MASTERARBEIT / MASTER'S THESIS

Titel der Masterarbeit / Title of the Master's Thesis

„Community-based Filmmaking within the Context of Community Arts"

verfasst von / submitted by

Mag.ª Veronika Hackl, BA

angestrebter akademischer Grad / in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts (MA)

Wien, 2016 / Vienna 2016

CONTENT

Acknowledgements

This work is a work of common creation. It would not exist without inputs and suggestions, careful reviewing and proof-reading, detailed lectorship, as well as moral backup of colleagues, family and friends. I thank all of you for your support.

I would also like to thank my interview partners and all those people I met during my fieldwork for sharing their thoughts on the topic, for reflections and debates and for giving me insights into their work.

And finally I would like to thank my supervisor for sharing my interest in the topic.

1. Introduction

1.1. Research Topic

The topic of my research is community-based filmmaking in the context of community arts. This topic is situated in the field of visual anthropology, as it deals with visual material and includes the analysis of videos to gain a deeper understanding of what the images themselves show, as well as of the processes through which they have been created. But it is also situated in the field of anthropology and arts, seeing art "as a mode of investigating the world" rather than "an object of enquiry" (Grimshaw/Owen/Ravetz 2010: 160). Art is not just the subject of my research, but it is also a field that has many affinities to anthropology, both in the method of research as well as regarding contents. It is part of the aim of this thesis to show such points of contact and I argue, following Marcus (2010) as well as Schneider and Wright (2010, 2013), that the boundaries between these disciplines are blurred.

Community-based filmmaking is a process of film production within a community. It is a process of common cinematic creation, where different opinions are heard and various perspectives are shown. It is one of the aims of community-based filmmaking to produce a product that can be shown to many since video is easily broadcast and makes it possible to spread a message. Nevertheless, this method has a strong emphasis on the process, because within this procedure images are created, ideas get formed, and decisions are made. The discussions and debates that come with it are a fundamental part of the strategy. In the context of community arts, community-based filmmaking is furthermore an artistic project with a strong focus on the creative process which results in a product that in the end is displayed rather than broadcast. Parameters such as originality or artistic value play an important part in community-based filmmaking. In either case, many actors are involved in this complex field and each of them has his/her own interests in the realisation of the project.

To position community-based filmmaking inside of the broader field of community arts makes it necessary to construct this field in different layers. First, it is inevitable to define community-based filmmaking as a process of common creation and show how this method is used, and which chances and limitations it has. Second, it is necessary to have a closer look at the concept of community arts, its different implementations and techniques. And finally, it is important to see how those two concepts are combined in community-based artistic video projects. This means that the field traced

in this thesis consists of two different approaches towards community-based filmmaking. One is situated in the area of community-based filmmaking as activism and is represented in this thesis through the work of the organisation InsightShare in Oxford, UK. The other is strongly embedded in the area of community arts, where filmmaking is just one of many forms of common artistic creation. The community arts organisation Jumblies Theatre in Toronto serves as an example of the latter.

InsightShare is a UK-based organisation that facilitates community video projects all around the world. Many of the projects are placed in rather small communities where participatory video is used as a way of addressing certain topics of interest. The team of InsightShare is rather small, with associated members who conduct video projects. InsightShare has a certain methodology of working with video, called participatory video-making, which can be applied to different fields and subjects such as human rights, conflict resolution, health, climate change, or community action to name just a few. Also, teaching this methodology and creating hubs of participatory video-making is an important part of the organisation's work.

Jumblies Theater, on the other hand, is a community arts organisation in Toronto, Canada, that works with people of different neighbourhoods of the city, such as a group of Tamil-speaking seniors in Scarborough or inhabitants of public housing in Etobicoke. It is a big organisation that consists of the main organisation and several so-called off-shoots that usually emerged out of temporary projects of Jumblies Theatre. The main characteristic of this organisation is a big pool of artists who are involved in different projects. Those artists have different backgrounds, such as theatre, design, visual arts, dance, etc. The diversity of artistic expertise that all those artists bring to the group is central for the way Jumblies Theatre works. Therefore, video work is one out of many practices that are used in their artistic work within different communities of Toronto.

While the work and method of InsightShare has been the starting point of this research project, the focus lies on the way how Jumblies Theatre uses community-based filmmaking within their community art. The research has been done in form of a multi-sited fieldwork between Rotterdam, Oxford, London, Toronto and Manitoulin Island, always following the relations between people, events and organisations, such as indicated by Marcus (2010). The space of my fieldwork also extended to the internet in form of google hangout and Skype talks, online discussions and E-mailing. A first initial research at InsightShare contributes additional knowledge and material, while the main fieldwork was done at Jumblies Theatre. The importance of multi-sitedness for this research shows in the fact that the two organisations I visited, InsightShare in the UK and Jumblies

Theatre in Canada, both work on an international level and the actors in this field are part of a network that allows more than one way to trace one back to the other.

During my field work at both of these organisations I followed the events, took part in classes and was actively involved in the projects or workshops during my stay. The main focus of my observations were the social relations between the people involved, how the artists, or facilitators respectively, interact with the community, and how social relations influence common creation and the other way around. Working with video includes certain technical issues and requires knowledge about exposure, lightening, or framing on the one hand, as well as storytelling on the other hand. In video work with communities, it is especially interesting to see how this knowledge is imparted and how the community gets engaged in this field.

Three case studies build the core of this thesis, two of them are taken from the work of Jumblies Theatre and one from InsightShare, in order to introduce an additional perspective. All three of them show how the above-mentioned approaches are implemented. Each of them examines the aims of the projects, the role of the different actors, the project genesis as well as the outcome.

1.2. Genesis of the Research Interest and Field Approach

In the following chapter I would like to sketch how my research interest developed and how I came to choose the organisations for my fieldwork. My personal examination of the overall topic of community arts started with an internship in an organisation that also combines community work with arts, but the general interest in social aspects of art traces back much longer, as this was a central interest of my art history studies. I should like to state that I am still working in the field of community work in relation to arts. And, while this master thesis has taken shape, I have also started to conduct community-based video projects as part of my work. While many of the insights I gained through this research helped me to develop my own practical work, these first attempts of implementing some of my theoretical knowledge also helped me to understand better what I had first heard and witnessed as a researcher. Again, I want to underline the connection between art and anthropology, which is in my case represented by the critical researcher who wrote this master thesis as well as the hopeful activist who tries to transfer it into practice.

The Community Arts Festival in Rotterdam (ICAF) 2014 was the starting point for this research and

should help me to narrow down my research interest. The sixth edition of this Festival took place at the end of March 2014 and lasted for five days. During those days, the work of artists and groups in the areas of dance, theatre, film, visual art, site-specific performance, music and new media was presented. It was especially noticeable that not only a broad range of artistic genres was represented, but participants also used a broad range of (self-)definitions regarding the term 'community arts' and opinions on what it would need to have a successful community arts project (field notes, Mar. 26, 2014). This is important to understand my doubts concerning these definitions and the need to clarify those by close reading of literature on the subject that will be presented in the theoretical part of this thesis. All the artists that were part of the festival worked with different methodologies and diverse emphases, such as body-centred dance performance, biographic theatre work, large-scale public art, to name just a few. Many of the informal conversations that I had during the festival influenced my perception of community arts and guided my research questions as well as the interest I had and have in this field.

Among all those workshops, one stood out because of its difference: the one of InsightShare on participatory video making. InsightShare does not define itself as a community arts project but an organization that carries out communal video projects. Interestingly, they were invited by the festival director Eugène Van Erven because of their "well-established methodology", according to Nick Lunch, one of the founders of InsightShare, and they in turn wanted to profit from artistic approaches of storytelling and oral history to be used in their projects (informal talk with Nick Lunch, field notes, Mar. 26, 2014). This connection between participatory video and community arts was highly interesting to me, mainly considering the questions of which concepts these two approaches have in common and how they differ, as well as the strengths and weaknesses of each approach. New media is playing a growing role in community arts, a field traditionally focused on performative arts such as theatre or dance. In one of my first days at the festival I talked to a dancer who stated that, through working with the own body, people get a feeling for their body which makes them more self conscious even outside of dance lessons. And I asked myself the simple question: "How can this work with visual arts and media? Self- consciousness through the product? Or the process?" (field notes, Mar. 29, 2014).

I will therefore concentrate on the use of video in the context of community arts. I will have a look on how video is used and which processes underlie the production. I ask questions such as: Which power relations are implicit in such projects? Who leads and guides the process and who makes decisions? What is the aim and what do participants get out of this process? How is community

built in this context?

After I had met Nick Lunch and Gareth Benest – the former being the founder of InsightShare, the latter its programme director – at ICAF festival, I contacted them to see if a research at InsightShare was possible. Unfortunately, I was not allowed to accompany an entire participatory video project, but was rather invited to assist in a training course for facilitators and visit the organisation in Oxford. This is how I came to conduct the initial part of my research in September 2014. To cover the area of community arts I directly contacted the Toronto-based community arts organisation Jumblies Theatre with the help of my colleague at work (at Stand129, a community project of Caritas Vienna). Before my time in the organisation, Ruth Howard – director of Jumblies Theatre – had visited Brunnenpassage, another community arts space run by Caritas in Vienna, to present her work and methodology. As I had heard much about her and her organisation and was impressed by the quality of her work, I was intrigued to find out her way of using community-based filmmaking. I was invited to conduct research with them, which I did from December 2014 to January 2015.

This work is an attempt to understand the many layers that act together and how they facilitate the building of community in this field. It is also the aim of this thesis to take a critical view on the practices of community-based filmmaking inside and outside of the context of community arts, always considering the genesis of the projects and the involvement of the community members in the process. This research aims at an illustration of methods of facilitation in community-based video projects within and outside of the community-arts context. During my research in Toronto it became clear that the video works of Jumblies Theatre are very closely bound to their general way of working with communities. The two case studies of Jumblies' video projects show recurrent methods, but also highlight differences in the approach of different artists. Community work is always personal and the way such projects are executed is highly bound to the characters involved. The case studies are used to show common characteristics as well as differences in the approach of Jumblies Theatre. A third case study focuses on a different perspective on community-based video-making outside of the community arts context, which shows community-based video-making techniques according to InsightShare's methodology. In this case, the facilitators are supposed to keep entirely in the background and lead the participants to develop their own video, according to their needs and wishes. The third case study adds additional value as it opens the vision on community-based filmmaking again and makes both ways of working more tangible.

Apart from my own ethnographic research, a detailed study of literature on the subject gives further

insight into current debates on community arts. My aim is to use this literature to sketch the limits of community arts while also highlighting its potential within other relational artistic practices.

1.3. Research at InsightShare and Research Methods

While the organisation InsightShare is based in Oxford, United Kingdom, it holds participatory video projects all over the world. Main target groups of InsightShare are supposedly marginalized people who, through the means of participatory video, find new ways to express themselves and call attention to local problems and possible solutions, as InsightShare claims. Usually, InsightShare is commissioned by NGOs or other organisations that work within different communities and often have specific topics that the project should deal with, such as permaculture in Nepal, conflict resolution in Ivory Cost, or others. It is part of their methodology that each and every step – from the first draft of concepts, the storyboard, filming, etc., until the final editing – is led and done by the group itself and everybody is participating in an equal way. There is no division of labour but every person is encouraged to and enabled to do every single step. Roles are switched continuously during the tasks. The whole process is accompanied by the team of InsightShare, without them actively taking part in any of the tasks mentioned above. Chris Lunch, an anthropologist and, together with his brother Nick, founder of InsightShare, developed this method out of the need to find ways of giving people the chance to express themselves rather than being observed (field notes, Mar. 29, 2014). Participatory Video making for them is a step from participatory observation into action. In the ideal case, the participants decide for themselves what they want to talk about, and how they want to present it, and they create their own product where their voices are heard and their stories are listened to. After around fifteen years of experience, InsightShare work with many NGOs all over the world. They have built various hubs that work independently on local projects and they train new facilitators in participatory video in their biannual training courses. This is how InsightShare works on building a legacy, an important aim of their methodology.

My research at InsightShare took place between September 21 and October 1, 2014. It should be seen as an initial research to acquire knowledge about the method of participatory video-making, as well as getting to know the organisation and its members, and learning about some of their projects. The data I collected during my stay serve as additional material to the the research at Jumblies Theatre.

During my stay with InsightShare, I participated in a 6-day training course for participatory video

facilitators led by Sara Asadullah, Soledad Muñiz and Marleen Bovenmars. The active participation in the course helped me to learn about InsightShare's methods and strategies and to allow a deep insight in and increase the understanding of their methodology. The other participants of this course were seven women and four men from England, Scotland, France, Italy, Thailand, Australia and the USA. The participants were between twenty-five and fifty-five years old and most of them were sent by the organisation they work for, while some of them intended to use participatory video as freelancers. InsightShare teaches its methods in a very hands-on way and explains the techniques through implementing each step as they usually do in projects. Thus I was somehow experiencing the perspective of a participant, while also debating about the implementation and the use of each step with the other course participants, which allowed me to get a glimpse at both sides of the process (the participant's as well as the facilitator's). The participation in the course further facilitated the contact to possible interview partners among the trainees as well as trainers and InsightShare associates.

The method used during my stay was first and foremost participatory observation during the course, which aimed at 1) exploring group formation and social processes during the training, 2) understanding the role of the facilitator in the participatory process and 3) experiencing the role of a participant / active part of a participatory video process with all the challenges involved (speaking in front of a camera, self- representation, positioning oneself in the group, etc.). Numerous informal talks and some shorter interviews with the participants and trainers completed this picture and were all documented in form of protocols in the field diary at the end of the day. I talked to the trainees about their experiences with participatory video and their reasons for attending the course, about their expectations and impressions of the methodology. Some of these conversations took place after the training course, which allowed a longer and more concentrated talk. The keeping of a field diary was in itself one of the most important methods during this initial research phase, as it allowed continuous reflection and helped to shape the research interest.

Detailed interviews with the trainers Sara Asadullah and Soledad Muñiz were made after the course both in Oxford and in London. Two more interviews, with InsightShare programme director Gareth Benest and photographer Ingrid Guyon, had to be done later via Skype due to short-time schedule difficulties. The latter is director of the participatory photography project Fotosynthesis and co-operated closely with InsightShare over a long period at the so-called London Hub, where several community arts projects worked together under one roof, but which was later cut down due to internal difficulties as well as political decisions. The beginning and end of the London Hub was a

central topic in these interviews and gave important insights into funding and administrative challenges in such projects. Sara Asadullah's latest projects in the UK, which I found most interesting for my research, were also a central theme in those interviews. One of them, "Welcome to the UK" serves as the third case study of this master thesis.

Marleen Bovenmars proved to be an important source of information and door opener. In her role as Operations Manager she gave further information about project logistics and gave me access to some of the organisation's archives and library at InsightShare's office in Oxford. Nevertheless, most of the material I ended up using is accessible on their very comprehensive homepage.

Informal talks were very important during all stages of this initial research phase. Many of them took place during or after the training course, at lunch time or in the office with Marleen Bovenmars. Often, these situations did not allow for more formal interviews, but the knowledge collected little by little through informal talks proved to be extensive and illustrative. Some of these informal talks continued after the training course in form of online discussions in a common google group, google hangout and Skype talks, which were held by the trainees to exchange experiences and ideas and which I also used to collect additional material about the facilitation of community-based film projects, about challenges and considerations as well as general thoughts on the topic from part of the participatory-filmmaking facilitators who had just completed their training.

The data collected during that part of my fieldwork encompass: protocols of participant observation during the training; protocols of informal talks during and after the training course as well as interviews; personal notes; collective notes concerning methods and reflections that were done during the course by all participants (in form of photo-documentation of the notes in the workshop space as well as shared documents); audio recordings from two short interviews with participants as well as the two long interviews with Sara Asadullah and Soledad Muñiz; recordings or notes from skype interviews; video material that was produced during the training as well as literature and video resources available from InsightShare. As for the analysis of the data, I consider this stage of my fieldwork as the first part of the ethnographic sampling where first codes are developed. Knoblauch et al state that "ethnographic sampling starts with questions of access to social situations" and that both "ethnographic sampling and the sampling of video data for analysis are iterative processes" (Knoblauch et al. 2014: 445). In case of video analysis, "coding consists of identifying fragments that can be subjected to a fine-grained sequential analysis" (ibid). They further state that video recordings have to be seen as data, and not material, as they are actively

constructed. Their description of video analysis refers to videography, which means data induced by the researchers (Knoblauch et al. 2014: 437). Yet in my case, I consider the videos material, as they have not been produced by myself, but rather by "the actors involved", and it is part of the analysis to understand the intentions that guided this production (ibid: 436). Nevertheless, the field notes that I produced during the field research, as well as comments on and questions about the videos can be considered data, as they involve a first phase of immediate interpretation. DeWalt and DeWalt (2002) refer to coding as an open process of "abstracting and interpreting ideas contained in the data themselves", which therefore serves the generation of emic categories (DeWalt and DeWalt 2002: 167).

It is necessary to emphasize that this was only the first part of a longer process. This first sampling and coding led to the second stage of my fieldwork at Jumblies Theatre in Canada. Further analysis of the material collected in Oxford was done later in the course of the ethnographic description of the third case study. The video analysis of this case study was done in analogy to the first two case studies and will be explained in the next chapter.

1.4. Research at Jumblies Theatre and Research Methods

The central part of the research took place at Jumblies Theatre, a Toronto based community arts organisation, as well as its off-shoots Arts4All, MabelleArts and Community Arts Guild respectively. They all emerged from the work of Jumblies Theatre in the different Neighbourhoods of Toronto. A fourth off-shoot, Making Room, counts as an "adopted" off-shoot, as there was no prior project of Jumblies before they started their work, but they are nevertheless closely connected to Jumblies and its artists (field notes, Dec. 13, 2014).

Jumblies Theatre and its off-shoots in Toronto emerged from the work of Artistic Director Ruth Howard, who works with different forms of socially engaged performance and theatre. Her first theatre production had a preliminary lead time of about two years. Over two hundred people were engaged in the play, taking on a particular role in front of or behind the curtains. Costume designers, musicians, photographers, stage designers, etc. were all part of this long-term process. After Ruth Howard, who gained her experience in this field with community plays in England, had founded the organisation Jumblies Theatre, more multidisciplinary and multilingual theatre performances were produced, each of them accompanied by many workshops and events. All of them developed over a couple of years each. According to Ruth Howard, the work of Jumblies Theatre is based on the

principle of highlighting each and everyone's talents, so that everybody can contribute to the final play in a way that suits him or her. That is how each production takes shape and develops during the process according to the people who participate (field notes, Dec. 13, 2014). Furthermore, each of the off-shoots mentioned above emerged from one of these projects. Each of them specializes in different themes, such as transformation of public space (MabelleArts), site-specific visual art (Making Room), performance (Arts4All), or storytelling (Community Arts Guild). More recently, Jumblies At the Ground Floor was opened in 2014 as a new space that focusses on interdisciplinary installations, performances and oral history. Nevertheless, each off-shoot uses more than one artistic technique and as the artists switch from one off-shoot to another, so the focuses change. Most of the projects involve a combination of various art forms, video being one of them.

Community arts are highly seasonal and are usually divided into periods of project development and periods of project implementation. At the end of each term, after a couple of months, the projects are presented in a celebratory event, where participants, artists and affiliates come together to present their work and exchange thoughts about it. At Jumblies Theatre it is customary that artists who work on other projects come to these events to support their colleagues, but also because it is one of the few opportunities for them to see the work of the other off-shoots, as usually there is little time for exchange (field notes, Dec. 12, 2014). The time during which I conducted my research gave me the opportunity to witness such project presentations at the off-shoots. It also allowed me to assist in the community arts training course Artfare Essentials, which takes part once a year. During my research I conducted interviews with artists, interns, participants and trainees, took part in several community arts events and was furthermore invited to various private events, during which both community and art were always present. To clarify where and how I collected the data for the empirical part of this thesis, I would like to briefly sketch the frame and different settings of my research in the following paragraphs.

The research took place in Toronto between December 11th, 2014 and January 18th, 2015. The main elements of my fieldwork were: participant observation, semi-structured and unstructured interviews, informal talks, keeping a field diary as well as archival work. In the first week of my stay, I assisted in the course Artfare Essentials, a training course for people interested in community arts. This helped to a) get a quick overview of and insight into Jumblies activities as well as methodology, b) get to know most of the Jumblies staff and create contacts and c) further develop my research interest according to the reality I faced. During that time, I participated in all the activities as well as observed what was happening during the course and I wrote a detailed field

diary in the evenings. My main focus and interest during that time was to understand the structure of the organisation and the way they work. How do projects develop? Where do they get funding and how? How do the artists work together and how closely are the different off-shoots linked? But also, more generally, what do they understand as community art and what are the communities they work with?

I assisted at various events during the time of my stay. The first one was a presentation and seasonal closure in the form of an exhibition/ installation at the off-shoot Making Room. At this event I met many of the artists who work for Jumblies and its off-shoots, as well as former interns, friends, and of course participants. Some concepts that were later explained as essential in their work became already clear from my first observations at this event, such as the importance of presentation and celebration, of the participants being in the spot-light, of sharing food together etc. I also realized the strong commitment of the artists and their strong relation to each other. Many of the questions that I had after this event accompanied my research from then on. The second event took place during the Artfare Essentials and was the seasonal closure of Arts4All at Davenport Perth. The group of training participants joined the Arts4All players (this is what regular participants are called there) and developed a short performance together that was then presented. The Arts4All players and their activities will be important for the first case study in this thesis. The following day, I joined a workshop of the Community Arts Guild together with some of the Artfare Essentials participants. The workshop was held with a group of Tamil seniors, who will be important for my second case study. Outside of Jumblies Theatre I took part at a winter solstice celebration with a performance by community artists who are partly connected to Jumblies and its off-shoots, where many of the artists were present and I got connected to other community artists who work in different projects. In January, I took part in the first workshop of the year at Making Room, as well as observing a workshop that Ruth Howard did together with artists and interns of Jumblies at the University of Toronto to a group of students of mixed fields of study. I also took part in a try-out that the artist Shifra Cooper did in a small group to test a workshop session she had under construction and I witnessed the presentation of Sonja Rainey's exhibition that summed up her year as Jumblies intern through a grant by Metcalf Foundation. Furthermore, I took part in the so-called Mockjury, a simulation of a jury process for arts funding that was held by Jumblies together with Ontario Arts Council and Toronto Arts Council Community Arts funding officers to show young artists how such processes work in order to prepare them for future applications, and I observed a meeting of Platform A, which is a programme funded by the Toronto Arts Council to connect different Toronto community arts organisations.

During my stay I conducted a total of eighteen interviews with the Artistic Director Ruth Howard and the Managing Director Keith McNair from Jumblies Theatre, the Artistic Directors of Jumblies' off-shoots Liz Rucker (Arts4All), Leah Houston (MABELLEarts), Beth Helmers (Community Arts Guild) and Michael Burtt (Making Room); with seven artists who are associated to one or various of these organisations; with four interns, two of whom had already known Jumblies as participants in their childhood; with one participant of Jumblies at the Ground Floor and two participants of the Artfare Essential training course, one of them being the artistic director of a community arts organisation in Winnipeg (Columpa Bobb). Some of the interviews were conducted with two persons at the same time (interns), with others (mainly the video artists) I met more than once. The questions that guided these conversations naturally depended a lot on the role of the interviewees. While I asked the participants (both of the workshops and of the training course) about their experiences with and around community arts, about their reasons for participation and their view on certain topics, such as the appreciation of the process and the importance of the product, amongst other things, when talking to the artists, the focus was much more on issues of facilitation, the work with different groups, ethics, and so on. The interviews with the artists also covered their own experiences and how they came to work in this field, and were sometimes very specifically focussed on the genesis of certain projects. Some of these interviews were long conversations, where topics emerged from the talk and I also brought my personal opinions into the conversation for debate. During the course of my stay, some key words crystallized as the most important ones in almost every conversation. Those key words were: participation, inclusion, facilitation, ethics, aesthetics, ownership, as well as authorship.

I would like to stress again the importance of informal talks and conversations that I had during my whole stay in addition to these formal interviews. Ideas developed over time and diving into this community of community artists, helped me a lot to understand their approach towards art, community and life. These conversations took place during the Artfare Essential course with the artists as well as the participants, they took place at each of the events mentioned above as well as during the time I spent at the Ground Floor with or without specific events taking place. They also took place in streetcar rides, at a birthday party and during a Hanukkah celebration, to name just a few examples.

During the time of my research with Jumblies, I also had the chance to make an excursion of a couple of days to visit Debajehmujig Storytellers at Manitoulin Island in northern Ontario. I met the artistic director Joe Osawabine and Administrative Director Joahnna Berti during Artfare Essentials

in Toronto. As they had a strong interchange with InsightShare during ICAF 2014 in Rotterdam and were about to install a media centre in their company, they were also interested in my research and we both profited from my visit up north. I got insights into the way the company works and how productions are usually made. Winter is a very slow period in their work, because most of the productions take place in summer. However, I learned about the approach of the company which does not only do theatre productions, but also grows food for their common supply and works together with international WWOOFers (World Wide Opportunities on Organic Farms)[1] and trains students. Joe Osawabine was my most important informant during that stay. I accompanied him to various events on the island and did a detailed interview with him, partly about their video work, as well as about their collaboration with ICAF and other European community arts organisations. This connection shows again how the agents in this field are linked and how important personal connections are for the development of their work (even more than local proximity).

Data and Analysis

The data I collected encompass visual material (which includes both photos and short videos that I took during my stay as well as photos and videos that I got from the organisations' archives and that were given to me by the artists), audio material (recorded interviews as well as discussions), digital as well as handwritten notes and additional material in form of flyers, leaflets, small publications and magazines from the Jumblies' archive.

To be able to analyse this material, careful archiving and selecting were necessary. Part of the sampling and coding was already done during the fieldwork, which means that important categories and key concepts were educed already in the field. In my case, recurrent themes that first appeared as key words (participation, inclusion, facilitation, ethics, aesthetics, ownership and authorship) in interviews and informal talks as mentioned above, were later especially considered in the process of coding.

Afterwards, with some distance to the field, a more detailed selection was made. The recorded interviews were transcribed in parts and with special focus on 1) the key concepts and themes that proved to be important throughout the research, 2) the selected case studies, which include

---

1   WWOOF is a worldwide network that links volunteers with organic farms. It is possible to stay at one farm for a longer period time and work in exchange for food and accommodation. It is also possible to stay for just a few days at each place and use this network to travel across a country.

background information on the production and project genesis, the process of the production itself as well as personal and general reception, and 3) personal experiences and interpretations of the interviewees. Reiterated screening of the transcripts and field notes led to a selection of emic codes that were later arranged by recurrent themes, paraphrased and commented. These sets of data were then further densified and connected to theoretical approaches for analysis. In a further step three case studies were selected to exemplify the themes and build a narration. Two of them come from Jumblies off-shoots and one from InsightShare.

Each of these case studies has one video production (in one case two separate videos) at its core. The analysis of each of these examples includes a visual analysis of the videos as well as the genesis of the production and its context. Pink (2007) states that "(a)nalysis is not a simple matter of interpreting the visual content of photographs and video, but also involves examining how different producers and viewers of images give subjective meanings to their content and form" (Pink 2007: 119). In the first place I use the videos as material for a visual analysis with a focus on composition (mise-en-scene), camera work (cinematography), sound and editing. I take the videos, especially those of Jumblies Theatre, as an artistic product, as an entity. The first analysis therefore concentrates on the content as well as the technique of the video. It narratively describes the contents while focussing at the same time on above-mentioned elements of film analysis (see Bordwell and Thompson 2008).

The additional data, such as interviews, field notes, etc., are used to explain the meanings that are given to them by their producers and viewers. An ethnographic description of the setting, the project genesis and a contextualisation are further fundamental parts of each case study. The meanings of images are made at three different sites, according to Rose (2007): how the image is made (*site of production*), what it looks like (*site of image or object itself*) and how it is seen (*site of audiencing*) (Rose 2007: 13). The latter is represented in my research mostly through secondary data, in form of interviews and informal conversations with participants as well as artists. The focus, however, lies on the site of production and the site of the image (the video or the performance) itself.

1.5. Main Theories and Structure

The theories that most encouraged my research in the beginning were the ones that concern general relations between the disciplines of art and anthropology. First and foremost the works of Schneider

and Wright (2006, 2010, 2013), who continuously explore the encounters between the two disciplines and argue that it is no longer necessary to see if these two disciplines have something in common, rather they call for a discussing of how these two disciplines can benefit from each other, both on a practical and a theoretical level (Schneider and Wright 2013: 6). In their anthology "Between Art and Anthropology" (2010) the contribution of Anna Grimshaw, Elspeth Owen and Amanda Ravetz "Making Do: The Materials of Art and Anthropology" (2010) provides insights into their experience with visual media in theory and practice, as well as assumptions about art and anthropology in different contexts. Once the similarities between the two disciplines are established, it is possible to think further how methodologies of the one can enrich the practices of the other and vice versa. Other inspirational texts I would like to mention, are Anna Grimshaw's "The Ethnographer's Eye" (2001), which offers a general discussion of vision in anthropology, and George Marcus' Article on "Contemporary Fieldwork Aesthetics in Art an Anthropology" (2010) which highlights the affinities between art and anthropology in research and thinks through what anthropology could learn from artistic practices such as conceptual, performance and installation art.

I will now give a short overview of the main theories discussed in the text by simultaneously explaining the structure of this thesis. This master thesis is divided into seven chapters. After the introduction, a second chapter will present the organisations InsightShare and Jumblies Theatre in greater detail by giving concrete examples of their way of working and introducing the most important actors for this research. The presentation of the organisations is supposed to help the reader to understand the setting of the research, as well as to show the organisational structures behind the projects.

In chapter three, I offer some theoretical considerations on community-based filmmaking based on visual anthropological literature by, e.g., Sarah Pink (2007) and Claudia Mitchell (2011) as well as articles on participatory video, e.g. Low et al. (2012) and White (2003). Considerations of the importance of the product will be treated here, as well as questions on whether or not participatory videomaking can be empowering for the participants. In chapter four, I present three case studies, two by Jumblies Theatre, and one by InsightShare. I localize these case studies in their local context and trace their project genesis to show the underlying structure and steps that lead to the final product. The ethnographic description of these settings is accompanied by a visual analysis of the videos. Bringing together the knowledge of the ethnographic description and the visual analysis deepens the findings on how the people involved interact and which relations are built in this

process in order to and by way of producing the video.

In a fifth chapter, I offer "An Attempt at Defining Community Arts" in order to develop a theoretical discussion on the topic and give an overview of current debates in this field, by use of current literature on community arts and other contemporary art forms. As a starting point, I took Nicolas Bourriaud's "Relational Aesthetics" (2002), which describes relation as central moment for new tendencies in the art of the 1990s. This concept will be contrasted by other ways of interpreting the interaction in relational artworks. Pascal Gielen (2011) differentiates allo- and auto-relational, digestive, and subversive tendencies and designs a map of community arts to facilitate a localization of such art practices in between these forces. Claire Bishop (2012) offers a historical approach on community arts in the UK and sets community arts in the context of other participatory art practices. Grant Kester (2011) highlights the importance of art institutions to legitimize these new forms of artistic practices and also emphasizes the need for new forms of art criticism to do justice to what he calls "dialogical" art practices.

This theoretical discussion is complemented by chapter six, which focusses on (anthropological) perspectives on community arts. Kate Crehan's (2011) study of Free Form Arts Trust is the most important resource for this undertaking. She helps to understand the distribution of expertise in community arts and the importance of workshop-based co-creation. This chapter also offers some examples of other artistic practices to contrast them and see different ways of engagement of the community. This examples are taken from Roger Sansi (2015), amongst others, who looks at artistic practice as a tool for constituting social relations. In contrast to the positive approach of the writings of practitioners (both in community arts as well as in participatory video), Sansi states that these relations are not necessarily empowering or liberating, but could also reproduce existing hierarchies. Which power relations exist in this field is also discussed by Kwon (2002), who gives valuable additional thoughts on the structures that underly community arts. When it comes to a demarcation between social practices and socially-engaged art, Jacques Rancière's "Aesthetic and its Discontents" (2009) offers a perspective on aesthetics that provides space for political transformation.

Finally, and leading to the conclusion, chapter seven discusses the notions of inclusion, production and reception in order to link findings of the empirical part with theoretical considerations. Jumblies' strategies of inclusion are discussed, pointing out the important factors of time and place and the importance of structuring a project in different phases in order to deal with fluctuation. The

long-term process of community building is also discussed, including a closer look on the relationship between artists and participants, as well as the community of community artists. Questions of how the product can be influenced by certain techniques and tricks are debated alongside questions of whether or not a product should be polished up. At the end of the chapter, the focus lies on the question if community arts are or should be included in a general discourse of art. Van Erven (2013) argues for the need of specialized critics and a criticism that values the relational and dialogical aspects of community arts rather than separating the product from the process, as will be shown in chapter seven.

2. Presentation of the Organisations

2.1. Jumblies Theatre and its Off-shoots

> *About fifteen seniors are in the room when we enter. Some of them are sitting around a table, eating snacks, others are talking or just looking around. I feel like I have entered a home for the elderly, while in fact we are in a community health centre[2]. The group is part of a Health and Wellness programme for Tamil-speaking seniors. There is also a younger woman waiting for us who turns out to be the translator working in this programme. The artists greet her amicably and also say hello to the seniors, ask how they are doing and cheerfully explain that they are pleased to see them. After this first greeting, we all move tables and chairs and sit down in a circle in the middle of the room. The artists welcome everybody and explain who we are (the group of Artfare Essentials training). My neighbour welcomes me and asks my name. She introduces herself and tells me that she has been coming here for a long time. For an introduction, everybody is called upon telling their names and doing one movement. Beth gives an example. She tells her name and makes a far-reaching movement with her hands. The translator translates into Tamil. One after another, we tell our names and do a movement. Some stand up to do so, others stay seated. While the Artfare Essentials training participants all invent new movements, the seniors often do the same movement that Beth did or at least try to reach out as far as their bodies allow. One after another, this movement continues to be used and "interpreted" similar to Chinese whispers or the telephone game[3]. In between, the artists give comments like "your name...AND a movement" or "now you", "mhm, next one" and the translator too gives some comments for her part. After that, Beth and Sean further explain what we are going to do in this session and explain that we will work with the idea of going to the dark and coming into light, as winter solstice is coming soon. The translator translates. The artists talk very slowly and often repeat. Everything takes a lot of time. In between my neighbour talks to me in broken English with a strong accent and is seemingly interested in all the new people that have joined the group. In the middle of the first exercise, a man stands up and leaves the room. Now only women are in the room, except for the artist Sean Frey and two men of our group from Essentials. (Field notes, Dec. 17, 2014)*

This note is taken from my field diary and explains the first workshop session I attended, together with a group of participants of Artfare Essentials training, with the Community Arts Guild in Scarborough. I take this as an example to introduce Jumblies' methodology in their community work. After the section described in my transcript, the workshop continued in small groups where we were supposed to develop movements according to the given themes (going to the dark and coming into light). Communication became a lot harder in these small groups as the translator could not be with all of us at the same time. I noticed that many of the Artfare Essentials trainees somehow took the lead in their group and tried to explain the task again and again to the seniors and encourage them to develop different movements. One group was also assigned to do some music.

---

2 The local health centre is called The Hub Mid-Scarborough and offers services provided by the Scarborough Centre for Healthy Communities. See: http://www.schcontario.ca/programs-and-opportunities/community-engagement/hub-mid-scarborough .

3 In the original field notes, I noted down „Stille Post", the German name for this children's game.

The two men in our group took over this task, as both of them were musicians, as well as some of the seniors. While the small groups were developing and exercising the moves, the artists Beth Helmers and Sean Frey prepared a small stage, consisting of two chairs, each with a tall pole attached to it, which again served to hold a sheet which was spread between them. They directed a spotlight at this screen and placed a bare branch close to the light. On the other side of this screen, chairs were put up for the audience. Now the artists explained that we were going to show our movements, each group at a time, entering the scenario from one side, executing the movements behind the screen and leaving on the other side, clearing the space for the next group. The groups which were waiting for their turn could sit down in front of the screen and watch the scenario as audience. During the whole time, the music group gave the soundtrack to this little performance with percussion and ambient sounds.

It is crucial to see the way in which a two-hour workshop can lead to a small performance. Jumblies and its off-shoots try to make sure that there is a certain outcome to all of their workshops or at least to a series of workshops. Even if these lead to a bigger production at the end, the participants see the results on a small scale and get direct feedback to what they have been doing. The performance described here is simple and unpretentious, but beautiful despite and at the same time due to the basic materials. Shadow play is an easy but powerful way to produce appealing images. The artists pimp the outcome by small interventions, such as the branch that they added in this case. On the screen its shadow appears to be a big winterly tree and the spot of the spotlight appears to be the faint sun that tries to regain its power after winter solstice. Even tough the movements might be clumsy or lack variation, I introduce this workshop because there for the first time it became visible to me, how these basic elements could lead to an impressive outcome with just a little more time, exercise and a story. These aspects should be kept in mind, as I will later come back to them in one of the case studies.

Jumblies Theatre used to work in form of multi-year residencies in certain districts of Toronto which later continued in the legacy of the so-called off shoots. These districts are: Davenport West (now Arts4All with Artistic Director Liz Rucker), Etobicoke (now MABELLEarts with Artistic Director Leah Houston), and Scarborough (now Community Arts Guild with Artistic Director Beth Helmers). Each of these residencies followed a similar structure. First there is a research and development phase, were the core team goes to the place, meets people, offers artistic activities and does so-called arts-based research. Arts-based research refers to artistic techniques to collect people's stories and learn about their lives, background and the environment. The second phase is

about creation, when they "explore and invent form and content, and create the blueprint for a new hybrid work of art that is informed by the guiding artistic vision and the stories, landscape and cultures of the neighbourhood/ community" (Howard 2014: 11). After the creation follows the production, which is the densest and also most visible phase, when the work is presented in form of a production that includes an artistic team and hundreds of community members. This is the phase when the play itself gets shaped, costumes and props are made in workshops, roles are rehearsed, etc., until the final production is performed. After this climax comes the last phase, namely legacy and sustainability. This is usually when the off-shoots are built, an artistic director is named and further funding is applied for. Each of these phases lasts at least one year. In Ruth Howard's words this process can be summed up like this:

> This entire process is a continuum of relationship-cultivation; participatory activities; exploration of material; and social-aesthetic gatherings and events which gradually grow in scope and entanglement of elements, culminating in a large-scale production in the third phase (typically an interdisciplinary performance piece linked to a multi-media installation). Community participants, partners and professional artists are implicated from the start and in all phases. (ibid: 11)

One more off-shoot that is frequently referred to as "adopted" by Ruth Howard is located in Parkdale (Making Room with Artistic Director Michael Burtt). Adopted, in this case, means that there has not been a previous Jumblies residency in the area, but the organisation was founded by an associate of Jumblies Theatre, Michael Burtt, and closely works together with Jumblies and the other off-shoots. In 2006 Jumblies also developed the Jumblies Studio which is seen as the part of their work that is bound to learning, mentorship and research, and involves internships, workshops and seminars[4], as well as the above-mentioned Artfare Essentials training that takes place once a year in Toronto, but is also occasionally delivered in other regions of Canada. The latest of Jumblies' projects is called The Ground Floor. Since the beginning of 2014 Jumblies has run a studio and office in a new Toronto Community Housing building that is situated in the south of Toronto, close to the lakeshore. This area, the so-called CityPlace, is an area that has just recently been developed and mainly consists of condominium housing: skyscrapers with freehold flats. During the time of my research the newly-built library, a small park and one coffee shop were the only public places in this area. A fact that made many passers-by drop in at The Ground Floor to see what this space was all about.

To gain a deeper understanding of the way in which Jumblies and its off-shoots work, the following

---

4   Such as, for example, the workshop at University of Toronto that I attended during my fieldwork. It was led by Ruth Howard together with artists and interns and included a presentation of Jumblies' work as well as a practical artistic workshop for students from different fields of study.

statement of Marianne Alas, an artist who has been working with Jumblies for many years, serves to give another quick overview from an insider's perspective:

> MABELLE(arts) is the most visual. They do have big events but they are not that performance based. And they have the park there too [which they have built and transformed over the years, note]. We're outside a lot in the summer, which is nice. And it's really cool that we have that, considering it's such an urban place. In Arts4All we're inside all the time in a room without windows. It is more theatre based, but they do visual stuff as well.In Scarborough [Community Arts Guild, note] it's much more theatre based, there is usually a production that is happening. And The Ground Floor is like the new space. We've only been there for a year. We're doing drop-ins once a week.(...) It's also somehow a home base for Ruth's work. (…) So, I told you about Arts4All, Scarborough and Mabelle, and there are all different populations too, which is very interesting. At Mabelle, there's a lot of Somali and Bangladeshi and a lot of families. And there's a lot of kids involved and also seniors. At Arts4All it's mostly adults, and in Scarborough it's seniors, teens, and some families. But mostly seniors, surprisingly. (Interview with Marianne Alas, Jan. 5, 2015)

As Marianne is working for all these organisations, it is especially interesting to see how she describes the differences in working with each of them and her words are worth getting some more space:

> Yeah, it is definitely (hard to work in all of the off-shoots at the same time). Because people are very different in their leadership. Beth [Community Arts Guild] is very open to us doing our own projects and she's there to support us. But Leah [MABELLEarts] has a very strong vision of what she wants done... Liz [Arts4All] ... has also a very strong vision but she's not very good at saying what she wants. Which is a little tricky. Especially visually, because she wants us to work visually and she's not a visual artist and she cannot describe what she wants. Which is tricky. And also I feel like, as Arts4All has been there for so long, and so people have their expectations, they do know what they want to do and there is not so much space for changes and experiments like in other places. (Interview with Marianne Alas, Jan. 5, 2015)

This quote does more than just describing the styles of leadership of the different artistic directors. It also shows two interesting aspects concerning the artistic lead as well as the building of community: First, she refers to communication problems between the artists if they come from different fields. Working in a team of artists makes the sharing of ideas especially important. When the artistic lead comes from a different artistic background than the other artists, clear communication and a concrete vision are necessary for a successful output. Second, and even even more striking is the comment on the participants' expectations at Arts4All. As they are long-term participants, they have clear ideas on what to expect and seem not to be open to (artistic) experiments. From the viewpoint of the artist, this might be difficult. On the other hand, it shows active decision-making on the part of the community addressed.

Marianne Alas' case also shows, how funding processes are the necessary foundation for all community-arts work. Apart from the longer residencies that Ruth Howard initiated, the off-shoots basically work in the same way: They apply for funding for a project and then, depending on

whether it is granted or not, implement it. At Arts4All regular Monday sessions take place throughout the year and other special projects take place alongside, while at Community Arts Guild, funding is still more concretely tied to specific projects. Applying for funding means conceptualizing a project and describing it, drawing up a budget according to the needs such as space, resources, involved artists, time etc., and finally presenting it in an attractive, convincing way to the respective authorities. Marianne Alas states that "they never even tell me about which grant they write me in, which I'm grateful because I don't have to write grants. But also they know that I have to be there, and I have to be available" (Interview with Marianne Alas, Jan. 5, 2015). So it happens that sometimes all three of the Jumblies off-shoots count on her at the same time because once the funding gets granted, they have to start working. It is a practical approach to write these applications in that way because meticulous planning and coordinating between three or four organisations would take the time and energy needed for the actual work. For the artists, especially for the ones working on a contract basis and not as part of the core team, this requires a high level of flexibility.

Funding is fundamental for a successful community arts project and it is certainly part of Jumblies' success that Ruth Howard has a talent for and great expertise in grant writing. In the Artfare Essentials Companion – a guide of selected materials and texts for participants of this training – a whole chapter is dedicated to this topic, including a list of addresses where to apply for grants. Almost all of these are somehow funding Jumblies Theatre, either in the form of project funding and providing space or by way of grants for young artists in form of micro-grants or internships. Some of these fundings come from: the municipality, the province and the state (Toronto Arts Council, Ontario Arts Council, Canada Council for Arts; but also Toronto Community Housing, Ontario Trillium Foundation, a Gaming/Lottery fund etc.); private foundations (such as Metcalf Foundation, Toronto Community Foundation, others); as well as other funders such as local arts councils and boards.[5] One specific programme that I would like to mention is Platform A. This programme is funded by the Toronto Arts Council in order to "combine the strengths and experiences of four Toronto arts organisations (…) supporting a shared vision of sustainable and high-quality community arts practice, and providing new opportunities for emerging artists, youth and communities".[6] This platform serves as a means of exchange and sharing between different community arts projects of Toronto, but also provides special micro-grants for young artists.

---

5 A more complete list of Jumblies Theatre's funding can be found here:
   http://www.jumbliestheatre.org/jumblies/supporters/funders as well as on the websites of the off-shoots.
6 Quoted from Platform A website: https://platformatoronto.com/ .

Community arts are institutionalized and fostered in Canada and Jumblies regularly gets invited to work at specific places. There are, of course, political decisions involved. This setting prepares the ground for Jumblies' elaborate community arts projects involving many artists of different disciplines and several hundreds of participants.

2.2. InsightShare

A circle of chairs is prepared for the group to sit down. In its centre, a bag is placed. Nick from InsightShare is sitting in the circle as well, he turns to his neighbour on his right side and asks him to open the bag, see what is in there – it is a camera – and take it to have a look at it. The man carefully takes out the camcorder, moves it in his hands and looks at it. Nick watches him do so and step by step explains how to hold it, where to switch it on and where to press the record button. He does not go into detail about the technical aspects, nor does he explain more of the functions that the camera has. He just explains the steps from switching the camera on, to keeping it in a steady position and recording. While the man is still concentrated on the camera, Nick turns to the person who sits opposite to this man and encourages her to have a look at the camera bag too. What else is in there? The woman takes out a microphone and a cable, as well as a head set. Nick tells her to put the cable into the microphone and walk over to the man with the camera to see where to connect the microphone with the camera. Both are very careful in their handling of the camera set. Also, she is told to hand the headset to the man sitting next to the one with the camera and the three of them look for the input to connect it to the camera as well. Nick watches them and gives indications if needed. Nick explains that this is going to be a game to get to know each other. He tells the woman with the microphone to introduce herself to the camera, saying her name and the phrase "If I were an animal, I would be ...". He reminds the man with the camera to point it at her and record, whenever she is ready and he also tells the person with the headset to check the sound. After this first recording, all three of them are encouraged to hand their items to the person on their right sides and explain to them what they have just been told. Before handing over the camera, Nick tells the man to switch the camera off again, put on the cap of the lens and fold the screen as if he would pack it back to the bag. This way, the next person gets the camera in the same state as the first one and the one who has just done the recording has to explain everything from scratch again. This game goes on until the last person of the circle has had the a chance to use the camera and gives it back to Nick, explaining the same things as if Nick were unfamiliar with the set as well. After the last recording, everyone has told their names and their animals to the camera and Nick invites someone to pack the items back into the bag, carefully explaining what to take care of ("Put the cap on the lens first, because it's the most fragile part of the camera", "Fold the cable like this, so it doesn't break", "The microphone goes in here"). (Field notes, Mar. 3, 2014)

This is how Nick Lunch from InsightShare presented their work during a workshop he did together with Gareth Benest at the ICAF in Rotterdam. After the described actions, the two circles (one led by Nick, one by Gareth) came together and discussed what they experienced during this task. In the setting of this workshop, the game was meant to introduce their methodology to a group of people interested in their work. Usually, it stands at the beginning of a participatory video project and follows various aims at the same time. In a project setting, after this game, the camera is connected

to a screen or TV and the recorded material is watched by the group. As most of the participants will not be familiar with filming – and even if they are! - many pictures will be shaky, lighting will change according to the window situation of the room, some participants might play with the mic while speaking or somebody will zoom in and out a lot while filming. All this will be noticeable and the facilitator will ask the participants leading questions to explore some of the main issues of filmmaking together. Those questions could be "What did you like best?", "Which one didn't you like too much?", "What did you notice while watching?" etc. With the participants' answers, topics like lighting ("in this recording you couldn't see the face because the window in the back was so bright"), framing ("her head was partly chopped off"), and sound ("there was a lot of background noise") are learned without any technical input from the part of the facilitator (field notes, Mar. 27, 2014).

The facilitator's restraint is probably the most important part of InsightShare's methodology. Their motto is: "Each one teach one" (ibid). The facilitators are meant to stay in the background and give the participants space to explore the topics on their own. Of course, the participants are somehow directed to the answers by way of questions and hints by the facilitator, but they are never taught technical details in the first place, but rather called upon looking and finding out for themselves. Familiarization with the camera and first simple techniques, getting used to being in front of, as well as behind the camera, getting to know each other in the group, noticing simple facts about lighting, framing, sound recording, setting-up, etc., are all explored just by doing and then watching the recorded material and talking about it. Another crucial aspect is the constant use of visual support, that is to say drawings, symbols, differently coloured cards, etc., which helps the facilitators also in groups with language issues or in less literate groups. The method of participatory video-making is mainly used for groups that are little or not at all media literate, which must be considered its greatest strength but at the same time also its greatest weakness.

Often, the projects of InsightShare take place in rural areas, where people might have less access to technology, which makes the method of participatory video both more attractive and scarier. In an informal conversation with Gareth Benest from InsightShare during ICAF 2014, he mentioned that many people immediately think about youths when planning a video project. However, in his opinion, participatory video is more suitable as a method for those who have none or little knowledge of video-making, because then it is all about the subject and not just about technology (field notes, Mar. 29, 2014). Also, he later confirmed in an interview that participatory video is designed for people who otherwise have no access to video, because the camera serves as a magnet

to attract people who then explore a certain topic.[7] With highly media literate youths in the UK or elsewhere, however, it is not like that, which makes every video project in such a context more challenging (interview with Gareth Benest, Oct. 30, 2014). This refers clearly to the effect participatory video workshops can have on a personal level. The so-called empowerment is stronger, if the difference between before and after is greater. This effect is often discussed in literature about participatory video practices. Such is the case when Renuka Bery writes about building self-confidence and exercising one's voice; when she writes about power equalization and empowerment through participatory video, she quotes the example of an Indian woman who had never talked to a strange man before interviewing a man on the street as a video trainee (Bery 2003: 106). Such experiences or the fact that someone who has never held a camera before is then able not only to record, but also edit a movie, certainly are of benefit on a personal level. And this benefit might be more obvious and more visible than the effect that participatory video has or could have on the personal level of a youngster who has already recorded numerous videos with his or her cellphone. Nevertheless, speaking to a stranger on the street is hard for many people anywhere in the world, and therefore might be the best example to show how empowerment also means small steps in personal development. It is always empowering to achieve something on one's own. In the best case of a participatory video project, the facilitator opens the space for such things to happen without putting too much of him- or herself in it. The facilitator sets the context, while the content comes from the participants. However, many participatory video projects have been accused of imposing topics on the participants or even of using the community to follow their own interests. Also, projects sometimes claim to be more inclusive than they actually are. There are always decisions that are made before the project starts and some of the interests that stand behind a project might not even be clear to its participants.

Whereas many of InsightShare's projects aim for an impact on an institutional level, which means reaching out to decision-makers and stakeholders, others seem to answer the purpose of an impact on a personal level. In the first case, the product is very important, as it is the video that is shown to decision-makers or other institutions whom the group wants to reach. To take the message seriously, the video has to have a certain quality. The second kind, on the other hand, is more focused on the process itself, and the personal experience of the participants is more important than the final product. The balance between process and product – where to set the focus? – is therefore important for both the project in general as well as its outcome:

---

7   See also TEDx Talk „This is NOT a video camera" by Chris Lunch: http://insightshare.org/watch/video/not-a-video-camera

> Thinking critically about the interrelationship of process and product can prove useful in addressing the complexities of participatory video as a tool for social change. Despite the prevalence of process-focussed accounts, the act of working toward a video product necessitates discussion of aesthetic conventions and choices with participants; participatory video is, at its core, an aesthetic endeavour. (Thomas and Britton 2012: 217)

InsightShare claims to make video for social change, which means that their way of implementing community-based video is always linked to activism. InsightShare does participatory video workshops mainly (but not only) in small-scale communities in many parts of the world. They are specialized in using this method for advocacy, capacity building, community consultation, monitoring and evaluation, amongst others. The organisation has worked in many settings, has used participatory video as a method of exploring all these different means and is also offering trainings in participatory video for future facilitators. As an organisation which has a strong methodology and is very well known in the field, but also as an organisation that publishes and shares their theoretical and methodological background, it is helpful to start this discussion with their own description of what participatory video means.

On their homepage, InsightShare explain participatory video (PV) as follows:

> Participatory Video (PV) is a set of techniques to involve a group or community in shaping and creating their own film. The idea behind this is that making a video is easy and accessible, and is a great way of bringing people together to explore issues, voice concerns or simply to be creative and tell stories.

> This process can be very empowering, enabling a group or community to take action to solve their own problems and also to communicate their needs and ideas to decision-makers and/or other groups and communities. As such, PV can be a highly effective tool to engage and mobilise marginalised people and to help them implement their own forms of sustainable development based on local needs.[8]

The first part of this description uses very general terms such as "bringing people together" or "to explore issues" and "to tell stories" so that a lot of different projects can be subsumed under this explanation and it seems suitable for almost every context. The second part of the description nevertheless speaks about "empowering", "enabling", and "to engage and mobilise marginalised people". The connotation of helping the supposedly marginalised gets even clearer when consulting InsightShare's Handbook for participatory video, where the cover text says self-reliantly: "PV is a tool for positive social change; it empowers the marginalised and it encourages individuals and communities to take control of their destinies" (Lunch and Lunch 2006: back cover).

InsightShare usually gets commissioned by an NGO, a research institution, a governmental or other

---

8   See http://insightshare.org/pv/pv-nutshell .

organisation. This organisation comes with a certain topic of concern, a problem or conflict in a community, a project to be evaluated, or else. Even if InsightShare states that they do not deliver a specific product, but rather work with the community to see its perspective on the matter, which might as well turn out to be completely different, they still do have a certain liability towards the commissioner. All my interview partners acknowledged that the way of communication and negotiation with the commissioners can facilitate a successful participatory video project or make it impossible. InsightShare publishes a list of "negotiables" and "non-negotiables"[9] on their homepage which serves as a first orientation for this process of negotiation before the actual participatory video project might begin.

InsightShare aims for sustainability and legacy building in all projects. But not every context allows the same amount of sustainability, which is why InsightShare divides its work into three categories: Short-term projects, capacity building and the development of hubs that will then work as autonomous community video centres.[10] Legacy is important for each of those three categories. Even in short-term projects the aim is always to reach out further than to the group of participants. If and how this legacy is built, however, depends strongly on the means of the client and, once more, on funding. Like other NGOs, InsightShare is dependent on private and public funding. While the projects themselves are basically funded by the commissioners (which are listed under "partners and clients" on InsightShare's webpage), those general fundings guarantee a continuous work and organisational infrastructure. Part of these are community or social foundations, such as the Christensen Fund ("for indigenous-led and community-based organisations")[11], Walcot Foundation or Staples Trust; others fund for specific issues, such as the Girl Effect[12] or IUCN National Committee of the Netherlands that works for nature conservation. Another source of income is, naturally, the biannual training course for participatory video facilitators in Oxford.

I should now like to introduce the most important persons at InsightShare – in general and specifically for this research: InsightShare was founded by the brothers Nick and Chris Lunch. Nick Lunch and Gareth Benest, the programme director of InsightShare, have been my "gate-keepers", as I have met them personally at ICAF and they have encouraged my undertaking of investigating community-based filmmaking within and outside of the context of community arts. Sara Asadullah, Soledad Muñiz and Marleen Bovenmars were not only trainers during the participatory video

---

9 See http://insightshare.org/about-us/charter .
10 See http://insightshare.org/pv/how-we-work .
11 Www.christensenfund.org
12 Www.girleffect.org

course, but also the most important interview partners during my stay and beyond. To get an additional perspective on the London Hub, they also connected me with Ingrid Guyon, with whom I was meant to meet in London, but finally met online via Skype to talk about her perspective on the topic as well as her own work as participatory photographer. The participants of the training course in Oxford gave important input to different ways of using participatory video-making as well as being my partners in discussing the possibilities and weaknesses of this methodology. More over they gave me further insights into facilitation skills. They will not appear in this master thesis personally, though.

3. Perspectives on Community-based Filmmaking

As different as the organisations presented, are the approaches to community-based filmmaking in general. First of all, the term community-based filmmaking distinguishes those practices from film productions made by professional teams. But it is not enough to see the working with non-professionals as the main characteristic of community-based video. It is the approach towards the way film-making is done and the purposes it might serve that defines its particularity. Hence I now want to discuss different ways of community-based filmmaking strategies and address some key questions that they evoke.

Community-based filmmaking can be used as a method for anthropological research. In this case, visual material is not only used as a source for anthropological analysis, but anthropologists apply visual methods already in the field to collect data. This means that the collection of data goes beyond using video as a way of capturing what happens in the field, but it takes place together with the community, using video as a tool to debate certain topics and to deepen their understanding. Claudia Mitchell's "Doing Visual Research" (2011) offers perspectives on participatory visual methods in anthropological research.

In clear reference to Pink (2007), Claudia Mitchell focusses on the applied method of visual research to offer "an innovative orientation to the ways in which visual tools such as photography, video, drawing or objects can be used as modes of inquiry, modes of representation and modes of dissemination in research related to social change" (Mitchell 2011: xi). It is striking that this very first sentence already relates to social change, which can be read not only as a reference to the topic, but rather as a demand of doing research *for* social change. Applied visual anthropology often goes hand in hand with activism and Mitchell, for instance, refers to herself as a researcher-activist. There is another question that Mitchell poses in her preface which is worth reading closely: "Research designs that use the visual raise many new questions, including those that look at the blurring of boundaries related to research and intervention, for example. Is the work research or is it art, and how do we take account of the new technologies and challenges related to representation?" (ibid). The question of whether a video is art or something else refers to discussions on the value of the outcome and forms of (re)presentation that will come up again at a later point in this thesis.

Mitchell's book "Doing Visual Research" (2011) focusses on participatory research not only but also through community-based video work. As to the question of why to use video as a method of

research, she states: "Sometimes the answer rests entirely with issues of innovation or what the funders will fund, but in other cases, the choice of video-making might be described as a particular research strategy for reaching particular audiences – or (…) it may have some specific benefits in relation to deepening an understanding of the issues under study" (Mitchell 2011: 87). The method usually referred to as participatory video (PV), allows a group to deeply immerse itself into a subject of interest, while at the same time it offers the researcher a multi-layered bundle of material for analysis. It is not just the video which is finally analysed and discussed, but the whole process which the group has gone through is important to the researcher. The task of doing a storyboard, for example, is necessary to realize the film, but it is also interesting to the researcher to see how the group discusses the subject while storyboarding. What is, and what is not important to them? How are they talking about it? Are there a lot of different opinions or is the group quite homogeneous in their view on the topic? Does the topic raise specific questions? Is the topic important to the group at all? These and many more questions can be asked when analysing the process of participatory video projects for research. The process also shapes the emphasis that should be given when analysing the product. It is important to see how the idea for the video evolved instead of just taking the product as material for analysis. This is why, in this master thesis, I centre the ethnographic description around three case studies to give context to and explore the genesis of such community-based video undertakings.

When it comes to working with community-based video for research, Mitchell distinguishes different categories for analysis: First, there is the video as a primary text that can be analysed in analogy with interviews or other primary texts (ibid: 79-80), but in addition to that, they can also be analysed with a focus on the images themselves, considering camera angles or special effects. Secondly, we have the producer texts that show what the people who have done the video have to say about their work, about the process, as well as on the subject. As a third element for analysing participatory video projects, Mitchell lists the audience text, because the design of a film workshop aims at a screening in front of an audience (ibid: 84f). The audience – being part of the broader community but not directly involved in the production of the video – offers yet another perspective on the topic. It is important to see their reactions to the video and ask whether or not they find the topic in question well represented. Along with those different texts, Mitchell numbers certain categories, which are important for the analysis. Those are: constructedness, reflexivity, collectivity, convergence and embodiment. I find the category of constructedness especially interesting, because

> (o)nce you have acquired some skills and have explored possibilities, however, you may find yourself improvising and seeking out additional materials to incorporate into your constructions, and find that what you end up with has unintended potential use. Suggested blueprints or models

may be included (…), but individual and collective interpretations may differ; negotiation, subversion and adaptation are commonplace. Digital production as creative construction in this way embodies the manipulation of gendered, racialized and sexualized identities. (Mitchell 2011: 90)

This means that the constructedness of the scenes, as opposed to a natural environment, should not be seen as a deficiency, but as a construct that actually shows *more* than reality, it gives an interpretation of the participants' experiences and gives them "access to a type of socially constructed knowledge" (ibid: 89). Those categories and the different layers of texts that Mitchell describes are crucial to any analysis of video in social research.

The audience text shows how people who have not been part in the process see and interpret the video. Mitchell suggests to use the advantages of video and organise many screening sessions with different audiences (ibid: 86). One important factor to be considered, though, is the quality of the video itself, which is crucial for how people who have not been part of the process see the final outcome. While the quality of the video in an artistic sense might not be so important to the researcher, it certainly is for the participants and the audience. Even participants who did the participatory video might be disappointed with their product when they expect too high a quality in the first place. Hollywood productions are all too often a point of reference in filmmaking and the limits of the equipment or even limits due to time and know-how that necessarily affect participatory video projects might be difficult to explain to people who are new to the field. The expectations that come with the production of a video have to be considered and researchers should also aim for a high quality of participatory videos instead of giving participants a wrong idea about the quality of their work.The discussion about genuine participatory production versus polishing up a product to raise its quality is still ongoing (ibid: 87). This discussion remains important in all participatory video projects, not only in applied visual anthropology.

An overly positive attitude towards the potential of the practice from part of the practitioners does not serve its purpose. We have seen such attitude in the description of participatory video by InsightShare. The organisation sees its work as empowering participants, both on a personal and on an institutional level. Shirley White, professor emeritus at the Department of Communication at Cornell University and longterm researcher in the field of video and participatory communication, writes in a similar tone about the potential of participatory video:

> While video is a tool, it becomes more than a tool when used within developmental conceptual frameworks such as self-concept, reflective listening, dialog, conflict management, or consensus building. It then becomes a vital force for change and transformation of individuals and communities. It has unlimited potential. (White 2003: 100)

This potential is due to a "democratic process, characterized by dialog, creative and consensual thinking, and collective action" (White 2003: 20). It is therefore the process of working together, exploring a certain subject and entering a dialogue within the group that forms the potential of social change. The overall problem of this very optimistic view is that it always starts from a sense of doing something good to a certain group of people. It implies the wish to empower the supposedly marginalised and to give voices to the supposedly unheard. The introduction of the volume "Participatory Video: Images that Transform and Empower", edited by White, reads almost like a manifesto:

> Video has been used to reach the policymakers, to empower women behind the camera, to share stories and experiences, to rescue the culture and heritage of poor peasants and indigenous people. As a mediation tool, the power of video was used to help resolve conflicts, achieve consensus and find common ground for collective action. Video has been used for role modelling, as a medium to expose social injustice, to lend a voice to the voiceless, to challenge public stereotypes and for many other development processes involving illiterate communities. The various accounts presented in this book demonstrate how powerful images can be in documenting realities, sharing those realities, and using the realities to bring about significant changes. (Foreword by Silvia Balit in White 2003: 9-10)

This is a strong statement considering that the majority of these projects are imposed on a certain group of people by outsiders.[13] The process of participatory video is still very much focussed on the participants and their interests are at the centre of attention once the project has started, but it is important to realize that there are additional interests involved in every project besides the needs and sorrows of the community. This is why it is important to look closely at every single project to understand its numerous layers. Who wants to "rescue the culture and heritage of poor peasants and indigenous people" (ibid, quoted on previous page)? Are they rescued because they are videotaped? Who said that they were in danger? Who "lend(s) a voice to the voiceless" (ibid) – and is it going to be taken away again, once the project is finished?

It is therefore indispensable to take a critical look at the literature in this area. Low et al. (2012) note a close relation between participatory video literature and concepts and theories of the pedagogy of the oppressed by Paolo Freire (Freire 1970) and state:

> Key to this discussion of participation, often linked to the ideals of critical pedagogy through the work of Freire (1970), is the notion that the outcome of the participatory video method is most importantly about participants enacting some form of social or political transformation. (Low et al. 2012: 51)

This approach assumes the power of naming the world in order to change it. It therefore focusses on the possibility of change on a personal level. Low et al. further point out that "(...) much of the

---

13 Namely NGOs, governmental organisations and others, see previous chapter.

scholarship describes participation as agency in terms of voice, authorship, and self-representation" (Low et al. 2012: 53) and that "telling one's story through participatory video can be understood as a manifestation of agency" (ibid: 55). But this equation of participation and agency is dangerous, because then the simple act of storytelling becomes the proof of empowerment, while logically there is a huge gap between those two. It is not my aim to negate the possibility of transformation and empowerment through participatory video, but to refute an overly positive and simplistic approach to that matter. If the equation *storytelling = agency = empowerment* is taken seriously, there is neither space for criticism nor for improvement. Eventually, Low et al. emphasise

> the need to understand participatory video projects as situated and grounded within already existing and growing regional social movements and transnational networks. The use of participatory video in transnational contexts raises questions about how the local appropriation of global technologies and consumer media might create social zones for community life, imaginary spaces, and novel subjectivities and attachments as well as economic resources. (ibid: 61)

After all, they conclude in reference to Smith (1999), methodologies have to be decolonized and the debate about whether or not participatory video empowers the participants must be located within the discourses and experiences of neoliberal globalization (Low et al. 2012: 61). Questions of representation and forms of participation have to be asked constantly, when it comes to analysing community-based filmmaking for activism. Who is the group of participants and how did they come together? Is there an organisation behind them? What interests do the different agents have? Who is the facilitator and what are her/his personal interests? Who are the funders and what are their conditions? Those questions and many more arise when it comes to negotiating the setting of a participatory video project. In most cases, participants enter the scene only after many decisions have been made. It must not be forgotten how those decisions influence the participatory process.

Community-based video is not only used for research or activism, but can also be located in a broader process of community-building. In that case, the methodology that lies behind it is not as important as in a participatory video process, as it is about the people who do it rather than the way they do it. In such settings, the building of a group or a community takes place before, during and after the video-making process and once that project is completed, the group goes on to a next one. In the setting of community arts, video is just one tool out of many to engage a group in the process. Video-making is then often combined with other tools and artistic practices, such as theatre, performance, music, but also plastic arts.

The common artistic creation is of course fundamental for this kind of work, which leads to

differences in the way video-making is approached in this context in comparison to the ones described above. After all, "'Community artists' are distinguishable not by the techniques they use, although some (e.g. video, inflatables) are specially suited to their purposes, but by their *attitude* towards the place of their activities in the life of society", according to a committee that was set up in the UK in 1974 to define the new tendency of community arts (Bishop 2012: 178). Its definition of community artists further states that "(t)heir primary concern is their *impact on a community* and their relationship with it: by assisting those with whom they make contact to become more aware of their situation and of their own creative powers (...)" (ibid). What is it then, that makes community-based video in the context of community arts different to other forms of community-based videomaking?

One might say that community artists have a different creative and aesthetic approach to the subject than those who strongly concentrate on the message of the video and have a specific agenda for their participatory video project. Jumblies' aesthetics have been pointed out to me throughout my research as something characteristic of the organisation and something very closely attached to the vision of Artistic Director Ruth Howard. A common strategy of the artists is the reduction of material in order to gain a coherent aesthetic output even though many hands are involved.

In one of the artistic activities during the Artfare Essentials training, everybody was invited to paint a winter scenario according to Ruth's instructions. There were several tables arranged in a square, each covered with rough brown paper. While Ruth described a winter landscape and invited the participants to follow this imaginary travel, they were supposed to paint on the paper according to the evoked images. While painting with white colour and little sponges, they were also encouraged to move around the place, switch from one table to another and therefore leave a mark in different places, rather than drawing an individual scene. As such, the painting got collective rather than individual. Ruth first gave out just white paint and sponges while she described the landscape in general and the wintery weather. Then, she introduced some nuances of blues when she talked about a winter storm and encouraged people to make bigger movements according to this image and even sounds. Later, silver and shiny greys were put on the tables to accentuate some spots. At the very end, she finally put all the acrylic paint away and just gave the participants brown crayons in order for them to walk around watching the landscape and mark some roads or paths where they thought it would fit the texture of the painted landscape. (Field notes, Dec. 14, 2014)

The outcome of this little artistic activity was very coherent although many people worked on it at

the same time. This example serves to illustrate how these techniques guarantee an outcome that corresponds with the needs of the artists: As the participants were moving around the room, none of them had their very own spot, and handwritings or drawing skills were not clearly distinguishable but rather blended together. The selection of material again served to unify the outcome. Whereas everybody had the freedom to paint and draw what she or he liked, the final product would still go together. Limitation sometimes leads to more creativity and when working with non-artists, the vision of the artist manifests itself in the concept and the selection done beforehand. Angie, one of Jumblies interns at the time, describes being selective in the materials as the most tangible way of using "creative limitations" (group discussion on aesthetics, Artfare Essentials Training, Dec. 19, 2014). Video artist Sean Frey also explains the "simplicity of the material (as) informing the aesthetic outcome" (interview with Sean Frey, Jan. 10, 2015) and Sonja Rainey refers to the necessity to shape the workshop "in order to let there be a maximum of expression while also holding it together aesthetically as in `we're doing something together within those parameters´" (interview with Sonja Rainey, Jan. 11, 2015). She also states that this part is especially difficult for her when she is working with communities, because she usually has a particular way in mind of how she wants to have things, which might not be the vision of others. And so it becomes a "dance between inclusiveness and letting things happen during the workshop" as well as "holding the outcome together so that it stays conclusive" (ibid). In the work of Jumblies and its off-shoots aesthetic considerations are always of great importance, no matter what art form – be it video, painting, theatre or else.

Participatory video projects for research or activism are not meant to be artistic and might not use that much energy on creating an aesthetically pleasing outcome. Aesthetics, nevertheless, is important to all of them. Verena Thomas and Kate Britton (2012) provide an interesting counterpoint to usual discussions about empowerment that dominate the discourse about participatory video, when they introduce aesthetics as an essential aspect to every video project, because "(e)ngaging in aesthetics requires that all parties engage in the complexities of representation and collaborative relationships, as aesthetic elements are considered, negotiated, and made visible in the creative output" (Thomas and Britton 2012: 212). They argue that the aesthetic output is, in fact, a product of consent and point out how the concept of aesthetics differs in different cultural and social contexts. They further link these thoughts to Bourriaud's concept of relational aesthetics (2002):

> Artistic creations and media making in this context are conversations, happening between people and in relationships and positioning the producers of these conversations as able to create new ways of experiencing the world through aesthetic experiences. For Bourriaud (2002), "the

artist's practice, and his behaviour as producer, determines the relationship that will be struck up with his work. In other words, what he produces, first and foremost, is relations between people and the world, by way of aesthetic objects" (p.42). In participatory video projects, in which the producer is a group rather than an individual, this production of relations is a principal motivation, as facilitators strive to work collaboratively with particular groups to effect social change. (Thomas and Britton 2012: 218f)

This comparison, however, seems to cut many considerations short. Even though participatory video projects are realised in steady negotiations, not only, but also with regard to aesthetics; and even though Bourriaud detects relations as being intrinsic to (a certain type of) art, the converse argument that every relation is art, is not valid. It is highly critical to relate art and aesthetics in this way. However, Thomas and Britton do have a point when they argue that the readings and discussions about participatory video should be expanded by the aspect of aesthetics:

> Here, aesthetics cannot be restricted to audience perceptions as a purely visual phenomenon or relegated to being a privilege of artists. Rather, aesthetics play out in social group relationships and are affected by both, the facilitator and participants of participatory video projects. By exploring the potential of aesthetics to reframe discourse around relationships, media and art making, and social change, participatory video could gain new insights and perspectives into its practice. (ibid: 220)

Certainly, the concept of aesthetics cannot be the point of distinction between artistic and activist community-based filmmaking. However, it is striking that the term is used very frequently in the work of Jumblies Theatre and nearly never at InsightShare. How is this concept seen in case of Jumblies Theatre and InsightShare? The members of Jumblies Theatre often use terms such as common creation, collective creativity, artistic creation, or even artistic people when they refer to the people they work with and the way they work with them. Those terms describe an attitude rather than a strict methodology. Referring to the participants as "artistic people" is a way of saying, creativity belongs to all of us and we are all creating this (piece of) art together. But at the same time the use of this term shows an intrinsic distinction between trained artists ("us", who do the conceptualizing) and artistic people ("them", the people we work with). Beyond that, even people who are not trained as artists from their scholarly background, refer to themselves as such, once they are in a certain position within the organisation (field notes taken after the interviews with Leah Houston, Michael Burtt and Amy Turner, Jan. 6, 2015). Consequently the denomination implements what has been shown in the quotations above: In community arts, the artist is responsible for the aesthetic outcome and there is a clear hierarchy between those who decide and those who follow.

Other than that, in participatory video projects, the aesthetic outcome is negotiated between the participants. Participatory video projects follow strict guidance and a clear methodology, which

includes the idea that the facilitator is supposed to lose control and keep in the background. In community arts though, the work within the community is usually strongly bound to the persons involved. Jumblies Theatre advocate "putting yourself into it", because after all, community arts are about "people doing things with people" (Ruth Howard during the Artfare Essentials training, field notes, Dec. 15, 2014). Personality and character are essential features in the work of community artists, because the relation between the artists and the community is crucial for the outcome.

In many cases in the context of community arts, video functions as a kind of extension of theatre work, as it has many similarities (the story, the script, the different roles, the props, etc.) and it is an interesting variety for a group that usually works with drama. To give an example, this is the case for the feature-length film "Frontera" (Spain, 2013) which was filmed entirely in a prison with both inmates as well as professional actors. This film was realised with the theatre company "teatroDENTRO" ("theatreINSIDE"), that had already worked for eight years in the *Centro Penitenciario Cuatre Camins*, a prison in the Catalonian city of Granollers, when the movie was made.[14] TeatroDENTRO is part of the company "transFORMAS – Artes Escénicas y transformación", which makes art with "different people in different places"[15]. The film was presented at the ICAF – International Community Arts Festival in Rotterdam in 2014 –, where the genesis of the movie was described as a process that happened during the weekly theatre sessions, which the movie also reflects (field notes, Mar. 19, 2014). It is therefore a work of an amateur theatre group of inmates and theatre community artists, with the help of professional filmmakers. As another example, I would like to come back to Debajehmujig Storytellers, a community arts organisation based on Manitoulin Island in Northern Ontario. Usually they work with drama, but they also realized a big film project. In the comedy "Elders gone AWOL" (2011) a group of senior citizens break out of the nursing home. In this case, the film project was a way for the community theatre group that mostly consists of youths to connect with the elders of Manitowaning. The Artistc Director Joe Osawabine highlights the advantage of working with video with the elders because of the time and energy they dedicated:

> We didn't know it was going to be a video project, we decided on that later on because you just get so much energy and time out of the elders, you know. We don't want to have them performing seven nights a week. So we thought, if we recorded it; if we did a video project then we'd do a lot of intense work out front but then the project can live on for longer. (Interview with Joe Osawabine, Jan. 14, 2015)

---

14 See: http://transformas.org.es/proyecto/frontera/ .
15 „Referente en la creación artística en espacios diferentes y con personas diferentes", see: http://transformas.es/ .

In the case of Jumblies Theatre, on the other hand, video is mostly used as part of a bigger production, but they also do projects that only focus on video. The multi-arts approach of that company becomes visible in the way they work with video. How video is used in the context of community arts, as well as the many advantages and disadvantages of the use of video for community-art will be analysed more deeply in the next chapter.

4. Empirical Research and Analysis – Case Studies

This chapter analyses the question of how community-based filmmaking is used in the context of community arts with the help of three case studies. I have chosen one project of Jumblies' off-shoot Arts4All, which is an example of how video productions are incorporated in a bigger community arts production and how different elements nurture each other. The second case study comes from Jumblies' newest off-shoot Community Arts Guild. In this case, the video production stands for itself as a product, even if it is conceptually part of a triptych. These examples show two different approaches towards community video production in the context of community arts and help to understand the way in which Jumblies Theatre uses video also as part of bigger productions. The third case study comes from a participatory video project of InsightShare and gives an example of how community-based video-making is used outside of the context of community arts. The approach of participatory video is very distinct to the one of community arts. Thus, the third example is given to highlight those differences, which may serve to understand the specificities of community-based filmmaking in the context of community arts.

4.1. First Case Study: "I Was a Brave Child" (2013)

„I Was a Brave Child" is a radio drama written by Liz Rucker, the artistic director of Arts4All, which is based on local Italian seniors' childhood memories of WWII. The radio play was later transferred into a multi-media performance piece that includes two videos. This performance was shown in February 2013 at Davenport Perth Neighbourhood Centre. The way these films were made and how they are incorporated in a larger performance shows how those videos are created in a community arts context. The genesis of this project is important in order to understand how the production "I Was a Brave Child" had grown over time, and which part the videos play in this multi-arts performance. Furthermore, I offer a visual analysis of the videos themselves to show them as artistic products; because in the end, the balance between process and product is always at the heart of community arts.

4.1.1. Setting

Arts4All is Jumblies' oldest off-shoot, and was founded after the three years of Jumblies' residency at Davenport Perth Neighbourhood Centre (2002-2004) culminated in the production of "Once a

Shoreline", a theatre play that was inspired by oral histories from local seniors and by all the artistic workshops that had been done during the residency with community groups. The production involved professional artists as well as over a hundred community participants and was the first Jumblies show of this scope.[16] After Jumblies went on to the next residency, associated artists took over leadership. Since then, the work of Arts4All has continued until today, now under Artistic Director Liz Rucker. The so-called "Arts4All Players" who come regularly to Arts4All's Monday sessions have been participating in those activities for up to twelve years. As a group, they also took part in Jumblies' most recent production in Scarborough, "Like an Old Tale" (2011).

The Davenport-Perth Neighbourhood and Community Health Centre, DPNC, is a Neighbourhood Centre where different groups meet and all kinds of community activities take place. Arts4All rehearses every Monday for two hours in the centre's sanctuary, which is a big hall. The people that participate in Arts4All's Monday sessions and projects are mostly people from the area, namely Davenport neighbourhood in the north of the city of Toronto. The group consists of people with different abilities (mentally and physically challenged people), with different cultural backgrounds, a great number of senior citizens and only few young people. Some of them are regular participants and come every Monday, others drop in occasionally. During my visit at Arts4All it became very clear that those who have been participating for a long time in Arts4All's activities identify very much with it. At my first visit, I was, for example, welcomed by a young man who presented himself emphasizing immediately that he had over twelve years of experience with Arts4All and kindly offered: "Tell me if you need anything. There's food and drinks, help yourself", adding "I always tell this to people that are new here!" (field notes, Dec. 15, 2014). Whereas others, who are new, experience the workshops as an open format where they can come and go as they please, and participate as much as they want, dropping in and out during the session or just coming in to say hello.

4.1.2. Project Genesis

"I Was a Brave Child" is the title of a project that lasted from 2010 to 2012 and was first conceptualized as a radio play that had Italian seniors' childhood memories of WWII at its core. That is to say, the story is based on interviews that were done with those seniors as a piece of oral history, and were then transformed into a script by Artistic Director Liz Rucker. She describes this

---

16 For photographic material and project descriptions see http://www.jumbliestheatre.org/jumblies/arts4all-gallery or http://www.arts4all.ca/about/past-projects/ .

process as three phases of working: In the first phase she collects material through arts-based research with the community members, interviews them and collects their stories. In a second step, she looks for corresponding themes, things that interest her and that have a potential. Then she withdraws from the community and puts the pieces together to form a script. That is where she as a playwright comes in and combines all of the collected memories into one plot. The third phase brings this back to the community and consists of organizing and coordinating the community and the production of the final play.

> I would describe the whole process as a conversation, where I make something or I present something and go hear and see what the community members do with it. And I may have kind of an outcome in mind (…), but I'm not thinking so much in how it's going to show, I'm not so much thinking in that way. (Interview with Liz Rucker, Jan. 10, 2015)

The original idea for this project developed out of her interest in radio and "stories of fear and truth" during that time (ibid). Once the radio play was done, over time the idea of transforming it into a site-specific show emerged. Amy Siegel, the video artist involved in this project, mentioned that the wish for transferring the radio play into a site-specific show was partly due to the lack of forms of presentation of such an audio recording. Community members and their friends and families would not sit together in a room just to listen to a radio play (interview with Amy Siegel, Jan. 2, 2015). This performance or show was then conceptualized as a multi-media experience where there was no separation between stage and audience but the audience moved through the space, and all rooms of the health centre including the lobby, etc., were used. Between the scenes, the audience was guided to the next setting with the help of music and the actors who the audience had to follow. Two videos, made by Amy Siegel and Esther Maloney together with the community, were part of these multi-arts experiences.

The applied concept can be seen in many of Jumblies' productions as well as those of their off-shoots. It is a strategy to divide a piece into many scenes, where different people have their roles and responsibilities. This is a way of including many people in one theatre play or performance and at the same time alleviating the pressure put on each and every one of them, because while many things can happen at the same time, everyone is only responsible for a small part of it. This strategy is also clearly visible in the productions of the videos, as we will see below. Also, the actors themselves become the audience in another part of the play, which makes the experience for everyone special. If the audience mainly consists of participants and their relatives, there will be no harsh criticism of the performance. It is therefore also a strategy to obtain a positive atmosphere among the viewers.

After this performance, Amy Siegel wished for a final video that could translate the experience of the performance into something that could be shared. However, she and the Artistic Director eventually decided against it, because it would not work to translate those experiences into a video "because of the site, the movement, the people involved, the surprises that would happen or the little moments in between" (interview with Amy Siegel, Jan. 2, 2015). The ephemeralness of the performance was something that attracted her especially in comparison to other community-based video projects that she had done. Therefore, the two videos of this case study always have to be considered as a part of the whole project including the radio play and the performance.

4.1.3. Video Analysis

The first of the two videos that were made for the performance is a scene from a carnival party. In the original radio play we hear music, voices and party noises, while two children are talking about what they experience and how they are afraid of the drunken crowd because they would not recognize the adults behind the carnival masks. The video shows people with masks, playing cards, laughing, dancing and making music, drinking or playing around with garlands and sparklers. The music of the video is fast and cheerful, with Italian singing and clapping, whistling and sounds of laughter. In some of the shots, the persons are directly interacting with the viewer, looking straight into the camera or beckoning someone over, who is supposedly in the position of the viewer. One party guest is also offering candy. These interactions are supposed to be directed at the children who are the main characters in this scene. But at the same time, they also include the spectator, who finds herself/himself in the place of the children. The video consists of many shots from below, which simulate the children's perspective. The spectator is led through the scene and the diverse settings of the party: Through different rooms, up the stairs, etc. The focus constantly changes, which is another stylistic element of this video. The blurred images and the movement give an idea of the "drunken view" of the party guests. Through this method, the atmosphere is captured and easily understandable for the audience. At the same time though, it creates a contrast to the use of low shots, representing the children's position. This means that the video stylistically represents both, the children's as well as the adults' point of view. The music and the soundscape that is used in the video was pre-recorded by Sarah Miller and suggests both, the mood of the party, as well as the setting of the story: The Italian music reminds the audience of the place and time of the play. Each of the actors is seen just for a little moment. The shots are rather short or the camera pans toward the next person quickly. There is not so much acting involved, as the movements are

repeated and it is clearly visible that each of the performers has got concrete instructions (e.g. drinking out of a bottle, raising the glass, watching the sparkler and laughing). This shows an advantage of video in comparison to theatre or performance in the context of community arts, as the attention of the viewer can be directed effectively and insecurities of the actors can be smoothed over with the help of strategic cuts. The way in which this video has been shot and edited are the most important factors that contribute to the success of the scene. And both are done by a professional.

This scene was embedded in the performance as follows: In the rear part of the sanctuary where Arts4All usually holds the Monday sessions and which was the central venue of the play as well as the place where the video was filmed, there is a small staircase (which is recognizably the same as in the video party scene) where the audience could sit huddled on the stairs. The video was projected on the wall, while at the same time a shadow play complemented the scene. This shadow play showed the children washing the dishes in the kitchen while the party that was shown in the video was going on in the other room. This means that the video is embedded in a scene that consists of three elements: the projected video that shows the adults having a carnival party; the live shadow-performance that shows the children washing the dishes; and the voices and the music of the radio play that added the soundscape to the party, the sound of dish washing, as well as the voices of the children talking, thus the actual story. The setting of the scene shows the important strategy of involving as many people as possible, which is not just for the sake of it, but also to avoid problems when somebody drops out during the process. By splitting up roles, there is always someone else that can stand in to perform a small part. At the same time it allows the participants to concentrate on one thing at a time: Thus the children who apparently wash the dishes behind the curtain as a shadow play do not have to remember any line or act in a specific way at the same time:

> I was back with them washing the dishes, handing them the plates and stuff. They were panicking because they were so nervous. They didn't speak their lines, they were prerecorded. So that´s what I was talking about. If you think about those kids, they were 7 to 10 years old. So to play their roles, to wash the dishes, to remember all that is a lot. So it makes sense to break that up. They had already recorded their roles, so they didn't have to worry about it. They could just stand there and wash the dishes. And that is great. (Interview with Esther Maloney, Jan. 17, 2015)

Also, it is not necessary that the same children that recorded the voices act as shadows for the radio play. Hence it is a strategy of engagement that is very typical of the work of Jumblies and its off-shoots and which distinguishes them from many other community art plays that are still more dependent on the performance of the individual participant. It is necessary to see these strategies as a way to optimize the outcome, which can be interpreted in two ways: First, as a way to get the

most out of the process with and for the community members, and secondly, as an evidence that the product does have a great importance. It is not just about the process with the community.

After the scene just described, bomber noises are heard in the radio play and the children run outside and take refuge in the woods where they stay all night. In the performance, the audience was then moved from the stairs and accompanied to the next setting with the help of music, so that the audience knew that they had to follow.There, the second video was projected on a large scrim – a cotton textile with a special texture – that gave the video a special tangible effect. The video shows figures with masks appearing and disappearing behind trees. The masks look very innocent and are made in the style of comics. They are disproportionately big and have very small eyes, which gives the already clumsy acting an even clumsier effect. The calmness and the bright colours of this scene contrast the fear that the children had to face when hiding from the bombs. But despite their innocent look, the figures with the masks are also spooky. They are supposed to represent the children's emotions as they were hiding in the woods. The first minute and fifteen seconds of the video just show these figures popping up behind trees and disappearing again. There are different viewpoints, close ups and long shots, but always the same movement, made by different people with different masks. Only one scene is surprising, when one of the figures wears a different mask that is not oversized and allows viewers to see the expression of the face. Later in the video, there are some shots where figures move from one tree to hide behind another. They hesitate, tiptoe and look around or run. Those are the only shots that require more acting techniques than the one movement learned.

The music that underlies this scene is an Italian tarantella, which in the middle of the video changes to some kind of Italian swing music. From this moment onwards, the figures beckon and meet in pairs that slowly move out of the scene in the end. Again, it is clearly visible that those are movements that were learned and rehearsed in just that way. It is also very clear who are the professional actors and who the community members less experienced in acting, even though they are all hidden behind the same masks. In between those sequences, we have one sequence that shows five figures in the woods at the same time, somehow disoriented, looking around, hiding or pointing towards the sky. Supposedly, this scene represents the fear and loss of orientation that the children experience in that night in the woods, hiding from bombers. The sudden appearance of many of these figures multiplies the experience. The looks and gazes, hiding and appearing, pointing towards the sky, etc., are always repeated more than once. In the end, when the figures come together in pairs, they hold hands or link arms with each other. This is the moment when in

the music the voice sets in and a man begins to sing in Italian. Both, the closeness of the figures as well as the singing voice, relegate to the idea of the children comforting each other and getting through the experience together. In the end of the video, the couples leave the frame and the woods remain empty for a short still shot. The somehow clumsy acting contrasts with the dancing music in the second half of the video. The music also contrasts the theme of the scene, namely fear. But this contrast gives a nice innocent touch to the video that stirringly forgives mistakes. There are, for example, some changes in focus that might or might not be on purpose. At least there is no clear intention visible, as was the case in playing with the focus in the first video.

The aesthetic language of the images leans towards the hyperreal through the effects that were added in the editing, such as special contrasts in the outlines of the trees, which gives a painted effect to the image, and of course the low saturation that causes a cold image. In the actual performance, the huge scrim gave another special effect to the video because of its texture and the enormous scale of the projection. This video and its presentation show best how Jumblies' aesthetic is reproduced in the video work. The reduction of material is usually the way to guarantee an aesthetically pleasing outcome and a certain kind of unity, even if many hands were working on the piece of art, be it masks, costumes, paintings, or even acting. In this video, the reduction is achieved by lowering the saturation of the image to bring it closer to the vitreous appearance of the masks. The whole scene is very reduced. There is little movement, little action. It stands in sharp contrast to the first video with the party scene, which is colourful, bright and loud. It is exactly the lack of movement and action that transports the uncanny feeling.

During the projection of the video in this scene, actors were standing on the sides of the screen, wearing the same masks as the figures in the video and joining the movement of popping up behind the trees, or on the sides of the screen respectively. Therefore the scene was doubled and a similar effect was achieved as in the scene before: different things happening at the same time, without necessarily involving the same people in the multiple tasks. The positioning of and performance by actors during the screening of the video has the effect that the audience feels closer to the scene, because the setting of the woods was brought into the sanctuary or vice versa, the audience taken outside into the woods. This became even more tangible when directly after this video the audience was blindfolded and taken through a soundscape that represented these woods.

4.1.4. Contextualisation / Analysis of this Case Study

The production and the setting of the two videos show how closely the multiple elements are interwoven. Each video is produced during a series of workshop sessions (dealing with the development of movements, the sound recording, etc.) and can be seen as a piece in itself. But on the other hand, it is such an intrinsic part of the performance that it cannot just be analysed as such without losing a great part of its essence. Each of the shows of Jumblies and its off-shoots contains a string of elements that have been produced during a long period of time and that culminate in the big production at the end. Nevertheless, at every stage of the production, there are bits and pieces that are already an outcome on their own. Liz Rucker stresses the importance of regular celebrations for two reasons: first, to mark certain landmarks during a longterm process and second, because people come and go and not everybody is going to experience the excitement of the final show as a big celebration (interview with Liz Rucker, Jan. 10, 2015). This is, for example, the case with a workshop for the production of the masks that is somehow separated from the actual video shooting. And even this shooting required again a separate preparatory workshop for the development and training of the movements. There is a product assigned to each of these sections, so that all participants who were part of just one of them can identify with a certain result. This is what was explained to me as "collective ownership" so many times:

> It's always collective ownership, in my experience. And when I hear ownership I think there's also another question that comes to mind, which is authorship. How do you credit everyone that is involved? And ownership and participation or inclusion are really tight together (…) The more that there is participation and inclusion the more of this ownership is shared. And yet there is always the understanding that something has been shaped, that there has been a focus created and there's someone who has authorship. It's usually the company or the artistic director or the team as a whole that's creating participation. And so sometimes projects start out with a very clear authorship of someone who's creating an invitation (…) and then over the course of the project that this ownership moves towards collective ownership. (Interview with Sonja Rainey, Jan. 11, 2015)

Even if we see these productions as owned by a collective (the community), only few people have a complete overview of the whole production. Not even the artists might have this vision, but only the artistic director him/herself.
Coming back to the videos themselves, it is apparent that the biggest part of the production was made by video artists Amy Siegel and Esther Maloney. Although the community was represented on the screen and in the whole piece, the video production had a clear aim and clear direction. The task of the participants was that of actors, whereas both filming and editing was done by the artists. In comparison to other community-based video projects, where it is of great importance that the

participants are involved in every step and each decision, I found it hard to see this as a community-based video product in the first place. Because, in the end, the participants do what they are told to do and have little to say in this picture. Amy Siegel explains this as follows:

> Sometimes when I came in, I came in as the video person, because I would teach them if they should look at me or not and we did exercises where we acted as if I were the video camera. And there's also something really unappealing in being that person and teaching that skill in a way when it's so prolific in our society. (Interview with Amy Siegel, Jan. 2, 2015)

She further explains that she would like to lead a video project at Arts4All, teaching video making skills and the development of a story, but on the other hand she likes the lack of technology there and enjoys the difference of projects like those to other video projects she did, which were about advocacy and where dissemination played a big role. There is a strong notion of teaching and the importance of skills in this statement. Also a certain lack of understanding on the part of the participants of the technique that is used. The lack of speech in both videos can be traced back to that, because there have certainly been given directions during the shooting of the video, so that the original sound could not have been used, even if wanted.[17] Also, there is a nice little sequence "behind the scenes" at the very end of the second video, where voices are heard (one of them being Liz Rucker's, the Artistic Director) and one participant wearing the mask asks towards the camera: "What happens if you have to blow your nose?" which gives a funny impression of the recording session (Video "Spookies in the Forest", courtesy of Amy Siegel).

This kind of community-based video production earns the title mostly because it is embedded in a bigger project, based on the community's oral history. Nevertheless, it seems like the community serves, more than anything, as a material for the artists to produce their art. Even though, it is also owned by the community because they have contributed to it in different ways. Whether participants feel ownership of the product or not also depends on their expectations. In the workshop that I assisted at Arts4All I only heard positive feedback from part of the community members. The workshop lasted for two hours and worked with the same strategy of split scenes as explained above. The participants were divided into small groups and each of them had to represent a small part of a story that was told in the beginning. The scene could be represented through music, acting, movement or any other means, but there was very little supporting material (some fabrics, cardboard, musical instruments, later paper and colours). The story was told in a way that each group acted out their sequence one after the other, so that it would add up to a whole. This took place in the sanctuary where Arts4All rehearses and the audience was the same group of

---

17 This was a topic in my conversation with Sonja Rainey in reference to a video project of hers with children at Mabelle, but it is very likely that the same applies in this example.

participants that moved around in the big hall from one scene to the next, including their own. During the play, one of the participants that had come for the first time, assured me over and over again: "This was fun. This was wonderful. I could have cried" and in the end "I hope they will do this again" (field notes, Dec. 15, 2014). The reason why I introduce this example at this point is because it illustrates my previous statement that whether participants feel ownership over the product or not also depends on their expectations. In saying that I do not mean that the expectations have to be low in order to feel ownership over a product that was not necessarily developed by the participants themselves. I rather refer to the surprise effect that results from the fact that only the artists, or maybe even only the artistic director, has/have the overview until the revelation, which makes the final product more exciting than all of its parts seen separately. This surprise effect leads to a feeling of pride that all those single contributions have added up to a beautiful experience. I would even say that the experience of the outcome and the way how the different pieces finally come together, gives more excitement and pride to the participants than the actual task in the workshop. The same is true for the videos that are more powerful as part of this big multi-arts performance piece than they would be on their own. It is still worth asking what would change if the community members were more involved in the whole production of the video (e.g. setting, filming, editing) and if this would or would not spoil the surprise effect, and if, on the other hand, it would increase the feeling of ownership that the participants have over the whole process.

4.2. Second Case Study: "Lost & Found 2: Coming to Past" (2013)

The second video I should like to examine more deeply is the short film „Coming to Past". As part of the Lost & Found Triptych, this film was made by Tamil seniors from the Storefront, by Scarborough youths and other community members from the Scarborough neighbourhood together with the Community Arts Guild. The Film is directed by Sean Frey and Sonja Rainey, the concept done by Sean Frey and Beth Helmers, for her part Artistic Director of the Community Arts Guild. The music is done by Sharada Eswar (vocals), Sarma Donepudi (percussion) and Rebecca Bruton (strings). I chose this example on the one hand because I assisted in a workshop with the Tamil seniors and had the chance to get to know the group, and on the other hand because the work with seniors and the challenge of language barriers that is apparent in this group was especially interesting to me.

4.2.1. Setting

The Community Arts Guild is Jumblies Theatre's latest off-shoot. It was launched in 2008 and became independent after the end of the production "Like an Old Tale" (based on Shakespeare's A Winter's Tale). This has been the biggest Jumblies' production so far and involved several hundred community members and about forty-five professional artists.[18] The participants did not only come from the Scarborough neighbourhood, but participants of former Jumblies productions and projects, such as some of the Arts4All Players, also took part. This meant an enormous amount of logistics on the part of the artistic team and director Ruth Howard and is certainly the reason for this production being more challenging than the ones before. The hugeness and complexity of this production has been pointed out to me by all interview partners when we came to talking about Scarborough. Transportation and logistics were of central concern during Jumblies' residency in Scarborough and it continues to be an important task to be considered for the work of the Community Arts Guild even today. In contrast to other off-shoots, the Community Arts Guild has never been centred in just one place. Rather, the participants were scattered all over the district and bringing those people together was one of the main achievements of the group. It says on their webpage: "The Community Arts Guild makes art of all sorts with people in East Scarborough: connecting people separated from each other because of distance, language, income, age, culture or ability; inviting everyone, including those who may not normally have the opportunity to participate (...)" and further: "We work in partnership with local residents and other organizations in the neighbourhood to: (…) (m)ake our art activities accessible by removing barriers to participation: providing activities free of cost, taking art activities into different locations, or helping with food, translation, transportation or childcare."[19]. The fact that distance is the first reason for separation that is listed above shows how important logistics are for the work of the Community Arts Guild, for example when it comes to providing transport for those living far away or who cannot manage to come on their own. Also, the artists themselves travel to meet the people where they live and produce art with them on the spot.

This was also the case with a group of Tamil seniors, who play a very important role in the video "Coming to Past". It is remarkable that such organisational issues are listed on the webpage as main goals and requirements in their work. Jumblies' residency in Scarborough has always been about

---

18 For more information on the project and pictures see
    http://www.jumbliestheatre.org/jumblies/about/offshoots/community-arts-guild_galler .
19 See http://communityartsguild.ca/who-we-are/ .

working with many different groups and bringing them together, which is partly because of the size of the district and (lack of) transport connection. Even though the Community Arts Guild also has a place to meet, namely at the Cedar Ridge Creative Centre, which is part of the City of Toronto's Arts Services Live Arts Hub, a community arts initiative from the City of Toronto[20], it is not a central neighbourhood centre. At this centre, the Community Arts Guild organizes regular "Campfires", where people come together to share food and get to know each other. The setting of campfires refers to another basic part of their work: the stories. Many of their projects are based on family stories, tales, real as well as imagined histories which are the beginning of further projects and presentations. Arts-based research is an intrinsic part of their work, as we will also see in the project genesis of "Coming to Past".

As mentioned above, the Community Arts Guild works with Tamil-speaking seniors in regular workshops. Those are embedded in a health and wellness programme of The Hub – Mid Scarborough as part of the Scarborough Centre for Healthy Communities. During the workshop, a translator is present or rather a person that continuously works in the health and wellness programme for Tamil-speaking seniors and who assumes the role of a translator for the artists during their workshops. A lot of their workshops are based on movements. Naturally, the senior's specific physical demands have to be considered and the range of activities cannot be as broad as they might be with other groups. During one workshop that I attended, one woman who frequently had to sit down remarked that she had taken part in many activities of the Community Arts Guild as well as the Jumblies' production, but due to her back pains she was not at her best anymore (field notes, Dec. 17, 2014). This particular target group certainly requires a slower and more concentrated working process as well as a different style of facilitation. I observed more direct intervention in comparison to the Arts4All workshop where asking focused questions was a main technique of the facilitators. Another particularity of the group of Tamil seniors that I noticed was that they very much liked to imitate one another. This observation was confirmed amongst others by the Artist Marianne Alas, according to whom this traces back to their school system that is based on copying, even with creative matters:

> Yeah, it's a big problem. I think because of their schooling system, they always had to copy, even if they did visual things like embroidery, they always have to copy, so they now copy each others' stuff. Sometimes they have to repeat something like as a warm up and then they start doing their own stuff. (Interview with Marianne Alas, Jan. 5, 2015)

So the artists have to consider this during their workshops and integrate repetition as part of the

---

20 See http://www1.toronto.ca/wps/portal/contentonly?vgnextoid=1d3edada600f0410VgnVCM10000071d60f89RCRD

process.

4.2.2. Project Genesis

The Lost & Found Triptych is the first project that the Community Arts Guild realized independently, after the Jumblies Theatre residency that had started in 2008 ended. It was launched in 2012 and was funded by all three levels of arts councils (Toronto Arts Council, Ontario Arts Council and Canada Council for the Arts). The triptych consists of the radio play "You are not lost", the film "Coming to Past", which serves as a second case study here, as well as the stage production "Train Payanam". All three works are inspired by Tamil seniors' stories and are related to people and things lost and found.[21] Although part of a triptych, each of the works can be considered an independent project. In this particular group of seniors, many stories that were told during the research phase of the project were about being in a different city, on public transport and getting lost in the city, whereas other groups, for example, told stories about a child being lost. Many of those stories about getting lost were funny or absurd. Out of these stories, the plot of the film developed. In a further step, the artistic director Beth Helmers introduced the idea of getting lost and finding oneself in a fantastic place (interview with Beth Helmers, Jan. 9, 2015). In the workshops they were exploring what this place might look like, partly in form of theatre improvisation. As many participants imagined beautiful nature, gardens or beaches, the fantastic place they designed together became such a natural space. After this phase of common exploration, the artist Sean Frey did the writing and storyboarding of the video. In a subsequent workshop session the participants created the movements they wanted to use. As the workshops with Tamil seniors usually take place during the health and wellness programme, they have a time limit of two hours. That is why the artist recruited a group of people who wanted to do the filming for extra shooting dates. This small group went out to film in means of public transport, an activity that took several days. In a different workshop, the seniors all designed the imaginary world and painted the props for a small set that appears in the video. At this stage of the process, the Scarborough youths came into the project and contributed to the drawing, and later mainly to the animation of this sequence. Also, the Scarborough youths did the credits of the film, which can be seen almost as a separate project, as we will see later on.

In different workshops, different elements are produced (movements, soundscape, props etc.) that are later combined in the video, or the final product. In this case, the collaboration between seniors

---

21 For more information see: http://communityartsguild.ca/projects/lost-and-found-triptych/ .

and youths that had taken place during this process is not clearly visible in the video. The explanation why the credits of the film are so long and elaborated can be found in the fact that they were the product of a totally separated workshop. Beth Helmers explains the decision making process as follows:

> We did storyboarding with the seniors to kind of get their ideas for the story and then Sean [Frey, note of the author] took them away and probably with Sonja [Rainey, note of the author] as well, they decided which elements to use. So, it is pretty collaborative that way, like it got passed back and forth, I would say. (Interview with Beth Helmers, 9.1.2015)

She also states that they "sort of scale the options for participation (and) try to make a range of options for people so that they can choose what they are excited about doing or what feels comfortable for them" (ibid). In the case of the video "Coming to Past", the division is mainly between what has been done during and what outside the usual workshops. So, the group as a whole participated in telling the stories, drawing the storyboards, designing the fantastic place with plants and animals, but only few of them participated in the filming process that took place outside the workshop hours and required a lot of extra time and commitment. Somehow all these elements influence the final outcome.

4.2.3. Video Analysis

The film "Coming to Past" starts with a pan shot on chrysanthemum blossoms accompanied by a steady violin tune. We see a colourful dress in the blurred background and the hands of a woman holding a needle with a thread. She picks one of the blossoms and starts making a floral wreath. We can see her hands working, touching the flowers carefully. The focus on her hands gives more importance to the work she does than to herself. We do not see the person, but the thing she is producing, until the music is interrupted by the ringing of a telephone. We see her face clearly for the first time when she answers the phone. She notes something down on a piece of paper and hangs up the telephone, when suddenly a rough cut takes us outside her home to a passenger pick-up where she gets out of a red van, two floral wreaths dangling from her arm. At this point, new music sets in which is characterized by a woman singing probably in Tamil and by drums. A sequence of scenes follows: We see different women dressed like the first one in traditional, mostly red, clothes, all of them with floral wreaths, traveling on public transport. They walk down stairs or take the escalator, sit in the subway, get on or off a bus. The sounds of traffic, of the stopping buses and of passing cars are mixed with the music that continues to play. We follow the women to different bus stops, walking over a bridge, taking a path downhill and finally arriving at a park or garden. The noise of the city is replaced by singing birds and finally the music fades out and we just hear natural

sounds. A woman picks a leaf – not real but drawn – from a bush, which marks the first intersection between the real and the imagined world. When the birdsong sets in, the camera focuses on the faces of women listening and looking around. Soft humming and a discreet ambient sound set in and mix with the sounds of birds. In the next scene, we suddenly see painted mountains, probably made of cardboard. As the camera moves, other painted elements such as trees, a bird and other animals appear in the scene. They are partly animated like paper puppets, moved by a stick that is attached to the figures. Sometimes the painted elements mix with the real world, when, for example, painted birds are moved through real grass. Then, surprisingly, a red painted car enters the picture, moving through the grass too, and the mystic sounds are replaced by a singing voice, the same that we have already heard before. This car seems especially alien in the imaginary environment and marks the return to the real world. In the next scene, we see the red van again, driving into the frame of the video from the left just like the painted car appeared before. The woman (who is actually represented by three different women) gets in the van and the camera accompanies her on her ride through the city, always focusing on her face that is looking around, out of the windows. This scene takes a little longer than expected and ends in a blackout. The music fades out and merges with the fading in of slight humming, singing and drumming, which appears to be a soundscape recorded by the group, maybe even taken out of the radio play which was the first part of the triptych.

This soundscape accompanies the long sequence of credits. We see a table with many colourful pencils, a card and a hand that writes the beginning of the credits. One by one, all the credits (artists, participants, collaborators) appear playfully, either written on the objects on the table, like on a role of tape, a pair of scissors, on paper that is crumpled and unfolded, on the palm of a hand, on a little cardboard airplane, a ship, or even on real leaves. The names of the actresses are written on the trees that were used in the scene of the fantastic world. When everyone is named, the plants are blurred and the drumming fades out.

The length (2min 36 sec) of these credits and the fact that there is little connection between them and the film itself– formally as well as with regard to content – gives the impression of a second independent video that has been added to the first. It really is the product of an independent workshop that the Community Arts Guild did with Scarborough youths. Therefore, the credits of the movie were done apart from the rest of the video making. If we take a closer look at the animated scenes of the original film though, we see that the props are moved by small hands that might as well belong to youths (rather than seniors). So we can see that different elements, done in separate

workshops, were put together to assemble the final piece. Even though the people who did the credits were most likely different from those involved in the original film, some of the elements refer to the production of the first; notably, the trees mentioned above that were done by the seniors in a separate workshop and then formed the scenery of the imagined world. But also the fact that some of the names were written on the leaves of bushes and the blurred image of a flower as a last shot forms a nice conjunction with the beginning of the video, where the woman picks flowers to make a floral wreath, as well as to the imaginary world of nature where the women find themselves eventually after getting lost on public transport. The use of the workshop material gives the impression that the credits were done in a very spontaneous way. The sequences require careful planning, though – or at least several tryouts.

One stylistic element that is particularly interesting is the focus on the person's hands. In "Coming to Past" the focus on the hands draws the viewers' attention to the labour rather than the person doing it, but at the same time does focus on the person very much, as hands are very expressive parts of the body. We can read age, gender and type of work done by the persons from their hands. Are the hands used to doing hard work outside or rather indoors? Have they gone through much or been taken care of a lot? Are they small or big, slim or fat? Do they have scars or characteristic marks?, etc. But apart from these issues which are valid generally and in any context of video making, there is one further aspect to this stylistic device: It takes the focus off the persons' faces while still giving a lot of expression to the film. We tend to notice if people are nervous, over- or underacting mainly from their faces and body language. Filming hands while they are doing something concrete, allows the community members to focus on the task without having to consider the camera too much. Nevertheless, the outcome appears to be very personal and expressive. In the film "Coming to Past" the attention is always centred on the women. They are in the foreground and in focus, while the background is often blurred or even overexposed.

4.2.4. Contextualisation / Analysis of this Case Study

Being part of the Lost & Found triptych, "Coming to Past" tells stories of places and things lost and found. This theme is hardly visible in the film itself, if one doesn't know the underlying idea. When I first saw the film without having any context, it seemed like a very calm and meditative, beautiful video more than anything because of the strong appearance of the women. But I did not see the intended message once the women were in the garden and the magical world appears. The connection between the woman who is apparently called to pick someone up at the airport and the

final scene where (another?!) woman is picked up after her journey to an imaginary place, is not clear without the information that the women actually told a lot of stories about getting lost on public transport and the additional information that they designed imaginary places where they could end up at such a journey. The transfer between real and imaginary world is beautifully done by gradually introducing painted elements. The arrival at the garden is not only marked by the different environment, but also by the change of sound: from traffic noise to humming birds. Rather than being lost, the women seem to have arrived at a safe place that is hidden from the noisy reality of the city. At this place, the perception is changed, but with the appearance of the car the woman is taken back into the real world. Is it the same woman that we saw at the very beginning? Or is it the one that has been picked up at the airport? In Sri Lanka, a floral wreath is often given as a welcome present. As all the women wear one around their arm from beginning to end, we can never be sure if the journey has just begun or if they have already arrived. All the women appearing in the video represent one woman, and at the same time, each of them represents the experiences and journeys of all of them together. In a way, the woman who left home to pick up a friend or family member is the same that is picked up at the end.

The title "Coming to Past" alludes to something that is happening without one's contribution or attention (to come to pass), but also to the past, one's own history. To overcome things that happened without intention. The arrival at the imaginary place is somehow the affirmation that no journey has been made in vain and that getting lost on public transport can also lead you to travel to new places. It transforms the negative experience of getting and feeling lost into the chance of experiencing something unexpected and beautiful. It shows how stories and experiences of the community can be transformed into a different tale. The artist somehow interprets the collected material and combines it with his or her own ideas and thoughts on the topic. In this case, there even seems to be an educational intention in letting the women know that they are not lost and letting them design their own safe idyllic place.

Even though the video is part of a triptych, it stands alone as a piece of art. The video is a final product in itself and does not need any other element to complete the picture. This somehow enhances the importance of the actors as they are part of a movie which has been presented in a community screening and on different occasions, such as a health fair in their building. Both, the leading artist, Sean Frey, as well as the Artistic Director of the Community Arts Guild, Beth Helmers, assured me that the women were very proud to be part of the video project and "felt like celebrities" (interview with Beth Helmers, Jan. 9, 2015). Not all of the Tamil seniors that are part of

the health programme contributed to the final film, which makes the ones who did especially proud to be in it and seen by their community on screen. This becomes very clear in an anecdote of a woman who came to be in the movie by chance. She was not part of the group of Tamil seniors but had taken part in other projects of Jumblies and the Community Arts Guild. One day, she was waiting for the bus, when she met the group by chance while they were shooting on public transport. She then spontaneously decided to take part and played the role of a woman who helped one of the seniors getting on the bus. Even though she was just waiting for the bus, she wanted to be part of the project when she encountered the group. As Beth Helmers tells the story, she underlines how proud this woman was when she saw herself in the final movie during the first screening and that it was a great surprise for many to see her featured in this short film (interview with Beth Helmers, Jan. 9, 2015). This anecdote shows how being in a movie is especially flattering: "Maybe it has to do with movies being the most important media in our society. The biggest celebrities in our society are movie stars. When you are in a movie, you are having a micro-celebrity status" (interview with Sean Frey, Jan. 10, 2015). Shooting a video in the public space adds to that feeling of being and experiencing something special. It takes courage to get exposed like this in a space that is not as closed and safe as a workshop setting. Hence not everybody is up to it. This is where we come back to the importance of scaling the options for participation so that everyone can participate as much or as little as he or she feels comfortable with. The filming of a video in the context of community arts is not participatory from beginning to end, but there is quite a broad range as to the extent of participation in different ways.

In case of the Lost & Found triptych, the first participatory element that involves almost everyone would be the collecting of the story. During the whole process of the project there are further participatory elements that involve the whole group as they are placed in the workshop setting. This would be, for example, the invention and creation of the fantasy world as well as movement workshops that add to the story and performance development, storyboard drawing workshops, the production of the soundscape for the radio play as well as for the film, and so forth. The video "Coming to Past" tells the story of one woman, who is actually represented by different women in every scene. This might be both, a strategic as well as an artistic decision: The strategic part of it is to involve more people in the filming process. Dividing a role among many people is a common strategy of Jumblies Theatre and its off-shoots, more than anything, because it makes the task easier when the role is split into little tasks. But at the same time, there is a conceptual reason to it, because in that way we see one woman that is represented by many, just as her part is representing the experiences of many women as well as men that have contributed their stories.

The group of Tamil seniors is the centre of this production. As mentioned above, they are part of a community health programme, which might be the reason why many of the workshops that the Community Arts Guild offers involve movement and body work. Repetition and practice are key elements in working with this group. This is not only due to their seniority but also because of communication issues and language barriers. Even if they work with a translator, some of the exercises and tasks have to be explained through body language, demonstration and repetition. During a workshop in Scarborough on December 17, 2014, I noticed a lot more directing and instruction than, for example, at the workshop with Arts4All on December 15, 2014. Instead of asking questions such as "How would you represent...?", "What would you like to do next?" or "Do you like it better this way or that?" (field notes, Dec. 17, 2014), the artists and volunteers gave more direct instructions and always demonstrated examples. This led to many repetitions as the Tamil seniors like to imitate what they have seen before and develop their own ideas only in a further step. Marianne Alas, who has worked with the Tamil seniors a lot, wishes for that reason that they would have more time with this group:

> We just have two hours with them. And sometimes it takes them time to process and to think about it (...) We do the two hour workshops and then sometimes we ask them to come at different times. And sometimes they can and sometimes they can't, they have quite busy lives. We never know who's going to show up. And there's not so much time to wait, so whoever is there, is in the video. (Interview with Marianne Alas, Jan. 5, 2015)

Despite my own impression during that workshop session, Beth Helmers claims that the Tamil seniors "are pretty proactive about deciding if they want to do something or not. Like, if it seems physically challenging, they would say, they don't want to do it or ask, can I have a chair" (interview with Beth Helmers, Jan. 9, 2015). She also mentions that she sometimes gets the impression that the participants find them (the artists of the Community Arts Guild) funny because they ask them to do weird things and they might not know why, but nevertheless, they are always very eager to participate and have fun doing it (ibid). In this context being proactive means to express personal needs and desires, but not necessarily to bring in new ideas or suggestions. It seems appropriate to their age and the programme in which they participate that they get suggestions and decide whether or not they want to follow them, rather than coming up with their own idea every time. Working with a translator also means that most of the information goes one way. The translator can translate the directions to the group and also questions from the group to the artist, but once they have been divided into smaller groups, not everything can be translated all the time. This is again a reason why showing and repeating is so important with this particular group.

There is one scene in the video that shows the gap between directing and acting in particular. It is when the women first enter the imaginary world and we see a sequence of close ups on their faces looking at the sky or looking around. Some of the women seem not to understand exactly why they are looking around. They don't *act* being in a new place and looking around, but seem to have been told to look around and therefore role their eyeballs. Amateur actors usually don´t have such clear expressions and such a broad band of facial expression as professionals. Therefore, the scenes where they walk around the city and travel on public transport, looking out of the window or directly into the camera, seem a lot more authentic. It is this what they associate with getting lost, so it is easy to empathise. Generally speaking we can conclude that a more authentic approach leads to more genuine results rather than pushing amateur actors into playing roles which they may not really understand or cope with.

One of the main aims of the Community Arts Guild is to bring people together who are separated by distance, language, income or age. The video "Coming to Past" has been done in collaboration with Tamil seniors and Scarborough youths. Nevertheless the co-operation is not visible in the final product. Rather, it seems like two different projects bound together. The young people animated the puppets done by the Tamil seniors and created a stop motion film that was then integrated in the video done by the seniors, with credits that were again made by the youths. Whereas the Tamil seniors get the feeling of being stars as they appear on screen, the youths are not really visible in the final product. They are rewarded by knowing their part and seeing their product as part of a bigger short movie. A more visible cooperation between the two groups would have had a nice effect, especially because a co-operation of seniors and youths is rare; even more so, it can lead to beautiful outcomes. In this case, anyhow, it becomes clear that the artists have the general overview over the project whereas the participants take part in particular workshops or tasks without having the big picture in mind.

It is the minor details that make the beauty of this video, such as the painted car that appears in the fictional world and then suddenly the red van coming back that we have seen in the beginning. Also, the changing shots of different women creates suspense although there is not much action. It is clearly one story, but the women change continuously. Sometimes, for example when they walk over the bridge, this gives a beautiful effect of doubling and we see the different women in the same situation. In other sequences though, different women make one and the same movement. For example, in the final scene, the woman who gets into the car is actually played by three women. The movement of walking towards the car, opening the door and entering it, is divided by fast cuts

and because of the different angles, it is hardly noticeable that there are three women and not just one who gets into the car. In this case, they clearly represent one woman, but with their differences they also represent different aspects of one person. This makes the representation of many stories in one video complete.

4.3. Third Case Study: „Welcome to the UK" (2012)

The third case study shows a participatory video project conducted by InsightShare. The project was facilitated by Sara Asadullah from InsightShare with a group of female English learners. This case study should be seen as a complement to the previous two examples that are located in a community arts context. Showing this example in its context gives another perspective to the broad range of community-based film making practices. The rules and practices of each of them might become clearer when they are seen in juxtaposition.

4.3.1. Setting

This participatory video originates in a collaboration of InsightShare and Learning Unlimited. Learning Unlimited is a social enterprise that offers free ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) classes through the Welcome to the UK project.[22] This project was funded by EIF, the European Integration Fund with support of Blackfriars Settlement, the British Council, the Institute of Education, Southwark Council and UKBET (the UK Bangladesh Education Trust) and consists of two main areas: a preparatory workshop for women in Bangladesh who are about to emigrate („Preparing for life in the UK"[23]) and a programme for women in the UK to „support the successful integration of TCN [Third Country National, note of the author] women"[24]. Both in Bangladesh and in the UK, a group of women were involved in a participatory video project facilitated by Sara Asadullah. She used the Most Significant Change method to collect the women's experiences and changes in their lives that are represented in the videos. This technique is based on the collection of stories before and after a certain event or time period, which are then discussed in the group to extract the story which shows the most change and used to represent all the other stories as well. The video "Welcome to the UK" was supposed to be shown to women in Bangladesh to help them prepare and to give advice to women who are about to emigrate. At the

---

22 For more information about the project see: http://www.learningunlimited.co/projects/previous-projects/wttuk .
23 See http://www.learningunlimited.co/projects/previous-projects/wttuk .
24 See http://www.learningunlimited.co/files/WUK_Information_Flyer.pdf .

same time, of course, it is supposed to encourage the women already living in the UK to tell their stories and to reflect about their own lives.

The women who participated in this project are from eleven different countries. All of them attended ESOL classes at the London South Bank University. The participatory video project took place within their language classes, sometimes with, sometimes without the regular English teacher, and lasted over twelve sessions of two hours each, once a week. The final video was later shown in Bangladesh, where women conducted their own participatory video project in preparation of coming to the UK.

Whereas many of InsightShare's projects are realized in collaboration with organisations in other countries, it is partly Sara Asadullah's initiative to facilitate projects within the UK. She describes this participatory video project as a pilot project which has been made with very little money that just covered some of her time (interview with Sara Asadullah, Sep. 29, 2014). Later, she realized other projects with ESOL students with the British council as part of a monitoring and evaluation commission.

4.3.2. Project Genesis

Sara Asadullah describes the genesis of the project as having emerged out of her master's project in visual anthropology, where she focused on different generations of Bengalis in London because of her own family background. Once she gained a foothold in this community she became more and more interested in the lives of immigrants in the UK and the difficulties they face, being disconnected from the "motherland", as well as from Britain. She says:

> (...) basically what I felt was (…) that when people emigrate, and especially people from Bangladesh, there is a whole lot of misunderstanding about what's going to happen when you get there. People in Bangladesh have this idea of, you know, streets are paved with gold (laughs) or you know, there is a lot of money, and everything is good and all that stuff works out. And there is not a lot of information passing back and forth about how they can be really lonely, and it can by really difficult to get ahead in London. You go from middle-class in Bangladesh to working in McDonalds in London and all those difficulties. And information doesn't pass. So that was one of my feelings before I went into this project that maybe video could help to raise awareness about that. (Interview with Sara Asadullah, Sep. 29, 2014)

That is the very personal reason for how she came to do a pilot participatory video project with students within the ESOL programme "Welcome to the UK", because this course offers a very practical approach to learning English and focuses on the needs of people who come to the UK. This project was conducted with very small funds and was made possible with the help of a friend of hers who teaches English at Learning Unlimited. The particularity of this project is that the

sessions were tied to the English classes, which limits the time and space for the filming:

> They [the women, note of the author] are really busy, have to look after their children, etc. ESOL class becomes a very important part of their lives. They had very much confidence in the teacher. So they also trusted in me when I came in. It was also about the freedom to speak and learn like that. But also, she [the teacher, note of the author] did work sheets so that they had the feeling that they were really learning something. (Interview with Sara Asadullah, Sep. 29, 2014)

The confidence the women had in their teacher helped the facilitator of the participatory video project to build trust from the very beginning when she was introduced to the group. As the course became a very important part of the lives of the women, so did the participatory video project once it was placed in that space. Although Sara Asadullah's statement about the worksheets shows that the women were eager not to lose track of the formal English classes, she also mentions her not being a teacher as another important element that helped the participants to feel at ease in the process and telling their stories:

> The fear of speaking wrongly stops them from trying (...)The way it really works for these women is that once you get them engaged with the topic and with sharing something in common they forget their language issues and just start trying to communicate. Start trying to understand each other. Start having a discussion even though they don't have the words and that stuff was not possible when the teacher was there because the focus was on how am I saying this correctly or not. So they pushed past so many barriers! (ibid)

This quotation shows one of the most important outcomes of this project on a personal level: the overcoming of the fear of speaking incorrectly and the confidence the participants gained in expressing their experiences in front of a camera.

4.3.3. Video Analysis

The video "Welcome to the UK" starts with a sequence of typical images and sounds associated with London and the UK. While the title appears, we hear the sound of Big Ben and street noise which soon overlaps with a melody played by a bagpipe player, whom we see in full costume playing on a bridge in front of the London Eye. Other typical images follow: The UK flag that flies on top of the Houses of Parliament, red double decker busses, black London cabs, the police in their uniforms, as well as a street performer. All these images and sounds show London as it is seen by tourists or as it is known from movies or advertising. The next scene takes the spectator directly inside a building where a woman introduces the aim of the video: "We made this film for you. We are English students. In the UK you can find ESOL courses. This course is free. Don't be afraid. This project helps us to learn English and about life in the UK". Other women follow, who talk about the travel money they get for public transport and welcome the spectators with the words "We

hope this film helps you to feel confident and we say – Welcome to the UK". The last words are spoken in chorus by thirteen women who are apparently all students of this ESOL course. The following sequences are divided into sections such as "Before I came to the UK", "When I first arrived", "Going shopping", "Going to the doctor", "At the job centre", "At the post office", "How to be a good mother in the UK", "Finding your way in London", "Going to English class" and "How I feel now" (Video "Welcome to the UK", courtesy of InsightShare)[25].

In each section, the women tell stories about their experiences and share their feelings during the different stages. Fear and excitement are common themes at the beginning, as well as leaving behind family and friends and starting a new life. The lack of English language skills and knowledge about the country and its customs are also recurrent themes. The women speak directly into the camera and the video shows different parts of the building where the language course is held. But these scenes are juxtaposed with sequences that take place outside and others that were clearly shot at the women's homes. The first one of those scenes shows one woman playing the cello at home. Cuts of this sequence alternate with cuts of the sequence where she tells her own story of coming to the UK. The second one shows one of the women having breakfast with her son, taking him to school and later, how she leaves the house to pick him up and goes to the park with him. This is the scene where a woman describes "how to be a good mother in the UK". Without presenting the whole stories and backgrounds of their lives, the women share little details that tell the spectator a lot about the reasons why they came to the UK, whether they came after their husbands, started a new job, etc. It also shows how little most of them knew about the city and the country before emigrating.

The sequences in the middle of the film give practical tips and insights into matters of daily life: going shopping, to the doctor, to the job centre, etc. These scenes consist of images that show the places in question, how the women act in different situations and the voices of the women giving practical tips about each topic. Mostly, the women speak English, but sometimes they also speak in their mother tongue (e.g. Bengali) and are subtitled in English. These scenes are mostly acted out by the women themselves. Even if they present everyday situations, they are all staged. The video takes the women (and the spectators) to a lot of different places around London: public authorities, the post office, etc. In the next scene, three of the women are singing a song in the classroom. The audio continues and adds music to the next scene where they go shopping. The scene "Finding your

---

25 See http://insightshare.org/watch/video/welcome-uk .

way in London" shows two women walking along the streets, looking lost and apparently looking for something. Music is added to the scene and we see various cuts, with each of them showing the women in a slightly different setting. The music only fades out when the women ask somebody the way and when they finally find someone who accompanies them to the University, where the English courses are held. "Going to English class" is the last of these practical sequences that leads the spectator back to where it all started: to the building and the classrooms where the English course takes place. The three women enter a classroom where the teacher is just explaining different vocabulary concerning public transportation (north-bound, south-bound). The teacher and the students welcome the newly arrived women and introduce themselves to them. We hear all of the women's names and where they come from. After that, the camera witnesses part of an English lesson, which is the end of the "practical" part of the short film. In "How I feel now", the women sum up how their lives have changed from when they first arrived up to the present day. Again, language skills, practice and orientation are recurrent topics in the women's statements, but also confidence and new friendships that they have gained. Those stories are juxtaposed with scenes from inside the classroom. Finally, the credits show pictures of the participatory video process and the women during the workshop sessions.

The structure of this short movie is divided into chapters, just like sections of a class book. Each of the sequences with practical tips could be one session in a language training course. It comes with the setting of this participatory video project – being situated within English lessons – that many of these topics seem to be taken out of what has been dealt with in the course. Also, the video is very close to the experiences the women make through these English classes and within their personal lives. Their personal stories and feelings add a personal touch to the video and make it more than just an image video of ESOL courses. The selection of themes clearly comes from the women themselves. A sequence about "How to be a good mother in the UK" would surprise readers very much, if it was part of a textbook for English learners in the 21st century, but is nevertheless considered an important information to pass on to other women, from part of the participants. Most of the video is done in a documentary style with participants speaking directly into the camera or interviewing one another. It is mainly based on women speaking about their experiences guided by questions such as "What did it feel like before you were coming to the UK? How was it, when you first arrived; after you arrived and how do you feel now?" These questions make up the narrative structure of the video. However, the scenes that centre around certain subjects, such as how to travel around the city, how to raise children and what it takes to live independently, give a clear guidances of what life in the UK is like, through the eyes of those migrant women from eleven different

countries.The documentary style of the video and the division into chapters gives the movie a tutorial touch, which is partly the purpose, because the video was made to be shown to women in Bangladesh who are about to emigrate to the UK. But it also shows the participatory process the participants went through: the topics that have been treated, the way they use camera skills, the way they tell their stories, etc.

Some of the scenes require acting, but as it is mostly about everyday situations, the women do not need a lot of acting skills and the scenes develop quite naturally. The scene where the two women ask for directions is probably the one with most acting involved. It is at the same time the scene with the highest number of different shots and most cuts. Also, this scene is the only scene where music is added – apart from the one where women go shopping and we see and hear them singing – and it is the longest chapter. Thus this scene becomes the highlight of the short movie because, with regard to images, it literally leads back to the classroom and with regard to content it builds a bridge between the tutorial part and the part where the women talk about their experiences and feelings at this very place. Other scenes, such as the one in the classroom, are probably staged too, but not necessarily acted out. This is to say that there were no particular roles to play, but the women acted out of their usual position as language learners and so did the teacher as a teacher. While the scene in the streets but also the one where the woman has breakfast and accompanies her child to school need additional planning (where to shoot, who is involved, who takes which part, what is the dialogue etc.), the one in the classroom can be shot at any course session they have and does not require additional practice. Even if it is clearly visible that all the scenes are staged or acted out, they still remain authentic because they show everyday situations in the lives of these women. The scene of the woman playing the cello is especially interesting, as it gives the spectator another insight into the woman's life apart from the stories she tells. It shows her in her individuality, shows what she is good at and sketches her personality apart from her role as an English student.

With regard to technical aspects, the video is rough and does not try too hard to compensate inaccuracies. For media-literate persons, the video shows little suspense, but the acted scenes give a personal touch to the video. The women's accents make some of the statements difficult to understand. Subtitles help the spectator to understand better. It is interesting to see that the first sections where the women talk directly into the camera are subtitled and the last ones are not. This somehow suggests an improvement in understanding on the part of the spectator. The video is authentic. It does not hide, but shows the women's reality in all of these aspects. Although the video shows authentic experiences of the women and does not try to polish anything up, it still does not

seem to be truly made by the women. This might be due to the fact that the structure (what was before – when you arrived – now) is so visible in the video. This structure reveals more of the participatory process that took place before the production of the video. It clearly shows the questions that have been asked by the facilitator, as well as the intention that lies behind them (namely to show the video to women who are preparing to emigrate to the UK, BUT also to show how ESOL courses will help these women to set foot in the UK). With this, it is also a kind of advertisement for Learning Unlimited, even though the experiences behind the video are real.

4.3.4. Contextualisation / Analysis of this Case Study

The first impression one gets of the video in question is of dynamics different from the first two case studies. It is clearly not a work of art, but – if it needs to be categorized – a documentation. The video is based on stories and not on an artistic interpretation of them. Whoever knows something about participatory video, sees the process that underlies the structure of the video very clearly. As Thomas and Britton state: "The process of negotiating the aesthetic content of a video product is intimately linked to the process of forming and understanding relationships, negotiating consent, and creating the conditions for social change" (Thomas and Britton 2012). Therefore I am going to contextualize the video in the following to understand this process.

There are different important aspects to this project. First, the aim of this participatory video project is partly to give the women confidence in speaking, even if they are just learning the language. In the course of the project, the women have to communicate with each other constantly, which gives them no time to think about speaking grammatically correct all the time. In this way, the participatory video project introduces non-formal education inside the formal structures of a language class. InsightShare's motto "Mistakes are great!" helps to encourage learners to have a different attitude towards learning (Asadullah 2014: 105). It has already been mentioned that according to Sara Asadullah, who facilitated this project, it was very important for the process and the confidence of the women that she is not a teacher. Because, once the teacher was away, it was no longer about speaking correctly but about communicating in whatever way they could. This shows in the final video: It is not about the way they speak, but about the fact that they are able to convey their message.

Second, the women value and appreciate their own stories through this storytelling process. The hook of this project were questions such as: What would you tell other women who are currently

preparing to come to the UK? What would you tell them about life in the UK? What do you want them to know? Sharing personal experiences and things they have learned, shows the women how much they already know and that their knowledge is appreciated. While usually migrants face the situation that the focus is often put on the things they don't know and have to learn, in this case, the focus lies on what they do know and what they have experienced. This change of perspectives is crucial to being able to appreciate their own progress, but also value what they have done before and what they are good at. The cello player is a good example to illustrate this aspect. While usually the role of the women in the language course is that of learners, it changes when we see one of them playing her instrument. In the course, she is always in the position of learning, listening, repeating and trying to understand in order to improve. The teacher sees her in class and evaluates her according to her linguistic improvement. In this case, she shows something she is good at, something she likes doing and an ability her teacher probably never saw in her. This somehow diminishes the hierarchy between English teacher and student, but also shows the woman as an individual and not just as part of the group. It reminds the spectator that there is more to each of these women than we see in the video. Sharing their stories puts the women in the situation of a teacher rather than a student because they pass their knowledge on to others. This makes the project somehow more serious because the women have a certain responsibility in what they show and tell.

The structure of the film can easily be explained by the participatory process that has led to it. InsightShare works with different games and activities that accumulate and finally lead to the video that marks the end of the process. First, there are games without too many technical descriptions, which show the participants how to use the camera and how to become familiar with the gear. Then, there is a phase where participants collect topics, discuss and decide about what they want to show in their video and finally, participants film and edit their video. One of the activities that they use a lot is called "river of life", where participants are invited to think about (a certain period of) their lives and draw a river that represents the story by means of metaphors: the spring, where everything begins, how the river grows, where it might have other streams coming in, spots that are quiet and peaceful and others where the river has drifts and dangerous currents that could represent problems, etc. In this case, that task was structured even more and the participants were told to think about the topic with the guiding questions, what they felt before coming to the UK, when they arrived, after having arrived, and now. Those are the sections that are visible in the women's interviews and statements shown in the video. In a second session, they did a general brainstorming about what they would tell women who came to the UK and prioritized what the group offered by clustering the ideas into topics. However, the facilitator states that

73

we didn't get much prioritization in fact; everybody wanted to include everything. That's why the film ends up being this river, people expressing (what they have written) and saying it. And then also a little bit of how to take care of your children, how to go shopping. (Interview with Sara Asadullah, Sep. 29, 2014)

The lack of prioritization is visible in the final video as well, as it seems to be a collage of many different topics. This shows the approach InsightShare has for participatory video projects: The methodology, the games and activities, are developed to offer both, a broad brainstorming and collection of different views and opinions; as well as a discussion about them and a decision-making process on the base of consensus. If the decision is to include every aspect, the facilitator is not supposed to convince the group of something else, but to accept their decision.

4.4. Comparison / Consolidation of the three Case Studies

I would now like to consolidate some results of the analysis of these three case studies to which I will come back later in chapter seven.

It is evident that the project genesis of the two first case studies follows a similar structure: First, the stories are collected from the community members (in form of arts-based research and interviews) and then the writing and storyboarding is done by the artist, or artistic team. The stories and memories of the community are transformed and combined into one storyline that has a different narrative but reflects upon the tales that stand behind. This is true for "I Was A Brave Child" as well as for "Coming to Past", whereas case study 3 offers a different approach: The storyline of "Welcome to the UK" is constructed within the group of participants. In this case, stories are collected with the help of tasks and exercises and are further developed in the very same workshop setting. Step by step, the facilitator leads the participants towards substantiating their narrative and translating it into a storyboard to be filmed. The facilitator accompanies the whole process, but always supports the group in their story writing rather than doing it alone.

Another strategy that became visible in both community arts case studies is the way how many people are involved in the process. Dividing a role among various persons is one way to do so. In case study 2 "Coming to Past" the main protagonist is represented by many women. This makes the task easier for all the actresses, because the role becomes smaller for each of them. Likewise the "spookies in the forest" of case study 1 "I Was A Brave Child" are played by a group of community members even if, in the radio play, just two children are meant to be in this scene. However, these

decisions should not be seen just as practical ones. They rather leave space for interpretation, and repetition is also an artistic technique. In this way, we see one women that is represented by many, just as the protagonist is representing the experiences of many women as well as men that have contributed their stories to form the plot. And we see the depth of different emotions at the same time represented by peculiar figures that move around the woods.

I described two ways of acting in the case studies. The first is acting a role, representing a character. The other is staging a scene that is familiar. The eye-roling of the women in case study 2, when they come to the fantastic world is a simple example of over-acting. The women do what they are told to, but it doesn't really translate to the story. When the same women walk around in public space though, they immediately radiate authenticity. When acting becomes too obvious, the spectator cannot relate to it, which is consequently seen as deficiency of the film.

However, there are ways to avoid that happening. One of them has been pointed out in case study 2. It is a technique frequently used by Jumblies also in other productions: The focus on the hands that we see in the beginning of this case study when the woman is making the floral wreaths. Sean Frey also uses this method in "A Light in Mid Winter"[26], which is a short film about outdoor bread making at MABELLEarts, the third of Jumblies' off-shoots. In that case, we have a long scene of different people kneading dough. The repetition of the movement emphasizes the focus on the different hands and styles, from children who have to use all their strength to knead the dough to adults who appear to have done it a lot of times in their lives. Similar to the use of masks, this method is a way of working with amateur actors without risking the above-mentioned over-acting. Masks give a certain expression without any acting needed and they also function as an abstraction. As opposed to the masks, though, the focus on hands still puts the individual persons in the centre of attention, who are not hidden underneath a mask that can be worn by anybody.

Another way of involving people does not even require including them as characters in the film itself, but rather finds other tasks that can be fulfilled in a collaborative way, such as the highly elaborate credits in case study 2. Similar methods had been used by Jumblies Theatre in other productions, for example in the super 8 film, "Into the Fall"[27] that was made by Sean Frey together with the Tamil seniors and Scarborough youths, just like "Coming to Past". In this example, the title that appears in the first shot seems to be written by hand but is in fact a thread, carefully placed on white linen to form the letters. The ball of yarn is visible on the edge of the frame. A hand appears

---

26 See: http://seanfrey.blogspot.co.at/2011/10/light-in-midwinter.html .
27 See: http://www.jumbliestheatre.org/jumblies/videos , page 4.

in the picture and grabs the other end of the thread, pulling softly so that the writing disappears little by little. The linen is then folded and formed into a ball and the first scene seems to be appearing underneath. Unfortunately, a subtle transition between film and credits like that is missing in the case of "Coming to Past", which makes the credits appear too long, but nevertheless playful and fascinatingly done.

The presentation of the respective videos is also worth looking at. Case study 3 showed a participatory video process that was made for a concrete audience, namely the women in Bangladesh who were about to emigrate to the UK. Therefore, it was conceptualized in such a practical way, similar to a tutorial. In case of the community arts projects, again two different approaches were seen: in the second case study the video stands alone as a product and was shown in a community screening. In the first case study, the video was part of a multi-media art installation that transferred a radio play into a performance. It is therefore situated in a context close to theatre, as it uses elements of both, live performance and video. It is staged, but rather in form of a performance than a play. Esther Maloney explains the particularity of a theatre presentation in comparison to film:

> One of the best things about theatre is that there is a particular kind of participatory energy. Everyone has to be in their spot at the same time when the curtains open. And that is a very specific energy. Film is different. It is a longer flowing process. People come in and out. (…) The video (on the other side) can take you outside and you can travel in time. (Interview with Esther Maloney, Jan. 17, 2015)

It is obvious that the production and screening of a video lacks a certain momentum that is characteristic of a theatre production. As we have seen in case study one, the fitting together of the different elements – the radio play, the videos, the live acting – makes the final play special. It involves both, elements of film making as well as the particular energy of a performance or play. In case of the screening of a short movie, the sense of community, of having made something together cannot be as strongly felt at just one moment. It is rather the personal experience of having been part of what is shown on the screen that makes the screening special for everyone that has participated in one form or another.

This example also shows what Beth Helmers referred to as "scaling" options of participation. It does show a certain flexibility and willingness to adapt. If there is someone who wants to take part, one will find a way to include her or him. And this is also one of the advantages of video over other forms of community arts: it somehow holds the moment of the production and makes it live on. Being able to capture the people who come and go, is also highlighted by Beth Helmers as one of

the most important advantages of working with film:

> What is great about film is that you can keep the traces of people even if they are gone. With theatre everyone has to be there, but with film, even if someone moves away or so, he leaves a mark on the project in a very concrete way. It kind of captures time or captures that moment. It is useful because people come and go a lot. (Interview with Beth Helmers, Jan. 9, 2015)

It is part of the beauty of it that in the final product, all of them have the same value. This is especially important for groups with a high rate of fluctuation.

After having seen these three case studies, there remains the question if and how much the participants of each project feel ownership over the final product. In case study 2 it became clear that not everybody is equally strongly connected with the final product. The woman who came by by chance and spontaneously got to take a little role certainly felt part of the outcome, when she finally saw herself in the video. The mere presence in the final product made her part of it, even tough she had not contributed to any previous workshop leading to the final film. Others who did contribute with their story and laid the groundwork for the storyboard, on the other hand, might not find themselves directly represented in the final outcome. Others again might not even come to see the end product or would not see the connection between what they had done in some workshop to what they saw on screen. Somehow it always remains the work of the artistic team, with contributions of the community. And that is the most significant difference between video-making in the context of community arts and participatory video-making. In the latter, the group forms during the process and each and every step is decided upon and done by the participants.

Before I come back to a further discussion of these topics, I am going to introduce a theoretical approach to the field of community arts in the following chapters.

5. An Attempt at Defining Community Arts

The case studies have shown different approaches of how to engage people in video-making, and the term community arts has been mainly used to describe the work of Jumblies Theatre. This chapter offers a further discussion of the use of this term and its affinity to, as well as its demarcation from other concepts that refer to socially-engaged art. In a first approach I am going to define community arts for myself as an art form that 1) involves artists who work within and with a certain community, 2) works collaboratively towards a certain product that is presented or displayed and 3) builds on relationships between both, the artists and the community.

During my research, I found that most of the writings about community arts are reports that place special projects in their local contexts and are written by people who were part of, or invested in these projects (i.e. Gielen 2011, De bisschop 2011, Van Erven 2013). In her study of Free Form Arts Trust, a London-based community arts organisation, Crehan (2011) notes that "academics have not studied the history of community arts in Britain in any depth" (Crehan 2011: 80, footnote). She goes on mentioning community arts practitioners who have written about community arts, such as Su Braden (1978), Owen Kelly (1984), Malcom Dickson (1995), or John Fox (2002), but claims that "(e)xactly what community arts was, however, tended to be left a little vague, in part because breaking down the boundaries between different art forms and between art and nonart was often the goal of its practitioners" (Crehan 2011: 80). Crehan's study underlines the use of a workshop technique as one of the central characteristics of community arts, and she further states:

> Within the visual arts, community art encompassed a general sense of an art that was not gallery art, that was collective rather than individual, and that addressed itself to those living in `areas of deprivation´ not normally reached by the established arts (ibid: 81).

According to her definition, the term community arts describes a movement that wanted to use art to bring about social change, but for many community artists it offered a new direction within the arts at the same time (ibid). Crehan's (2011) notion of community arts serves as a main point of reference in this thesis. She points out that through the use of workshops, community arts function as a democratization of expertise. While other community artists, such as Owen Kelly (1984), argue that community art should bring about social change and have an effect on social policies, in Crehan's study of Free Form Arts Trust, she notices "a more pragmatic, essentially reformist version of community art (that) was set up to give those living in impoverished neighbourhoods access to the expertise of skilled professionals (…) to improve bleak and neglected built environments, not to overthrow capitalism" (Crehan 2011: 182). While the forms and characteristics of different

community arts practices might be divergent and the use of "a workshop format in itself, does not define either the nature of the nonexpert's contribution or the power relationship between expert and nonexpert", the workshop format has "at least the potential to provide spaces in which experts and nonexperts can work collaboratively on identifying problems and coming up with solutions" (Crehan 2011: 182). As such, community artists can be seen as mediators, both between "the art world and the visual worlds of those living in impoverished neighbourhoods" as well as providing "a link between `the community´ and the various government and other bureaucracies local people had to navigate" in order to realize projects (ibid: 187).

The difficulty when talking about this subject starts with the need to separate community art from participatory art, relational art, new genre public art and many other artistic practices, even if all of those intertwine and at least partly overlap. Therefore, I will start with Nicolas Bourriaud's (2002) often cited and criticized concept of "relational aesthetics" to further explore other positions such as the one of Pascal Gielen, co-editor of the compilation "Community Art. The Politics of Trespassing" (2011), Claire Bishop, whose "Artificial Hells" (2012) offers a view on participatory arts and politics, or Grant Kester (2004), who concentrates on the dialogical appearance of such art practices.

5.1. Relational Aesthetics

Before I come back to discussing notions of community arts, I would like to start with Bourriaud´s influential, but also highly criticized concept of "Relational Aesthetics" (2002). Relational art, according to Bourriaud, is defined by personalized situations of encounter and exchange that overcome a former distance between artists and spectators. Referring to the art of the 1990s, "it is no longer possible to regard the contemporary work as a space to be walked through (...). It is henceforth presented as a period of time to be lived through, like an opening to unlimited discussion" (Bourriaud 2002: 15). Thus the term *relational* rather than participatory: The momentum of the art work originates in an ever-changing reunion of social beings that directly interact with the art:

> (t)his system of intensive encounters has ended up producing linked artistic practices: an art form where the substrate is formed by inter-subjectivity, and which takes being-together as a central theme, the "encounter" between beholder and picture, and the collective elaboration of meaning (ibid: 15).

Even if art has always been relational in some sense, as in the audience that experiences a piece of

art or the artist who responds to external conditions, the significant difference in Bourriaud's description is that relational art emerges out of this encounter. Bourriaud states that "art is a state of encounter" (Bourriaud 2002: 18) and "form is a lasting encounter" (ibid: 19). Art is therefore no longer a commodity, or a *piece*, but its form only exists in this encounter and through the dynamics of relationship, it is therefore a "formation" rather than a form (ibid: 21).

This means that the artist sets up a situation but the outcome of the art work is equally shaped by the (re-)action of those who experience it. The audience does more than just receive the artwork. It is part of it. Hence, the artist cannot guarantee the result. Will the audience take away all the candy of Félix González-Torres' C*andy Pieces* (For example *"Untitled" (A Corner of Baci)* 1990)? Does the stack of posters outlast the duration of the exhibition (For example *"Untitled" (Memorial Day weekend)* 1989)? What kind of answers do the 107 women give, when Sophie Calle asks them to interpret a letter she got from her ex-partner (*Prenez soin de vous* 2007)? Bourriaud distinguishes two forms of artworks proposed by those artists, namely a) artworks as moments of sociability and b) artworks as objects producing sociability (Bourriaud 2002: 33). The latter still refers to the artwork as an object, but with the difference that the audience is supposed to interact with it and therefore also changes it (as in the examples of Félix González-Torres). The former overcomes the idea of an artwork as an object and declares the momentary situation itself – initiated by the artist – as being the artwork.

One might tend to say that this kind of interactive art is a new form of conceptualism, as the artist is mainly responsible for the idea and the set-up. Nevertheless, Bourriaud points out that relational art is not about absence (as in the description of an action that substitutes the actual piece in conceptualism) but about presence (the encounter). The art originates from the meeting of different people and the collective elaboration of meaning is its central theme. The importance Bourriaud gives to this inter-human relations must be seen as an attempt to strictly distinguish the art of the 1990s from earlier movements: "The issue no longer resides in broadening the boundaries of art, but in experiencing art's capacities of resistance within the overall social arena" (ibid: 31).
For Bourriaud, this enforcement of relation in art is a direct response to the reduction of relational space due to a mechanisation of social functions and is, therefore, definitely political (ibid: 17). The art of the 1990s does not fit into the usual categories of art, such as sculpture, installation, or performance (ibid: 25). He argues that the "arena of exchange" (ibid: 18) has to be judged on the basis of new aesthetic criteria.

Bourriaud pits relational art against older practices such as the Situationists. The Situationists, or Situationist International (S.I.), was a group of artists that formed in the late 1950s and was mainly active in the 1960s. The group aimed for situating art within society and the daily life and aimed at a form of political art that finally dissolved into society and became politics. Therefore they changed from being an avant-garde art movement to becoming a political movement in the course of their praxis (see Plant 1995). One of the most important figures of this movement is certainly Guy Debort, whose work "The Society of the Spectacle" (Debord 1983/1967) is considered an influential factor of the uprisings in May 1968 in France. The image of "the society of the spectacle" refers to a society where everybody just occupies a certain role, where even resistance is only staged and where situations are collectively created (see Debord 1983/1967).

According to Bourriaud, in the 1990s utopia is not a projection of a better future any more but it is lived on small scales and it has become part of everyday life:

> Social utopias and revolutionary hopes have given way to everyday micro-utopias and imitative strategies, any stance that is "directly" critical of society is futile, if based on the illusion of a marginality that is nowadays impossible, not to say regressive (Bourriaud 2002:31).

These everyday micro-utopias are small, concrete and intentionally fragmentary experiments that try to alter day-to-day life and are supposed to have immediate effects. Hence art "is no longer seeking to represent utopias; rather, it is attempting to construct concrete spaces" (ibid: 46). In other words:

> (T)he role of artworks is no longer to form imaginary and utopian realities, but to actually be ways of living and models of action within the existing real, whatever the scale chosen by the artist (ibid:13).

Bourriaud states that the "society of the spectacle", introduced by Guy Debord (1967), has now become a "society of extras" (Bourriaud 2002: 113), where everyone gets to be active him/herself – even if it is just for fifteen minutes of fame and even though this activity might be carefully staged. Through this shift from consumers to participators we become "the *extras* of the spectacle", while we have been formerly regarded as its consumers (ibid). Hence the boundaries between spectator and actor get blurred.

Although Bourriaud's work has been highly influential, it has also been widely criticized, among others by Grant Kester (2004, 2011), Pascal Gielen (2011) and Claire Bishop (2012), as will be shown in the next subchapters.

5.2. Participatory Art

Claire Bishop (2012) refers to the "expanded field of post-studio practices" that have taken place since the early 1990s as participatory art, "since this connotes the involvement of many people (as opposed to the one-to-one relationship of `interactivity´) and avoids the ambiguities of `social engagement´" (Bishop 2012: 1). From the very beginning, she is clear in her separation of these practices from what Bourriaud referred to as relational aesthetics:

> (H)owever, many of the projects that formed the impetus for this book have emerged in the wake of *Relational Aesthetics* and the debates that it occasioned; the artists I discuss below are less interested in relational *aesthetic* than in the creative rewards of participation as a politicised working progress. (ibid: 2; original accentuation)

Despite her criticism she acknowledges Bourriaud's achievement in outlining discursive and dialogical projects which are located close to museums and galleries. Nevertheless, she even more appreciates the critical reactions to his theory which "catalysed a more critically informed discussion around participatory art". She further states that "(u)p until the early 1990s, community-based art was confined to the periphery of the art world; today it has become a genre in its own right" (Bishop 2012: 2).

For Bishop, what unites the artistic practices that lean towards the social, is the wish for a renewal of the traditional relationship between the artist, the art object and the audience, as "the artist is conceived less as an individual producer of discrete objects than as a collaborator and producer of *situations*; the work of art as a finite, portable, commodifiable product is reconceived as an ongoing or long-term *project* with an unclear beginning and end; while the audience, previously conceived as a `viewer´or `beholder´, is now repositioned as a co-producer or *participant*" (ibid; original accentuation).

Bishop offers a historical approach from a European perspective, eventually also drawing upon examples from other regions, such as South America, Russia, or the United States. What is decisive for the results of her research is a "profound ambivalence about the instrumentalisation of participatory art as it has developed in European cultural policy in tandem with the dismantling of the welfare state" (ibid: 5) which she sets in contrast to the US context, where public funding plays a minor role and therefore the question of the instrumentalisation of art is different. In this discussion she mainly refers to the political situation in the UK during Thatcherism, as will be shown below.

The Community Arts Movement in Britain is defined by Bishop as a middle-class phenomenon which emerged out of a collectivist ethos in the late 1960s that stood for the democratization of society as well as the arts. Even if the community arts movement consists of a variety of initiatives, certain aspects can be summed up as generally valid:

> (I)t was positioned against the hierarchies of the international art world and its criteria of success founded upon quality, skill, virtuosity, etc. since these conceal class interests; it advocated participation and co-authorship of works of art; it aimed to give shape to the creativity of all sectors of society, but especially to people living in areas of social, cultural, and financial deprivation; for some, it was also a powerful medium for social and political change, providing the blueprint for a participatory democracy. (Bishop 2012: 177)

Even though it may be a middle-class phenomenon, community arts operate on a grass-roots level of community activism, unlike other projects that reconsider the artist's place in society but in more glamorous contexts. In Bishop's words: "(t)he ideological motivations of community arts revolved around precisely this attention to the marginalised, whom they sought to empower through participatory creative practice, and through an opposition to elitist cultural hierarchies" (ibid).

Bishop further states that there is a lack of historic or scholarly writing about community arts that would either start a theoretical discourse or "emphasise the extent to which the concerns of community arts were closely related to those of contemporary art, in contrast to today's tendency to keep the two at arm's length" (ibid: 178). According to her, the separation of community arts and contemporary art practices is therefore a rather new phenomenon. However, generally speaking, she also claims that "(c)ommunity art has no secondary audience: it has no discursive framing nor an elaborated culture of reception to facilitate comparison and analysis with similar projects, because community art is not produced with such a critical audience in mind" (ibid: 190). Without appropriate means and categories for evaluation, the statement of *process comes over product* easily leads to a blurred *everything-is-good* attitude: "By avoiding questions of artistic criteria, the community arts movement unwittingly perpetuated the impression that it was full of good intentions and compassion, but ultimately not talented enough to be of broader interest." (ibid), says Bishop, always referring to the Community Arts Movement in Britain.

These aspects can be seen in many of the contemporary community arts projects as well. What I had first experienced as a *overly positive* attitude at ICAF in Rotterdam now matches this picture. Criticism and classifications like g*ood* or *bad* art are seen as part of the hierarchic art world and the artists are somehow stuck in the need to cherish all outcomes of community-engaged art production. But this leads to exactly that image of community arts as always being *outside* the art world, which

further leads to a categorisation of those projects as social work rather than artistic practice. It remains to be discussed where to draw the line between those two.

Bishop's analysis defines the ideological starting point of community arts as well as its limitation. The well-intentioned wish to empower the marginalized leads me directly to Gramsci's notion of the subaltern (Gramsci 1999/1934) and one step further to Spivak's answer to her well-known question "Can the subaltern speak?" (Spivak 1993). Many community artists want to give speech to the marginalised or empower them through the means of art. The question here is, if community arts can be a medium to overcome those global structures of power and exploitation that make it impossible for the subaltern to be heard. Or, on the other hand, whether it even reproduces the circle of representing "the other". If community arts emerged out of the wish for a more *down-to-earth* form of art that keeps outside of a certain elitist art circle, how can it, at the same time, bring attention to those that are not represented otherwise?

5.3. Communication and Dialogue

As against Bourriaud's "relational aesthetic" or Bishop's "participatory art", Kester refers to such art practices as *dialogical,* which again refers to Mikhail Bakhtin's interpretation of a work of art as a kind of conversation: "Dialogical projects (…) unfold through a process of performative interaction." (Kester 2004: 10). The difference between such contemporary practices and those tendencies in the 1990s that are Bourriaud's point of reference, can be seen as such:

> While it is common for a work of art to provoke dialogue among viewers, this typically occurs in response to a finished object. In these projects [e.g. WochenKlausur, note], on the other hand, conversation becomes an integral part of the work itself. It is reframed as an active, generative process that can help us speak and imagine beyond the limits of fixed identities, official discourse, and the perceived inevitability of partisan political conflict. (Kester 2004: 8)

Kester puts the need for models of successful communication at the centre of his examination of certain art projects. He also discusses "the ways in which these projects affirm certain beliefs associated with the avant-garde tradition (specifically, that the work of art can elicit a more open attitude toward new and different forms of experience) while challenging the assumption that avant-garde art must be shocking or difficult to understand" (ibid: 9). He does not see this tendency as a clear art "movement", but rather as an "inclination" of various groups and artists that has developed in the past thirty years and with a clear connection to community arts in the United Kingdom and public art in the United States (ibid). He locates these projects mainly outside of the international art world, namely museums, art galleries, the network of curators and collectors, but nevertheless

stresses its global scope (Kester 2004: 9).

Kester goes one step further than Bourriaud when he clearly separates dialogical projects form object-based artwork:

> The object-based artwork (with some exceptions) is produced entirely by the artist and only subsequently offered to the viewer. As a result, the viewer's response has no immediate reciprocal effect on the constitution of the work. Further, the physical object remains essentially static. Dialogical projects, in contrast, unfold through a process of performative interaction.(ibid:10)

It is his aim to describe those artworks that have been created outside of art galleries and museums, where artists work in places such as parking lots, on a cruising boat or a public market and enter into dialogue to address certain issues. Therefore, he places these practices in between art and cultural activism.

To examine one of the case studies given by Kester, the Austrian collective WochenKlausur will serve as an example. In the opening, Kester describes their project "Intervention to Aid Drug-Addicted Women" (1994) where WochenKlausur invited politicians, journalists, sex workers and activists from the city of Zürich to engage in a conversation about the situation of drug addicts that have turned to prostitution and homelessness, during a three-hour trip on a pleasure boat (see Kester 2004). After several weeks, at the end of this intervention, they raised funds and created a shelter for drug-addicted women.[28] Kester describes the particularity of this intervention as follows:

> Many of the participants in these boat talks would normally have taken opposite sides in the highly charged debate over drug use and prostitution, attacking and counterattacking with statistics and moral invective. But in the ritualistic context of an art event, with their statements insulated from direct media scrutiny, they were able to communicate outside the rhetorical demands of their official status. (Kester 2004: 2)

But what defines their work as art rather than activism? Their webpage reads:

> Since 1993 and on invitation from different art institutions, the artist group WochenKlausur develops concrete proposals aimed at small, but nevertheless effective improvements to socio-political deficiencies. Proceeding even further and invariably translating these proposals into action, artistic creativity is no longer seen as a formal act but as an intervention into society.[29]

This formulation clearly refers to the invitation of art institutions as an intrinsic part of their work. The setting is staged, as WochenKlausur's interventions always develop over a couple of weeks and follow the ideas of the artists according to the situation they face. The set time frame defines the projects "during which they first describe a specific problem and then bring together the resources

---

28 For more information on the project see also http://www.wochenklausur.at/projekt.php?lang=en&id=4 .
29 See http://www.wochenklausur.at/index1.php?lang=en .

necessary to facilitate its resolution through a concentrated series of actions" (Kester 2004: 98). While this setting does not necessarily elicit the image of an artwork or artistic intervention, its founding member Wolfgang Zinggl insists on its definitions in terms of art: "Localized between social work and politics, between media work and management, interventions are nonetheless based on ideas from the discourse of art" (Zinggl, cited in Kester 2004: 101). With this he refers to a special way of thinking that is characteristic for art and stands outside of the narrowness of specialization and outside of hierarchies of institutions. Furthermore, he situates WochenKlausur's practice within the line of activist art but "(a)s opposed to earlier forms of activist art, which often sought to `change everything but wound up changing nothing´" (Kester 2004: 98).

In this example, the context given by the art institution is not only needed for a legitimation of the work as an artwork, but makes the intervention possible in the first place, because "(a)n invitation form an art institution provides WochenKlausur with an infrastructural framework and cultural capital" and "(t)he context of art offers advantages when action involves circumventing social and bureaucratic hierarchies and quickly mobilizing people in positions of political, administrative or media responsibility to accomplish concrete measures" (Zinggl, cited in Kester 2004: 101). Art serves as a key for social interventions that produce change.

Kester highlights that artistic practices like the one of WochenKlausur facilitate "unique forms of discursive interaction" and arise from communication, reflection and dialogue (Kester 2004: 101). Moreover he emphasizes the importance of introducing new methodologies of art criticism and art theory to grasp all important aspects of these dialogical projects. If those works were criticized applying a formal methodology they would end up being classified as unaesthetic because the practices of contemporary art criticism cannot appreciate those communicative interactions which are so important to the artists (ibid:10).

5.4. Mapping Community Art

Another critic of Bourriaud's concept is Pascal Gielen (2011), who writes:

> French curator and art theoretician, Nicolas Borriaud, made a rather poor choice when he used the world ´relational` to shed light on a specific segment and tendency in the art world, for art is de facto relational or it is not art. (…) In fact, it does not matter so much what his art has to say about society and in which context it takes place. As long as the artist actively seeks a relationship with the public and attempts to engage it in a dialogue, a relational aesthetic is at work. (Gielen 2011: 17)

Other than that, Gielen notes that many artists not only seek a relationship to the public, but also convey a critical message to it. Nevertheless this does not guarantee that the message is taken seriously or the persons addressed are satisfied with the artistic signature: "Indeed, the significance and especially the effect of art depend very much on its context" (Gielen 2011: 18). While Bourriaud investigates an individual relation between the spectator and the artistic encounter, Gielen focusses on art that involves a certain community.

Instead of offering a clear demarcation of what this term does and does not include, he chooses to *map* community art (2011). His definition of community art is rather practical: "In order for a work to be considered community art, the bottom line is that it actively involves people in an artistic process or in the production of a work of art", but with the clarification that "the community is at least as crucial as the art" (Gielen 2011: 20). If this is not given, there is no real link between both of them and the project is doomed to fail. A second condition is that in community arts projects, artists work together with non-artists. When it comes to the purpose of community arts projects, the answer that Gielen gives becomes more fuzzy. He lists some possible purposes for community arts: political, subversive, social, therapeutic, etc., and he states that there has to be a symmetry between the community and the art. A good community arts project includes the participants, the artist, as well as the broader community at which it is aimed. Aesthetics, on the other hand, are not so important to Gielen, but "will only ever serve as a formal tool" (ibid: 21):

> Only when symmetry has been achieved between the community and the art does the expressive form have a claim within the professional art world. In other words, a relational work may well be aesthetic, but it is not necessarily a successful work of art. By the same token, an artistic project involving a community is not necessarily a successful community project. (ibid)

Mapping community arts helps to place all those different projects in relation to each other. In the long run it is not helpful to lump all the different kinds of participatory arts practices that work in or with a certain community together. It may even derogate them because the criticism cannot be adjusted to each of their realities. For his map of community art, Gielen creates a wind rose that has "auto-relational" as its West, opposed to "allo-relational" as its East as well as "digestive" as its North opposed to "subversive" as its South. The category auto-relational means practices that, in spite of being community engaged, primarily serve the identity of the artists. On the other end of the spectrum there are allo-relational practices, which "do not serve the identity of the artist or the artistic collective, but rather that of another person or the Other" (ibid: 18). Interestingly enough, Gielen sees the already mentioned Situationists as a possible example of this extreme, which in the end leads to artistic suicide once it definitely shifts from artistic movement to political activism. The

other two poles are subversive on the one end, and digestive on the other. Those refer to the degree in which community arts projects aim towards a radical change of society (subversive) or if they are rather interested in the socially integrative effect (digestive).

Gielen's map depicts an area where different forces work together and condition the actual localization of a community arts project. It allows placing all the practices in the appropriate intersection, without having to assign them each to one end of a dichotomy. It is especially rewarding to bear in mind that most of the actual practices lie somewhere in between those coordinates. To illustrate the use of this concept, I am going to use some of the examples that Gielen gives in his article, but I will also try to expand by giving additional examples. An auto-relational and subversive example would be – according to Gielen – the work of Mapplethorpe, as his aesthetic presentation of gay life and aesthetization of the male body have a political aim and a subversive message. It uses common means of aesthetic representation, but the topic itself was received as scandalous. But even if the political message behind those photographs appears to be clear, the art serves the fame of the artist. It is therefore auto-relational. The allo-relational opponent would be – and I keep using Gielen's examples – the Gay Pride Parade. The subversive claim of this parade is quite obvious and in contrast to the photographs of one artist, the Pride Parade does not allude to anyone in particular but rather to another person or "the Other" (Gielen 2011: 26).

Moving to the north side of the wind rose, art in public serves as an example of the combination of auto-relational and digestive art. The work corresponds with and responds to a certain public, a space or a place without necessarily claiming a strong political message, nevertheless always interacting with the people who move around and use the space where it is placed. It is therefore digestive. By being ascribed to one artist (or a collective), it is also auto-relational. Hence public art events such as Schlingensief's "Ausländer Raus" ("*Bitte liebt Österreich – Erste Österreichische Koalitionswoche*", Vienna 2000) or Hirschhorn's "Musée Precaire Albinet" (Paris 2004) still remain in the North-West of Gielen's wind rose. Their political message and interaction and community engagement in the end still serve primarily the artist. Actually, the claim of an already famous artist who works in and for a community is exactly what draws attention to the artist, rather than the community itself. In contrast to that, Gielen mentions the arts-in-correction training in the USA as a digestive art project that is also clearly allo-relational as it does not refer to a specific artist:

> The purpose of artistic interventions was to facilitate the transformation of criminals into economically productive citizens. (…) It goes without saying that this kind of community art programme primarily aims at social integration, with the artistic signature of the artist coming second. (Gielen 2011: 24)

Before yielding to the temptation to pin those projects down as being the only *real* or the *best* community arts projects, one has to keep in mind that this wind rose does not just point out directions but leaves space for exploring it as a whole, including the middle. In fact, most of the projects will lean towards one direction or the other, while still being close to the centre. There are just two steps between the North-East and the South-West. To sum up: "In short, community art only makes sense when it refuses to be used as an instrument of a uniform, homogenizing, calculating logic, and when it produces the most divergent communities through the confrontation of many singular and dissonant forms of imaginative power" (Gielen 2011: 33).

6. (Anthropological) Perspectives on Community Arts

In the following chapter I would like to discuss both anthropological perspectives on community arts as well as commonalities between the two disciplines art and anthropology as such. Kate Crehan (2011) offers "An anthropological perspective" on community arts with her historical ethnography on London-based organisation Free Form Arts Trust. It provides an important study of community art from an anthropological perspective that is based upon key concepts of the anthropology of art, but always highlighting the insufficiencies of this sub discipline when it comes to describing contemporary art practices of the global north (see Crehan 2011: 12).

How the two disciplines of art and anthropology are related is the main topic of the anthologies edited by Arnd Schneider and Christopher Wright (Schneider and Wright 2006, 2010, 2013). In their latest publication, "Anthropology and Art Practice" (2013), they claim that "the long encounters between the disciplines are important and necessary [but] an engagement between art practices and current anthropological theory is now required to push forward theory and practices in both those fields" (Schneider and Wright 2013: 6). They argue that we have arrived at a state where we should no longer discuss if those two disciplines have something in common and how they influence one another but how both disciplines can benefit from mutual engagement, both on a theoretical as well as on a practical level. Complementary to their work, Roger Sansi's "Art, Anthropology and the Gift" (2015) offers fresh perspectives on the discussion of anthropology and contemporary art practices. He engages with important concepts of anthropology, such as the gift, to explore how anthropology and art practices share methodologies, theoretical and political concerns, while also pointing out differences in the perspectives and practices of the two disciplines.

In order to understand the transformative political power of art, I refer to Jaques Rancière's "Aesthetics and its Discontents" (2009: 19-44), which offers a view on aesthetics that is highly important for the participatory and collaborative practices described in this thesis. Rancière opens the concept of aesthetics to introduce a space for political transformation, as for him, art is always political.[30] Miwon Kwon (2002), on the other hand, offers a precise study of power relations that are necessarily part of every collaborate art practice (Kwon 2002: 83-99). I will further refer to Grant Kester (2011), whose note on dialogical art has already been described in the previous chapter, as well as to new tendencies of the so-called "new sociology of art" that is mainly

---

30 See also Rancière (2004) „The Politics of Aesthetics".

represented by Georgina Born (2010).

6.1. The Distribution of Expertise

An important resource for an anthropological view on community arts is Kate Crehan's study on Free Form Arts Trust (2011). This London-based community arts organization was founded in the 1960s, mainly works with people living in impoverished areas (such as social housing) and aims at improving this environment through its projects. Her detailed study gives an anthropological perspective on community arts, not by analysing the phenomenon as a whole but by way of example of one organisation that has about forty years of practice in this area.

Crehan explains the lack of specific definitions of community arts "in part because breaking down the boundaries between different art forms and between art and nonart was often the goal of its practitioners" (Crehan 2011: 80). Nevertheless, there are specificities that account for this practice, such as the use of workshops that "explicitly rejected the primacy of the single creator, a rejection that begins at least to shift the location of the artist within the process of creative production" (ibid: 184). The production in community art is always collective, rather than individual. Crehan refers to the "aesthetic practices and aesthetic language" of the artists that is transformed by the experiences of their projects within the community (ibid: 87). In case of Free Form, the artists have been scholarly trained as such, but decided to turn their back on the established art world. But at the same time, community arts for them also represented a legitimate and important new direction in the arts (ibid: 81). Hence, community arts are placed in between the art world, from where many of their practitioners come, but from which they want to separate, and a social space that intends to use art to bring about social change. In Britain, support for community arts weakened in the 1980s, which was reflected in (lack of) funding and led to an association of community arts with "amateurish, poorly executed murals on the worst of the worst estates" (ibid: 85). Crehan links this (d)evolution to political changes: Through Thatcherism the positive attitude towards art for social change that had established for itself a place within the art world in Britain declined. What was left for community arts was a "retained legitimacy as a form of social welfare" (ibid:86). Hence it becomes clear that the reputation of community arts as a movement and the outcome of community arts projects as pieces of art depend strongly on a more general attitude towards the transformational power of art within society, as well as overall politics.

While studying the methods of Free Form Arts Trust, Crehan concentrates on the role of the expert

in a contemporary industrial society and rises the question how non-experts can be included in genuine ways. She looks for ways of collaboration in which so-called experts work together with people who "may `know´ a lot about where they live but lack formally accredited knowledge" (Crehan 2011: xvi). Hence, collaboration in community arts does not only mean common creation between artists and non-artists, but shows ways in which usual divisions in a contemporary western society (such as experts vs. non-experts) are being removed or at least blurred. By way of the example of the shifting of location of the artist within the process of production (ibid: 184), possible transformations within the society of experts become visible. It has already been pointed out that it is rather small alterations than great gestures that characterise the way community arts work toward social change.

It is crucial for the discussion of community arts projects to see two forces that act together: On the one hand the concept of the artist being the expert is opened up – mostly in response to its definitions by the so-called art world, which leads to ways of collaborative artistic creation and focuses on those who are usually excluded from these circles. But on the other hand, the artists maintain a certain decision-making power, mainly when it comes to aesthetic values. The tension between those two forces is pointed out clearly by Crehan, who argues that the claim for ownership from part of the communities does not mean a lack of ownership from the part of the artist (ibid: 184).

The strategy of workshop-based co-creation, highlighted by Crehan, means that the artists act as experts who facilitate others in creating something together. Crehan is aware of the intrinsic power relation between expert and non-expert that, within the community arts movement, varied widely. "Nonetheless, workshops can be seen as having at least the potential to provide spaces in which experts and nonexperts can work collaboratively on identifying problems and coming up with solutions, and nonexperts can learn specific skills" (ibid: 182). She further explains:

> The adoption of a workshop technique did not mean, however, that the Free Form artists had abandoned their role as experts. They still saw themselves as possessing specific skills, such as the ability to devise and structure workshops that enabled participants to discover their own creativity. What changed was how they defined their expertise and how they saw its place within the process of creative production; above all, they saw themselves as able to recognize, evaluate and develop nonartists´creative ideas. (…) It is crucial that this appropriation be done in such a way that it allows local people to recognize their contribution and claim ownership. (ibid: 184)

The reasons why or the way in which people claim ownership can vary according to the way they have been part of the process. Crehan lists possibilities from actively taking part in the creation process (e.g. by working on a mosaic) to just watching children or making tea (ibid: 184). All these

forms are valid, as long as the people decide for themselves which place they want to occupy. In either case she stresses that the communities' claim for ownership "does not mean, however, that the artists must relinquish their ownership" (Crehan 2011: 185). Even if in case of Free Form, the individual artists were not named and therefore did not get credit for a specific work, the organisation as such did.

Concerning the aesthetic language and the reception of Free Form projects, Crehan notes a striking difference between performative and permanent work. The latter reflecting the artists' aesthetic language more than the language of those who collaborated, while in case of the more performative projects

> this artworld language may have been pulled towards more populist aesthetics, but, in practice, what this tended to mean was the incorporation of more populist elements within an aesthetic language deriving from the art world. To some members of the curatoriat, this may well have looked like too much of a surrender to popular taste, but, in reality, when it came to the more permanent environmental work, a certain fundamental art world aesthetic remained hegemonic. (ibid)

Crehan does not specify what this art world aesthetics would look like. Nevertheless, her observations echo in my own research results, where I furthermore noted an important influence of the artistic director and the personalities of the artist involved on how far this aesthetic language was altered under the influence of all the other people involved.

6.2. Anthropology and Contemporary Art Practice

A lot of contemporary artworks deal with social issues that necessarily make them collaborate with other disciplines such as social activism, social science, urban planning - to name the ones mentioned by Schneider and Wright - and others. In all projects presented in the volume, the authors underline the importance of the process and the necessity of working with people and materials in ethnographic situations (Schneider and Wright 2013). In many arts practices, the finished product, however, is not so important anymore. When artists work in ethnographic situations it means, of course, that they no longer work by themselves but *collaborate* with others and enter different stages and forms of engagement, inclusion and collaboration with non-artists. In some cases, those relationships last for various years and are constantly being renegotiated. The artist is committed to this relationship on a long-term basis and the collaboration becomes

> an ongoing process in which artworks are always relatively provisional outcomes. Sometimes this involves dealing with collaborators who come and go, those leading a transitory existence in

which the presence of the artist is a temporary, although recurring feature. This all sounds familiar to anthropologists, who frequently have to maintain relationships with their collaborators under very similar circumstances (Schneider and Wright 2013: 4).

The renegotiation of those relations is crucial for maintaining a connection with the collaborators, or in other words: the community.

Schneider and Wright talk about collaborative works and refer to "artists who are dealing directly with some kind of social relations in their work" (Schneider and Wright2013: 9). Once more, the authors claim that Bourriaud's "Relational Aesthetics" (2002) has been seen in an all too positive way. They clarify:

> One problem with collaborations in the vein of relational aesthetics has been that they have failed to fully acknowledge the power differences that exist within a globally structured art world and global economic differences at large. It is also obvious that long-term durational work seems to offer quite a different set of issues in terms of participation than those involved with short-term collaborations. (Schneider and Weight 2013: 9)

The authors distinguish the term collaborational from participatory not only in terms of duration, but more importantly in terms of the level of co-creation. Participation for them means "taking part", whereas collaboration means "working together or co-laboring" (ibid:11). However, they do not juxtapose those terms as being either one or the other, but rather state that there is a "sliding scale of how the viewers of artworks or their coproducers are actually involved in the process and at which stages" (ibid). It should not be forgotten that "to enter as a participant in an artwork is to enter into a set of social relationships" and that one is designated a defined role in this game (ibid). The artists produce – maybe even without knowing and despite their original claim – not only a participatory art work, but at the same time they create a "particular kind of participant subject" (ibid). Here the authors see considerable analogies to anthropology. They claim that the power differentials involved in such practices should be fully acknowledged to act as a corrective to the collaborative work. This is why participation should be differentiated from collaboration and the particular context of the relative contexts have to be acknowledged, according to Schneider and Wright. This includes not to refute any of the practices as such, but to consider the different degrees of agency and control that are in operation.

Let me have a closer look at Francis Alÿs project "When Faith Moves Mountains"[31] (Lima 2002) to give an example. In this work, Alÿs contracted volunteers, mainly students, to displace a 500-meter-long sand dune shovel by shovel to move it forward by ten centimetres. The artist marked the

---

31 Discussed in Schneider and Wright 2013, p. 8-9, as well as Kester 2011, p. 64, and 67 onwards. See also Alÿs 2007.

beginning and the ending line, while the participants lined up to shovel sand. The plain goal was to move the sand dune a little forward, shovelling sand up the hill and down again, while the message lying behind it suggests that, by working together, even "mountains" can be moved. Taking place on the outskirts of Lima, references to work force, development, urbanism and Peru in general can easily be seen in this piece of art. Also, it is clearly a moment of collaborative work that builds community among the group of people who participated in the action, as in the feeling of having accomplished something together and consolidated by the mere magnitude of the project that involved about eight hundred people. However, the people that actually moved this mountain were not workers who lived in the area but students who were contracted and worked voluntarily. This fact somehow undermines the very proposition of the piece of art. In Sansi's words: "This is an act of collective waste of labor that, because of its very obvious uselessness, ends up taking the form of a celebration, like in the 'potlach' of Bataille and the situationists" (Sansi 2015: 40). Francis Alÿs' works are often collaborative and can be seen as highly political in their conceptualisation. Nevertheless, they are designed for a global audience of the art world and their message becomes clearest in their documentation (mostly: films) that are shown in galleries and at art events, from MoMA PS1 in New York to Venice Biennale.[32] And they *work* very well in this context. The project is certainly a relational piece of art but in my opinion does not fit in the category of art that includes people in a way that they would identify with, or take ownership of. Neither is it a piece of art that builds community, because it is not designed to form relations between the people who contribute. Therefore, I consider it a relational artwork in a deprived area, in Gielen's terms clearly an auto-relational work, but not a community artwork. To be regarded as such, it takes more than to hire a number of students to do this work. The argument that by doing so, Alÿs avoids being accused of exploiting poor workers or utilize cheap labour for his means and the art market is valid (Sansi 2015: 40), but at the same time it makes the difference between those artistic approaches even more evident.

As opposed to that example, Schneider and Wright (2013) give some examples to underline the fact that there are artistic collaborations that do not have the global audience in mind in the first place, such as the one of slum-tv[33]. This "media collective" (Schneider and Wright 2013:9) operates out of Mathare, a slum in Nairobi. It consists of artists from the UK and Austria, as well as a group of Mathare residents and was formed after a group show at the Alliance Française in Nairobi in 2006. In spite of this origin, Schneider and Wright note that "the notion of an artwork is itself put into

---

32 See also: http://francisalys.com/exhibitions/ .
33 Discussed in Schneider and Wright 2013: 9, but also Kester 2011.

question – although slum-tv has exhibited various elements of its output in art galleries, the primary audience is the population of Mathare" (Schneider and Wright 2013: 9). Slum-tv produces and distributes audiovisual material in the form of documentaries, drama or comedies. All of the productions are created by local residents and the collective has trained people from Mathare to use visual media, so that some people can even make a living with it. More than that, it is "an effective space for political and social issues to be addressed at a local level" (Schneider and Wright 2013: 9). Even if an international audience exists, this is secondary to the local audience who is always addressed first, via monthly screenings. Schneider and Wright place this project on the fringe of artistic practices:

> This is a form of collaboration that foregrounds its commitment to local concerns and voices. No single individual is claiming the work produced as his or her own; the creativity involved is multiauthored in a very real sense. The ongoing activity of slum-tv makes apparent the kinds of questions that need to be asked of work that spans the gaps among art, anthropology, and activism. (ibid)

In contrast to the example given above, slum-tv can be categorized as a real collaboration between an artistic team and a wider group of people engaged. I would also like to stress the affinities of this example with the practice of participatory video-making that have been described in this thesis.

6.3. Participation and Politics

Roger Sansi (2015) argues that anthropology has become a key to contemporary art at the turn of the twenty-first century because of its site-specificity and participatory element: It is now the technique, the method rather than the topic that artists borrow from anthropology as a discipline. With this "ethnographic turn", artists use anthropological methods and ideas in order to create their art. Field notes, photographs, interviews, participant observation are all means of collecting information and documenting a personal experience with a certain environment. After the fieldwork, the artist does not come back to write but might produce an installation out of the accumulated material or create a piece out of the collected information. Often, a personal reflection on the experience is part of the artwork as well.

Sansi states:"(...) it could be said that in the last decades, many art projects work with the immediate problems of today, in specific places, with specific communities, rather than towards a general revolution of the near future, like the situationists before them." (Sansi 2015: 36). In other words, the situationists acted in the name of revolution, whereas contemporary collaborative art projects

are intended to create change: "Everyday life has become a particular place, rather than a general problem. This site-specificity and participatory direction of many forms of art in the last forty years has made anthropology yet again key to contemporary art practice" (Sansi 2015: 36). This refers to artists using fieldwork, participant observation, interviews and life histories as methods, but it also means posing anthropological questions about exchange, personhood, and identity that play an important role in such projects. This is the case in the work of Sophie Calle, who deliberately uses her experiences and observations in her artwork, but also invites others to do so. Such is the case in the work "Prenez soin de vous" (2007) that Sansi uses as an example (Sansi 2015: 37). In this work, she takes a letter of her ex-partner, who has ended their relationship via email, and gives it to 107 women with the invitation to analyse it or comment on it. The women coming from diverse professions, send their interpretations – written, orally, in form of a video message or as music pieces – which are finally exhibited as the art work.[34]

Sansi detects a tendency of anthropologists criticizing artists that do fieldwork or use participant observation. It is always questioned if they use these methods *in a right way*. But it should not be about the question of *how* artists are using anthropological methods but rather about what they are using them *for*. He argues against the need of delimitation between the two disciplines and for taking a closer look at those artistic practices. The personal relationships that are built in community arts (and other relational art practices) and which further lead to an interest in anthropological topics such as personhood, identity and exchange, are another important reference to anthropology according to Sansi (2015). Those are the new forms of a reunion of everyday life and art. Nevertheless, "(t)he forms and ends of this process can be very different – from professional, international artists who turn everyday life into art, to politically engaged collectives and activists who seek to use art to produce local change within the communities they work with" (Sansi 2015: 37) What is especially interesting in this statement is that, in this categorization, community artists would enter the category of "politically engaged collectives and activists" (ibid).

I doubt that this is true for every community arts project. Although most of them might also have political motives or at least a strong opinion on topics that concern the community they work with, there are others that work on a much more individual and personal level for the sake of collaboration between artists and non-artists. It is definitely about common creation and community building through a collective process. It is about personal relations and personality development. It

---

34 See also http://www.tate.org.uk/context-comment/video/venice-biennale-sophie-calle .

is about creating and sharing skills. While all of this is political in some way, it does not necessarily correspond with the image of an activist. In other words: Many activists use artistic practices in protest and many artists that become activists use their skills (and reputation) to visualize their concerns. This happened extensively during the protests in Buenos Aires after the financial crisis in Argentina 2001, and could also be seen in more recent movements such as Occupy or 15-M in Spain.

The question whether or not such social practices can or should be seen as art form has often centred around the notion of aesthetics. Other than seeing aesthetics as property of the art work, Jacques Rancière offers to see it as a quality that is always political. In Bishop's words:

> Although Rancière's arguments are philosophical rather than art critical, he has undertaken important work in debunking some of the binaries upon which the discourse of politicised art has relied: individual/collective, author/spectator, active/passive, real life/art. In so doing, he has opened the way towards the development of a new artistic terminology by which to discuss and analyse spectatorship. (Bishop 2012: 18)

For Rancière (2009), politics always implies a "distribution of the sensible", this means that an aesthetic judgment is always also a political judgment. Rancière's concept of aesthetics builds on *aisthesis*, the sensible perception of the art. For an art work to become art, it needs a specific gaze, it needs to be seen as art. It is not the art work that has to be autonomous, but our experience in relation to it. Rancière first introduces the "ethical regime of images" (Rancière 2009: 20) that refers to the assesment of images concerning their inner truth and effects. Within this regime, there is no art, but just images. Second, he introduces the "representative regime of the arts" (ibid: 29) which raises the question of the artists' ability to give forms expression. This regime refers to the usual logic of classifying art according to what can be done and made, and that "corresponds to the overall hierarchy of social and political occupations" (Bishop 2012: 29). Finally, "the aesthetic regime of art" (Rancière 2009: 32) does not focus on ways of production, but ways of being:

> The aesthetic regime of art institutes the relation between the forms of identification of art and the forms of political community in such a way as to challenge in advance every opposition between autonomous art and heteronomous art, art for art's sake and art in the service of politics, museum art and street art. For aesthetic autonomy is not that autonomy of artistic 'making' celebrated by modernism. It is the autonomy of a form of sensory experience. And it is that experience which appears as the germ of a new humanity, of a new form of individual and collective life. (ibid)

Within this regime, everything can be a potential subject for art and everyone is a potential viewer of the art. Rancière argues against a "simplistic opposition between objects and situations, effecting a short-circuit where the point is to carry out a transformation of those problematic spaces that once contrasted conceptual art with art objects/commodities" (ibid: 56). Against the strong division

between the production of an artwork and its reception by an (external) observer, Rancière defines aesthetics as "the thought of the new disorder" and explicates as follows:

> This disorder does not only imply that the hierarchy of subjects and of publics become blurred. It implies that artworks no longer refer to those who commissioned them, to those whose image they established and grandeur they celebrated. Artworks henceforth relate to the 'genius' of peoples and present themselves, at least in principle, to the gaze of anyone at all. (Rancière 2009: 13)

Rancière's concept of aesthetics offers the ability to think contradiction, because even claims of something to be unaesthetic, or refused the status of art, still function within this very same aesthetic regime. This notion is of specific interest in the discussion of participatory art practices or community arts, as it leads away from over-simplified allocations of practices as being art or being non-art. Bishop pins this thought down in one sentence: "In short, the aesthetic doesn't need to be sacrificed at the altar of social change, because it always already contains this ameliorative promise" (Bishop 2012: 29).

Sansi however points out the "limitation of Rancière's vision of politics, which essentially maintains a division between people and things as subjects and objects of political action that contemporary anthropology and artistic practice may bring into question" (Sansi 2015: 18). While Rancière focusses on the egalitarian power of art, Sansi uses the concept of the gift to show how, from an anthropological perspective, it is used "as a form of building hierarchy, fame, people, and things" (ibid:18), because "(o)ne of the central points of gift theory in anthropology is, precisely, the reversibility of people and things as objects and subjects of exchange" (ibid:19). In arts however, the concept of the gift is seen as an egalitarian one, where the gift is "a fundamentally voluntary, free exchange between peers, an exchange that results in an egalitarian community" (Sansi 2015: 87). However, "(i)n their attempt to build communities, many of these projects [of participatory art practices, note of the author] run the risk of reproducing the inequalities they were fighting against, or building new ones" (ibid: 109).

6.4. Community Arts and Power Relations

An interesting view on social processes in community arts is given by Miwon Kwon (2002), who sees community art as another form of site-specific art that shifts to "issue-specific" public art:

> The invocation of the community-specific and the audience-specific, in which the site is displaced by a group of people assumed to share some sense of common/communal identity based on (experiences of) ethnicity, gender, geographical proximity, political affiliation, religious beliefs, social and economic classes, etc., can be described as an extension of the

discursive virtualization of the site, at least to the extent that identity itself is constructed within a complex discursive field. (Kwon 2002: 112)

Kwon also alludes to the danger that such projects may deepen uneven power relations. She pins this down using the example of John Ahearn and his work in the Bronx in the 1980s and 1990s. Even though this artist was presumed to be an integral part of the community and approved by community leaders, he was heavily criticized for three sculptures of three actual community members that he built for the South Bronx Sculpture Park (1991). Kwon highlights that the space where the sculptures were supposed to stand were seen by Ahearn "not so much as an abstract formal entity but as an extension of the community, of which he himself was a part" (Kwon 2002: 89). Nevertheless, his work got heavily criticized both by the officials of the Department of General Services, who were overseeing the project as a whole and who objected that "Ahearn, as a white man, could never understand the experience of the African American `community'" and charged that, "in fact, the sculptures were racist" (ibid: 91). He was also accused by a small group of residents who "found the sculptures an absolute misrepresentation of *their* community [and] accused Ahearn of glorifying illegitimate members of the community" (ibid, original accentuation). While for the artist the sculptures (a young black teenage girl on roller skates, a shirtless black man with a boom box and a basketball, and a Puerto Rican man in a hooded sweatshirt with his pit pull) "represented a certain truth about the neighborhood", the residents argued "that in essence Ahearn promoted the outsider's view of the Bronx with negative stereotypes" (ibid). After these reactions, the artist first tried to enter a dialogue with the community, especially those members who expressed their criticism openly and felt offended by his work, to explain his point of view. But in the end he decided to remove the sculptures, acknowledging that he had to choose between being on the community's side or being their enemy, and he refused to be that (ibid: 93). Interestingly enough, in the artist's statement cited by Kwon, he connects this decision with a decision between "the art world", to which the bronzes were "serious, ironic [and] strong" and the community, whose perception was different (ibid: 92). Even though the project was made with, of and for the community, it was in the end disowned by the community for several reasons, and the artist decided to stand behind them, because otherwise the sculptures would "never look like this again" anyhow (ibid).

I would like to underline the complexity of hierarchies that come into play in such projects. Questions of identity, the construction of community and power relations are raised in this examination of community arts as site-specific art form. The importance of the personal relation between artists and community members, or those of artists as community members, cannot be too

highly emphasized. The interaction between the artist and the community is an integral part of the meaning or value of the art work. The social factor does not lie in the object but is built little by little over time. This is why the importance of the process is emphasized so much when it comes to community arts. Kwon detects the need of the community to see and recognize itself in the work (Kwon 2002: 95). In collaborative projects, the community contributes time, energy, stories and ideas. An identification with the project is possible when community members are able to find themselves in the final product and know which part is *theirs*. This is what makes successful community arts different from other relational artistic practices, even if those are about and work together with non-artists.

Having detected the intrinsic power relations of these artistic practices leads Sansi to see them as "laboratories of experimentation with social relations" that establish connections between different agents and collectives (Sansi 2015: 43). His interest lies in seeing how artistic practice may be a tool for constituting social relations – and how it may inform anthropology as a discipline. The outcome of those relations cannot be foreseen and it does not mean that they are necessarily empowering or liberating. They might even reproduce existing hierarchies and create conflict. Therefore one cannot see such artistic practices as a solution or an answer to social phenomena. To bring this perception back to anthropology, both Sansi and Schneider and Wright suggest seeing fieldwork as a form of practice that constitutes social relations, and propose that the discussion should shift from how anthropologists represent the people they work with to how these relations have been constituted (Sansi 2015: 43). Hence, the question what fieldwork is used for is equally important for artists as well as anthropologists.

At this point I would like to open the discussion again and see how these arguments fit into a more general discussion of community arts, as offered in the previous chapter. It is important to see how relations are created in this field and how they are received. As I mentioned before, the writing about community arts is mostly done by the artists themselves. It is moreover heavily linked to the need of representing the work in order to gain funds for projects. I have also mentioned the very positive spirit I find characteristic of people working in community arts and the general consent on the positive effect that art has on people in general. In some ways, power relations and hierarchies are not questioned because hierarchy is part of a lot of artistic practices.

6.5. Anthropological vs. Artistic Practices

Two theoreticians that constantly work on the intersection between art and anthropology are Anna Grimshaw and Amanda Ravetz. In their article "The ethnographic turn – and after: a critical approach towards the realignment of art and anthropology" (2015) they "seek to map a terrain in which non-traditional work might be more securely situated and evaluated" with the help of "a critical examination of the contemporary debate that has followed the ethnographic turn" (Grimshaw and Ravetz 2015: 419). The so-called 'ethnographic turn' serves as point of departure of this examination, but also their personal struggle "to make an effective argument for non-traditional forms (for example, film, exhibitions, photo-essays, soundscapes) to be taken seriously as *anthropology*" (ibid: 419, original accentuation). The 'ethnographic turn' is mainly associated with the writing of James Clifford (Clifford and Marcus 1986; Clifford 1988), who fostered exchange and collaboration between different disciplines and fields of practice, as well as Hal Foster (Foster 1996) who, on the contrary, underlined the significant differences in the practice of anthropologists and artists. Grimshaw and Ravetz take a look at the practices of several artists in order to see their point of view on the matter and to elaborate on their use of anthropology "as an artistic resource that could be mined and appropriated" rather than as a fixed methodology (Grimshaw and Ravetz 2015: 423).

Having a closer look on the writings of Schneider (1993, 1996), Ingold (2000, 2011, 2013) and Ssorin-Chaikov (2013a, 2013b), Grimshaw and Ravetz (2015) notice that "the ethnographic turn in contemporary art suggested new possibilities for dialogue and collaboration between artists and anthropologists" (Grimshaw and Ravetz 2015: 426), but more importantly they ask "whether Clifford's generalised and hybrid notion of ethnography, while encompassing a broad landscape of practice, also obscured significant interpretive dissonance between artists and anthropologists" (ibid). For the authors, "*not knowing* where something was leading – was part of an artist's skill", while anthropological training helped "to think about problems, contexts, techniques and form in such a way that each element of the process folded logically into an overarching framework and, ultimately, served to generate knowledge *about* something" (Grimshaw and Ravetz 2015: 429, original accentuation). Hence, artistic work is a "disruptive kind of knowledge practice", while anthropology is a cumulative one (ibid: 430).

They conclude that the dialogue between anthropology and contemporary art has created new possibilities for the discipline of anthropology, such as reconceptualising research "as kind of

making" and seeing anthropological work as "emergent" and "generated through active audience participation" rather than complete. However, they highlight the risks when assuming that the anthropological concerns are too close to artistic ones and warn not to over-estimate the role of anthropology for certain artistic practices in order to overcome the two positions of either 1) erasing the differences of the disciplines or 2) creating an irreconcilable conflict. They rather suggest a "more nuanced understanding of both convergence and friction (that) has the potential to destabilise these established positions, yielding greater clarity about what is at stake in exploring human (and other) worlds" (Grimshaw and Ravetz 2015:: 431).

It is not just the question of how the disciplines of anthropology and art could benefit from each other methodologically. There is also the question of how both disciplines view art or the artwork. Recent tendencies in social science writing that can be labelled "new sociology of art", come back to a broader approach towards the study of art that goes beyond situating it in the institution and analysing the processes of production that lie underneath.[35] One of the blind spots of these studies is "the concrete work that aesthetic factors perform in social life (…); and a blindness to the artwork itself" (De la Fuente 2007: 423). An analysis and an understanding of the artwork itself is therefore necessary, just as much as the processes that work underneath it. Georgina Born (2010) presents anthropology as a way to introduce temporality and agency in this debate. I find it specifically interesting that Born states: "Compared with sociology, anthropology has been more ambitious in its substantive studies of art, music and media practices, benefiting from its cross-cultural orientation, and yet more fragmentary in its theoretical response" (Born 2010: 182). Also, she accuses anthropology as "(s)ympathetic to the groups that it studies" and "advocating their creative salience, a creativity that is commonly perceived to be linked to the promotion of a heightened sense of communality or social consciousness" (ibid). Art is always embedded in immediate social relations and construes networks of exchange. It is this "biographical" point of view of the arts that Gell suggests in contrast to common sociological approaches that focus on art's institutionalization (Gell 1998: 11). For him, the object is distributed in time and space and holds an agency.[36] The factor of time, history and temporality as well as the consideration of larger cultural- and social-historical processes is what Born pins down as central differences of the contemporary anthropology of art in comparison with sociological approaches (Born 2010: 187).

---

35 As was the main focus of classic sociology of arts. See for example Hauser 1974, Thurn 1973, Adorno 1977, Wolff 1993, but also Nochlin 1988.
36 This position has been frequently criticized by Morphy (2009) amongst others.

Through a "post-positivist empiricism" Born advocates a new relation between theory and empirical research (Born 2010: : 172). She specifies five key themes that need reinvention for an explanatory theory of cultural production, namely: "aesthetics and the cultural object; the place of the institutions; agency and subjectivity; questions of history, temporality and change; and problems of value and judgement" (ibid). Those key themes have been discussed throughout this chapter. I will now come back to my own ethnographical research to see how they operate in practice.

7. Inclusion, Production, and Reception

With reference to the case studies presented in chapter four, as well as the theoretical chapters five and six, I will now elaborate on some key concepts. In the first subchapter (7.1. Strategies of Inclusion), I concentrate on Jumblies' technique of role splitting and the division of plays into small sequences as a way of facilitating participation, and I deal with the important factors of time and place that are also noticeable in the strategic use of different project phases, valuing both the specific task of each workshop and the overarching long-term project. Celebration is mentioned as a crucial part of this valuation, and the long-term process of community building is described. The latter is more extensively treated in the second subchapter (7.2. Building Community), where the practice of welcoming is explained and notions of participation and common creation, process and outcome, ownership and setting are discussed. The relationship between artists and participants as well as the importance of networking and the personal social environment of the community artists are fundamental parts of this process. The following subchapter (7.3. Product and Outcome) elaborates on the relation between product and outcome by explaining the effects of surprise in Jumblies' work as well as the visual appearance of video in community arts. Questions about the proportion of process and outcome lead to considerations about strategies of influencing the product while keeping a high level of participation. These thoughts finally conclude with a discussion of reception, criticism and funding of community arts in the subchapter (7.4. Reception, Critics and Funding).

7.1. Strategies of Inclusion

Jumblies Theatre uses the workshop technique pointed out by Crehan (Crehan 2011: 81) to involve many people over a long period of time in different activities and in various settings. In the description of the case studies in chapter four I aimed at showing how in the final play, performance piece, or video, roles are split as a strategy of involvement. By using different layers and elements, one role can be shared by people, which further allows each participant to concentrate on one thing at a time. This has been shown in "I Was a Brave Child", where the children have to "wash dishes" for the shadow play during the performance, but do not have to remember any lines at the same time because the audio is pre-recorded. Especially for children, it is helpful to split roles and give them specific tasks, so that they can contribute according to their skills. During my time at Jumblies

I learned that every performance consists of many small sequences like that. Big Jumblies Productions further stage those scenes in different places, so that the attention of the audience switches and moves through space.[37] By doing that, everybody feels responsible for one part at a specific time and place.

I further aimed at showing the importance of the factors time and place, where important differences between video and other forms of community arts become visible. Video can be used to travel in time or take the audience to a different place in a very tangible way. Also, it serves as a good tool when working with a group that constantly changes (interview Esther Maloney, Jan. 17, 2015) or in the work with elders. This was the case when elders at MABELLEarts were recorded and their images were screened during the winter's parade, which was then documented and they could see how they were part of the parade, even without being there (interview with Sonja Rainey, Jan. 11, 2015). The advantages of not being limited to real time and space in video were also pointed out to me by Joe Osawabine from Debajehmujig Storytellers, who similarly argued that in the work with elders, video helps to adapt to their energy and health conditions and that people who participated will live on in the product even if they could not be on stage (interview with Joe Osawabine, Jan. 14, 2015).

The case studies also showed parallels in the genesis of productions from Jumblies and its off-shoots. There are always different phases to a project. The story comes out of the community, is based on a specific topic and based on people's lives. It is then developed and shaped by the artists who come back to the community with a script or concept in mind. In a series of workshops, these develop and take shape, with every workshop having its own product. This could be a film, a song, a sequence of movements etc. The sum of these products becomes the actual performance or is represented in the product (the film). This strategy is important, because usually, groups in community arts fluctuate a lot and participants are likely not to take part permanently on a project from beginning to end. Celebrating little steps and realizing completed tasks during each workshop helps the participants to see immediate results of their contributions.

Celebration is a crucial part of community arts. It is more than just valuing the outcome, it is also a ritual for those who were part of the process. As the audience is usually closely related to the participants, the show is a performance, a parade and a celebration at once. The long duration and

---

37 See for example: https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLAzRIsF-86bhSSGVUNyWTUpPzz8J2oYcF, a series of videos of „Like an Old Tale" (2011).

the sometimes difficult process leads to an overwhelming celebration, to the overly positive reception of minor details and to an attitude that always sees the good things first. That is, in fact, the very opposite of what the conventional art world is used to. When one goes to the theatre or the movies or the museum, s/he is trained to scrutinize what lies in front of her or him, often without considering the context in which it has been made. With community arts it is the other way round, because the context is always communicated and the process is an intrinsic part of the whole. When one knows that a performance is not done by a professional artist, but by someone who might be on stage for the first time, the judgement might be less tight (Van Erven 2013: 135). The angles and shots of a film might not be of such an importance when it is not made by a professional who has learned his/her skills. This does not mean that one does not see mistakes, errors or inaccuracies in community arts. But the appreciation of the process makes looking beyond certain errors easier, because those inaccuracies that will always be part of art that is made with non-professionals, are acceptable as part of the whole.

In this context, it is worth noting that Ruth Howard claims food as being another one of Jumblies' strategies to include people. She states that in order to create a safe space one should not jump into a subject rashly but invite people to come together. Food is such a community building element because it is inviting and creates a space for people to come together and share their stories besides the actual workshop. According to her, this gives the impression that people are really interested in the person and do not just "want them to do something for them" or "have an offer for them" (Ruth Howard during the Workshop at University of Toronto, field notes, Jan. 9, 2015).

Inclusion and community building are main focuses of community arts. This becomes clearer when the production of community-based videos in the context of community arts is seen in contrast to other community-based filmmaking strategies, such as the one of InsightShare. The latter claims to give voices and be an amplifier. In reference to Spivak (1993) though, one is inclined to ask: Can the subaltern make a video? And in the end, who is the community that is created and how is it done? Also, in terms of Low et al. (2012) and Smith (1999) one should ask which decisions have already been made before a project starts. With the example of case studies 2 and 3, we see that in many cases the community exists before the video-project sets in. In case study 3 the women are connected through the English language course they all attend. For newcomers, such spaces are usually an important place to gain new contacts and friendships. The participatory video project might have deepened this relation through its methodology of sharing and through encouraging the participants to speak, no matter how, to overcome language barriers.

InsightShare usually works together with local NGOs, which means that the recruitment of participants is not their direct concern (field notes, Sep. 26, 2014). In the case of "Welcome to the UK" project, they even worked inside pre-existing structures. In contrast to that, the installation of the London Hub that InsideShare ran from 2008 to 2010 aimed for a community building that can be seen similar to the one we face at community-arts projects such as Jumblies Theatre: Through the installation and implementation of a project in a certain area of interest and through the co-operation with the population over a longer period of time, new relations are formed and community is built. This is a long-term process which includes many factors of success or failure, such as the way of working with the community, the participants' expectations as opposed to the organisations' offer, the requirements of funders, as well as personal resources, as much of this work is done by working closely with the people and investing much of oneself.

Community Arts projects don't aim to give voices, but create art for and with people. This movement emerged out of the wish for a more inclusive art that, for example, also involves kids. Michael Burtt, Artistic Director of Making Room, once said that community artists are either artists who are dissatisfied with the main-stream art world, or social workers who are dissatisfied with the practices of social work (field notes, Jan. 9, 2015). Either way, they are placed in this intersection of art and social engagement, where both categories are equally important and necessary. The artists are convinced that they are doing good and this is important for their work, as they invest a lot of themselves in it. Many of the artists I have talked to, such as Sean Frey, Sonja Rainey and Marianne Alas, to name just a few, have expressed their need of having other projects beside community arts projects to do their own thing or draw explicit lines between the one and the other. Others are completely involved in this practice.

7.2. Building Community

Jumblies claims to be "radically inclusive", which means that everybody is welcome. Artist Sonja Rainey defines inclusion as being linked with the notion of participation, with the addition of

> understanding where we might be different and making room for that. Noticing any pre-conceptions I might have about a way to do something and being honest and acknowledging those and expecting that. Being aware of the different backgrounds and abilities and skills and interestes and how to create a space that feels safe and welcoming for anybody who might come and being able to, I guess, adapt to those circumstances. (Interview with Sonja Rainey, Jan. 11, 2015)

She also talks about being aware of who is in the room and who is *not*, which means inviting

especially those who would not come on their own (Interview with Sonja Rainey, Jan. 11, 2015). How the engagement of many people in one production is possible, has already been explained with the techniques of splitting roles and sequencing. The slow development over time and through different workshops allows more people to take part in the process without having to be there from beginning to end. It is definitely one of the aims of Jumblies and its off-shoots to include as many people as possible.[38] But inclusion also means that the work is mainly focused on those living in the margins for one reason or another (socio-economic situations, abilities, age, language etc.). According to the artist, creating a space that makes participation possible and holding that space are tasks of the artistic team (ibid). The strategy here is to be aware of everybody's skills (the artists' as well as the participants') and find a fitting task for each and everyone. Also, to create a space where people feel comfortable to try out things they have never done before. "The main point is that everyone participates and no one feels badly about what they can or cannot do and we all work together and give each other ideas and feedback" (interview with Esther Maloney, Jan. 17, 2014).

As far as I had the chance to talk to participants, resonance was always positive and similar aspects were highlighted. But it also became clear that many of the activities were seen as some kind of service. This became obvious, for example, in the use of the term "classes" for drop-in sessions at the Ground Floor and their description as well as the attitude towards them (interview with Rangoli, Jan. 1, 2015). The community members are *participants*, but the degree of common creation is always exclusively defined by the artists. One might refer to Crehan's claim that there are different possibilities of taking part, which might even include making tea, and ownership can vary according to that (Crehan 2011: 184), but this argument echoes the organisation's or artists' perspective. Even if the artists claim something else, the contributions of the community members seem to be more of a resource than allowing them to be equal partners and collaborators in the process. Somehow, even community arts tend towards the direction of auto-relational practices, according to Gielen's map of community arts (Gielen 2011). In case of community arts, the fame might not reflect on one artist, however, it does on the organisation as a whole. Nevertheless, both the outcome as well as the process are mainly seen in a positive way by the participants.[39] In all settings that I have seen, participants engaged quickly in the activities and even people who were sceptical at first, joined in.

---

38 This does not mean that it is the only aim to include as many people as possible, but it rather means that the projects are designed for a great number of participants in Jumbies Theatre, as well as most of its off-shoots. This is not so much the case in the off-shoot Making Room, which works with a special group of users of the Parkdale Activity Recreation Centre, who have experienced homelessness or alcoholic disease. This group is rather small and usually calculates with the same participants over a longer period of time.

39 At least this is what I gained out of the few interviews with participants and, more importantly, informal talks during the events I assisted. However my data are not sufficient to allow for a more extensive elaboration on that topic out of the participant's perspective.

Only in some cases, one or two participants left during the workshop if they were not interested in the activity.[40]

Community engagement should not be evaluated by the same factors in every project, because it makes a big difference why people take part in such a project and what they expect. The Tamil seniors, for example, attend the workshops of Community Arts Guild as part of a health program. Some might be interested in investing more time in certain projects, outside of this structure, others would not. This is a similar situation to case study 3, where the participants of the video projects were participating in it *as part of* their language class and not because they subscribed to a video seminar. Somehow, these situations call for more decisions on the part of the artists/facilitators because the participants do not have concrete ideas about what to expect. The Arts4All players, on the other hand, have taken part in community arts projects for a long time now and therefore know better what they have to expect, what they do want and what they do not. Marianne Alas points to the development of long-term participants in reference to the Arts4All players and states that over time they would do different things than they would have done at the beginning and decide more clearly on their own. She states that she can see participants now as taking ownership of the projects because of these developments, and also wishes to have more time with the Tamil seniors as processes take longer there and sometimes a long time passes between one project and another (interview with Marianne Alas, Jan. 5, 2014).

Apart from the relationships between artists and participants, there is another community building process that I find highly interesting: the community of community artists themselves. As I have noticed during my research with Jumblies and its off-shoots, the way this community of community artists is formed, depends largely on the Artistic Director of every Off-Shoot and in general to Ruth Howard, overall Artistic Director and founder of Jumblies Theatre. She has a policy of "radical inclusion" of her family and friends of her family's in the company. Her daughter works at one of the off-shoots, the other, a student of graphic design, does many of the illustrations for leaflets, posters or the web page. One of the office workers is a remote relative of her husband and many of the current interns or participants in the Artfare Essentials training are friends of the family or of her kids. The interest in supporting young artists is very visible in the organisation. The fact that many of them have been attached to Jumblies or even the family of the artistic director is easily explained by the fact that the inclusion of family and the possibility to involve kids in the making of art stand

---

40 Such was the case during the workshop of Community Arts Guild with Tamil-speaking seniors (Dec. 17, 2014) and the worksop at Arts4All in Davenport (Dec. 15, 2014).

at the beginning of community arts. In fact, Ruth Howard explains her interest in working in community arts and her founding of Jumblies Theatre as a consequence of the need to do art that makes it possible to include her own family and involve kids (field notes, Dec. 13, 2014). This is a strategy she has kept up ever since, which is noticeable in the way the company works. Shifra Cooper told me her personal story of how she "grew into community arts" as Ruth's daughter, and after distancing herself from it for a couple of years, came back to work in that field because she had been trained her whole life to work in community arts (interview with Shifra Cooper, Jan. 7, 2015). She also reflects on her tendency to bring people together even as a teenager, a quality that helps her now in her work at MABELLEarts.

In an interview with Sasha and Dylan Tate-Howarth, both twin sisters describe how they had participated in Jumblies productions as children and then sooner or later came back to work with Jumblies now that they are studying. Although Dylan is not so sure about it yet (she participated in the Artfare Essentials training in 2014), Sasha already worked with Ruth for a summer and sees her future in the area of community arts. During this interview it became clear how strongly Jumblies Theatre promotes and involves young artists by acquiring funds for internships and projects within their work (interview with Dylan and Sasha Tate-Howarth, Jan. 4, 2015). Platform A, a cooperation between various community arts projects in Toronto of which Jumblies Theatre is a part, also holds special microgrants for emerging artists to realize projects. For people who work in community arts, networking is very important. The community arts organisations in Toronto know from and collaborate with each other. For all of those artists who are highly engaged in community arts, it comes natural that their social environment either lies within this community or becomes part of it sooner or later. Nevertheless, a certain delimitation is important for many of them. Some do distinguish between their work as community artists and their own artistic work, as well as between their private and their professional lives, depending on both personal needs as well as external circumstances.

Considering the strategy of "radical inclusion" in the work of Jumblies Theatre, it is striking that the diversity that can be found in the group of participants is not reflected in the rather homogeneous team of community artists. Here we can see what Bishop meant by her definition of community arts as being a middle-class phenomenon (Bishop 2012: 177). This topic came up once during the Artfare Essentials training and was brought up by Fiona, a participant with whom I also talked about this subject in an interview:

> To me it comes back down to: the young people who are allowed to pursue those things are very

few and far between, because you need your parent's support basically to go to university. And if your parents, like mine did, say you're not allowed to study theatre or you're not allowed to do that, it's not going to happen. And so for me, if a program focusses on people who are traditionally and professionally trained, it's going to leave out people like me who can do it but never got the chance to, you know what I mean? (Interview with Fiona, Jan. 11, 2015)

Notwithstanding, Jumblies Theatre tries to involve some community members more into their work; such is the case of Pat, a community member that gets a monthly honoraria and mostly provides food during activities at MABELLEarts' park, but also serves as a link to the broader community and helps with community engagement (Interview with Shifra Cooper, Jan. 7, 2015). However, diversity is not reflected in the artistic team. It would take a conscious decision and special effort to achieve a broader spectrum of social backgrounds that community artists bring into this community of community artists. In the case of Jumblies, the focus lies more on having a diverse team in terms of artistic backgrounds and not so much of social or cultural backgrounds or language skills.

7.3. Product and Outcome

Seeing immediate outcomes at the end of the workshops certainly helps participants to appreciate the activities more. As it is mostly the artists who have the overview and know what each and every activity leads to, the participants can be surprised with the outcome. This surprise effect has proved to be a central element that contributes to the success of Jumblies Theatre. This means, of course, that to achieve this effect, strong leading and directing on the part of the artists are necessary. It is only when all the participants concentrate on their specific contributions and a small group of artists have the overview over the project, the outcome will be a (positive) surprise. I would like to underline that this effect can only be achieved if there is a certain product in the end.

During my research with Jumblies, I experienced three workshops that produced mini-plays in such a form. One took place with the trainees during the Artfare Essentials training, one took place during a Monday session at Arts4All, and a third one took place during the workshop Ruth Howard held at the University of Toronto.[41] Each of them worked in a similar way: A story was told and divided into short scenes. Each scene was allocated to a group of people who then had a certain amount of time to come up with an idea of how to represent it. For that, some simple material was provided, such as cardboard, tissues, in some cases colours, as well as musical instruments. During Artfare Essentials Training participants were even allowed to use everything available at The

---

41 The following descriptions are based on my field notes of those events that took place on Dec.15 and 18, 2014, and Jan. 9, 2015.

Ground Floor, which included technical equipment and led some of the participants to use video and audio for their scenes. The outcome of these short scenes varied from theatrical performance, shadow plays, dance to musical interpretations. At the different settings, where I experienced such mini-plays, I observed a strong correlation between the artist or intern who assisted each group, to what materials or art forms the group chose to use. By that I mean that a group lead by artist Shifra Cooper, for example, was more likely to use songs or music, while a group lead by Mackenzie would probably stay in the field of visual arts.

In the end, the scenes are joined together in a simple but effective way: The leading artist reads out the lines dedicated to the scenes in order and the group in question shows what they came up with. Without applause or comments, the "performance" moves on like this until every group has shown their scene and the story is completed. Throughout the performance, the other groups watch from where they are in the room, or are invited to move along from scene to scene. In all three contexts where I experienced this kind of miniature community play, it worked out surprisingly well and led to beautiful results. Some of the statements of the participants during the recap session of this process at Artfare Essential Training read as follows:

> There was certain trust that each piece is going to float into the other somehow (Jason); I really felt fear...and then exceptional relief (Amy); I hate my stuff being represented by someone else, but yesterday I loved it. It was the first time I felt comfortable with it (Kathleen); I felt honoured (Joahnna); It was a much bigger experience than I expected. I loved it (Liz); Somehow I feel more comfortable doing community art with non-artists, going out in the community (Mackenzie); I felt represented (Tristan); I really enjoyed being part of my story and losing control of it (Columpa). (Field notes Dec. 19, 2014)

These quotes show how the participants of the Artfare Essentials Training course experienced this mini-play that they had developed according to stories that had been shared among the group. The overall positive feedback shows that minor mistakes that were made along the road could easily be shielded. This experience underlines my suggestion that the view upon the outcome changes with participation because everybody is participant and audience at the same time. Nevertheless, I would like to accentuate some of the statements made by Jumblies interns or artists that already work in the field of community art and that show that even for them it is a challenge to be on the side of the participants, with all the benefits and downsides: "A lot of time we ask people to do something. So it felt good to see how this actually feels. I got papers saying 'after you hear the word "tree", you have to say that sentence and you just wait and hope you don't miss it" (Shifra Cooper, field notes Dec. 19, 2014). In this quotation, the artist refers to the way, how this mini-play was set up: The participants teamed up in pairs. Every team was responsible for the performance of one scene, but

whenever they needed someone else to contribute, they were supposed to write down the task on a piece of paper and give it to the person as a reminder. In the end, the scenes were performed one after another and everybody should know when it was their turn – in their own scene, as well as contributing in scenes of others. As an artist working with Jumblies Theatre, Shifra Cooper is used to give directions like that, but is rarely in the position of experience such a set-up from the participant's perspective.

In the workshop with Tamil seniors in Scarborough, the procedure was the same, only that there was no story told, but every group had to come up with three movements dedicated to different themes and all of them were shown as a shadow play where each group acted out their scenes behind the screen and then went back to be the audience who watched the others. This additional example shows, how context, time and the ability of the participants influence the outcome the artists create with the group. It would not be possible to produce a short play like the ones described above in just one workshop with elders. And the shadow play allows them to sit in front of the screen when it is not their turn.

Movement is another fundamental element of Jumblies' work. The big productions or plays always include movement. Either the audience moves along with the play (as in "I Was a Brave Child") or the play is even transformed into a parade (as in MABELLEarts winter parades), and even the big Jumblies productions are not just performed on stage but move through space. Either way, there is no classical separation between the audience and the stage.

A main difference between community-based video in the context of community arts to participatory video-making is their visual appearance. While case study 3 showed a documentary, case studies 1 and 2 made the influence of the artists who were involved clear. The need to create an "artistic" output explains the strong leadership that I noticed in community arts in contrast to strategies in participatory video-making, as in the way the artists assert their aesthetic language. In participatory video the final outcome might not be as important as the process and the fact that participants produce their own video and have control over each and every step. But this often leads to a fear of criticizing at all, which further leads to the overwhelming celebration, to the overly positive reception of minor details and to an attitude that always sees the good things first, as I have described in chapter 5.2. in reference to practices in community arts. All my interview partners insisted on the process to be more important than the product in participatory video and that what really counted was the aftermath that the project initiated, which means how the process that the

participatory video project initiated, further developed in the future (Gareth Benest, field notes Sep. 25, 2014). Nevertheless, I was not surprised to read a similar argument when Mitchell refers to Jennifer Jenson, who "argues that perhaps there is a need to counter an over-celebratory approach, 'an anything goes' when it comes to participatory video, highlighting that she has seen one too many shaky camera shots at conferences where researchers show participatory videos based on their field work. She makes the point that we should not give participants a false sense of worth of their work and that ultimately we should be working with them to strive for higher quality" (Mitchell 2011: 87). Because in the end, the quality of the product and the satisfaction that the participants have when they see it for the first time, does influence the way they reflect on the project as a whole:

> Ultimately, representation is one of the fundamental aspects of participation in practices of participatory video, both in the act of making video images and narratives and in the role those videos play in speaking or standing in for their subjects in relation to larger sociopolitical discourses (Low et al: 56).

This is when questions of whether or not to polish up a product arise. While InsightShare does polish up certain videos while editing, even if this means that there are two versions (one edited by the participants and one that is shown to stakeholders, which is usually cut faster), Jumblies Theatre has its own method of gaining the results they aim for, that has been described by the term "Jumblies' aesthetic".[42] I have already delineated the strategy of the reduction of the material by way of the collaborate creation of a winter scenario in chapter 3.

During the Artfare Essentials Training course a group discussion about the topic of aesthetics brought up different strategies and considerations concerning that question. The question of the predominance of process or product was asked as well as considerations concerning control and loss of control. The first one was discussed along the line of the need of giving the process more importance in community arts generally as opposed to the need to have a certain product in the end. The product is necessary not just for the participants to be proud of what they have achieved but also for funders, because as a community arts organisation one has to show results and prove that the funds were well spent (group discussion on aesthetics, Artfare Essentials Training, Dec. 19, 2014). One of the younger participants of the training course asked the question of how working with the community could become part of the aesthetics (ibid). Later, in an interview with her and her sister the latter talked about an "aesthetic of the masses" meaning that the big Jumblies productions were so impressive because of the huge number of participants and that the masses of people produced a special effect that was characteristic of Jumblies plays (Interview with Dylan and

---

42 See , for example, group discussion on aesthetics, Artfare Essentials Training, Dec. 19, 2014

Sasha Tate-Howarth, Jan. 4, 2015).

Despite the shift from the artist as a single creator towards collaborate production and its supposed influence on the aesthetic language (Crehan 2011: 184), the role of the artistic director and the leading artist is decisive in every project of Jumblies and its off-shoots. The artistic lead strongly influences the outcome, as we have seen in chapter 4, and the importance of the artistic directors of each off-shoot for the way each of them works was mentioned more than once in interviews and informal talks with artists. The balance between control and loss of control is essential to see how the artists work with the community. Whereas the level of engagement from part of the participants in the workshops is highly encouraged, the overall control of the process still lies in the hand of the "expert", namely the artistic lead. At Jumblies, Ruth Howard has established a certain aesthetic language that clearly has her handwriting and is easily recognizable. During the group discussion about aesthetics, Angela Loft referred to this aesthetic as working with some tricks, such as the reduction of material. There are things that the artists can control beforehand which will determine the outcome. By restricting the materials, the outcome, even if many hands work on it, will somehow fit together and be cohesive. In visual arts, the material is also important for an appreciation of the work itself. As Angela Loft said "If you work with adults, you have to give them adult materials" (group discussion on aesthetics, Artfare Essentials Training, Dec. 19, 2014).

Reduction as an aesthetic principle can also be seen in Jumblies videos, such as "Winter Comes" (2010) and "Into the Fall" (2010-11), both Jumblies Theatre films by Sean Frey and other artists together with the group of Tamil seniors and Scarborough youths.[43] These films were shot with super 8 camera in black and white and as mute films with music. The combination of these elements gives the films an anachronistic touch and together with the use of costumes and masks leads the viewer into a dreamworld that alludes to emotions rather than content. Those videos were both made in the context of Jumblies' residency in Scarborough, before the off-shoot Community Arts Guild was founded. In comparison to the video "Coming to Past" from case study 2, some differences can be noted, even if the leading artist is the same: It is likely that there was a bigger team of artists involved and there were many background actors that are referred to as "Jumblies Kids" in the credits of "Into the Fall". It is also likely that there were more funds for these films because the music was composed especially for the films, which influences the outcome a lot. Sean Frey explains the decision of doing a super 8 video as follows:

> You're looking for what works for the constellation of people that are involved and I still would

---

43 To watch the videos visit: http://www.jumbliestheatre.org/jumblies/videos page 4 and 5.

hold a high aesthetic desire when working with a community, but it can be a DIFFERENT aesthetic choice based on the people that are involved. It can be messy but I could want that. (…) You always have to work with what is there and that will inform what this (the product) is. (…) Because if you eliminate parts or you force parts to be something they're not then there is an aesthetic disruption. (Interview with Sean Frey, Jan. 10, 2015)

This means that the decision of making a super 8 movie came out of a consideration of how "edgy" the acting would be, so he chose the simplest method that has this edgy aesthetic anyway. In this way, little inconsistencies would not be seen as mistakes but would fit into the picture. The musical composition further enhances the outcome. Music plays a special role in every production. In the videos we saw how music evokes emotions. Sound and soundscapes are also produced during workshops, with easy tools and under the direction of musicians.

7.4. Reception, Critics and Funding

The reception and visibility of community arts projects depends on whether or not they are included in a general discourse about art. The importance of art criticism that was pointed out by Kester (2004), becomes even more evident in a historical context as indicated by Bishop (2012):

> Despite the overlapping ambitions of community arts and contemporary art in the 1970s, it is conspicuous that the gestures undertaken by the former remained localised in impact and have fallen out of historical memory; when similar projects were undertaken by a single artist (…) a critical debate was formed, established and defended (Bishop 2012: 185).

The visibility of collaborative projects stands and falls with their being embedded in an artistic discourse and/or the high profile of the artist. This is as true today as it was then. Why else should Thomas Hirschhorn's "Musée Precaire Albinet" (Paris 2004) be well known to a broad public but the two decades of work of Toronto-based Jumblies Theatre mostly known by insiders? It is not surprising that the (deliberate) differentiation from an elitist art world results in a certain invisibility to a broader public.

Community artists, no matter in which area, do have one thing in common: they work with "the Other", with "outsiders", "the common" or " the community" as well as "non-artists". But what does this actually mean? In a way, it means that they have made the conscious decision of making things more complicated. Or, as Van Erven phrases: "The community artist works according to certain self-imposed rules consciously founded on specific principles" (Van Erven 2013: 134) and s/he also wants to be judged according to these rules:

> One might define their discipline as follows: to work conscientiously, either ad hoc or according to a predetermined plan, on a reciprocal relationship with ordinary people to produce work with

117

aesthetic and social resonance within the context in which it is made, and perhaps beyond it (Van Erven 2013: 134-135).

This quotation shows two important things of general validity: First, that community arts are about more than just working *together* with people, but it is about *working on the relationship* between all the people who are involved in the long term. Communication and interrelation, the inter-human relationships are constantly and consciously built on.

Van Erven extends the balance between art and community that Gielen (2011) claimed as a premise for community art by requiring the artist to be able to build community. If s/he is not able to do so, whatever kind of project will not be successful. Second and beyond that, the outcome has to be an aesthetically pleasing (art)work, according to Van Erven (Van Erven 2013: 135). That means, even if the first point is inalienable, it is not just about creating relationships but it is about producing art. This again draws on the importance of a symmetry between both factors. Interestingly enough, Van Erven leaves the judgement of whether or not this product is good or aesthetically pleasing to the community itself. The acceptance and appreciation of the context in which art is made, is a must. Everything else, which includes the acceptance in certain art circles, is an extra. I find this approach very convincing because of its pragmatic attitude. It is in fact often the case that the outcome is appreciated very differently if one was part of the production process and if one keeps in mind the relations that have been built. We could then say that aesthetic resonance is different for the participant/producer. But this easily leads to the already mentioned effusive way of judgment when it comes to community engagement. Participation alters the viewpoint towards a more personal appreciation of the outcome that forgives many errors. But the mere appreciation by the community denies broader aesthetic principles and pretends that those personal receptions are of general value. Despite his claim that community arts have to resonate first and foremost with the community, Van Erven shares the opinion that there have to be certain criteria to evaluate community arts that include an adequate language to define them (Van Erven 2013: 136).

It has been shown by way of the example of the so-called mini-plays that the participation in the process of production is crucial for the participants' reception of the outcome. Once people partake in the creation, they have a different relation to the artwork than an audience usually has. It has further been shown that relation-building is both part of the process, that means the production phase, the work that leads to the art-work, as well as being part of the outcome, as relational and dialogical aspects are part of the aesthetic qualities. According to Van Erven it is here, where the new methods of criticism should set in to value those relational and dialogical aspects in a way that

also allows criticism. The social outcome should nevertheless be part of these and therefore not evaluated as such, but as part of the whole: (…) art that must be judged by its dialogical, relational and aesthetic qualities and not by the quantity of new intercultural contacts it instigates in a deprived area" (Van Erven 2013: 139). He further criticizes that all too often, community arts projects are judged by different criteria than other artistic programs. One must see relation and dialogue as constructive part of community arts projects and not just as a means to an end. It makes a difference, if we see community arts as just another way of doing community work or if we see it as just another form of art (ibid).

Having come so far, I have shown that a paradigm shift will be necessary, as claimed by Kester (2004) and supported by Van Erven (2013),

> in order to arrive at an understanding of art that integrates rather than drives a wedge between the social and the purely artistic dimensions of art; that does not distinguish between process and product, but sees each of them as aspects of a single whole; that sometimes even dares to look beyond the scope of a single project, and views the long-term relationship between artists and the community as a multilayered socio-artistic fabric with a variety of manifestations and climaxes; that does not on the one hand prejudge participatory processes involving ordinary people as conservative or of low value, or on the other hand prejudge individual and autonomous art works as naturally pioneering, disruptive or challenging; that looks not only at the social *effect*, but also – setting statistics to one side – at the instinctive, emotional *affect* that people feel in their heart and their gut and that is unmeasurable – and for which there are no precise words. (Van Erven 2013: 134, original accentuation)

Beyond that claim for a paradigm shift towards a broader view on the social aspects of art, another crucial kind of criticism comes into play in community arts. The persons who are actually constantly criticizing the work of community artists are those who fund the projects. Every grant proposal includes an overview over past projects, descriptions of work, the approach, the participants and the outcome. Whether or not they meet the expectations of the jury, is a precondition for the development of other projects. However, the big difference to other forms of art criticism is the unavoidable binary form of judgement: Either it is good enough to get funding or not. There is no written discussion or oral feedback and there is no second opinion.

For An De bisschop (2011), the inclusion or exclusion of community art in fundings is central to the construction of meaning in the policy domain of the discourse on community arts (De bisschop 2011: 55). In the article "Community Art is What We Say and Write It is" (2011), she refers to the need of "questioning the obvious meanings around community art, based on the idea that discourse is always connected to power" (ibid: 52). In her discourse analysis she concentrates on the domains of policy and print media in two very different geographical contexts, namely Flanders and South

Africa, and illustrates how the general perception of community arts is influenced by the policy domain and vice versa.

Community arts projects are often very much dependent on state fundings, as it is the case in the UK. Claire Bishop links the decline of Britain's Community Arts Movement with the decline of state fundings under the Thatcher Government from 1979 onwards. Only three years later, there were almost no direct fundings for community arts left. This dependency on the remaining grants further led to a professionalisation of community arts and less radical political positioning. There was a shift in the meaning of community arts: "from subversive dehierarchisation" to an educational programme leading people towards high culture (Bishop 2012: 187-188). By way of this example the strong and direct effect of changes in the state's funding policy on community arts becomes visible. A certain part of the tendency of community arts towards a naïve, good-will art can be explained by this dependency. The state somehow tries to re-appropriate community arts as part of the social state. As long as community arts are dependent on state fundings and grants, there will be no highly political community art. Thus: "In some respects, the organization's relationship to the various grant-giving bodies was closer to older models of patronage than to those of the market", states Crehan in reference to Free Form Arts Trust (Crehan 2011: 133).

In the case of Jumblies Theatre, funding mostly comes from state and private funds that they apply for, both project-based, as well as for general funding of their organisation. A special community arts funds exists on a national, regional as well as on a city level. This means that Jumblies Theatre, for instance, can apply to the Canada Council for the Arts, the Ontario Arts Council, as well as the Toronto Arts Council for support. Moreover, there are several private agencies and foundations that mostly support their interns. In an interview with Ruth Howard, Artistic Director of Jumblies Theatre, she mentioned the parallel development between the history of Jumblies Theatre and the increasing number of funding possibilities in that sector. When Ruth Howard started bringing her experience with community theatre that she had gained in the UK back to Toronto and began to work with community arts there, several other groups and collectives emerged in this area. As the need for funding in this sector increased, so did the number of funding possibilities provided by the state and others (interview with Ruth Howard, Jan. 4, 2015).

8. Conclusions and Outlook

I have aimed at showing the process of community-based filmmaking in the context of community arts, regarding the genesis of a community-based video (how a project is started, how stories are collected and interpreted, how they are transformed into a video and how the outcome is presented and shared), the relationships of the persons involved and their communication, as well as the product as such. To do so, I have contrasted this process with other community-based video projects, namely so-called participatory video, to show additional perspectives on the process of video-making within a community. I have provided this additional view, because I am of the opinion that it serves to 1) give a demarcation of what is or is not community-based video, 2) describe the particularities of community arts in comparison with topic-based participatory video projects and 3) highlight the particularities of both approaches.

For that purpose, I have thoroughly described the research process that underlies this thesis, giving weight to the events I assisted, the people I met and the topics I dealt with. Furthermore, I have given more detailed descriptions of the two organisations I worked with, namely Jumblies Theatre in Canada, and InsightShare in the UK. These give important insights into the way of working of both organisations, as we have seen in the importance of state funding for Jumblies Theatre and their support of interns and young artists mainly through private foundations and scholarships on the one hand, and the project-based commissions (by NGOs, etc), and private funds for InsightShare on the other hand.

In chapter 3 I suggested a distinction between topic-based participatory video projects (as in research and activism) and relation-based video projects for community building. I locate the work of InsightShare in the first, and the work of Jumblies Theatre in the second scope. In that chapter, I further opened the topic to a discussion of the importance of both the process and the product and where to find the balance between them (or: where to put the focus). I also broached the issue of an overly positive attitude towards community-based videos and the claim for a more critical approach by giving the participants realistic expectations of what they can hope to achieve with their video, and at the same time aiming for a high quality instead of giving them a wrong idea of their work, as addressed by Mitchell (2011). Not least because the outcome of a participatory video project also addresses the broader community in form of the audience, who offers its own perspective of the topic in question (See "audience text", Mitchell 2011: 84f). I have raised questions about whether or

not participatory video-making can be empowering for the participants and what lies underneath the "democratic process" of participatory video that "has unlimited potential" (White 2003: 100) once it is situated within its regional but globalised context, as pointed out by Low et al. (2012). I have highlighted the possibility of change on a personal level and the use of community-based video as part of a broader process of community-building in a relation-based approach that is often closely connected to theatre work, as my examples from teatroDENTRO and Debajehmujig Storytellers showed.

The case studies in chapter 4 have traced the genesis of three different video projects and offered a visual analysis of the videos produced. The analysis of the product offers a lot of insights into its making and working. With a close look, the product itself sheds light on the underlying process. This is clearly visible in case study 3, where the video directly traces the path of the participatory video process. But it is also true for case studies 1 and 2, where acting, directing and editing give clues on the working process. Some strategies of involving people have been named in the consolidation of the three case studies and further explained in chapter 7.

In the theoretical chapters 5 and 6 of this thesis, I introduced anthropological perspectives on community arts, above all Kate Crehan's study of Free Form Arts Trust, which helps to understand the distribution of expertise in community arts and the importance of workshop-based co-creation. The rejection of art as being made by a single creator might stand at the core of community arts, but the way in which a broad community is involved in such a process is what makes it different to other participatory art practices. The division between experts and non-experts already suggests a level of inequality that comes to play in community arts practice, notwithstanding its good intentions. How fragile the line between acceptance and rejection might be, is shown by way of example of the artist John Ahearn, as given by Kwon (2002). I argue that these power relations must be shown instead of hidden and that an overly positive approach towards both, the process and the product can be counterproductive. When practitioners talk about empowerment, it is inevitable to ask who should be empowered by whom and to what end.

Bishop states that aesthetic criteria are also used as a form of validation, a proof that this kind of artistic practice is just as valid as others. I detect this use of an aesthetic language as a hallmark also at Jumblies Theatre, whose artists and associates do not get tired of highlighting the so-called "Jumblies Aesthetics" as their core quality, as what makes their work special. The question of aesthetics has been discussed with the help of Rancière's "aesthetic regime of art" (Ranicère 2009:

32) and his argument that every art is necessarily political. He claims that an aesthetic autonomy means the autonomy of "a form of sensory experience", which is the beginning of "a new form of collective life" (Rancière 2009: 32). His notion of art that only becomes art by the gaze that is pointed at it, and the new type of art that relates to anyone at all, stands somehow in contrast to the way how Jumblies' artists describe their art and the need for classification that is apparent in their work. However, this strong defence from part of the community artists comes from a need to claim legitimacy within the art world and with regard to the people they work with. The opening up of binaries of author and spectator, individual and collective that Rancière suggests for the discourse on political art, is indeed of great importance for community arts. For Rancière, art becomes art through the way it is seen. I argue that the strong focus on aesthetics and the special aesthetic language of Jumblies comes from exactly this need to proclaim and confirm their work as artwork towards a broader public.

I should like to emphasize the possibilities of video in the context of community arts that make it possible to include and appreciate all contributions even in a highly fluctuating setting. Hence, video is a less ephemeral community arts practice that furthermore offers great varieties of inclusion. However, it turns out that in the case of community-based video in the context of community arts as against other participatory video practices, a strong direction and leadership is at work. No matter how much importance is given to the process, the outcome is still considered highly significant and has to meet the artistic and aesthetic principles of the artistic director. When I claim that video in the context of community arts is relation-based, in contrast to a more topic-based focus of participatory video according to InsightShare, I refer to all kinds of relations that come to mind in the setting of co-creation between various artists under the lead of an artistic director, and a group of community members as participants and collaborators. It is therefore not only focussed on building relations between the people involved, but also dependent on the already existing relations within that setting.

Finally, I would like to emphasize the need to intensify the discussion of community arts as a setting of social relations, with strong hierarchies and alliances. It is the setting of social relations that stands behind every successful community arts project and fosters a redistribution of expertise, but also strictly frames the space for operation on the part of the participants. To deepen the discourse on community-arts, it is necessary to give more space to the participants' perspective, also in research. I have shown how most of the writings on both community arts and participatory video-making come form practitioners who clearly refer to their own perspective on the subject, with their

own interpretation of the participants' involvement. It is time to open up this discussion and to spotlight the participants' perspective.

Bibliography

Adorno, Theodor W. 1977. Thesen zur Kunstsoziologie. In: *Gesammelte Schriften, Band 10.1.* Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 367-374.

Alÿs, Francis. 2007. *Francis Alÿs.* London: Phaidon.

Asadullah, Sara. 2014. `Wrong or no wrong, I speak`. In: Mallows, David (ed). *Language issues in migration and integration: perspectives from teachers and learners.* London: British Council, 95-110.

Benest, Gareth. 2011. *A Rights-Based Approach to Participatory Video: Toolkit.* London: InsightShare.

Bery, Renuka. 2003. Participatory Video that Empowers. In: White, Shirley (ed). *Participatory Video: Images that Transform and Empower.* Los Angeles: SAGE, 102-121.

Bishop, Claire. 2012. *Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship.* London/ New York: Verso.

Bordwell, David and Kristin Thompson. 2008. *Film Art: An Introduction. Eighth Edition.* New York: McGraw-Hill International Edition.

Born, Georgina 2010. *The Social and the Aesthetic: For a Post-Bourdieuian Theory of Cultural Production.* In: Cultural Sociology Vol. 4(2): 171-208.

Bourriaud, Nicolas. 2002. *Relational Aesthetics.* Dijon: Les presses du réel.

Braden, Su. 1978. *Artists and People.* London: Routledge.

Buchloh, Benjamin (ed.). 2004. *Thomas Hirschhorn.* London: Phaidon Press.

Calle, Sophie. 2007. *Prenez Soin de vous.* Arles: Actes Sud.

Cerwonka, Allaine and Liisa H. Malkki. 2007. *Improvising Theory. Process and Temporality in Ethnographic Fieldwork.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Clifford, James. 1988. *The predicament of culture: twentieth century ethnography, literature and art.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Clifford, James and George Marcus (eds.). 1986. *Writing culture: the poetics and politics of ethnography.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Crehan, Kate. 2011. *Community Art. An Anthropological Perspective.* Oxford, New York: Berg.

Debord, Guy. 1983 (1967). *Society of the spectacle.* Detroit: Black & Red.

De bisschop, An. 2011. Community Art is What We Say and Write It is. In: De Bruyne, Paul and Pascal Gielen (eds.). *Community Art. The Politics of Trespassing*. Amsterdam: Valiz, 51-73.

De la Fuente, Eduardo. 2007. *The `New Sociology of Art´: Putting Art Back into Social Science Approaches to the Arts.* In: Cultural Sociology Vol. 1(3): 409-425.

DeWalt, Kathleen M. and Billie R. DeWalt. 2002. *Participant Observation. A Guide for Fieldworkers*. Lanham: AltaMira Press.

Dickson, Malcom (ed.). 1995. *Art with People*. Sunderland: AN Publications.

Elger, Dietmar. 1997. *Felix Gonzalez-Torres. Catalogue raisonné.* Museum Moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien. Ostfildern-Ruit: Cantz.

Flick, Uwe. 2002. *Qualitative Sozialforschung. Eine Einführung*, Reinbeck/Hamburg: Rowohlt.

Foster, Hal. 1996. The Artist as ethnographer? In: Foster, Hal (ed.). T*he return of the real: the avant-garde at the end of the century*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 171-203.

Fox, John. 2002. *Eyes on Stalks.* London: Methuen Drama.

Freire, Paulo. 1970. *Pedagogy of the Opressed.* New York: Herder and Herder.

Gell, Alfred. 1998. *Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gielen, Pascal. 2011. Mapping Community Art. In: De Bruyne, Paul and Pascal Gielen (eds). *Community Art. The Politics of Trespassing.* Amsterdam: Valiz, 15-33.

Gramsci, Antonio. 1999 (1934). Fünfundzwanzigstes Heft (XXIII) An den Rändern der Geschichte (Geschichte der subalternen gesellschaftlichen Gruppen). In: Jehle, Peter, Klaus Bochmann and Wolfgang Fritz Haug (eds). *Gefängnishefte, Band 9, Hefte 22 bis 29*, Hamburg: Argument, 2185-2200.

Grimshaw, Anna (2001). *The Ethnographer's Eye. Ways of seeing in anthropology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grimshaw, Anna, Elspeth Owen, and Amanda Ravetz. 2010. Making Do: The Materials of Art and Anthropology. In: Schneider, Arnd and Christopher Wright (eds.). *Between Art and Anthropology. Contemporary Ethnographic Practice.* Oxford and New York: Berg.

Grimshaw, Anna and Amanda Ravetz. 2015. *The ethnographic turn – and after: a critical approach towards the realignment of art and anthropology.* In: Social Anthropology 23: 418-434.

Hauser, Arnold. 1974. *Soziologie der Kunst.* München: Beck.

Howard, Ruth. 2014. *Artfare Essentials Companion.* Jumblies Studio, unpublished manual for Artfare Essentials Trainees.

Ingold, Tim. 2000. *The perception of the environment: essays in livelihood, dwelling and skill.* London: Routledge.

Ingold, Tim. 2011. *Being alive: essays on movement, knowledge, and description.* London: Routledge.

Ingold, Tim. 2013. *Making: anthropology, archaeology, art and architecture*. London: Routhledge.

Kelly, Owen. 1984. *Community Art and the State: Stormin the Citadels*. Comedia Publishing Group.

Kester, Grant. 2004. *Conversation Pieces. Community and Communication in Modern Art.* Berkley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.

Kester, Grant. 2011. *The One and the Many. Contemporary Collaborative Art in a Global Context.* Durham, London: Duke University Press.

Knoblauch, Hubert, René Tuma and Bernt Schnettler. 2014. *Video Analysis and Videography.* In: Flick, Uwe: The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis. London: SAGE, 435-449.

Kwon, Miwon. 2002. *One Place after Another: Site-specific Art and Locational Identity.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Lilienthal, Matthias (ed.), 2000. *Schlingensiefs "Ausländer raus"*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp.

Low, Bronwen et al. 2012. (Re)framing the Scholarship on Participatory Video: From Celebration to Critical Engagement. In: Milne, E-J, Claudia Mitchell, and Naydene de Lange (eds.). *Handbook of Participatory Video*. Lanham: AltaMira, 49-64.

Lunch, Nick and Chris Lunch. 2006. *Insights Into Participatory Video. A Handbook For The Field.* Oxford: InsightShare.

Marcus, George E. 2010. Contemporary Fieldwork Aesthetics in Art an Anthropology: Experiments in Collaboration and Intervention. In: *Visual Anthropology, 23*: 263-277.

Mason, Jennifer (ed.). 2002. *Qualitative Researching*, London: SAGE.

Milne, E-J, Claudia Mitchell, and Naydene de Lange (eds.). 2012. *Handbook of Participatory Video*. Lanham: AltaMira.

Mitchell, Claudia. 2011. *Doing Visual Research.* Los Angeles: SAGE.

Morphy, Howard. 2009. Art as A Mode of Action. Some Problems with Gell's *Art and Agency*. In: *Journal of Material Culture Vol. 14(1)*: 5-27. Los Angeles: SAGE.

Nochlin, Linda. 1989. Why Have There Been No Great Woman Artists? In: *Women, Art, and Power and Other Essays.* London: Thames and Hudson, 145-178.

Pink, Sarah. 2007. *Doing visual Ethnography*. Los Angeles: SAGE.

Plant, Sadie. 1995. *The most radical gesture.* London and New York: Routledge.

Rancière, Jacques. 2004. *The Politics of Aesthetics. The Distribution of the Sensible.* London and New York: Continuum.

Rancière, Jacques. 2009. *Aesthetics and its discontents.* Cambridge: polity.

Rose, Gillian. 2007. *Visual Methodologies. An Introduction to the Interpretation of Visual Materials.* Los Angeles: SAGE.

Sansi, Roger. 2015. *Art, Anthropology and the Gift.* London et al: Bloomsbury Academic.

Schneider, Arnd. 1993. *The Art diviners.* In: Anthropology Today 9:3-9.

Schneider, Arnd. 1996. *Uneasy relationships: contemporary artists and anthropology.* In: Journl of Material Culture 1: 183-210.

Schneider, Arnd and Christopher Wright (eds.). 2006. *Contemporary Art and Anthropology.* Oxford and New York: Berg.

Schneider, Arnd and Christopher Wright (eds.). 2010. *Between Art and Anthropology. Contemporary Ethnographic Practice.* Oxford and New York: Berg.

Schneider, Arnd and Christopher Wright (eds.). 2013. *Anthropology and Art Practice.* London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. 1999. *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples.* New York: Zed Books.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1993. Can The Subaltern Speak? In: Williams, Patrick and Laura Chrisman (eds.). *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory. A Reader.* New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 66-111.

Ssorin-Chaikov, Nikolai. 2013a. *Ethnographic conceptualism: an introduction.* In: Laboratorium 5: 5-18.

Ssorin-Chaikov,Nikolai. 2013b. *Gift/knowledge relations at the exhibition of gifts to Soviet leaders.* In: Laboratorium 5: 166-192.

Thomas, Verena and Kate Britton. 2012. The Art of Participatory Video. Relational Aesthetics in Artistic Collaborations. In: Milne, E-J, Claudia Mitchell, and Naydene de Lange (eds.) *Handbook of Participatory Video.* Lanham: AltaMira, 208-222.

Thurn, Hans-Peter. 1973. *Soziologie der Kunst.* Stuttgart/ Berlin/ Köln/ Mainz: Kohlhammer.

Van Erven, Eugène. 2013. *Community Arts Dialogues.* Utrecht: Treaty of Utrecht Foundation.

White, Shirley. 2003. *Participatory Video: Images that Transform and Empower.* Los Angeles: SAGE.

Wolff, Janet. 1993. *The Social Production of Art.* London: Macmillan.

Sources

Cited Interviews (in chronological order)

Interview with Sara Asadullah, Sep. 29, 2014

Interview with Gareth Benest, Oct. 30, 2014

Interview with Amy Siegel, Jan. 2, 2015

Interview with Dylan and Sasha Tate-Howarth, Jan. 4, 2015

Interview with Ruth Howard, Jan. 4, 2015

Interview with Marianne Alas, Jan. 5, 2015

Interview with Leah Houston and Amy Turner, Jan. 6, 2015

Interview with Michael Burtt, Jan. 6, 2015

Interview with Shifra Cooper, Jan. 7, 2015

Interview with Rangoli, Jan. 8, 2015

Interview with Beth Helmers, Jan. 9, 2015

Interview with Sean Frey, Jan. 10, 2015

Interview with Liz Rucker, Jan. 10, 2015

Interview with Sonja Rainey, Jan. 11, 2015

Interview with Fiona, Jan. 11, 2015

Interview with Joe Osawabine, Jan. 14, 2015

Interview with Esther Maloney, Jan. 17, 2015

Additional Recording

Group discussion on aesthetics, Artfare Essentials Training, Dec. 19, 2014

Videos

Case Study 1: "I Was A Brave Child":
Video "PartyParty", courtesy of Amy Siegel.
Video "Spookies in the Forest", courtesy of Amy Siegel.

Case Study 2: "Coming to Past":
Video "Coming to Past", http://seanfrey.blogspot.co.at/.

Case Study 3: "Welcome to the UK":
Video "Welcome to the UK", http://insightshare.org/watch/video/welcome-uk.

Additional Videos

Video "Winter Comes" (2010), http://www.jumbliestheatre.org/jumblies/videos , page 5.

Video "Into the Fall" (2010-11), http://www.jumbliestheatre.org/jumblies/videos , page 4.

Video "A Light in Mid Winter" (2010-11), http://seanfrey.blogspot.co.at/2011/10/light-in-midwinter.html.

Video "Waving Goodbye" (2012), http://seanfrey.blogspot.co.at/2012/02/waving-goodbye.html.

Video "Elders Gone AWOL" (2011), courtesy of Debajehmujig Storytellers.

Web Pages (in alphabetical order)

Arts4all: http://www.arts4all.ca/ .

City of Toronto, Live Arts Hub:

http://www1.toronto.ca/wps/portal/contentonly?vgnextoid=1d3edada600f0410VgnVCM10000071d60f89RCRD .

Community Arts Guild: http://communityartsguild.ca/.

Francis Alÿs: http://francisalys.com/exhibitions/ .

Girleffect: www.girleffect.org.

InsightShare: http://insightshare.org/.

Jumblies Theatre: http://www.jumbliestheatre.org/.

Learning Unlimited: http://www.learningunlimited.co/.

Platform A: https://platformatoronto.com/ .

Sean Frey: http://seanfrey.blogspot.co.at/ .

Tate/ Sophie Calle: http://www.tate.org.uk/context-comment/video/venice-biennale-sophie-calle .

The Christensen Fund: www.christensenfund.org .

TransFORMAS: http://transformas.es/.

Wochenklausur: http://www.wochenklausur.at/index1.php?lang=en .

Abstract

Community-based filmmaking is a process of film production within or with a certain community. This research focusses on the use of video in community arts and the particularities of this practice by analysing the work of Toronto-based community arts organisation Jumblies Theatre and its off-shoots. In the context of community arts, video is one technique out of many for common artistic creation. In order to position community-based filmmaking within the broader field of community arts it is necessary to construct this field in different layers. First, it is important to define community-based filmmaking as a process of common creation and show how this method is used and which chances and limitations it has. In order to do so, the work of the organisation InsightShare and its method of participatory video (PV) is used to gain additional insights and offer various perspectives on community-based filmmaking. A close look at the concept of community arts, its different implementations and techniques is the basis for seeing how these two concepts are combined in community-based artistic video projects.

During the ethnographic research, the main focus of my observations were the social relations between the people involved, how the artists, or facilitators respectively, interact with the community, and how social relations influence common creation vice versa. Working with video includes certain technical issues and requires knowledge about exposure, lightening or framing on the one hand, as well as storytelling on the other hand. In video work with communities, it is especially interesting to see how this knowledge is imparted and how the community gets engaged in this field. Three case studies build the core of this thesis, two of them are taken from the work of Jumblies Theatre and one from InsightShare, in order to introduce an additional perspective. Each of them examines the aims of the projects, the role of the different actors, the project genesis as well as the outcome.

This work is an attempt to understand the many layers that act together and how they facilitate the building of community in this field. It is also the aim of this thesis to take a critical view on the practices of community-based filmmaking inside and outside of the context of community arts, always considering the genesis of the projects and the involvement of the community members in the process. This research aims at an illustration of methods of facilitation in community-based video projects within and outside of the community-arts context. It is situated in the field of visual anthropology, as it deals with visual material and includes the analysis of videos to gain a deeper

understanding of what the images themselves show, as well as of the processes through which they have been created. But it is also situated in the field of anthropology and arts, seeing art "as a mode of investigating the world" rather than "an object of enquiry" (Grimshaw/Owen/Ravetz 2010: 160). Art is not just the subject of my research, but it is also a field that has many affinities to anthropology, both in the method of research as well as regarding contents. It is part of the aim of this thesis to show such points of contact.

Deutsches Abstract

Communtiy-based Filmmaking ist ein Prozess der Filmproduktion in oder mit einer bestimmten Community. Der Schwerpunkt dieser Forschungsarbeit liegt in der Verwendung von Video in Community Arts und den Besonderheiten dieser Praxis, die durch eine Analyse der Community Arts Organisation Jumblies Theatre und seiner Off-shoots in Toronto herausgearbeitet wird. Im Kontext von Community Art ist Video eine von vielen Techniken der gemeinschaftlichen Kunstproduktion. Um Community-based Filmmaking in diesem breiteren Feld der Community Arts zu positionieren, ist es entscheidend, das Feld auf verschiedenen Ebenen zu konstruieren. Es ist zunächst wichtig, Community-based Filmmaking als einen Prozess gemeinschaftlicher Kreation zu definieren und zu zeigen, wie diese Methode verwendet wird, welche Vorteile sie hat und welche Grenzen sie aufweist. Um das zu tun, wird die Arbeit der Organisation InsightShare herangezogen und deren Methode des teilnehmenden Videoschaffens (PV – Participatory Video-making) verwendet, um zusätzliche Perspektiven auf Community-based Filmmaking zu bekommen. Ein genauer Blick auf das Konzept von Community Arts, die verschiedenen Anwendungen und Techniken dieser Disziplin, sind der Ausgangspunkt, um zu sehen, wie diese zwei Konzepte in künstlerischen community-based Videoprojekten vereint werden.

Während meiner ethnographischen Forschung lag der Hauptfokus meiner Beobachtungen auf den sozialen Beziehungen zwischen den Menschen und darauf, wie die Künstler_innen beziehungsweise Vermittler_innen mit der Community interagieren, sowie darauf, wie soziale Beziehungen gemeinschaftliches Schaffen beeinflussen, und umgekehrt. Um mit Video zu arbeiten, braucht es technisches Wissen über Belichtung oder das Wählen eines Bildausschnitts einerseits, sowie Techniken des Storytellings auf der anderen Seite. In der Arbeit mit Video in Communities ist es besonders interessant zu sehen, wie dieses Wissen vermittelt wird und wie die Community in das Thema eingearbeitet wird. Drei Fallbeispiele stehen im Zentrum dieser Arbeit. Zwei von ihnen wurden aus der Arbeit von Jumblies Theatre ausgesucht und das dritte stammt von InsightShare, um eine zusätzliche Perspektive zu eröffnen. Jedes dieser Fallbeispiele untersucht die Entstehung des Projekts, die Ziele dieser Projekte, die Rolle der verschiedenen Akteure sowie das Ergebnis.

Diese Arbeit ist ein Versuch, die verschiedenen Ebenen zu verstehen, die in diesem Feld zusammenarbeiten , und wie sie die Bildung einer Community begünstigen. Ein weiteres Ziel dieser Arbeit ist es, einen kritischen Blick auf die Praktiken von Community-based Filmmaking innerhalb

und außerhalb von Community Arts zu werfen, wobei stets die Entstehungsgeschichte der Projekte und die Einbindung der Gemeindemitglieder in den Prozess bedacht werden. Diese Forschungsarbeit hat zum Ziel, die Vermittlungsmethoden in community-based Videoprojekten, innerhalb sowie außerhalb von Community Arts, zu illustrieren. Sie ist im Bereich der visuellen Anthropologie verortet, da sie mit visuellem Material arbeitet und Videoanalysen beinhaltet, die ein tieferes Verständnis dafür geben sollen, was die Bilder an sich zeigen, sowie den Prozess, in dem sie geschaffen wurden. Aber sie ist auch im Bereich der Kunstanthropologie verortet, die Kunst als eine Art sieht, die Welt zu erforschen und nicht bloß als einen Untersuchungsgegenstand (Grimshaw/Owen/Ravetz 2010: 160). Kunst ist nicht nur das Thema dieser Forschung, sondern auch ein Bereich, der sowohl in den Forschungsmethoden als auch inhaltlich viele Affinitäten zur Anthropologie aufweist. Es ist eines der Ziele dieser Masterarbeit, diese Schnittpunkte aufzuzeigen.