**Intuition and Creative Process Methodologies in Digital Performance**

Camille C. Baker

practice makes tangible the theoretical[;] … practice as a response to lived experience, the temporal, the personal, and the collaborative – reveal[s] how new subject matter requires new forms of expression and representation*.*

Diane Reid (in Barrett and Bolt, 2007)

**Introduction**

This chapter is a result of many years of reflective and practical exploration and examination of my own creative process in the context of my practice, as well as within an academic context. It describes the difficulties created by the tension between the iterative interaction between myself and my performance practice, and the academic methodological framework governing my Masters and Doctoral research studies within which I needed to describe the creative practice. I then go onto describe how I resolved this dilemma, and to share my own creative process in the hope of reassuring others of the value of maintaining an intuitive approach to their art and design practice within an academic framework. It was born out of frustration of first encounters with the academic framework of research during my Masters and my PhD studies, having spent much time both ‘jumping through the hoops’ of the academy, simultaneously fighting it and also wanting to mentor other artists through the process.

This chapter’s main areas of focus are:

* what is art or practice as research for the artist/designer,
* how phenomenology or 1st person lived experience methods can be helpful in framing reflective practice in one’s creative development,
* the writing voice as part of the creative and research practice, as well as
* the development a personal approach to creative process in my practice in performance and interactive art-as-research**[[1]](#footnote-1)** andtheinfluence of Susan Kozel as my long-time mentor in phenomenological methods in performance.

 I will also explore the idea that all art practice-as-research can be thought of as knowledge-making, as well as aesthetic creation.

Even though art-as-research has become prominent in UK, Australian, European and North American arts and design PhDs, particularly in cross-over disciplines like digital and electronic arts PhDs, it remains an evolving area of both academic and artistic practice. I share my own exploration and understanding of art-as-research processes I have developed for digital participatory performance projects over the years, beyond and outside of only academic art and performance making, as well as art and performance making that involves cross-disciplinary thinking.

During most of my creative art projects, my personal life and experiences[[2]](#footnote-2) have always greatly influenced my thinking, intuition, experience, and understanding, influencing the choices and approaches to making artwork. I developed my own creative process of linking my embodied vision for each work with ‘experience, practice and theory to produce situated knowledge’ of my own[[3]](#footnote-3), which has included learning facilitation and techniques of organising people from earlier creative work as well as through yoga and meditation training. This further evolved into devising performance activities used in many of my projects. Intuitive and embedded knowledge gained from experience is an approach used in designing most of my participatory activities to ensure they become meaningful experiences, and to deeply connect each participant to their own inner world, in an emotionally safe way.

I will discuss the following artists in relation to my own practice: mainly Susan Kozel, both as a postgraduate supervisor and mentor, and as collaborator on several projects; Thecla Schiphorst, having great influence during my Masters studies; Kate Sicchio, my long-term collaborator; the artists mentioned below by Barrett (2007), such as Stephen Goddard; as well as other artists elsewhere in this book, like Kristina Andersen. Their ideas and experiences support much of my thought processes and aspects of my practice.

**Context**

Some artistic processes can be conducted like scientific experimentation, especially in media art or technologically manifested art, which directly relates to my own experience. I have found that working with technical aspects in a work as well as creating the performance dimension, involves making or planning an element, then testing it and iterating it – this approach can be said to borrow from the scientific and technical process of experimentation. Marilyn Burgess, formerly of the Media Arts division of the Canada Council for the Arts, observed that media artists usually work beyond traditional art practice methods, and incorporate ‘lateral thinking, re-purposing and invention’, borrowing from sciences to measure their outcomes:

… such as ‘collaborativeness, algorithmic thinking, interface innovations, philosophical commentary, adaptability or robustness, humour, critical commentary and scalability’, which point to the specificity and radically different artistic paradigm of new media arts … The artist's role is to challenge, critique and investigate existing conventions. (Burgess, 2002: 2)

Burgess proposes a hybrid practice-based approach as a standard in media arts and performance practice. As such, my own intuitive approach, which was further developed in my ***MINDtouch*** project (discussed further on), which is not always conscious, involves working according to the needs and requirements emanating from the work-in-progress itself, and is then acted upon as each requirement arises, rather than necessarily according to a step-by-step path.

When working with materials, Barrett suggests:

Materials methods and theoretical ideas and paradigms may be viewed as the apparatuses, or procedures of production from which the research design emerges ... forged in relation to established or antecedent methods and ideas*.* (2007: 137–138)

Barrett additionally asserts that this approach,

… explores the complex interrelationship that exists between artistic research and other research and scholarly paradigms ... Acknowledging the emergent and subjective dimensions of artistic research, Stewart describes this method as a process of continuous discovery, correspondence contradictions, intuition, surprise and serendipity. (Barrett on Stewart, 2007: 12)

Evaluating the approaches of these artists and practitioners over the years has helped to clarify my own practice, approach to each work, thinking, and overall practice. They validate my own use of an embodied and embedded knowledge to guide the process – as opposed to following a formulaic methodology for the sake of it: I allow the work and experimentation with it, to guide the next steps. This has meant being sensitive and open to taking new directions from the work and improvising to the next level. As such, even though it may start with a first person or observational approach, methods and tools from other approaches are then additionally applied to it to help balance the process out. The participatory and improvisational nature of the activities I devise for the work, echo the process of the overall project, and evolve organically, like an iterative interaction between myself and the work[[4]](#footnote-4). Thus, this openness to allow anything to arise in the work is necessary help move the development along, but also can enable new directions to surface. However, keeping all the other different interdependent aspects of the work in sight is also important. If one aspect does not work I will then improvise and trial the next solution to make sure that all the other interlocking aspects continue to work as well. Therefore, one rigid, predetermined method is not effective. The process is a balance of working with technology, creative ideas, people and performances, each with their own systems, ecologies and needs.

In ‘Correspondences Between Practices’, Stephen Goddard, describes how to approach writing: *Rather than relying only on the written component … to demonstrate a reflective process, it can also be reflexively performed with the practice itself ...* (2007: 117). While it could have been intriguing to ‘write’ an analysis of my practice or process, such as in the ***MINDtouch*** project, using the mobile video itself as a self-reflexive mode of further exploring theory, there was already enough going on in my practice, so this was saved for a future project. Goddard further discusses the writing process in art practice as research:

As a methodological strategy, it was useful to integrate **the narrative of the research process** into both the practice and the exegesis ... The overall narrative of the research process includes the story of the practice–exegesis relationship, and the ways in which both the practice and the exegesis reflect upon the chronology of the research process. (Goddard in Barrett and Bolt, 2007: 118, my emphasis)

I have thought of the ‘narrative’ as the phenomenology of process. This narrative is critical to the work as it unfolds; it is the investigation, as much as are the more practical, hands-on aspects. I tend to write throughout my creative process and the writing responds to the practice and IS the practice as much as the final physical, technological or performance work itself. The writing, especially through journaling, helps me to clarify the devising process and the overall concept of the work itself.[[5]](#footnote-5)

Goddard uses the creative practice as investigative approach (2007: 119). He muses that his process of finding the method within the practice as it evolved:

I was attempting to trace the ways in which writing and video technologies mediated and recorded my memories, stories, annotations and analysis*.* (Goddard in Barrett, 2007: 118)

This resonated greatly with me when considering my process during my last few years of project development.

***MINDtouch:* Mobile Media Research**

Within the *MINDtouch* project, I explored embodied, non-linguistic[[6]](#footnote-6) interaction using wearable, biosensing devices and mobile phones. These technologies served as the ‘interfaces’ to enable me to remotely connect participants’ media experiences within the various performative social events that I staged. I wanted to investigate how people might ‘connect to each other’ through technology, in alternate ways, as a simulation of synaesthetic, telepathic, dream [[7]](#footnote-7)exchange. Through the project, I sought to understand how bodily sensations, perceptions, and responses might be meaningfully utilised, and find unique ways to visualise the body/mind activity, and to enable people to experience that activity in a collaborative, performance context. The project proposed that the mobile phone’s video camera become a new way to communicate non-verbally, visually, and sensually across distance. In it I explored notions of ephemeral transference, distance collaboration, and participant as performer, in order to study ‘presence’ and ‘liveness’ mobile technologies within real-time performance contexts.

The projectwas a performative research, in which I developed a series of live, iterative, and in-person, participatory social events, using mobile technologies. The five performative social events took place from July 2009 to spring 2010. These performance experiments involved me facilitating participants’ improvisation, while aiding them in generating live, collaborative visualisations on the web and on their phone’s screen. I guided participants through specific activities, developed to intensify their embodied interaction and engagement. Pre-recorded and live streamed video clips in a remote database were triggered and mixed via the biofeedback sensor data gathered from from participants’ bodies. I combined the live, in-person participation with that of the remote interactors, by a daisy-chain of technologies in virtual networked space. Each aspect was woven together by computer and mobile code that enabled the phones and sensors to communicate with one another, in as close to real-time as possible. Using this live body data (breath, muscle activity, temperature, and galvanic skin response), I had concurrent streams of mobile video mixing together into a multi-threaded, non-linguistic, collaborative, visual dialogue that enabled an embodied, meaningful, and personalised exchange between the remote participant groups.

For *MINDtouch,* I brought together diverging areas of new media research and media art/performance practices, and provided additional methods for working with wearable devices and mobile phones, using participatory activities, and video in performance. I developed a new participatory performance process to aid people to tune into their bodies, to translate their sensations and perceptions visually and playfully using their mobiles devices, and as such I revealed a new mobile media screen aesthetic. This changed people’s relationship to mobile devices to enable a new non-verbal interaction.

This research also revealed the methods I developed in order to embody technology and transmit presence and emotion remotely to loved ones and friends, through a new mobile visual modality. I discovered that this extension of presence can be done consciously, and directed emotional, interpersonal connections can be transferred through mobile devices when facilitated by certain activities. With intent and desire to connect, participants demonstrated that they could send and transform their presence through the device, as one does through Internet engagement. Thus, it became clear that we can embody or send our presence over distance through our mobile technologies, beyond the typical voice and text modalities.

**First Person Perspective in Art Practice**

A first-person voice is often used in art-based research, which is in direct contrast to the scientific third-person voice. I prefer to use a first-person voice it the work comes from me and feels the most authentic to use a subjective perspective as it is the only one I have to encounter the world with in the most immediate and empirical sense. The immediate, intuitive approach to writing by artists commonly rejects the use of a removed, third person voice characteristic of traditional academic contexts, since the work in development is lived by the artist in the first person. In the same way, artists often choose a phenomenological approach in their artistic practice. The entrenched academic traditions and constraints of disassociation and so-called ‘objectivity’ imposed on investigative practice to lend scientific credibility and reproducibility of experiments, is foreign and antithetical to art practice, where ideas originate from the artist, and there is often little desire for reproducibility of within art. There is an evident paradox or tension here between scientific and artistic cultures of knowledge.

I try to experience my own encounters with ideas through lived experience first, as pure sensation and expression as it surfaces, and then express this in my writing and in my work. It is then possible to contextualise with others who have had a similar sensation, thought or experience. Thus, I argue that an individual experience in one’s own life and art practice has its own dimensions, lived insight, and nuance differing to that of others’ work and ideas, which can be added to and contextualised amongst those other, more prominent ideas. Regarding the academic practice of crediting others, Barrett makes a similar argument:

An innovative dimension of this subjective approach to research lies in its capacity to bring into view, particularities of lived experience that reflect alternative realities that are either marginalised or not yet recognised in established theory and practice*.* (2007: 143)

Artists can understandably be initially resistant when they are asked to contextualise their practice, ideas and experience of process within those of other thinkers in the discourse within the research community, especially when asked to make an original contribution to knowledge. No matter how similar or widely discussed a more recognised and knowledgeable artist’s or theorist’s ideas are, artists’ need to be true to their personal practice and their own experience first. This is not a resistance to explore others’ ideas or learn from them, on the contrary, these theorists do inspire, influence and motivate artistic notions and approaches to the work. However, it can feel disingenuous when, upon having a thought, feeling, sensation or experience in life or in practice – which can often become the motivation or inspiration for the work or theory – some artists, do feel that others do not have copyright on that thought, experience or sensation.

In my creative investigative process I explore individual, contextualised artistic ideas through my reflective ‘musings’. Sometimes these are based on new connections or realisations from the practice itself, and sometimes they are inspired by others. The process of contextualising my own ideas, creative visions and unique thoughts through others *does* indeedhelp me to find other approaches or like minds to demonstrate that my thinking is shared. We cannot help but be influenced; yet artistic work is often about expressing one’s own unique experience or interpretation of the world, to reflect back to others and to contribute and share with others. Finding the right mix is a fine balance. Artists and performers sometimes undertake practice-based research in order to explore their own artistic work and specific creative concerns, while adding to their own process, understanding and skills, and finding their place in their field and the current discourse. Learning is primarily gained through the experience of other creatives and thinkers in their work and thought, and synthesised, written about and applied as relevant to one’s own practice and/or thinking. Much of my artistic research has been inspired by the insights of other artists and theorists, found by reading, studying, exploring, examining, witnessing and analysing to help me find a path of my own.

In terms of using personal experience to influence work, Reid confessed that her approach was even more personal in her dance work, resulting in a blur between personal and work. She reveals:

I have drawn on autobiographical incidents in which the inner self and the outer body collide, where a point on or movement of my body references and reveals a specific emotional experience or intellectual realisation. ... extrapolated from stories connected to specific scars or points on my body associated with accidents or trauma. (Reid in Barrett and Bolt, 2007: 58)

Through my creative journaling, I reflect and reveal specific emotional experiences, like Reid, triggered in the exploration, devising, and making processes, and allow the new realisations to bubble through, connecting the personal to the conceptual. This is similar to Goddard’s experience, as he has noted on his own work,

…[it] was situated within and across the overlapping fields of autobiographical writing and subjective video practices. (Goddard in Barrett, 2007: 117)

This statement has inspired me to consider my own practical insights on my work, writing sections in my project journal *as a diary.* However, over time this was abandoned in favour of the personal/poetic observations of lived experience and musings of the project investigations, such as on: mobile phone, virtual and actual presence, embodiment and telepathy, and many other themes in my work. Many entries in my creative project journal have been called ‘MUSINGS’ and these are integrated as part of my phenomenological practice, within the theory aspects of my artistic projects.

Within her book Barrett charts many artistic approaches as a guide for artist researchers. One section states:

The researcher traces the genesis of ideas in his/her own works as well as the works/ideas of others; compares them and maps the way they inter-relate; **examines how earlier work has influenced development of current work**; identifies gap/contribution to knowledge/discourse made in the works. (Barrett, 2007: 139, my emphasis)[[8]](#footnote-8)

Therefore, there are many instances where artists use personal experience to filter into the creative process, to inform and shape their artwork or performance (Barrett, 2007: 68). This approach is essentially a phenomenological or first person approach, since it is influenced by their personal perspective, experience and embodied skills and knowledge: this is where artists start. It could be argued that it is more honest to admit that this personal embedded experience is key to the artwork’s authenticity.

**Phenomenology for/as Creative Practice**

Phenomenology as an artistic method and approach for creating work is for me a guiding approach and a grounding philosophy for my practice. It is appropriate since media performance can be very intimate in its creation processes and a body-centred approach used in my work, and specifically in the facilitation of self-attention with participants using mobile or wearable devices, has required a more intimate, personal, first-person treatment. Merleau-Ponty’s[[9]](#footnote-9) perspective on perception and lived experience has been used primarily in my work, filtered through the study and guidance of Susan Kozel in much of my academic work.

Francisco Varela and Jonathan Shear defined phenomenology as the study of, and the method of studying, lived, first-person experience that is not about ‘things-out-there’, but rather one’s mental ‘contents-in-here’. They state that:

… the level of the user of one’s own cognitions, of intentions and doings, in everyday practices … the realm of experience is essential for human activity and life involving the use of one’s own mind … the experiential domain can be explored ... (1999: 3)

Thus, they are saying that it is only our own experience that is real, that exists for us, and essential to use our own mind and experience more directly to understand the world and our practice, rather than attempting to be ‘objective’.

Varela and Shear’s phenomenological approach and tools of phenomenology include: introspection; attention during defined tasks using verbal accounts; meditation or sustained attention, uncontrived awareness and suspension of mental activity (1999: 5). I employ these tools and approaches when thinking through the design and application of conceptual notions of presence and technological embodiment within the participatory activities in my projects’ workshops and events. Many of the various concepts and realisations employed in my work come from the lived experience of using mobile, wearable and digital technology in my personal and professional life. I am introspective and pay particular attention to my own responses during these activities, and meditate or muse upon these experiences to draw further from them for the work.

Martha Ladly has another interpretation of Heidegger’s phenomenological methods in *… the self showing in itself …* (Heidegger, 1996 in Ladly, 2007:142) and she states that,

… it is the active process we undertake when we assign meaning to our experiences [which] cannot be separated from reality; it is an active process and as such, a creative act. Communication – one to self; one to one; one to many; and many to many*.* (2007: 142)

This notion of assigning meaning to our experiences is one employed in my practice on multiple levels: in understanding the overall creative processes, but also in the specific activities when working with mobile or wearable devices, my collaborators, and with my interactive project participants[[10]](#footnote-10). These positions manifest in my work in terms of: one to self, in my phenomenological process of creating and reflecting the work throughout it; one to one, in how I communicate with distance family and friends through these technologies daily, through the year as they evolve, as well as in the more formal communication with; one to many, it frames how I relate to the participants in my project workshops; and for many to many, in how the work is made, so that many live and remote participants can communicate/participate in my work. Ladly also reinterprets Herbert Spiegelberg’s ‘elaborate seven-step method’ from *The Phenomenological*,stating that his steps are to:

…formulate a phenomenological description using phenomenological intuition, …make a phenomenological reduction ... determine ... which parts of the description are essential. ... isolate the object of consciousness, the thing, situation, emotion or person that constitutes the experience ... based directly on the experience, rather than on a conception of what the experience may be like ... produce a phenomenological interpretation, an attempt to signify meaning, using hermeneutic analysis. (2007: 142)

I have used some of Ladley’ steps listed above in my own work, as well Susan Kozel’s step-by-step methods below from her book *Closer*, which is a rethinking (reconsideration) of Merleau-Ponty’s phenomenology. In *Closer,* Kozel provides an important set of phenomenological methods for body-based practices, performance, and for technology art practices, which has impacted my practices. This set of tools was constructed and interpreted through her performance, philosophical and technological practice. In it, she reveals that one of the objectives in her reinterpretation or framing of phenomenology is to devise a means for creative practitioners and performers to use phenomenology to reflect and write on their practices. Kozel’s list of processes or tools to guide practitioners include that we:

... loosen our rationalist structures of meaning sufficiently to permit qualities associated with the pre-rational, such as ambiguity of meaning, fluidity of existential and conceptual structures, scope for entirely new thought, perceptions, including contradictions, reversals of meaning, or paradoxes. (2007: 18–19)

This perspective gives the artistic researcher more freedom to allow uncensored perceptions and encounters with the work, and intuitive responses to it, express themselves, either directly or after further reflection.

I have my own phenomenological, practice-based approach from personal and professional experience and background, and there has been a refinement of my thinking and approach to the processes of practice. During my practice-based art research project development my own unique intuitive phenomenological approach or sense in establishing my own methodology from the felt experience and process of making work was unearthed. Thus, phenomenology became a foundational methodology[[11]](#footnote-11). Working through my art-as-research practice, a hybrid approach has been developed and realised in my artwork. Therefore, a Merleau-Pontian-infused phenomenology flavours the thinking, intuition and writing in my process. Mindfulness meditation techniques are indirectly incorporated into much of my work as well as dance, yoga practice, Tai Chi and meditation training have all inspired my approach to participatory performance work. This approach is akin to Buddhist Mindfulness practices.[[12]](#footnote-12) In my performance project ***MINDtouch***, this Mindfulness influence is evident through the performance development processes taken from lived experience; since collective bodies, networked art and other embodied practices are as the basis of the practice.In my PhD thesis (Baker, 2010), I argued for mind–body extension through embodiment in technology and to explore this through the phenomenological lens of both myself as artist, and of the participants in the project. The hybrid methodology of the ***MINDtouch*** projectwas first experienced intuitively, and first surfaced through the development of the goals, expression and possible activities for the project. The intuitive approach developed through a vision of how others might experience the interaction, as well as how they would be encouraged to record their experiences during the events. Following this vision, a sketch of the experiential construct for participants was created, and then enacted as a creative approach for ‘walking through’ the activities. The first step in this process was to note down these ideas like a script. They were then tested, both in workshops and on my own. It was an first person approach of ‘trial and error’ (as Burgess suggested above) that was subsequently enacted by the participants, and each with individual and different responses to the work. I did not attempt to predetermine or influence their outcomes or experiences, since each person comes with their own history, perspective and relationship with their own and others' bodies, as well as expectations and interpretations of what might happen. As such, they explored the activities and used the technology to interpret their own vision from their embodied experience of their sensations in varied and unique ways. This was also an intuitive creative process.

An intuitive approach to writing from a phenomenological perspective or lived experience of my process is the heart of how my work and practice evolves, using a hybrid approach to the development of each project. I use a phenomenological *voice* in writing of my lived experience and practice when working with participants. This can be compared as first-, second- and third-person art-as-research investigations, and the content revealed is not different, but rather the artist ... *is 'inserted into the network of social exchanges**...* (Varela and Shear, 2007: 57) and is validated by making the second-person investigator an ‘empathic resonator’. Here the artist becomes sensitive to the other person’s phrasing, body-language and expression. This role of a facilitator, as well as of a director and experience designer is one I usually take in my work; I became an ‘empathic resonator’ in responding to my performance participants.

Merleau-Ponty insists that a pre-reflective state is the starting point to accessing and evaluating experience. In a phenomenological approach, prior to reflection (especially when writing on lived experience as it is encountered), pre-reflection is necessary:

This [pre-reflective] belongingness with the world that preexists our conceptual engagement with it, but does not exist apart from it ... not just primordial but as *mysterious*: the body is 'a mysterious and expressive mode of belonging to the world through our perceptions, gestures, sexuality, and speech. It is through our bodies as living centres of intentionality ... that we choose the world and the world chooses us.' (Merleau-Ponty, 1986: 74, quoted by Kozel, 2007: 17, her emphasis)

This phenomenological intentionality of connecting to and engaging with the world through the body and through reflection, shapes most encounters, whether understood and experienced as primordial, primitive or mysterious. Reconfigured through a performance lens, Merleau-Ponty’s position repositions my own experiences in life, art and performance more concisely: I too try to engage through the body with intentionality and through reflection, cultivating pre-reflection through meditation and in art practice.

This discussion illuminates another question to make a reflective practitioner pause and think: perhaps it is not possible *not* to ‘violate’ or alter the pre-reflective state in the process of translation. One could argue that culture, gender and language, along with other factors, alter and colour or filter pre-reflection to enable us to work with and understand it in lived, daily contexts that we find ourselves in, as suggested above. As artists, we can find ways through the practice to manifest nearer to the original pre-reflective state. Kozel speaks of ‘opening to aesthetic experience’ of pre-reflection and hyper-reflection[[13]](#footnote-13) within phenomenological art practice. She maintains that this is important as a means of working with bodies and technology–listening to the body pre-reflectively and:

As we assess the artistic, social, and corporeal implications of developments in computational devices and ambient systems, **we need to have a method and an intent to receive information from our own bodies and from the bodies of others.** In giving a voice to diverse corporeal states we **can overcome naive distinctions between matter and spirit, between body and mind**. The second reason for crafting a role for the pre-reflective is that it can open a way for **understanding the deep entanglement between reflection and experience, between thinking and making**, which is so important to many arts and sciences. (2007: 22–23, my emphasis)

This perspective clarifies and reconciles my own conceptual conflicts encountered regarding the dualities of consciousness and corporeality that previously confounded my thinking and pre-reflection on daily, lived experience. It also clarifies the concerns and philosophical notions explored in my past artwork, as well as how to facilitate others in their experiences within technologically enabled performance activities.

**Conclusion**

What I have outlined in this chapter, is that it is important to me to elucidate for fellow artists and artist-researchers on my creative process and methods, especially in the technology-based arts, which often has artists coming from a scientific paradigm perhaps first as engineers or programmers, and I feel it is crucial to emphasise that– we must trust our intuitive creative methods as valid, as knowledge and meaning-making activities, expanding the global collective creative wisdom. I believe is critical that we all share our unique creative processes in *practice/art-as-research*, and allow the first-person, lived experiences with our making experiences to surface. It is a heartening validation for this form of knowledge-making that a movement is growing in arts, craft and the DIY/Maker culture, as well as slowly into academic-arts discourse, in the western world. However, academic artists and designers, who are already using their methods and methodologies in the creative industries successfully and transitioning into the academic world, must also be validated as contributing greatly to practice-as-research as knowledge-making endeavour.
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1. For this chapter, I will use digital and participatory performance as a reference in particular to my practice, which involves using digital media creative and delivery tools, such as video, video-streaming, interactive media art, web and online platforms and, social media for audience interaction, as well as in-person performances that involve audience participation. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. As an example of using first-person writing as an artistic choice, I will move between a first and third person voice within this chapter. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. This chapter has been recrafted and reworked from my PhD thesis and appendices, defended in December 2010, and completed August 2011. This section is adapted from pages 36-38 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. As suggested by Alison Williams, this aligns with Sawyer's (2003) description of the very fast 'ideation-evaluation' creative process loop in improvisation. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. As is part of the Phenomenological methods that Kozel uses in her practice, see further on. Also see Sawyer again, and Resnick (2007) [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. This means there was no sound or speech to be heard in the videos, but more importantly, participants were guided to create the mobile videos without speaking at all. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. This is a recurring theme in my work: telepathic dream exchange and non-verbal embodied ways to reaching out to loved ones, started in my Master's final project. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. This is a critical aspect to understanding or contextualising the genesis of my work. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. I will work from Merleau-Ponty more directly in upcoming writing and the final methodology chapter to be able to refer to his theories more directly. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. By ‘collaborators’ I mean people I devise art projects and performances with, while ‘participants’ is my prefered term for participating audience members as co-creators in a different way - like an open work where myself and my collaborators create the framework for participation or interaction and the audience completes the work by their interaction and engagement with it. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. *Closer* was not published until 2007 when I developed some of my own creative processes, but was then used to help me articulate my own through Kozel’s philosophical clarity and breadth of experience. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Pema Chodron, a prominent Buddhist teacher and writer, as well as others, has many books and teachings on Mindfulness that contain practical methods similar to Kozel’s that she uses with her students. *Start Where You Are: A Guide to Compassionate Living* (1994) is one Buddhist book that teaches Mindfulness meditation. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Such as over self conscious, over self-reflective, and overly focuses one’s own thoughts and experiences [↑](#footnote-ref-13)