documentary

In contrast to observational documentary, participatory documentary includes an understanding that the documenter is part of the documentary process and cannot be thought as a silent observer, because the documenter shapes or influences the outcome of the recording. The truth is within the frame and it’s not an absolute truth. (e.g. 1960s cinéma vérités)

- Inclusive and collaborative
- Intrusive
- Handheld devices
- Interviews
- Multi-medium
- Visibility
- Voice overs
- Long takes

Reflective Documentary

This is a documentary that questions its authenticity and examines the construction of itself, as part of the filmmaking process. It focuses on representation rather than authenticity.

- Borrows fictional film techniques
- Re-enactments
- Dramatic
- Voice overs
- Suggestion rather than facts

Performativ Documentary

This is a subjective experience towards the world and the documentary is formed through the emotional responses and views of the documenter (e.g. compilation film, life logging).

- Personal/subjective
- Visible filmmaker
- Open-ended
- Addresses the spectator

Table 1: Form of Documentary Practices

From the 1950s, the development of portable 16 mm film camera and sound-recording devices gave the documentarian the mobility to record and venture into more intimate spaces in recording the subject. From capturing what was happening in actuality to how the subject and event were portrayed in visual imagery, the documentarian decisions on how content was now being produced brought forth examination of the artist-documentarian role.

From 1958 to 1962, direct cinema emerged as a new form of the documentary genre, using a strictly observational method to record the naturalistic truth. The documenter used a non-interventional approach to question the relationship between reality and cinema, and this observational method placed the artist-documentarian in the position of passive observer. As a form of passive observation, Lancaster University Professor of Visual Art Nigel Whiteley argues that the practice of observational documentary has often neglected the artist’s decision-making process. He explains that this practice is “representational” rather than “factual” and the imagery is often opaque and unclear, and the content produced often “visible” rather than “understandable” (Whiteley, 2007).

In the 1960s, in contrast to direct cinema, cinéma vérité placed the artist-documentarian as an active participant and contributor in front of the camera. This practice is subjective and external factors, including the presence of equipment, are inclusively acknowledged by the documentarian as factors that contribute to the production. The angles, composition, lighting and focus chosen to capture the subject’s characteristics, movements and reactions in the documenting process are represented as portrayal, rather than a realistic view. The view of objectivity in documentary practice can only be realised as a representational truth, as NYU Professor of Anthropology Faye Ginsburg describes, as a type of reality generated through the equally shared experiences between the subject and the documentarian (2006).

In the early 1980s, the introduction of the microprocessor to the consumer market provided the individual use of personal computers. With the first graphical user interface introduced in 1982,
Apple’s ‘Lisa’ computer, the quality of graphics and sounds superseded any previous computing technology. Concurrently, the emergent of lifelogging or the lifeblogger movement created a different type of documenter (Kieron, Tuffield & Mischa, 2009). Canadian computational photography researcher Steve Mann experimented with an early version of wearable computing and video-streaming (Schofield, 2012). Through the manipulation of video and television parts, Mann developed an ‘as-you-go’ self-documenting technology and method of capturing daily events; this idea not only expands the photographic convention of capturing a ‘moment’ in a single image, but encapsulates a desire to capture and share ‘every’ moment.

Figure 5: Angeline Stewart, Self-Portraits of Mann with Digital Eye Glass (Wearable computer and Augmented Reality System) from the 1980s to 2000s.

The World Wide Web became publicly available on 6 August 1991, created by Tim Berners-Lee as a project to connect physicists and to share information from all around the world (McPherson, 2009). The ability to connect with people and information from all over the world dramatically increased the usefulness of computers beyond their word-processing history. As information and connection with people were now at the user’s fingertips, social network evolutions in the late 1990s ramped up the computational evolutionary pace with the development of computer-mediated technologies. The computer-mediated technologies embedded in consumer devices including phone cameras, tablet cameras, PC webcams and phone applications made habitual documentation readily available for anyone to use and publish daily lived experiences.

In 2006, Axel Bruns wrote about the feedback loop of our habitual, daily documentation through consumer and computer-mediated technologies. In this article, Bruns coined the term ‘produser’, a noun derived from ‘produsage’, combining the word of ‘production’ and ‘usage’, as described by Bruns as a culture that lives in a continuous loop of creating and feeding into the virtual community. He describes a produser as a ‘user’ not only passively consuming online content, but also an active ‘producer’ of content to feed into the virtual networks. He suggests that the produser’s habitual action in generating content is a collaborative and participatory process (Bruns 2007:2) as the content the user publishes on the internet welcome a dialogue for feedback from produser in the virtual community. The consumer and computer-mediated technologies have brought changes not only to equipment handling, but also to the distribution and communication of content in virtually connected networks.
The produser is seen as a modern documentarian without formal journalism or filmmaking skills. By using (often) free computer-mediated technologies such as Instagram, Facebook and YouTube, the produser can capture and share instantaneously on the internet worthy events or stories. The produser role in habitual self-documentary practices is described by UNSW design researcher and senior lecturer Katherine Moline as an act of “aestheticizing everyday life by moulding, shaping and penetrating every corner of daily experience” (2011:29). The modern documentarian embodied experiences can be seen as playing an increasingly important role in our contemporary culture as we habitually document our daily activities to feed the insatiable social networked.

Art Documentary

This section describes five art documentaries that have been influential to this research. Presented in chronological order, these documentaries have provided the areas of investigation into, participatory practices, collaborative production, and observational documenting via situationist theory.

In 1950, a major art documentary about Jackson Pollock, an American abstract expressionist painter, was produced by Hans Namuth and Paul Falkenberg. In this documentary, Namuth’s filming focused on Pollock’s personal image, rather than his art practice. Namuth took on participatory methods in manipulating Pollock to paint outside his normal way of practice. Namuth set up a large sheet of glass on plinths for Pollock to paint on, and this was configured to allow Namuth accessibility to film underneath the work while Pollock painted on the top. Although the documenter idea was to create a new viewpoint in documenting, the video resulted in a performance piece that took away Pollock’s naturalistic approach to painting. In the afternote to this documentary, it is speculated that Pollock’s “boundless” way of painting altered due to the participatory approach Namuth took in documenting (Boxer, 1998).

In Marion Cajori’s 1998 documentary of American artist-photographer Chuck Close, Cajori took on a different approach in documenting Close as he paints. As Close, a photorealist painter, already severely paralysed at the time of filming, was still physically active with painting with his hands. Cajori used the opportunity to attached a lipstick camera to Close’s paintbrush, allowing the recorder to document the movement of the brush moving across the canvas as he painted. For just a few seconds, it shows not only the perspective of the artist’s body and the natural movements of his practice, but it also transforms the subject into a dual artist-documenter role, from that of a subject artist to a collaborative cinematographer.

In an art documentary filmed by British artist Tacita Dean, titled Edwin Parker (2011), Dean documented American artist Cy Twombly as he did no more than walking and sitting, nothing physically to contribute to his art-making. The observational documenting style in Dean’s approach is unconventional compared to what most conventional documentarians would portray of their artist subjects. The traditional method captures an active artist working, making and doing art; Dean chose instead the approach of an in-depth look into the artist’s daily life and random moments that can contribute a greater perspective of the artist.
In documenting the last days of an artist’s life, the technique of Dean’s approach is a strict practice of observational documentary. However, in Bryony White’s journal article for *Studies in Theatre and Performance*, titled ‘Film Still: The Artistic Impulse to Document in Tacita Dean’s Craneway Events’, she argues that Dean’s documentary practice is an art form, as her recording decision is based on an “artistic impulse to document” rather than an “archival impulse to document” as described in Hal Foster’s review. In this documentary, Dean filmed dancers in rehearsal in the Merce Cunningham Dance Company, the 16mm film documentary capturing the dancers moving in and out of the frame as the camera was set in a stationary position. White believes the equipment choices Dean made to use a 16 mm camera and the angle or composition used to film the dance rehearsals are Dean’s artistic participatory decisions, and not as purely an observational method to capture a lost or archival moment of a historical figure (White, 2016).

Dean’s film practice is presented based on chance and incidental imagery that shows the subject as a performer or collaborator. In Susan Bright’s book *Auto Focus: The Self-Portrait in Contemporary Photography*, she discusses further the collaborative production between the subject and the documenter. In this book, Bright describes how the documented subject often becomes acutely aware of the presence of the camera, as some subjects conduct performances or self-conscious actions that present them as more photogenic for the benefit of the camera. This observation supports what art historian and writer of *Interviews with the Artist* Michael Peppiatt suggests that the subject behaves and acts performative in the presence of equipment and a documenter in the way of “manipulations to fit the perceived ideal self” (Peppiatt & Bellony-Rewald, 1982).

In contrary to what Peppiatt suggests as an internal motivation of the subject to best represent themselves in front of the camera, psychogeographic studies by situationists suggest the environment, space and time affect or dictate an individual’s behaviour (Bright, 2010). An example to the effects of the subject’s performative experience in front of the camera is presented through Corinne Belz’s 2012 documentary *Gerhard Richter: Painting*. Richter describes to Belz his experience as the subject of her documentary: “it’s [the camera] watching me, and because I know this, I walk differently”. How Richter describes his experience suggests his action was not based on his internal motivation to present an ideal self, but rather as an involuntary response due to his awareness of the camera.

The question of whether documentary-making can be viewed as a collaborative production is determined by the intentions of the subject and the documenter. By documenting different artists, the experimentation in this research partly examines whether the subject’s personal intentions are an external factor that affects the documentary outcome.

**Artistic Documentary Practices**

The practice of documentary, crosses into a creative and performative platform, with artists using various documentation practices to create art. This section looks at how documentary practice is interpreted creatively by artists in various art disciplines. This section is presented chronologically to examine the artist-documentarian position within the contemporary art.
In the 1960s performance art, observational practice in art documentary, was embraced, as seen in the performance videos of Marina Abramovic and Ulay, Chris Burden, and Mike Parr. The video documentation of these performances showed the limitation of the technology used as the aesthetic, composition and creative qualities were secondary to the archival practice in ‘capturing the moment’ for archival purposes.

From 1966 to 1968, American artist John Baldessari utilised traditional documenting techniques to create a series of artworks. In *A Painting that Is its Own Documentation*, a text-based painting, Baldessari argues that what constitutes as art is what is marketed (Henry, 2006). In this black-text painting on seven canvas panels, Baldessari records the life of the canvases, from the date and time of the idea being conceived to the rest of its exhibition history. This creative reinterpretation of the traditional provenance techniques of documenting alters the documentarian position from that of a record-keeper to that of an artist, and vice versa.

In 1970, technological experimentation with the video format brought forth video art and experimental film practice. The ‘godfather’ of video art, Nam June Paik, and Peter Campus examined and created abstract artworks based on the technology medium itself. The artist-documentarian Dan Graham used a Sony Portapak video recorder to create interactive real-time video art (Meigh-Andrews, 2013:17) that explores observational and participatory practices.

In 1973, Peter Campus started to use experimental editing techniques and digital manipulation to examine the digital medium. In this period, Campus created a series of Chroma Keys videos, titled ‘Three Transitions’ depicting self-perception through video technologies. The artistic approach Campus’s examined technological and art is closely in line with the method used for this research, as an investigation to how technology can be used to create an artistic dialogue within the culture. (SFMOMA, 2014)

In his 1977 *Performer/Audience/Mirror* performance, Dan Graham uses vocal commentary to describe himself, the audience and the audience’s reflection. In a continuous commentary, while he stands in front of a large mirror, Graham’s vocal documentary of the subject is recorded in a video format as an archival document of the performance. Collaborative production is evident in this performance video work, as the artist’s and the subject’s voluntary movements are captured on film. From the artist-documentarian commentary, the narration describing the event, the person and the experience happening before the artist’s eyes, and the reactions of the audience, the subject and the artist all provide the immediate feedback loop reflecting back to what Bruns describes as the produsage culture (Graham, 1999:26).

In extending the artist-documentarian position similar to Graham’s work, UK interdisciplinary artist Fiona Banner uses writing and text to document her subjects. In Banner’s text-drawings series, titled *Performance Nude* (2009), she draws on the idea of life writing by using descriptive text to document the pose and the form of a life model. Life writing (Banner, 2009) reflects on the interplay between observational and performative documentary; it resembles an anthropology approach to documenting and analysing. Similar to Graham’s role in his performance, Banner is
both the documenter and the subject, as she collaboratively performs writing phrases onto a canvas with the subject (model) of the audience standing in front of her.

In looking at the ways artist utilise documentary practices as part of their art creation, this research combines art, technologies and documentary practice into a series of creative constructions. Central to my research is an exploration of the artist-documentarian role through the documentary production and construction process. With close alignment to Campus’s practice from the 1990s to the 2000s, his experimentation expanded to testing digital editing techniques including multi-screen editing, multi-layering, image mapping and time manipulation (Herzogenrath, 2003:20). The experimental constructions for this research are an attempt to investigate the limits of digital imagery through self-documenting, wearable technology and spherical recording.
Chapter 4: Trials through Experimental Documentary

As documentation in a user-led content community, the videos created in these experiments utilise consumer technologies, the collaborative production between subject and documenter, and network culture to construct a series of video works that explore the artist-documentarian position. By experimenting with traditional documentary techniques in using various user-friendly consumer and computer-mediated technologies, these experiments evaluate how consumer audiovisual technologies affect the documentary practice. As each experimentation session was set up with multiple recording devices, some creative outcomes and findings overlap. This chapter has been written during the progress of the research and each section is titled according to the type of creative outcome produced during the experimentation.

Experiment 1: Photo Collage – Still Image Sequences

In Dean’s documentary of Cy Twombly, a sequence of Twombly’s shaky hand as he tried to hold onto his glasses were captured, Dean explains this approach capture the incidental information the human body display (White, 2016). In line with the study of situationism, this experiment tests the observational documentary practice via photography, examining whether a subject’s behaviours in front of the camera are directly dictated by the surrounding environment or other external factors (McDonough; Levin; Bandini: 1996). By using the observational method to record and collect an artist’s naturalistic actions in their art-making practices, the subject’s reactions and interactions with the camera have been observed and recorded in photographic images.

How a DSLR camera on a tripod altered the documentation practice

By holding a consumer-grade digital single-lens reflex (DSLR) camera and positioning myself at an unobtrusive distance and stationary position from the artist, images were captured of the subject as they moved in and out of the frame. The artist-subject rigidity and often slow body movement suggest they acknowledged the presence of the camera, and the artist attempts to stay within the
frame as a reaction to the camera suggesting an element of performativity. In one way, we can view the camera as what Marshall McLuhan’s situationism theory calls as the ‘external factor’ that dictate or affect the way subjects re/act. However, from another perspective, through the preparation stage, when the artist-subject set parameter as to where the documenter should be positioned, and how the camera should be placed, the limitation of what the observer can document can be viewed as what Peppiatt describes as the artist-subject tendency to act out their perceived ideal self (Peppiatt, 2012). In restricting the documenter accessibility to record, the handheld technology relies solely on the technique of zooming in and out of the camera by the documenter, and the artist-subject willingness to interact with the camera to capture the essence of artist-subject’s movement. With the deliberate composition of each capture from the hand-held camera and the artist-subject reactive movement to the camera, the imagery produce in this experiment can be viewed as what Whiteley describes as ‘representational’ rather than ‘factual’ content (Whiteley, 2007).

The way collaborative production occurred between subject and documentarian

The collaborative production happened in the setting up of the documentation. This interaction was unavoidable as the open communication between the artist and the documenter allowed both to express their creative vision for the process. The documenter talked with the artist-subject of any possible invasiveness; in exchange, the artist-subject described their work process to prepare the documenter for what was to come. The location of where the artist-subject practised to where the camera was placed was all part of the interaction. As the documentation began, the subject willingness to interact with and perform in front of the camera altered the non-intervening observational stationary position to a more collaborative production approach.

Exploring the artist-documentarian position through photo collage and motion graphic

From this photographic experiment with a DSLR camera, the artist-documentarian examined photo collage and motion graphic as creative reflection. By looking into psychological studies in how people behave in front of a camera, I have constructed a series of photographic collages that encapsulate ‘performed’ photography, which is described by Jennifer Blessing (curator of the 1997 New York exhibition “Rrose is a Rrose is a Rrose: Gender Performance in Photography) as a performance developed for the camera (Blessing, 2006). From the process of editing and reviewing to the collation of images, the series of photo collages (triptychs and polyptychs) were constructed in sequence in relation to the actions of the subject as they made art. In creating stories from different viewpoints, the decision to use triptychs involved collating images side-by-side and this presents a fuller story of the action-in-process, and the time and spatial passing. After the initial placement, assembled static sequences were loaded into video editing software for editing to create moving image sequences or motion graphics. Through the construction of these motion graphics, this led the experimentation to explore the function of time-lapse imagery in documentary practice.
Experiment 2: Video Collage – Multi-Screen Videos

In this experiment, the documentation was conducted through a mixture of observational and participatory techniques. By exploring composition and camera angles through the video function of a DSLR camera, this experiment attempts to collect naturalistic actions of the unaware artist as they make art. By setting the camera on a tripod in a stationary position, the experiment has recorded the naturalistic movement of an artist entering and exiting the frame. The decision to use a wide-angle (16:9) lens to capture as much of the subject’s movement and surroundings without the documenter intervention is to explore American historian and theoretician Bill Nichols’s ‘fly-on-the-wall’ observational documenting technique (Nichols, 2001: 116).

The difference between this experiment and the experiment prior is that there were two cameras recording simultaneously. One camera was on tripod to capture video footages, while the other camera was strapped to the documenter’s body via a camera strap. The handheld camera directed the artist’s attention to the documenter’s hands, whereas the camera strapped to the body, like an extension to the eyes, remained ‘invisible’ to the artist. In contrast to what Marshall McLuhan describes in The Medium is the Message: An Inventory of Effects (1967) as technology become the extension to the body, it also ‘amputate’ another part of the body (or sensorium) function (McLuhan & Fiore, 2008). This experiment attempts to replicate Cajori’s 1998 documentary of Chuck Close, or Namuth’s 1950 Jackson Pollock documentary by adding new methods and technologies in the practice and create a new viewing perspective of the artist working processes.
How video functions on stationary and body-strapped DSLR cameras altered the documentation practice

In consideration of the weight of the camera and the comfort level in wearing this piece of equipment, the subject was not requested to wear the equipment as part of this experiment. Instead, the documenter took on the dual role of subject and documenter. The body-strapped camera allowed the experiment to explore the documenter practice as part of the process. In continuing from the experimentation with DSLR cameras, the documenter used a Canon Rebel 300D DSLR camera and a Canon 600D DSLR camera with video-recording function, positioning the 600D camera on tripod and strapping the 300D onto the body. The documenter was in a free position to move around the subject, as the camera on tripod tracked and photographed the ‘performative’ movement of the artist, as suggested through the last experiment. The body-strapped camera captured not only clips of the unaware artist, but also the documenter movement as they documented the artist. The resulting quality of the images from the strapped camera is shaky as the camera oscillated from the documenter’s body. In the clips collected, several sections in the recording show the camera shutter paused, but that is not the result of a technical glitch (i.e. a frame dropped from the camera). Instead, the in-between break from the video function to still images are part of the camera’s dual function.

With the body-strapped camera, the clips capture the movement of the documenter, showing the camera as an extension of the body. In recording a non-controlled perspective, the clips intermittently show recognisable images, such as the subject’s face, the process of art-making and the working space of the subject and the documenter. While McLuhan suggests the amputation of other body parts through the development of technology or technology as an extension of the body, this experiment with a body-strapped camera gives the documentation an additional perspective for the research that provides an alternative viewpoint or an additional narrative for documenting the subject’s and the documenter’s practices as they unfold.

The way collaborative production occurred between subject and documentarian

In this experiment, the subject’s unawareness of the body-strapped video camera provides a different viewpoint for documenting, despite the fact that the stationary camera is still recording ‘performative’ actions by the subject as part of the process, the voyeuristic nature of the hidden camera on the body and the distraction created by the stationary and visible camera. The clips show the movements and reactions of the subject and the documenter that are outside the orchestrated composition, and glimpses of naturalistic movements and reactions captured outside the standard camera frame. The collaborative production in this circumstance is voyeuristic and similar to the direct cinema method of capturing clips without the subject’s awareness (Saunders, 2007).

Exploring the artist-documentarian position through video collage and multiscreen video

From the documenter perspective, the editing of clips is a creative practice that is similar to how a sculptor constructs a sculpture. From the collection of different clips captured on both cameras, the thought process in creating a piece of work that is reflective of the outcome of the experiments took place by working through a deconstruction and reconstruction method. By
selecting and collating clips in sequential and simultaneous ways, we can see complex mixtures of angles taken of the artist as they made art. The decision to produce multiscreen video through the side-by-side placement of clips is because each screen displays different equipment and angles used in recording the subject’s practice, similar to the multiscreen video installation by Tacita Dean, ‘Film’, exhibited as part of the Unilever Series at the Tate Modern in 2011. Her video installation work consists of a looped eleven-minute silent 35mm film, where the colouration, camera angles and compositions of different clips narrate individual stories. In contrast to Dean’s vertical placement of her video, in this construction different clips were placed horizontally to create a triptych that builds on a dynamic story of the artist making art. As Maya Deren describes in her 1953 book *Poetry and the Film Symposium*, horizontal viewing creates drama that is strictly narrative and sequential, where one action leads the eyes to another (Royoux, Warner, Greer, 2006). The construction of these video works attempts to build on the different perspectives between the artist, the documenter and the space where the creations were made.

![Figure 8: Joanne Chang, Video Collage Stills of Lesley O’Gorman Work in Progress, 2016 [Melbourne, Victoria]](image)

**Experiment 3: Time-Lapse Video Collage**

This experiment investigates the time and space of documentary through the customised functions of IOS (Internetwork Operating System) mobile phone and tablet devices. In one aspect, the experiment is interested in how light weight recording devices changes the way of documentary practice between the artist-subject and the documenter. In another, this experiment also looks into ways where the handleability of the technology can be altered. Similar to Steve Mann’s manipulation of existing technology to fit its function (Schofield, 2012), this experiment attempts to manipulates the device from hand-held device to wearable recording device. Using the lifelogging methodology in capturing every moment, this experiment produced the limitation of documenting an artist-subject for a long period of time. As result, this experiment focus mainly on the documenter in the documenter-subject role. In the dual role of both the documenter and
the subject, this experiment will serve as catalyst to the investigation to the artist-documentarian position in the produsage culture. In the creative reflection of this experiment, using computer-mediated application, the videos produced were altered and transform into a series of time-lapse videos.

**How mobile phone and tablet cameras altered the documentation practice**

There are two parts to this experiment. In the first part, a series of the self-documenting videos was created. By using video and time-lapse functions on the mobile phone camera, a series of journeys derived through the research were collated. Clips include travel, events and experiences of the documenter leading up to each documenting session. By attaching the mobile phone camera to the car dashboard, it captured clips of multiple journeys to the artist-subject’s studio or space. Where limited space was available (e.g. on a plane), the handheld mobile phone was used to capture video clips. Differently to the camera that was strapped to the documenter’s body, the mobile phone camera was handheld over an extended period suggesting the device has merged with the body and became an extension of the arm. In continuing with McLuhan’s theory that technology ‘amputates’ other bodies and sensory perception, this experiment suggests the phone camera extended and multiplied visual perception, rather than replacing it. To create an altered reality through the speeding up of actions and time, the organ eyes, organic and set in one place on the upper part of the human body, were replaced by the handheld phone camera, placed in various positions is portrayed as a second set of eyes in documenting and recording.

![Figure 9: Joanne Chang, Multiscreen Video Stills of Self-Trace-Travel, 2014-2016 (Melbourne, Victoria & Brisbane, Queensland)](image)

In the second part of this experiment, an Apple IOS IPad Mini tablet was used to extend the testing of the time-lapse. The tablet camera was placed at a far distance to capture the subject, the documenter and the space surrounding the documentation session. With the camera capturing...
the movement of the subject and the documenter in one frame, the continuous time-lapse function contributed to the lesser intervention of the observational documentary technique. In contrast to the mobile phone, this device captures from a further distance. The time-lapse function changed the experiment of observational studies into the artist’s and documenter practice, to transform the documenter into both subject and documenter. In both self-documentary and observational studies, the collaborative part is the dual role the documenter plays as both subject and documenter.

![Figure 10: Joanne Chang, Multiscreen Video Stills of Kaya Barry & Jondi Keane Work in Progress, 2016 (Melbourne, Victoria)](image)

The way collaborative production occurred between subject and documentarian

In the first part of the experiment, where a handheld camera was used to capture the artist-subject, the perceived size of the mobile phone camera seemed less intrusive and thus created an opportunity for more intimate capturing of the subject’s practice. However, as the camera is limited in its zooming capability, the documenter action in holding the camera up close made the artist-subject experience more invasiveness and thus resulted in less responsiveness to their practice. In the time-lapse observational study, the distance between the camera and the subject made the viewpoint wider and less receptive to the documenter interpretation.
Exploring the artist-documentarian position through time-lapse video

In this two-part experiment, the artist-documentarian position was reflective and personal, working closely with the device through an extended period; the device slowly moulded to or became part of the documenter’s body.

Over the duration of twenty months, the IOS phone was used to self-document. From the documenter’s journeys to and from the studio and everyday experiences recorded, a collection of 36 videos were edited and collated through selections of computer-mediated applications and software. From the experiment, the editing process combined clips to construct a series of multi-screen videos capturing an artist-documentarian practice. To differentiate each documentary journey, different travelling clips were used as dividers of events. These video work shows the artist-documentarian experiences in a fast-speed, nomadic way, moving among the various tribes (art disciplines) and cultures (artist practices). Unlike Steve Mann’s daily recording and publishing of events, this multiscreen video has been constructed to combine the whole documenting experience, allowing the entire story to be presented.

In the second part of the experiment, the iPad was used to capture the subject’s and documenter’s practices simultaneously. As the documenter played a dual role of being in front of and behind the camera, the time-lapse shows the participatory practice of the documenter. In the creative constructions, the time-lapse is used as a part of a larger multiscreen video collage. Where the camera captured the presence of the equipment utilised in the documentation session, the subject and the documenter were filmed as being oblivious to the existence of the camera, and the results of movement between the subject and the documenter narrate an in-depth retelling of the documentary process.
Figure 12: Joanne Chang, Multiscreen Video Stills of *Self-Trace-Travel*, 2016 [Sydney, New South Wales]

Figure 13: Joanne Chang, Multiscreen Video Stills of *Self-Trace - Travel*, 2016 [Melbourne, Victoria & Sydney, New South Wales & Brisbane, Queensland]
Experiment 4: Self-Documenting with Wearable Cameras (Head and Body Strapped)

In continuing with DSLR and mobile phone experiments, this research looked further into self-documenting practice, using wearable recording devices. Unlike the body-strapped DSLR camera and handheld phone camera, this type of wearable camera is specially made for self-documenting. The lightweight fitted device allows the experiment to examine the artist-documentarian position as both subject and documenter. By wearing the device on the head or other parts of the body, this research brought forth additional elements from the previous experiment. The experiment used a wearable camera as the ‘eye of insight’ and attached itself to various parts of the documenter’s body, allowing different perspectives on the artist’s way of practice to be captured. Similar to the method Marion Cajori use to document Chuck Close mentioned in Chapter 3, this experiment collates a series of clips that show the artist-documentarian self-perception in practice.

How wearable cameras altered the documentation practice

For this experiment, two Go Pro Hero 4 cameras were used. This camera not only provides lightweight wearability but it is also small enough to be utilised in any restricted space as required. In the first part of the experiment, the subject and the documenter wore the devices on their heads to capture the viewpoint from the head down. By strapping the camera to the head, it captured the documenter’s journey to the subject’s studio with pre-setting of the camera to capture images at five-second intervals. For the duration of the studio visit, the subject was asked to wear the second camera to self-document and its time-lapse recordings were also pre-set to capture images at five-second intervals. By using two cameras, the documenter examines time-lapse collaborative production via the perspectives of both the subject and the documenter. As a result, more than two thousand images were captured and then reconstructed into a two-hour video clip in the full duration of the experiment.
In the second part of the experiment, the documenter strapped one camera onto her head, with the second camera strapped onto her limbs as it records her own artistic process. The camera function was set to film continuously until the function was stopped or the memory card was full. The documenter examined her artistic practice through the different viewpoints of her body. By using the video mode for the artist-documenter to self-document, the clips of the perspectives from the head to the arm and the hand provide an in-depth look at the artist making art.

The use of wearable video-recording devices was partially successful, as several technical issues with the camera set-up affected the outcome. The composition is unstable as the adjustable frame from the base of the camera adjusted itself when the activities of the artist-subject increased. In the first part of the experiment the recording was shaky, and for the second part of the experiment several images adjusted due to the camera’s mount moving through the artist’s physical activities. The content, although low quality, does provide an obscured view of how both the subject and the documenter practiced, capturing not only one moment of the studio but the whole process of the documentary experimentation.
The way collaborative production occurred between subject and documentarian

In the experiment, the subject and the documenter both wore cameras on their heads. In a cooperative way of documenting, the mutual documentation between the subject and the documenter shows participatory production as the documenter becomes the documented and the documented becomes the documenter. The back-and-forth of simultaneous views between the documenter and documented becomes an active dialogue about processes.

Exploring the artist-documentarian position through self-documenting

The artist-documentarian position was immersive as the experience required the artist-documentarian to play a role that was both in front of and behind the camera.

In the first part of the experiment, the collection of time-lapse images is sectioned into three categories: the subject, the documenter and the motions. In combining all images through the editing process, a ‘ken-burn’ filter was added to create an effect of zooming in and out. The static images produced after the editing process are a series of erratic but rhythmic motion graphics between the three elements mentioned.

In the second part of the experiment, exploring documenting through wearable recording devices and the strapping of cameras onto different parts of the body, including the hand, upper arm and head, the cameras recorded the documenter own artistic practice. These clips have been compiled, edited and constructed into three horizontal panels. By aligning the clips the way our eyes see, reading from left to right, the idea of a horizontal triptych as Deren describes is used to show the three different perspectives of the artist, the documentarian and the recording device (2006). From here, further construction has been made to include text and sounds. The sounds
were recorded from the wearable devices and initially separated in the editing process before being brought back together at the end to create an over-laying narrative to accompany the clips.

Through the analysis and review of previous experiments, it has been seen that none of the equipment used from prior experiment was able to capture and represent the artist-documentarian position in the produsage culture. The collaboration between the artist and the documenter exists through the techniques and technologies used in the previous experiments, but in the latter parts of experiment three, the use of wearable video-recording devices required active participation of the subject as well as the documenter. For example, in using wearable recording device, the artist-subject was required to wear the technology to capture their perspective.

![Figure 17: Joanne Chang, Spherical Video Stills of Chris Worfold Work in Progress. 2016 [Brisbane, Queensland]](image)

**Experiment 5: 360-degree Video-Recording Devices (Handheld and Stationary)**

For this experiment, the spherical recording technology and the computer-mediated applications represent the central investigation of the research, examining the passive and active produser practice in the produsage culture. In the first part of this experiment, the camera was used to document large public gatherings for the purpose of testing the camera’s capability and to allowing any issues that arose to be resolved before the artist-subject documentation. In the second part of the experiment, the camera was used to document the entire documenting process of the artist-subject, the studio and the documenter as they worked. In creative reflections of the footages, the experiment investigates the subject’s and the documenter positions from a spherical perspective.

**How a consumer-grade 360-degree spherical recording camera altered the documentary practice**

Additional from how the 360-degree video camera expand the two-dimensional imagery to 360-degree image, the traditional directional practice expand itself in capturing the full radius of
the artist-subject at work, the working space, and the documenter. This consumer-grade camera consisted only of two simple photography and video functions. In relying on the mobile phone application to act as a viewfinder for the camera, it also manages the device. The lightweight camera is equipped with internal storage and consisted of two in-built fish-eye cameras and tripod mount for stationary recording.

In using Ricoh Theta 360-degree spherical camera, the Ricoh application, and the YouTube application, the sphere (fish-eye) lenses record simultaneously from both sides of the handle, producing two spherical recordings from the ‘front’ and ‘back’ of the camera. At the conversion process within the computer-mediated application, the two spherical clips are stitched together to form one stretched landscape. At the completion of the editing process, metadata is added to final clips to transform it from a two-dimensional video to a 360-degree spherical video that navigable by trackable mouse or VR goggles.

The way collaborative production occurred between subject and documentarian

In this experiment, the subject’s and the documenter’s positions are immersive and collaborative, as the camera captured all that was happening, the 360-capture left no place for either the subject and the documenter to hide. As the artist-subject could only occupy one side of the spherical capturing space, the other side of the spherical clips often captured in addition the surrounding environment the artist is working in and the documenter in motion.

Exploring the artist-documentarian position through navigable space

In this experiment, the artist-documentarian position has fully merged with the position of the produser. By using a combination of technologies, both consumer and computer-mediated technologies, as well as social media, to form a series of work that constructs the circular feedback loop described by Bruns as the “produsage process” (2008:3). Produsage combines the words ‘produce’ and ‘usage’, denoting the idea of the documenter as both passive and active, and so the video work constructed takes on both a narrative as well as a dialogue form in an extension of art documentary.

For the first part of the construction, a collection of pre-converted clips of the documenter testing the camera was collated. The duration of each clip was less than three seconds, and the separation of the unconverted videos, recorded at the same time and displayed side by side, shows both the documenter and the subject interacting on the opposite sides of the lenses. Without conversion, the clips take on unique self-documenting perspectives, showing what the documenter sees in the documenting process.

For the second construction, the clip was converted into a 360-degree interactive video through the YouTube network. An interactive view allows the viewers to interact and see a 360-degree aspect of how the subject and the documenter work. The video work is considered to be partially observational, but it has an exploratory element in its interactivity.
Overall, these six experiments provide strong foundation for the investigation into the artist-documentarian in the produsage age. Evaluation of the technologies used in the experiment provides answers to the technological effects on documenting practice, and the repositioning of the documenter in the produsage age.

In creative reflection on these experiments, a series of video works have been created. Even though the six sets of video work in comparison to the evaluations in the dissertation may sound dissimilar, the creative work produced from the experiments demonstrates a progressive research into changes of the documentary process through technological innovation. Similar to Campus’s creation of works to test the limits of technology, this research also tests current technology, with art documentation as the theme of investigation.

What has been learnt in these six experiments is that documentary practice has moved from a historically driven practice to a technology-driven practice. The duality of the artist-documenter position as both the producer and the documented has vastly becoming the norm in the produsage culture of encapsulating creativity through the representation of an altered reality.
Chapter 5: Virtual Exhibition

By undertaking the theoretical and experimental aspects developed through this research, a series of three video artworks have been exhibited in the virtual space of two social media platforms, WordPress and YouTube. In translating the dual position of produser described by Axel Bruns to an artist-documentarian position, this exhibition took on WordPress and YouTube as the modern exhibition space in the produsage age. WordPress as a blogging and website content management system where the user can build a website or a blog page via open source or computer-mediated technology, and YouTube as a free video-sharing website where the user can publish their video online for public viewing. The decision to combined these social media platforms as the exhibition space was firstly defined by the central theme of this practice-led research, in examining the technological development in art-documentary via networking platform and computer-mediated technology. Secondly, in curating and presenting the series of work via these two platforms, the artist-documentarian practice merged with the produser role in producing continuous feedback loop as both the producer (active) and user (passive) in the produsage culture, where the documenter is also the subject, and the producer is also the viewer.

Logistically, the widely accepted functionality and stability of YouTube has provided the reliable loading platform for the two dimensional and virtual reality videos, whereas WordPress has provided insulated landing space, like an art gallery, for this video exhibition viewing. The one important function of YouTube for these final works are the YouTube 360-degree function, spherical video can be uploaded and converted to interactive or navigable video that allows the audience to view and interact with the 360-degree spaces on a computer or a mobile phone.

As mentioned, the exhibition showed both two-dimensional video art for passive consumption, but also a 360-degree interactive video that is seeking active participation from the viewer. The consideration of target viewers and accessibility to the exhibition have been left wide open with the use of these two social media platforms, as any person with access to the internet is welcome to navigate and actively explore the artist space in any location they choose. In the 360-degree video, the work can be viewed and interacted by using the appropriate accessories like Google cardboard and You Tube mobile phone application to transform the desktop-stationary position to a mobile immersive virtual reality experience.

In the selection of the artworks to exhibit, I took a range of ideas and documentary practices from each conducted experiment to create the final series of work. In the final work, one artist-subject were chosen, the footages captured were mixture of 360 degrees and self-documenting videos.

The reason to choose one artist as the subject for the final work is because as the experimental research develops, the research aim to explore the artist-documenter position have shifted the focus from the artist-subject to the documenter-subject, and through examining the new way in art-documentary making, the experimentation of technology had to some extent overshadowed the documentation of artist-subject process of working.
In the following section, the essence of collaborative production between the photographer, the documenter, the artist-subject, the editor, and the creative commons music contributed to the final works will be reflected through the concept and practices incorporated through the experimenting process.

![Image](image.png)

*Figure 19: Joanne Chang, Multiscreen Video Stills for Self-Trace, 2016 (Brisbane, Queensland)*

**The Artist-Documentarian**

In experiment one, I looked into the placement of static images to compile a series of triptych sequences in order to narrate a story; the photo montage initiates a fascinating exploration into time-lapse photography. I used this concept to develop part of the work that denotes the artist-documentarian position. In experiment two, I looked into multi-perspective viewing via multiscreen editing. By compiling footage from recordings of different perspectives, such as the documenter, the subject and the space, I created a piece of multiscreen video work that illustrates the collaborative production that exists in art documentary practices. In experiment four, the concept of self-documentary was used to capture the artist-documentarian perspective, from handling cameras to wearing visual recording device on the body. In experiment six, the spherical footages prior to conversion were explored. Finally, in experiment five the horizontal composition was creatively explored in multiscreen viewing.

As result from these experiments, I have created the work with a combination of photographic and video collages to narrate the story of the artist-subject in her studio. In the starting sequences, I have used photo-collage to create a short introductory clip of how the artist-subject’s practice. In the second sequence, two videos were constructed and placed horizontally next to each other. One video was made via a wearable recording device, where the artist-subject worn the recorder on her head, and the second video is filmed through spherical recording device, where the camera-on-tripod is placed at the center of the studio. The layout of this video collage resembled a book layout, using the image referencing method, the author, the title of the work, and the duration of the video are clearly identifiable at the bottom of the video. In duration of the video, number of paragraph of texts appears at the lower-third of each video to explain the artist-subject way of practice. Both of these videos have been edited with video filters added, in addition to time-lapse, filters such as overlay, transitions and straight cut editing were used to present time and movements. In the spherical video, only one side of the recording were used to presents the artist-subject as she works, the space or surrounding where the artist practice, as well as documenter who were documenting. In contrast, the video where wearable technology was used, a more intimate view of the artist perspective can be viewed. The contrasting videos, were placed side-by-side, horizontally, to presents the two perspective of the artist-subject and the camera.
Without the vocal narration of the artist-subject and the documenter, the story is developed through text and sounds. The collaborative production between the photographer, the artist, and the tripod (where the spherical camera is position) extends its collaboration through the produsage of creative commons music material to further enhance the final video.

Overall, the work created are based on ‘artistic-impulse’ to document (White, 2016), as decision of technology, composition, and editing through the experiments process determined the final outcome of this video. As the cinema vérité placed the documenter-subject as active participants and contributors for the final work, this final video work also placed the artist-subject in an active documenter role.

![Figure: Joanne Chang Spherical Video Stills for Mary Hackett Work in Progress, 2016 (Melbourne, Victoria)](image)

**Collaborative Production**

For the final work under this title, I have created a 360-degree video work to presents how the artist-subject and the documenter works in one space. Even though, the artist and the documenter creative practices are entirely different, the viewer is presented with an overview of the ways artist-subject practices and the way documenter practices is shared in a seemingly equal shared experiences that is described by Ginsburg as ‘representational truth’ (2006).

Combining the two spherical videos together to create a stretched landscape, the video presented an abstract space in which the collaborative production between the artist and the documenter occurs. On the right-hand side of the video, viewer sees floating text describing the method of how the artist-subject practice while the background image reflects the space of the artist-subject’s studio. As the altered space have not been converted to spherical view, the viewer can see the artist-subject appearing at the two edge of the screen, whereas, the documenter can be viewed as moving in and out of the frame working to photograph the artist-subject. The
publish layout were used again for the composition of this video, where the image reference of
the artist, the art title, and the duration of the film is presented at the bottom of the video.
Simple edit and transitions were used to denote passing of time, and black & white with high
contrast filter has been used to emphasise the movement of the artist-subject and the
documenter-subject.

In the duration of the video, the subject-artist vocal commentary is presented in her own personal
words to how her art practice is developed through silver/blacksmithing. Additional to Hackett’s
commentary, common creative music material was used to enhance the monotonous nature of
the video. Other elements such as pop-up labels were presented as a way to introduce important
aspect of the artist-subject art-making. Influenced by Baldassari work mentioned in chapter three,
this piece of work labelled the material that the subject-artist mentioned in her commentary.

Overall, this video presented to the viewer the shared experience between the documenter and
the subject-artist. Furthermore, the interplay of observational and performative documentary by
the documenter-subject is also presented in this video, resembling Fiona Banner as the
documenter ‘performing’ documentary in front of the viewer in her life-writing work, the
documenter-subject is also performing the same role as both the documenter and the subject.
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*Figure 21: Joanne Chang, Spherical Video Stills for Mary Hackett Work in Progress, 2016 (Melbourne, Victoria)*

**Immersive Artist Practice**

For this final work in developing a new viewpoint in documenting, a 360-degree video work of
how the subject and the documenter worked together were created. Through filming, converting
and adding metadata, the video work is set up for the viewer to have an immersive experience,
using interactive and navigable functions through consumer and computer-mediated
technologies.
By combining the concepts derived from the Artist Documentarian and Collaborative Production video, this video includes multi-layering, speed-reversing and merging of two different videos. The result presented the ‘ghosting’ of the documenter as she moves in and out of the frame, suggesting traces of memory and fluidity of the documenter as she practices. In using pop-up text to describe the artist practices, the label also became directional to where the viewer should look as they immerse in the virtual reality experience. The placement of the camera during filming, positioned the viewer in the midst of the interactions between the artist and the documenter. The artist commentary and creative common music provided the soundtrack for the viewer to additionally immersed in the experience.

Overall, the online exhibition provides a wider view of the documenting process. Including the perspectives of both the subject and the documenter, the collaborative exchanges between subject and documenter show that technological development does create a view that values both the passivity and activity of both the documenter and the documented. By utilising wearable and spherical technologies to record, the role of the documenter and subject blurs, as the documenter becomes the documented and the documented becomes the documenter. The dual role of the artist-documentarian merges into one form in which the boundary between observational and participatory practice transforms into a position between the machine and the human. As human intervention in observational documentary practice can never be fully objective or be recognised as real, the machine (or technology) seems to slot into the role to provide a remotely-intervening objectivity.
Chapter 6: Conclusion for the Artist-Documentarian in the Electronic Age

This concluding chapter discusses the findings of the six experiments conducted. Through the use of various lens-based technologies, such as digital cameras, mobile devices, wearable technologies and spherical recording devices, it evaluates the findings and forms answers to the two research questions: How have technologies changed the practice of art documentary? And who is the artist-documentarian in the electronic age?

Through the six experiments conducted, three criteria were set. These include the effects of technology in documentary practice, the collaborative production of the subject and the artist, and the artist-documentarian position. Additionally, the final exhibited series of works is also discussed.

The Effects of Technology in Documentary Practice

In relation to how technologies have affected documentary practice, the findings from the experiments conducted suggest that, although technology enhances the accessibility and handleability in the documenter’s practice, the thought processes in thinking through logistics, ethics and methods of capturing remain the same. The current technologies assist with resolving issues arising from earlier documentary practices, such as broadening the scope of capturing by using a variety of lenses and accessories. They help to make the documenting experience more versatile and intimate, as lightweight and smaller handheld size devices allow the documenter to get closer to the action, but on the other hand they bring further invasiveness to the subject while the documenter is recording. Additionally, the consumer-grade quality of these technologies brings forth the issue of a lack in quality of the images the devices produce, as the consumer technologies used for these experiments suggest that the easier to handle a camera is, the lesser quality it has in its imagery.

However, the computer-mediated technologies in applications such as Instagram do assist with providing a remedy to the low quality of art documentary produced by these consumer-grade technologies. As the long editing process, has been shortened by the more formulated methods of computer formulas and algorithms, the role of editing in documentary practice has become more straightforward and predetermined. Furthermore, applications such as Instagram, YouTube and WordPress provide both the editing and the publishing platforms that assist with instantaneous publishing in social media.

In relation to the effects that technology innovation has on documentary practice for this experimental research, it shows that technological development does create views that value the duality of passivity and activity of the documenter and the documented. Additionally, the new wave of technologies does not substitute for experience, as claimed, but rather it adds to the experience, as the different placements of the wearable and spherical camera devices create an altered reality or extended set of perceptions in documenting and recording. The development of wearable technologies not only extends perception, but also encourages the documenting process to be self-initiated, as the placement of a camera on the body in a non-intervening way allows the dual role of an artist as well as a documenter.
The Collaborative Production that Emerges through Documentary Practice

The group of experiments has not only permitted testing of the technologies, but also explored the subject and documenter positions within documentary making. The findings from the research suggest the subject position in the documentary process is co-productive and performative. The subjects in these experiments had certain expectation and agendas set before committing to this research, whether the reason was that they wanted their work and practice to be documented for archival, marketing or artistic purposes, or they wanted to collaborate with the documenter to co-experiment with the current technologies that are available. In each session conducted, the subject had a strategy (unbeknown to the documenter) in their consciousness as to how or how not to re/act in front of the documenter and the camera. This subject’s approach was reflected in some footage collected, as the artist directed the documenter as to where and what to document, and so the results of the documentation construction suggest the experience was more of a guided tour from the artist to introduce their artwork to the documenter.

There are several considerations in reviewing these findings. The first factor is the comfort level between the subject and the documenter with what may be the reason for the subject’s willingness to open up their practices for documenting. Another factor is the scheduling planned for documenting each subject may have affected the data it produced; as each artist was in a different stage of art production, the coordination of the time and duration of documenting may not have always been optimal. The final consideration is the way that a camera is held and pointed by the documenter towards the subject directs how the subject reacts, acts or performs in front of the camera. In experiments where the camera (tablet and wearable cameras) was hidden from the artist’s and documenter’s view, the incidental images recorded were more naturalistic in comparison to a direct camera documenting approach.

Furthermore, the development of this experimental research into collaborative production altered the study from a collaboration between two people into the dual practice of the documenter and the device, as the documenter appeared in front of as well as behind the camera. The main creative output through this concept expands the photography convention from capturing what is in front of the camera to a desire to capturing every angle of the process.

The Artist-Documentarian

Finally, in the positioning of the artist-documentarian as a produser in the produsage age, the findings in these experiments suggest that the artist-documentarian body is fluid and that the thought process in the documentary-making process comes from personal and reflective practices. Aligning with the produser in the produsage age, the artist-documentarian continues to question the self and to embody the practice through the technologies used. The practice technique is always participatory and immersive; the artist-documentarian, like the produser, plays the roles of both the subject and the documenter. This research has constructed a body of video works that creatively interpret and portray the artist-documentarian’s position in the produsage age.
In the final exhibited work, the series of three video works represents the findings from the experimental research. By taking ideas from each experiment to construct the final series of work, these video works respond to the title of this research project, *Artist-Documentarian in the Electronic Age*. The artist-documentarian existed long before the industrial age, but what has changed in the past sixty years is how technological development has provided the artist-documentarian with wider options to document and publish their art. In using wearable and handleable devices, the artist-documentarian realise accessibility in self-documentary. Additionally, the development of computer-mediated technologies and social media networks has brought forth the capability to self-publish in sharing networks such as WordPress or YouTube applications offering free editing and sharing capabilities, as the instantaneous feeding of user-led content into the virtual network becomes habitual practice.

In the creative constructions for this research, the habitual practices of documentary become not only archival practice but also artistic practice. Because of the need to continuously feed content into the infinite virtual world, the artist-documentarian makes a creative point-of-difference through their post-production processing. The experimental constructions have taken on the imprint of the experimental film and video art genre in pushing boundaries within the medium. As the artist-documentarian understands and respects that modern documentary practice is inclusive of all factors surrounding the process as situationism suggest, the experiences of the documentation process are also shared experiences and thus should not hold single authorship. Instead, the artist documentary process should be a shared process in co-producing representational truth.
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Chronology of Research

Artistic Documentation:
- March 2015 Start of MFA research
- Experimentation:
  - Artist
    - 23/03/2015 Documentation #2
    - Tablet
  - Drawing
    - 31/03/2015 Documentation #4
    - Self
  - Experimentation
    - DSLR
      - Photography / Video
        - 14/04/2015 Documentation #5
        - Chris Warfield
  - Experimentation
    - DSLR / Tablet
      - Photography / Video
        - 14/04/2015 Documentation #5
        - Chris Warfield
  - Experimentation
    - DSLR / Tablet
      - 22-24/05/2015 Documentation #6
        - Key Aider, Amy Kraning
  - Experimentation
    - DSLR / GoPro
    - Photography / Video
      - 20/12/2016 Documentation #7
        - Lesley Drickhamer
  - Experimentation
    - DSLR / GoPro
      - India
      - Photography / Video
      - 20/12/2016 Documentation #8
        - Lesley Drickhamer

Self Documentation:
- 2009-Present
  - Creative Practitioner
  - Creative Space
  - Photo Documentary
- March 2015 Start of MFA research
- May 2015
  - Experimentation
    - Drawing
      - Self documenting
        - Travel
- August 2015
  - Experimentation
    - Drawing
    - Self documenting
      - Travel
- September 2015
  - Experimentation
    - Self Documenting
      - Travel
- June 2016
  - Experimentation
    - Self Documenting
      - Travel
- May 2016
  - Experimentation
    - Self Documenting
      - Studio
- September 2016
  - Experimentation
    - Self Documenting
      - 360 Capture
- October 2016
  - Experimentation
    - Self Documenting
      - Travel
**Location Map**

**Artist Documentarian in the Electronic Age**

This map marks the locations of the experimental documentary sessions conducted between 2015-2017.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Camera</th>
<th>Specifications</th>
<th>Software / Application</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Specifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canon EOS 5D Mark III</td>
<td>Digital single-lens reflex camera</td>
<td>Sensor: Full-frame CMOS 21.1 MP, ISO 100-12,800, 24.3 x 16.2 mm, Exif 8.3</td>
<td>Digital Print Pro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canon EOS 5D Mark IV</td>
<td>Digital single-lens reflex camera</td>
<td>Sensor: Full-frame CMOS 20.1 MP, ISO 100-25,600, 24.2 x 15.5 mm, Exif 8.3</td>
<td>Digital Print Pro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple iPhone 4</td>
<td>Smartphone with a 12 MP rear camera and 7 MP front camera</td>
<td>Camera: 12 MP, 7 MP, ISO 60-25,600, 40 x 30 mm, Exif 8.3</td>
<td>Apple Photos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoPro Hero Session</td>
<td>Action camera</td>
<td>Sensor: CMOS, ISO 80-25,600, 64 x 48 mm, Exif 8.3</td>
<td>GoPro HERO3+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple iPad mini 2 (16GB Wi-Fi)</td>
<td>Tablet with a 7.9-inch display</td>
<td>Camera: 5 MP, ISO 32-5,000, 40 x 30 mm, Exif 8.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoom H1n Portable Digital Recorder</td>
<td>Microphone with a 10-pin connector</td>
<td>Sensor: CMOS, ISO 80-12,800, 64 x 48 mm, Exif 8.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Digital Print Pro**: A digital photo printing software application that can create high-quality prints from digital cameras.

**Apple Photos**: The built-in Apple Photos app on iOS devices, which allows you to manage, view, and edit photos.

**GoPro HERO3+**: A compact action camera with a waterproof casing.

**Zoom H1n**: A portable digital recorder with a 10-pin connector for connecting to computers.

---

**Instagram**: A social media and photo-sharing platform that allows users to share photos and videos online.

**WordPress**: A popular content management system used for building websites, blogs, and other online projects.
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