Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for a degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter now, including display on the World Wide Web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis.

Samantha Rose Ditre   April 10, 2017

Exploring the Process of Translation from Stage to Screen

by

Samantha Rose Ditre

Sally Radell
Adviser

Emory Dance Program

Sally Radell

Adviser

Greg Catellier

Committee Member

Dr. Eddy Von Mueller

Committee Member

Dr. Michele Schreiber

Committee Member

2017

Exploring the Process of Translation from Stage to Screen

By

Samantha Rose Ditre

Sally Radell

Adviser

An abstract of
a thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

Emory Dance Program

2017

Abstract

Exploring the Process of Translation from Stage to Screen
By Samantha Rose Ditre

Dance has often been the filmmaker's subject of choice since the inception of film technology in the late 1800s. Yet over time, the relationship between dance and media has surpassed the simplistic bond of "motion captured" into more complex hybrid practices. This evolution has given way to the acknowledgement of a field recently coined "moving-picture dance", also referred to as "dance film", "screendance", "dance for camera", and more. The construction of media within this constantly changing field is what I have been researching through practical application and contemporary texts. Specifically, I have been exploring the process of translating choreography from the stage to the screen, and have approached this topic by attempting to render Cherry Fung's choreographic work PM 2.5 in digital form. Through this process I have grown as a creator of hybridized artwork, and have come to a deeper understanding of the mediated body, working in uncertainty, and my beliefs concerning the field in question. This paper serves to present the culmination of the discoveries I have made throughout my process, and later to evaluate my work's place in the emerging field of moving-picture dance.

Exploring the Process of Translation from Stage to Screen

By

Samantha Rose Ditre

Sally Radell

Adviser

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

Emory Dance Program

2017

Acknowledgements

Sincerest thanks to Sally Radell for our many long talks from which this project was shaped, for endless encouragement and words of wisdom, and for guiding me through this journey to its completion. Thank you to Greg Catellier for your continual support, much-needed advice, and most excellent lighting presets. Thank you to Dr. Von Mueller for making me feel like I could have made anything I set my mind to, and for giving me the tools and knowledge I needed to be successful in this endeavor. Thank you to Dr. Schreiber for inadvertently setting me on this path in my freshman year during Intro to Film, and for stepping in at the last minute. Thank you to Anne Walker and Kendall Simpson for the logistical support that made this all run smoothly. Many thanks to the incredibly talented Cherry Fung for supporting my re-imagination of *PM 2.5*, and to Diana Bender-Bier, Laura Briggs, Lauren Lym, and Alfredo Takori for your long hours, hard work, and enthusiasm. Thank you to Elizabeth Littlefield, Katrina Peed, Evan Welch, Conor Makowski, and Toby Teitel for your creativity, humor, and dedication to making this project the best it could be. Thank you to audience members for invaluable feedback, and to my friends and family for your always present love, support, and encouragement. Lastly, thank you to the Emory Dance Program for making this possible.

Table of Contents

I. Introduction

Since coming to Emory University, I have been exposed to a multitude of new communities, both on campus and off. One of the most influential and formative has been a community that I have rarely met in person, yet have been deeply involved in during my time here – what I call the online dance community. This is a group bonded by shared knowledge, passion, and interest in the unlabeled offspring of hip-hop dance, whose existence can be found in the digital space of YouTube.com and occasionally in person. We came to occupy this space by way of videos posted by up and coming (or come up) dancers, choreographers, and dance groups, which also serve as the basis for our inter-personal connection. Although not a self-acknowledged or formalized group, our shared "experiences" have cut a division between those who bear witness to and are involved in the evolution of hip-hop from the streets to virtual sites, and those who do not.

I share this information because, through this particular online dance community, I was introduced to artists whose work fluctuated between dance documentation and potential subgenres of moving-picture dance in a virtual, contemporary form. While absorbing their work I also grew conscious of the kinesthetic empathy I felt towards some pieces, and the techniques used in filming and editing which I believed potentially contributed to these feelings. As the entry point for my curiosity into recently produced material combining dance and media, my own creative enterprises were affected and founded in part on the artwork I had been consuming through said group. When deciding upon the topic of my honors thesis, therefore, I knew my

interests lay in practically experiencing this blend of media and dance that had been a part of my life for years.

But where to focus my efforts? I was intrigued at first by the point of reception, of audience perceptions of staged versus screened dance. I then began to wonder about potential differences between work that engaged the audience and work that granted the audience a mostly or totally unhindered view of the digital body, in some ways allowing greater "legibility" of the choreography. From here I wondered whether audiences' abilities to accurately perceive the intent behind a moving-picture dance piece would be affected by stereotypical interpretations of dance genres as commercial or non-commercial artwork. These ideas I intended to explore after developing a moving-picture dance piece, perhaps through questionnaires or interviews. These ideas also reflected a stage of early research into the field by assuming choreography captured by the camera would not be created intentionally for the camera and therefore tied "legibility" to the ability to see the entire mediated human form. Though these were valid ponderings, for several reasons I began to question my qualifications in building hybrids of media and dance specifically shaped for the purpose of excavating relevant data from an audience as a means of answering these questions. I had never made anything I would consider moving-picture dance before, and believed there was much inherent in the process of production that would be more suitable for my study.

As a product of many conversations with trusted advisors, I was able to re-establish the focus of my research to appropriately reflect my initial interests in media and dance *creation* instead of reception. In specific, I would concentrate on the translation of bodies and a body of work from a physical to a digital site. This process would allow me to draw upon knowledge accrued from both of my majors (Dance and Movement Studies and Media Studies) and provide

me with the necessary space to delve deeper into what may be seen as a subset of both fields - moving-picture dance. But the question still remained – would I translate a work of my own or that of another choreographer?

Choreographing myself would of course provide me with an intimate knowledge of the details of the piece, which may have made the task of translation simpler. However, adapting another's choreography would allow a degree of objectivity towards the work that would certainly not be present should I take on the roles of both director and choreographer. If I were to utilize choreography already set for the stage, I would also be relieved of the potential difficulties inherent in trying to regulate my own intentions behind the project while choreographing. I would otherwise need to restrict myself to creating choreography for a physical setting which would later be translated to media (instead of creating movement for the camera's eye directly, despite knowing production would occur). Although to some, creating work based on the understanding that it will be filmed yields results more true to a working definition of moving-picture dance, my interest in the translation of work from physical to digital space could be compromised by this method of choreographing.

Between concerns of lacking objectivity and time constraints, I realized that using a piece which had already been created could strengthen the integrity of my work given my focus on translation. Recommendations from my committee turned me towards works presented during the Emory Dance Company showcase in the spring of 2016. Watching the documentation footage of the event, I was particularly intrigued by Cherry Fung's piece, *PM 2.5*. I felt there was potential for rich exploration in camera work due to its composition and structure. As a consumer of dance works with aesthetic preferences, I was also drawn to the quieting and alternately fervent movement qualities embodied by the dancers.

After receiving permission from Cherry to reconstruct and translate her work, the subject matter of my thesis was finalized. I set out to explore the process of translation by creating my own moving-picture dance – adapting Cherry Fung's piece *PM 2.5* from the stage to the screen. By researching contemporary texts written on the field of moving-picture dance, I also hope to be able to analyze my creation's position within the field.

II. On the Field in Question

In order to be able to later assess the position of my work in the context of the field in question, it would be useful to understand specifically of what the field does or does not consist. To do this, it would be useful to have terminology to employ when referring to this field and its subgenres, both for the sake of simplicity while writing and to approach an understanding of the scope and internal distinctions that exist within the field. However, uncovering consistent terminology has been surprisingly difficult. The field in question seems to suffer from an (at times deliberately maintained) identity crisis, so to speak, as is evident by the inconsistent terminology and pushback from some scholars towards labeling/defining efforts.

I was formally introduced to this field as early as freshmen year, in film courses which touched upon big names in Hollywood such as Busby Berkeley, Fred Astaire, and the like in the context of the musical genre, and to Maya Deren's works in the experimental genre. My dance courses occasionally screened dances that had been filmed, but primarily did so to demonstrate a point about the choreography or mover, and not often to examine the hybridity of two art forms. Infrequently, there was passing reference to these works in both film and dance courses as existing in a field described as "cine-dance" or "dance films". Beginning my research, I quickly discovered that a broad spectrum of terms exist in reference to the overarching field, and also that these two terms which I was first introduced to are among the contested. In reference to the title of the field in question, *Dance Chronicle* writer Ok Hee Jeong states, "Various terms are used vaguely and interchangeably, including *choreocinema*, *screen dance*, *cine dance*, *video dance*, and *dance for camera*."[1] I have also noted the use of "dancefilm" and variations on these

---

[1] Jeong p. 372

titles (screendance vs. screen dance, cine-dance vs. cine dance) in published works referencing the field's title.[2]

There are several problems with such inconsistency, but one that is frequently touched upon in papers which defend a need for clarifying terminology is that, considering the field in question is often housed in festivals and competitions, using a term that is too narrow or broad complicates the ability to critique and analyze works. Labeling is no simple matter, however – the field in question is encompassing of many works with differing intentions, mediums, influences, modes of production and exhibition, born from different historical movements, etc. Consider this slice of the diverse dance and media combinations that exist: musicals, music videos, television shows featuring dance, works made for the internet, non-musical cinema featuring dance, and experimental works. Finding a term that encompasses all and which leaves room for potential future developments in technology is no small feat.

For the majority of field-descriptor terminology that I have listed above, the argument against their use lies in their too-narrow scope. Some face the problem of being medium-specific, such as dance film, which of course excludes works that are not made using those mediums. Others are contested due to the chosen word order which suggests a relationship of greater/lesser importance, or terms which imply a relationship that may not exist. Dance for camera, for instance, would seem to suggest that the dance exists as subservient in relation to the camera, and excludes works not made using a camera. Cine dance, in addition to raising questions of exclusion in terms of works not on made on celluloid, also faces arguments that placing "cine-" first implies greater importance to aspects of media over aspects of dance. Screen

---

[2] Brannigan

dance/Screendance, which have been proposed and adopted by many as a viable alternative to other too-narrow terms, have come into question as well. By utilizing the broad term "screen", emphasis is shifted from technological apparatus or medium to exhibition. However, as has been pointed out by Noël Carroll, while this term would seem to capture the entire expanse of works, it in fact excludes several that are seen as foundational to the field – works that were not intended for projection but for rarity shows viewed using a kinetoscope[3]. Edison's films of dancer Anabelle Moore, sometimes called *Serpentine Dance* or *Butterfly Dance*, were conceivably meant for kinetoscope exhibition and therefore would not count as screendance.

Instead of this and other terms, Carroll proposes "moving-picture dance", which I have chosen to make use of when referring to the field in this paper. I foresee potential issues with the word "picture" being too material-specific, and the ordering of terms still may face critique as implying moving-pictures hold greater importance in the relationship. It should be noted that there are also arguments that have been made for leaving the field ambiguous, and that terms generated are often considered "working terms" by both creator and user. For the sake of simplicity in writing, and because moving-picture dance is most inclusive term I have found thus far, I will from this point forward refer to the field combining media and dance as moving-picture dance.

---

[3] Carroll p. 115

III. Delving into Exploration: *Pre-Production Planning*

The term translation, when used in a framework of dance, can refer to adapting a piece of choreography from its originally intended context to another. This context is often a physical space, and through the translation from one space to another, the movement and the meanings derived from the movement may be altered. I have chosen to use this term "translation" in describing my process because I, too, believe I am adapting a piece of choreography from its originally intended context to another. However, instead of being adapted from physical site to physical site, the work is being adapted from physical site to virtual site.

PM 2.5 was a choreographic work originally created and intended for the stage. A roughly seven minute piece set on five dancers, it was exhibited during the Emory Dance Company concert in the spring of 2016. I believe it is worthwhile to note that I was abroad at the time of its conception and exhibition, and had never seen the work as it was intended to be seen – live, with an audience, in the Schwartz Center dance studio. Therefore, when beginning to conceptualize a translation of this piece I had only the aforementioned documentation footage to guide my visual understanding of the work. This footage, a single take long shot from a slightly high angle, seemed to have been taken with the intention of recording that the piece had existed, as well as to preserve the choreography where time may tamper with the memories and/or bodies of the audience, performers, and choreographer, should it ever need to be re-created. That is to say, the footage seemed to have been taken with the primary intention of documentation, and not to inspire in the viewer any emotional or conceptual aspects of the work through cinematography. In watching it, I consequently did not feel any sort of kinesthetic empathy, and had only a rough idea of the meanings behind the piece from movement themes and the knowledge that PM 2.5 likely referred to the air pollutant fine particulate matter. In beginning

my process with only a draw towards the movement qualities and structure of the composition, I felt inadequately informed to approach pre-production work.

Were I attempting to make this film solely for the purpose of exploring how the possibilities and limitations of the camera and editing process alter choreography, or how the digitized body is recorporealized, I may have been able to begin construction without further research into the choreography. Although these would surely be a part of my exploration, I felt a responsibility to represent *PM 2.5* in the ways that the documentation footage did not. My creation, in final form, could have functioned without attempting to convey the emotion or meaning of the piece, but I did not feel comfortable using my decision-making powers to remove elements that were potentially foundational to the choreography. I was not looking at dance as Edison, the Lumière brothers, and others had been – a tool granting the inscription of motion on new technologies – but as a dancer and choreographer myself, with the wish of creating a new work of art while maintaining a level of fidelity to the original creation.

Therefore, my next step was research. Cherry Fung graciously allowed me to interview her so that I might gain clearer insight into the intentions behind *PM 2.5*. Our conversation uncovered the following:

PM 2.5 did indeed refer to particulate matter, the size of which is small enough to be easily inhaled and cause significant health problems. In specific, by the title of the piece Cherry was referring to this fine particulate matter as a contributor to dangerous air pollution levels in Beijing. She described to me how living conditions are affected due to this pollution – masks are worn regularly outdoors, hazy skies are frequent. She detailed the emotional stages that many go through, which are caused by living under such conditions for long periods of time – apathy,

worry, desperation, and dejection. Her choreography was crafted in part to represent these stages. However, she wanted her dancers to be able to relate to these ideas as well, despite never having been to Beijing. Therefore, the meaning was extended from the effects of Particulate Matter 2.5 in Beijing to any situation from which you cannot escape – where instead you must adapt and live with the problem.

Learning that the emotional and conceptual aspects of Cherry's choreography were so intertwined, I had a better idea of what I hoped the translation would strive to accomplish. Unfortunately, Cherry's interview also revealed that out of several of the original dancers who had graduated, only one would be available to reconstruct and perform the work. This meant it was unlikely that I would be able to see her choreography in person before completing the bulk of my pre-production work, as new dancers needed to be found and taught. I accepted this likelihood and settled for using the documentation footage as my primary source from which I would establish planning materials.

Without seeing the work in person, however, the matter of constructing camera angles and distances was complicated. My decisions were so reliant on my ability to imagine how the choreography would look through various camera lenses at any given moment from any perspective in the room that I felt rather at a loss as to where to begin. Perhaps a more practiced hybridizer of dance and media would have been better able to make choices in this regard. Although I had some ideas of the shots I would like to attempt because I believed they could contribute to a meaningful whole, I knew I needed to have a tool that was flexible enough to allow room for the rest of my uncertainty. A storyboard would be completely unattainable or useful at this point, as I had no solidified concept of shots let alone their sequencing. I also suspected that a written shot list would be hard to produce as it would again require me to be

able to clarify and narrow down the angles and distances I hoped to shoot from. Instead of these seemingly more conventional tactics, I opted on the advice of Dr. Von Mueller to create a layout of the choreography from a bird's eye view, on which I would then be able to draw potential camera positions.

By using the documentation footage and dimensions of the Schwartz studio, I was able to plot the movement of the dancers onto graph paper as if looking at the stage from above. I did so by taking into account each shift in the upstage, downstage, right or left location of a dancer, and for each change in position a new diagram would be drawn. By the end, I had filled nearly an entire book of graph paper with this step-by-step overhead view of the choreography. A tedious process to be sure, the work afforded me two major benefits which made it worthwhile: it allowed me to become extremely familiar with the structure of the work, and it gave me the ability to easily draw in (and remove) camera positions around the dancers in relation to timecodes. Some insecurities existed in the fact that these graphs relied on my ability to perceive depth in a 2D video, and use this depth to remap the dancers from above, back onto a 2D form. There were also decisions to be made about how precisely I wanted to trace their movements. Some dancers shifted but within a relatively small range or moved a significant amount but quickly returned to their former position. In these instances it at times felt unnecessary to devote a whole new graph to the dancers' motion, considering the cameras that might have been plotted on these would-be graphs would likely be covered by the preceding or subsequent graph's camera positions. These decisions were not always easy to make, however, especially given the reliance on my accurate plotting of the dancers' location as the foundation on which cameras would be drawn. My only defense against these obstacles was to cast the net wide so I would have an abundance of material to choose from in post-production. By this, I essentially mean

drawing anywhere from 3-7 potential camera positions on each piece of graph paper. Despite the resulting impossibly large number of potential camera positions, I still felt I had more decisiveness and control than was previously possible, given the circumstances.

The following are a few of the considerations I took into account while plotting camera positions: the relationship between camera distance and emotional intimacy, having a range of distances to choose from in editing, where I believed the audiences' attention was meant to be drawn (or split) during the staged performance, movements that I believed would be best highlighted by close-ups, where I thought the best establishing shot might be taken from, whether the 180 degree rule should be applied, compositions that would build a sense of depth in the frame, shots that could potentially represent the sense of emotion portrayed in the dancers' motion, whether or not to attempt to hide the true nature of the space as a stage with chairs for an audience, how to compose the overall pacing in order to represent the eventual buildup of the dancers' speed and vigor through the camera, and selecting moments of choreography that might be given additional context by making use of moving shots (with the advice of Dr. Von Mueller to have proportionally far fewer of these). What this overhead graph plotting exercise made difficult to resolve was the matter of camera angling. With the exception of a few ideas derived from watching the documentation footage, I let go of this element of pre-production planning, knowing that without seeing the piece in the space with the dancers, it would be near impossible to make any firm decisions on this front.

My next step was to condense and reduce my graphed cameras where possible. As I mentioned before, I had hoped to maintain some sense of fidelity to the original piece, but I was not sure to what extent I should let this manifest. I made the decision at this stage to not stray far from the temporal elements of the choreography. I would not splice together portions of the

choreography in a way that they did not originally align, or expand or shrink time considerably. While my explorations into existing works thus far had of course exposed me to pieces that created meaning through this exact sort of manipulation of the movement, or had developed movement specifically for this purpose, I had not. I wanted the intention that existed behind the staged work to be exposed or perhaps deepened through my translation. Although manipulation would be unavoidable (and, in fact, desirable), it would not be done to intentionally derive a separate meaning about the effects of time superficially imposed on the choreography. This decision gave structure to my pre-production planning in that, foreseeing what the final product might look like in light of rejecting time play, I would need cameras covering each choreographic phrase.

I condensed my cameras for the sake of practicality after this realization, keeping as much coverage as possible while bearing in mind the time constraints of a three day shoot. The end product of this condensation was satisfying and gave me a basis to work from, but simultaneously overwhelming as the question became not what I would shoot, but how I would shoot it. How would I direct crew members and divide time on actual shooting days to accomplish all that needed to be shot without wearing out the dancers? Dr. Von Mueller recommended having the dancers run the piece from start to finish, in order to allow them to become fully engaged with the material as if it were a live performance, which may produce a level of authenticity that could be harder to achieve with a stop-and-go tactic. Therefore, it would make sense to plan takes with the entirety of the seven minutes of choreography in mind.

Utilizing his suggested template for planning takes, I began the process of dividing my condensed camera positions list into what could be achieved within a seven minute run through with three cameras. To do this, I overlaid a drawn version of the stage space (again from

overhead) with a battleship-esque grid. Each gridspace had a corresponding letter and number that could be used to signify where the camera was located. After dividing this potential stage-grid into three territories – one for camera A, camera B, and camera C – I used my former camera position graphs to guide which cameras would need to be where, facing what stage direction, at which time. If camera placements were close together and used to cover different moments in the piece, there was potential for the camera operator to shift the camera's placement in the middle of a take. This shifting is primarily what needed to be planned, in order to capture all of the shots that were needed in a reasonable amount of takes. These could then potentially be divided between the operators for cameras A, B, and C, so that they would know exactly what was expected of them when a take number was called.

This was quite a time-consuming process, and having never directed a film in this way, it was hard to gauge whether what I was asking of the camera operators would be feasible. So as a backup to these plans, I made a much simpler version of a shot list by taking screenshots of the documentation footage at moments I felt would be critical to capture, and short notation describing the general camera position and facings that needed to be captured. This multitude of planning documents – the condensed camera position graphs, the stage-grid map and accompanying take list, and the screenshot shot list – was created later in the fall, throughout the winter, and at the beginning of the spring semester. While creating these, I was also doing logistical work to collect the crew, find dancers who could fill in for previous cast members who were not available for the project, and, with the help of Kendall Simpson, reserve the Schwartz Studio space during a weekend that would work for all production members. Together with my initial research into the field, these elements constituted the pre-production stage of my work.

IV. From Thought to Practice: *Capturing Choreography*

On Friday, January 27th, production was set to start. My nerves were high, as no amount of pre-production work could fully prepare me for what would amount to the largest production I had ever led. There would be five dancers – Diana Bender-Bier, Laura Briggs, Lauren Lym, Alfredo Takori, and Cherry Fung – and five camera operators – Elizabeth Littlefield, Katrina Peed, Toby Teitel, Conor Makowski, and Evan Welch. Equipment had been borrowed, costumes collected, and Professor Catellier had been kind enough to set up lighting presets for us to use in the studio where we would be filming. Some crew members had even offered to bring their own equipment in addition to the film and media department's, which I accepted. Shooting days, due to unforeseen scheduling issues, had to be shortened from three days to two.

The experience was transformative, for both myself and the work. I realized soon after we began shooting that for several reasons, much of the pre-production planning would need to be scrapped. Firstly, we were no longer operating on a three camera setup. We had five cameras available, and taking into account the shortened timeframe we had for shooting, I felt that where possible all five should be used. This mostly applied to the establishing shots, since shots from other distances would cross sightlines if two cameras were added to the take list. Furthermore, seeing the work on the stage in person for the first time, I realized many shots could be eliminated and others would need to be added. It became apparent that full-length runs would be inefficient, because the crew had also not seen the piece live and would need to faithfully use a watch to time out their camera's path in coordination with the take list, parts of which were already rendered useless due to the three to five camera shift. This felt complicated and slow, so I decided to drop the take list for the most part.

Work became much more efficient as I let go of former, stricter plans in exchange for a more flexible atmosphere that I believed would produce better shots. I still relied on the screenshot shot list to ensure that we were capturing foundational shots, but left room for creativity. When an idea for a shot came to myself or a crew member (or even the dancers in some instances), we would take the time to experiment. One such experiment changed the shape of the entire project.

In preparation for the shoot, I had asked one of the crew members, Katrina Peed, to bring in a wheelchair so we could attempt tracking shots. Based on my pre-production plans, I had intended to shoot only a handful of moments in this way, such as Cherry rolling and catching on the legs of the other dancers standing in a line, and the final phrase featuring Alfredo's repetitive movement while the lights fade. However, as we continued to work, it became clear that these tracking shots were the most captivating material we were capturing. At first several new moments were selected to be shot in this way, but this developed into takes capturing the entire length of the choreography. The camera operator would sit in the wheelchair, and I would push and direct them as to who or what I wanted in focus. Entirely unplanned, this technique became a defining transition in our process from the conventional (and in many ways, typical) to the experimental. Elizabeth Littlefield was a key crew member in this capacity – her intuition of my vision and advanced ability to rack focus while in constant motion produced shots that made up a majority of the final product.

We continued to take risks in this manner – shooting unplanned material that seemed appropriate in the moment. While some experiments were not fruitful, all were necessary to my process. Because we had vied away from some of the set plans, and because our efforts were constricted to a shorter amount of time than was originally anticipated, it became even more vital

to maintain an enjoyable atmosphere for crew and cast. Although this may seem insignificant to point out in the larger scope of my thesis project, I believe that working with ten other artists on a multi-discipline art project made respect, mutual interest in creation, and a less rigid hierarchy important elements of production and consequently my greater process and product. While maintaining the authority necessary to conduct and produce my vision, I wanted the atmosphere of shooting days to be casual enough that dancers and camera operators could see their creative efforts at work, feel appreciated, and hopefully have a fun and non-stressful time in doing so.

The open-ended nature of this workflow resulted in a considerable and diverse amount of material. With hours upon hours of footage to go through, I left the collaborative portion of my film behind in exchange for the editing room.

V. Recorporealizing and Engaging: *Editing Methods*

With other films that I have made, I typically have a clear vision of the final product in the beginning stages of the work. As has been described, however, my attempts to visualize the results of this project from its origin have been difficult at best. Partly in an effort to define my work, I researched the field of moving-picture dance which I believed would encompass my exploration. This helped me to understand the broad spectrum of works that exist and later to contextualize my creation (to be discussed in the section *In the Context of the Field*). Yet the field's seemingly inclusive nature also coincided with a lack of consensus amongst theorists as to concrete definitions for work included or excluded by the field. Therefore, research into the field did little to inform the decisions made during my process. Instead, I worked with a blindness to the final product and picked up clues to the objective of my creation along the way.

I had some established ideas in pre-production, such as my desire to reflect the qualities of Cherry's work that I did not find within the documentation footage. Congruently, I decided that my exploration would not concern superimposing camera or effects work in order to uncover alternate meanings not found in the original piece. During production, it became apparent to me that the footage I found most worthwhile was that which felt engaged, either by capturing the choreography from a dynamic perspective or by camera motion, or both. Sitting in the library with an empty timeline to fill in Premiere, it occurred to me that at the core of all these thoughts was a desire to authentically relay to viewers the emotions and efforts of the dancers (and in doing so, the intention of the choreography) through immersive and dynamic shots. By engaging the viewer so that they at times may even feel a part of the piece, or perhaps a strong kinesthetic empathy, I hoped the physical and emotional states of the dancers could be conveyed. From this, I was able to better understand my boundaries and responsibilities in creating a new work of art

from the source material of an old work of art. The perpetually uncertain nature of my work felt resolved by articulating this goal. With the overwhelming amount of potential that existed in my footage, this purpose statement was invaluable as a guide for selecting and assembling clips to convey meaning.

Although during production, the moving bodies of the dancers were captured and converted to bodies of data, I believe that it was in the editing phase that "translation" occurred. It is in this stage where, by placing frames in relation to each other, kinesthesia is able to be reconstructed, aesthetics are formulated, and meaning is created (or, in my case, recreated). As described by Douglas Rosenberg in *Screendance: Inscribing the Ephemeral Image*, "'recorporealization' is used to describe a literal re-construction of the dancing body via screen techniques; at times a construction of an impossible body, one not encumbered by gravity, temporal restraints or even death."[4] It is in the process of applying these techniques that the body can regain a mediated corporeality, and therefore post-production became the most important phase in accomplishing my translation from stage to screen. Authorial decisions came more easily to me after recognizing my desire to draw out kinesthetic empathy through creation of a recorporealized body both visually and aurally in order to relay meaning to viewers.

One way I attempted to do this was through sound. In order to remain authentic to *PM 2.5*, the soundtrack in this piece tries to rebuild sound from the original work. The coordination of breath was an element that Cherry had intentionally used in her choreography as a reflection of the increasingly distressed emotional states the dancers embody, finalizing with the ongoing struggle of living with an unfixable problem as portrayed by Alfredo while the lights fade. She

---

[4] Rosenberg p. 55

also used a piece of music by Hildur Guðnadóttir which I intended to overlay in post. Unfortunately, although we captured a sound-only take during our shoot, the file was unusable, I believe due to improperly balancing the mic. This meant that sound would need to come from the camera's built-in mics, and manipulated more heavily due to their discrepancies and lower quality.

Much like recorporealizing the body visually, reconstructing the auditory was a process that started with sound existing in reality, capturing this sound with camera mics, and then editing these files to present the artifice of ephemeral sound as a viewer might expect it to have existed. This included mixing sound from multiple clips, removing or reducing ambience from some clips with additional software, ensuring that the distance of the camera and the distance of sound seemed to be relative, adding in a looped clip of room tone at times, and reducing specific noises that existed but would likely lessen the engagement of the viewer (such as noises cameras made when shifted, noises from the wheelchair, and overly loud floor squeaking). In an attempt to further increase the engagement of the audience by crafting intimacy through breath, and simply because it felt necessary to conclude the piece, the last few breaths that Alfredo took were a compilation of several sound clips, one which was faded abruptly to create the final, sensational exhalation.

In addition to the more complicated sound editing process listed above, the unusable sound take also meant that during the section of choreography utilizing Guðnadóttir's music, there would be no possibility of overlapping breathing, footfalls, or floor squeaks without complete manipulation. This was because the dancers, during every take excepting the sound-only take, needed to use the music heard from timestamps 4:34 to 7:46 for timing purposes. I was not able to separate the music present in these clips from the noises the dancers made which

were desirable to keep. Therefore, a shift would certainly need to occur which I suppose might be perceived as varying levels of diegetic sound. Towards the beginning of the film, the source of sound is either the dancers onscreen or an implied part of the world of the film. However, the moment at which these diegetic noises cut out and only the music score remains audible marks a turning point that I believe changes how the work is viewed. Although the music score does not seem diegetic in the same way that the noises from the dancers' bodies were, as there is no clear visible or off-screen implied source, it is plausible that the dancers are able to "hear" this music because they move in coordination with it. In one sense, I believe the music's quality as diegetic has been reinforced by the historical precedent for dancing to music without an obvious source on film or video, such as music that is danced to in musicals. Yet I also believe that the practically requisite increase in digital literacy has removed some of the "magic" of editing, and that most persons watching, say, a music video, understand that sound has been added in post-production. While this understanding alone doesn't necessarily deny engagement, I believe that within my work the changeover caused something to this effect. Despite both being diegetic, at the cut removing bodily sound and maintaining the music score there seems to be a significant shift in the level of realism that may distance a viewer from a more to less engrossed position.

Another deliberate choice made to fulfill my purpose statement was the frequent use of shots taken from the wheelchair. These allowed for uninterrupted transitions between close-ups, which I hoped would create a sense of intimacy between dancer and audience, and longer distances, which could create the impression of depth within the frame as dancers existed on different planes in space. They also provided a first person perspective shaped by human imperfection, perhaps best exhibited through the slight shakiness which resulted from being taken handheld. I believed that this would ground the audience in realism and provide a further

sense of closeness to the dancers that the perfection of stable shots would be less able to capture.

I would like to emphasize that the movement of the camera was not conducted for the sake of movement alone, but in order to compound the emotions relayed through the movements of the dancers via the qualities of the shots. Often quoted in studies recounting a history of dance and media, Astaire's statement "Either the camera will dance, or I will" is one I immediately thought of here.[5] Astaire's ideal mediated body existed with as little perceptual "interference" as possible, and is often referred to in contrast to Busby Berkeley's camera work which frequently mediated dancing bodies into aesthetically pleasing geometric forms devoid of deeper meaning. My work is not directly comparable on a scale capped by these artists at either end, as our works exist in entirely different contexts and with different intents. Yet I would use these polars to emphasize that the camera's "dance" in my work was not intended to depreciate the meaning of the dancers' bodies but in fact to alter the lens the audience looks through from that of a passive, third person spectator to a more active, first person participant. By re-forming moments in the choreography from stillness to chaos with the camera's speed and handling, I intended to produce meaning by relaying the dancers' embodied emotions through a more involved perspective.

Cuts were also used with engagement at least partially in mind. While some decisions felt forced due to a spate of usable coverage of certain areas of the choreography, most movement phrases had a multitude of potential clips. I often chose to cut mid-motion as opposed to during moments of stillness in the choreography. I believe that at times this created a more subtle transition from camera angle to camera angle and created a natural fluidity of the dancers' movements, so as not to disrupt the engagement of the viewer. However, my goal in cutting was

---

[5] Mitoma p. 221

often not to disguise the mediation of the camera, but instead to utilize its potential for constructing recorporealized bodies from perspectives that best highlighted their physicality or movement qualities. For instance, in order to emphasize the sudden, direct, and weighted qualities of Cherry, Lauren, and Diana as they dropped and crawled into a plank at timestamp 5:02, I cut from a higher angle shot which framed them as secondary subjects in the composition to a low angle shot which placed them in the foreground. By causing the audience to look up at the dancers from below, and by situating them as the primary subjects within the frame, I believe the qualities of their movements were better able to be understood. The speed of cuts also played a role in engaging the audience, and was often increased to heighten the perceived intensity of a situation and reflect the emotions embodied through movement. For example, the series of cuts beginning at timestamp 4:08 were intentionally paced faster in order to reflect the sense of confusion and worry that the dancers exhibited through increasingly frantic, improvised movement.

Many other elements that I made use of were not applied solely for the sake of drawing out kinesthetic empathy, but it's possible they inadvertently engaged the audience (or prevented disengagement). Almost every clip needed color correction, for instance, which I utilized to create a uniform tone throughout the piece to the best of my ability. This was done more for aesthetics, but not having significant shifts in coloration from clip to clip may have prevented audience disengagement. Primarily for aesthetics purposes I also resized clips, stabilized those that I felt were too shaky, and used effects such as sharpening or blurring certain elements of the frame. These may have contributed to the engagement levels the audience experienced as well, by focusing their attention or eliminating the effects of handheld camerawork that may have been disruptive.

Although I made a plethora of decisions during the post-production, I believe the above mentioned were the most significant in relation to my hopes of transferring meaning through audience engagement. Whether I was successful in this enterprise or not, however, was a question that could only be answered by interacting with those whom I hoped to deliver meaning to – the viewers.

VI. Exhibition and Reception

In my introduction, I mentioned a shift in my study from audience reception of work to the process of creation. I was not cognizant at the time of the possibility that uncovering my intent behind mediating *PM 2.5* might return my focus to audience response. To be clear, I do not believe that my piece is quantifiable as a success or a failure based on whether I accomplished my outlined intent, because this project has been an exploration into the process of translation. I also am not convinced that achieving intentions should solely quantify a work as successful in general. So, although my intention in media construction became tied to audience engagement, it is my discoveries in every stage of creation and personal growth in an emerging field that are of most concern to me. This section investigates audience engagement during reception, but I conceptualize it as simply another part of my process and not the ultimate signifier of success or failure overall.

I titled my piece *Adapt*. It was exhibited via projection twice in the Schwartz Dance Studio, once at 7:30pm on Friday, March 24th and once at 2:00pm on Saturday, March 25th. It was the first piece shown during a thesis concert which also featured the works of two other artists – Eliza Krakower and Cherry Fung. Both of their pieces were live dance performance, approximately 20-30 minutes each in length. I describe this because the context in which my piece was shown may have had an effect on the results of the audience questionnaire I developed.

This questionnaire consisted of two questions only. The first read, "Please describe in a few words what about *Adapt* engaged you (held you captivated, drew you into the experience) and/or disengaged you (brought you out of the experience, distanced you)". Two short answer

sections were available to use when responding to this question, one headed by the word "engaged" and the other by "disengaged". The other question read, "When watching the piece, would you say you were more, less, or equally engaged in the viewing experience than you are when you watch live dance?" From the first question, I hoped to pinpoint specific elements of the piece which felt captivating or distancing, both for future reference and in order to assess whether the techniques I had attempted to employ worked as they were intended. The other question was less directly operating to test my intentions, as I had not been working purposefully towards making a piece that was more, less, or equally engaging to live dance performance. I more so hoped that the audience would be able to reflect on their experiences with live and mediated dance to consider what they found engaging as a viewer. Between both shows I collected 38 questionnaires total, 21 during the evening show and 17 during the matinee.

In response to the engaged portion of the first question, there was a wide range of responses with a few key phrases that were mentioned multiple times. The following information lists the categories of answers which received repeated mention and the corresponding number of mentions: Movement of Dancers (3), Close-ups (7), Depth/Planes (2), Angles/Perspectives (14), Sound/Music (18), Lighting (2). Other responses that were mentioned once each were Quality, Cuts, Shaky Filming, and the Shape of the Projection (which was trapezoidal due to the inability to adjust the height of the projector). The disengaged portion had a wide range of responses as well, but with lower numbers of repeated mentions. The categories receiving repeated mention and the corresponding number of mentions are as follows: Cuts (3), Framing Which Cut Dancers out of the Shot (3), Abrupt Changes in Sound/Music (3), Nothing or N/A (5). Single mention responses included Shift to Long Shot, Shots Including the Whole Group, Repetition (no further explanation), Costume Fit, Costume Color, Portions Without Any Music, Lack of Autonomy in

What to Watch, Not Seeing the Full Bodies of the Dancers, Mistakes the Dancers Made, Knowing the Dancers Personally, and Seeing the Same Performance Space on Screen and in Person. 13 audience members left this portion of their questionnaires blank.

These answers often confirmed that some intentional choices in editing had effectively captured audience engagement – particularly the elements of sound/music and angles/perspectives. They also were useful in pinpointing moments of disengagement – often to do with the transition from sound to music or vice versa. This was valuable feedback to me because, as I mentioned, I believed the shift in diegetic sounds could possibly leave the audience less engrossed. It seemed that this had occurred. I also have been told numerous times during film courses at Emory that visual blips are more forgivable than mistakes in sound. While I wouldn't necessarily qualify some of the sounds mentioned as disengaging "mistakes", I do appreciate the feedback because having seen the work so many times myself, it was hard to retain a critical eye (or ear).

Reading through these responses, it was sometimes difficult but necessary to distinguish personal opinions from trends. Results that did not have multiple mentions, as an example of this point, seemed likely to be specific to a singular audience member's beliefs or preferences rather than a trending consensus on an element as engaging or disengaging. For instance, one comment under the disengaged portion read "Costumes – everyone wearing the same thing – grey". No other questionnaire had any mention of the color of the costumes, either as engaging or disengaging. While I don't invalidate this viewer's experience, in attempting to examine the larger perceptions at play I must isolate this response as not a trend. I also wondered at the audience's ability to perceive my work as potentially existing in a field hybridizing dance and media, as opposed to a dance that got filmed or a film that happened to include dance. Several

comments seemed to demonstrate a lack of understanding towards this very matter, such as one which, under the disengaged portion of question one, stated "The film somewhat distracted me from the dance". This in particular struck me as curious, since it was nowhere implied that my work was crafted in order to showcase the choreography with as little evidence of mediation as possible. Again, I do not mention this to invalidate an experience, but simply to note that some comments seemed to demonstrate a lack of understanding towards the overall goal of the work. In general, I also think it is interesting that so many audience members left the feedback section for disengagement blank or simply wrote "nothing" or "N/A". This tendency made me wonder if audience members simply found it easier to describe what engaged them than what did not, or if they truly felt that no elements of the project specifically disengaged them.

In response to the second question, I found that 13 felt they were equally engaged, 10 felt they were less engaged, 10 felt they were more engaged, 3 chose to answer with some variation on differently engaged, and 2 did not answer the question. Some chose to expand upon their answer to give supplemental details as to why the felt more, less, or equally engaged. Of those who expanded upon feeling more engaged, there were three mentions of perceived intimacy with the dancers, two mentions of enjoying having the choice of what to focus on made for them, one mention of the multitude of angles and perspectives, and one mention of the cuts. Of those who expanded upon feeling less engaged, there was one mention of disliking having the choice of what to focus on made for them, and one mention of feeling "once removed" from the dancing. These expanded comments made me question the influence of the screening's surrounding context of live dance performance. Although I did not craft this intentionally, the "live dance" to which audiences would most likely compare their relative engagement levels was the other two works shown during the thesis concert. While this cannot be assumed, I believe it is likely that

the experience of watching a live performance directly after my piece would weigh in significantly to this question's responses. An element I also somehow did not fully conceive of until it was pointed out to me by a friend was that my work and Cherry's work, which were placed in the same concerts, both featured Cherry's choreography. They noted that because of this, there seemed to be more grounds for direct comparison of engagement. I obviously cannot prove or disprove that this sort of comparison existed for the audience, but it seems in light of this possibility even more apropos that my questionnaires returned an equivalent number of viewers who experienced more and less engagement.

When crafting the evaluations, I found it difficult to branch out from general engagement to question the audience's level of kinesthetic empathy, because the likely unfamiliar concept would need extensive explanation. Although I did not include this ultimately, I would like to note that the writer of one questionnaire seemed to approach the topic, though without using the exact terminology. For the first question, under engagement, this writer said, "up-close view felt like I was there dancing". Having striven for a similar effect, I was excited to see this answer among the pile, though by my own definition it does not constitute a trending perception. Overall, the responses to my two questions felt illuminating, both to considerations I had never imagined previously and in terms of providing evidence that certain intentionally used camera and editing techniques did in fact engage the audience. All was good feedback for helping me to understand which elements did or did not work to deliver meaning as I had intended, though I will not be changing my work in response to feedback. I will simply be holding on to the understandings I have gleaned through the phases of exhibition and reception to inform my future work.

VII. In the Context of the Field

Hand in hand with complex discussions surrounding appropriate terminology for the field in question is a general ambiguity surrounding which works should be considered within the boundaries of the field, and which should be excluded. These edges seem to be in a constant state of fluctuation as definitions and assumptions are formed and later rendered irrelevant by artists producing work within the field but beyond proposed definitions. An example would be the film "Birds" by David Hinton and Yolanda Snaith, which won the IMZ Dance Screen Award in 2000 despite being composed of ornithological found footage (and no human dancers). Although certainly human-less moving-picture dances have been in question preceding the win for "Birds", the contention caused by this piece spurred desires to redefine the field to avoid the slippery slope between 'dance' and 'dance-like' content.

Further layers to the conversation involve those who think attempts at securing definitions should be deserted altogether. As much as was suggested by the editorial remarks in the 6th volume of the International Journal of Screendance, which read, "Tensions exist around boundaries and definitions, to be sure, and we offer the proposal that, while the maturation of the field is important, screendance needs to remain ambiguous to itself."[6] Concerns in response to anti-definition thinkers propose that rejecting labels will result in all-inclusion and therefore render the distinction of the field as meaningless. Such is the position taken up by choreographic filmmaker and dancemaker Wyn Pottratz who asks in her essay in the same volume of the International Journal of Screendance, "… screendance cannot be everything surely?"[7]

---

[6] Bench p. 7
[7] Pottratz

In addition to the acceptance or rejection of future works, as a result of these blurred lines the history of the field is also at stake. Some authors choose to trace the history back to Edwaerd Muybridge's photograph sequences capturing animal and human motion in the 1880s, such as Judy Mitoma's *Enivisioning Dance on Film and Video* and Douglas Rosenberg's *Screendance: Inscribing the Ephemeral Image*[89]. Others begin with filmed skirt dances in 1894, such as Dodd's *Dance on Screen: Genres and Media from Hollywood to Experimental Art*[10]. In *Screendance* Rosenberg also asserts the idea that screendance (his preferred title for the field in question) in its ideal form is equal parts moving-image production and dance[11]. This suggestion seems to be at odds with authors who have developed histories of the field and chose to take a broader stance where hybridity is concerned.

The indistinct lines drawn around most every aspect of moving-picture dance makes contextualizing my work in relation to the field difficult, to say the least. In order to attempt to do so, I would like to establish a few of my own beliefs concerning the field that I have developed. Firstly, I disagree with Rosenberg's claim that the end goal of screendance should manifest in equal parts moving-image production and dance. His statement has been echoed by others, but I reject this theory because I believe it is both unquantifiable and inaccurate. The term "equal" may seem fairly clear-cut here, referring to two halves of equivalent importance, but what are the "parts" being balanced? Elements of either art discipline could potentially be broken out and held up as parts of a whole – for instance, use of space or energy could be examined as components of dance. Yet it would be impossible to judge whether these were equivalently

---

[8] Mitoma p. xix
[9] Rosenberg p. 36-39
[10] Dodd p. 4-5
[11] Rosenberg p. 158

important in comparison to elements of film such as mise-en-scene or sound. This sort of apples-to-oranges judgement could not be the basis for determining equivalency. Perhaps he is suggesting that, instead of a direct comparison of parts to parts, one should take the intention of a piece and attempt to determine whether it was established more through dance or moving-image production. This sounds more plausible, but is a relative concept. The level of importance of either discipline as contributors to a meaningful whole may be relative to spectator and creator, and also requires the intention of a piece to be known in order to be evaluated. I do believe that there is a spectrum that works can be placed on such as Rosenberg's Flow Graph, which suggests the general leanings of a work's material nature as more dance or more media, but equivalency requires an exactness which seems incalculable[12].

More importantly than an inability to determine the equality of parts, I suppose, is my belief that perfectly balanced representation should not be the basis for which a work in the field should be determined as ideal or not ideal. Moving-picture dance artists falling on different sides of a spectrum should not be seen as missing the mark, but simply constructing works with different intentions. Contextualizing my work within this idea, I believe that *Adapt* potentially lies on Rosenberg's spectrum slightly towards the "more dance" edge. In working from the source material of *PM 2.5*, as I mentioned, my hope was to recreate the meaning behind this work. While I strived to utilize camera and editing techniques to do so, I believe that feeling a responsibility to portray Cherry's choreography as it existed temporally prevented me from exploring farther than I might have. Because meaning was so reliant on the dancers' physically embodied emotions, I felt that though the end product was indeed a hybrid creation, it relied on

---

[12] Rosenberg p. 114

the composition and energies of the dance in a way that pushed it slightly closer to being "more dance".

Another theory which is often used to determine the nature of a work as worthy of placement in the field has been extrapolated from Maya Deren's description of *A Study in Choreography for Camera.* She stated that her work was "a dance so related to camera and cutting that it cannot be 'performed' as a unit anywhere but in this particular film"[13]. This was also a defining feature which led to the innovation of a field called "choreocinema".[14] However, the idea behind her statement has been reiterated and distorted to suggest that choreography must be made for the camera if the larger work is to be considered a part of the moving-picture dance field. I could not hold this belief true if I considered my work as existing in the field, because the choreography was not developed for the camera and existed outside of my mediation. It is also possible that Deren's original sentiment referred to mediation as an inextricable creation, and therefore could include my work in the field as, due to cutting, framing, and other film elements, the choreography within could not actually exist in the real world. In general, however, I believe this avant-garde definition is not able to be used to cover the present, more inclusive field in question.

Lastly, though I detailed why I and others believe certain terminology is inappropriate when used to describe the overarching field in question, I would like to suggest that some of these have the possibility of describing sub-categories. Though in this essay, the term "screendance" has not been used primarily to describe the field in question, it is one of the more popular terms used. The main collection of scholarly articles produced in the field is, after all,

---

[13] Rosenberg p. 26
[14] Nikolai

still titled "The International Journal of Screendance". I believe it may be worthwhile to touch upon whether my own work could be considered screendance, considering the frequent use of the term, but contextualized as a sub-category of the larger field. Due to the context in which *Adapt* was exhibited, I believe the term screendance could possibly apply. As the work was projected onto a very large screen of sorts, I think this is a basis for qualification. However, the term also feels limiting, because in the future my work could hypothetically be exhibited without the use of a screen. Although Rosenberg argues for this phrase as the one thing that all combinations of dance and media have in common – exhibition on some sort of screen – I believe this actually feels a bit shortsighted considering the future possibilities of technology[15]. The term also seems mutable, where my work would qualify if it were projected on a screen and then would be disqualified by a non-screen method of exhibition. Linking defining terminology to a variable aspect of a work such as screendance does seems to be an unnecessary practice in this instance, and is hard to conceive as useful unless curating a collection which examines the mode of exhibition or some such reception exploration.

Overall, I believe that my work does qualify as existing within the field, though fluctuating terminology and boundaries make it hard to pinpoint its exact position. As the field continues to develop through the creation of works, expansion of curatorial efforts, critique, and scholarship, I hope to broaden my understanding of the inner workings of the field and further contribute as a creator in the future.

---

[15] Rosenberg p. 3

VIII. Conclusion

The experience of building this project has been transformational for me. It has allowed me to formally bridge the gap between my studies of media and dance and practice working through the presence of a plethora of uncertainties. It is the largest media project I have endeavored to create to date, and as such I experienced many firsts when trying on the hats of director, editor, camera operator, and cinematographer. These positions, which are primarily established within the world of film, were entirely molded by my background in dance and desire to create a dancework through a different medium. I believe that my dance education has heightened my sense of kinesthetic empathy, and it is through this understanding of motion and deep love for dance and its capabilities that I was able to endeavor to translate my feelings when watching *PM 2.5* to the screen.

I do not attempt to deny that much of my experience with moving-picture dance prior to this project has been with popular works. I believe it is possible, even likely, that delving into this sort of content contributed to my understanding and construction of this hybrid form. But this potentially embedded knowledge I would like to think worked to my advantage, since much popular content also deals with engagement in its construction. We simply diverge in the end goal and related aspects of pre-production and production – my work attempts to hybridize these disciplines to create meaning where many popular dance and media combinations work to engage in order to build an audience.

Approaching and researching another big unknown – the emerging field of moving-picture dance – broadened my understanding of the many possibilities for creation. While I remain somewhat overwhelmed by the uncertain nature of the field in which I chose to create my

work, I recognize that it is this same fluidity of boundaries that has allowed me to feel more assertive in developing my own opinions.

Were I to do this project over again, I believe there are many amateurish mistakes that I made during shooting that I would not make again. First on this list would be getting a better sound take. Yet the exploratory nature of the production is something I would like to replicate. Although I could easily see this sort of uncertain workflow as unnecessarily risky in terms of determining significant aspects of the final product, I believe I came to greater understandings of "dancing with the camera" through my process which would have been otherwise lost.

I feel more confident as a moving-picture dance artist having made *Adapt*. Through every phase of progress I faced obstacles and challenges which expanded my abilities to create and my understanding of the field. For instance, I needed to evaluate the extent to which I remained faithful to source material, adapt when planning materials were rendered useless, strike a balance between my authority as filmmaker and my dependence on collaborative creation, apply my understanding of dance qualities and kinesthetic empathy through a new medium, learn to cultivate meaning as a creator hybridizing two art disciplines, and understand the field in which I am attempting to operate in order to evaluate my own work's standing as a moving-picture dance. Approaching this field through the act of making and researching has opened the floodgates of potential for further projects involving media and dance. In fact, believe that my personal growth during this process has readied me for my next challenges: serving as both choreographer and filmmaker, and to experience choreographing directly for the camera's eye. Moving forward, the knowledge and lived experience I have gleaned from every step of this project will undoubtedly inform and shape my future works.

Appendix A: Promotional Flyer

The Emory Dance Program Presents
HONORS THESIS CONCERTS
March 23-25, 2017
Dance Studio, Schwartz Center for Performing Arts

PROGRAM A March 23 & 25, 7:30pm

Clara Guyton
an investigation of the boundaries between dance and poetry

Julianna Joss
analyzing the body's means for communication & identity expression

PROGRAM B March 24, 7:30pm & March 25, 2:00pm

Rosie Ditre
translating a modern dance work from the stage to the screen

Cherry Fung
an exploration of personal identity in the context of a divided political relationship

Eliza Krakower
an exploration of the intersections of musical theater, jazz, and modern dance

404-727-7266
dance@emory.edu
www.dance.emory.edu

EMORY
arts

no admission charge and no tickets required

Appendix B: Concert Program

The Emory Dance Program Presents

HONORS THESIS CONCERT

Program B: March 24, 2017, 7:30pm & March 25, 2017, 2:00pm

Dance Studio, Schwartz Center for Performing Arts

Adapt

Film Director and Editor: Rosie Ditre
Choreographer: Cherry Fung
Sound: "Erupting Light" by Hildur Guanadottir
Performers: Diana Bender-Bier, Laura Briggs, Cherry Fung, Lauren Lym, Alfredo Takori
Costumes: Rosie Ditre and the dancers
Camera Operators: Elizabeth Littlefield, Conor Makowski, Katrina Peed, Toby Teitel, Evan Welch

—————— INTERMISSION ——————

Between a Rock and Jazz Hand: A Personal Journey of Movement Style and the Female Experience

Choreographer: Eliza Krakower
Performers: Jessica Bertram, Katie DeWolf, Alice Halter, Eliza Krakower,
Breylan Martin, Serena Schmitt, Kelly Vogel
Sound Editing: Eliza Krakower with Kendall Simpson
Costumes: Eliza Krakower with Cynthia Church

Hey, Big Spender
Music: "Big Spender" by Fosse Ensemble & Valarie Pettiford

Breakdown *(noun):* A failure to progress or have effect
Music: "Big Spender" by DJ Crazy J Rodriguez

Self-Talk
Music: "Logic Moon" by Alva Noto + Ryuichi Sakamoto

Hey, Self-Talk
Music: "Quadrate Fur Max-Ernst" by CoH

Begin Again
Music: "Big Spender (In the Style of Shirley Bassey)"
by Ameritz – Karaoke

—————— INTERMISSION ——————

Appendix C: Post-Concert Audience Feedback Form

Please describe in a few words what about Adapt engaged you (held you captivated, drew you into the experience) and/or disengaged you (brought you out of the experience, distanced you).

    Engaged:

    Disengaged:

When watching the piece, would you say you were more, less, or equally engaged in the viewing experience than you are when you watch live dance?

Appendix D: Production Photographs

References

Bench, Harmony, and Simon Ellis. "IJSD Volume 6 Editorial: Field Perceptions." *The International Journal of Screendance* 6 (2016): n. pag. Web.

Brannigan, Erin. *Dancefilm: Choreography and the Moving Image*. New York: Oxford UP, 2011. Print.

Carroll, Noël. "Toward a Definition of Moving-Picture Dance." *Dance Research Journal* 33.1 (2001): 111-25. Web. p. 115

Dodds, Sherril. *Dance on Screen: Genres and Media from Hollywood to Experimental Art*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. Print.

Jeong, Ok Hee. "Recognizing Dance in the Ordinary Movement on Screen." *Dance Chronicle* 36.3 (2013): 372-77. Web.

Mitoma, Judy. *Envisioning Dance on Film and Video: Dance for the Camera*. London: Routledge, 2003. Print.

Nikolai, Jennifer R A. "The Camera-Dancer: A Dyadic Approach to Improvisation." *The International Journal of Screendance* 6 (2016): n. pag. Web.

Pottratz, Wyn. "Screendance Cannot Be Everything: Defining the Form Ten Years after the (Hu)manifesto." *The International Journal of Screendance* 6 (2016): n. pag. Web.

Rosenberg, Douglas. "Recorporealizing the Body Via Screen Dance." *Dance for the Camera Symposium*. University of Wisconsin–Madison. 11 February 2000. Lecture.

Rosenberg, Douglas. *Screendance: Inscribing the Ephemeral Image*. New York: Oxford UP,

2012. Print.

Rosenberg, Douglas. *The Oxford Handbook of Screendance Studies*. New York: Oxford UP,

2016. Print.