

# UC Irvine

## UC Irvine Electronic Theses and Dissertations

### Title

The Current and Future Role of Screendance Curation

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2mc2t0q0>

### Author

Nagy, Boroka Krisztina

### Publication Date

2015

### Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,  
IRVINE

The Current and Future Role of Screendance Curation

THESIS

submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements  
for the degree of

MASTER OF FINE ARTS

in Dance

by

Boroka Krisztina Nagy

Thesis Committee:  
Associate Professor John Crawford, Chair  
Professor Lisa Naugle  
Professor Alan Terricciano

2015



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 1: Historical Overview of Screendance and Curatorial Practice	3
CHAPTER 2: Survey of Current Screendance Festivals	13
CHAPTER 3: Practices of Current Practitioners	22
CHAPTER 4: Screendance and Interactive Performance: Presentation and Curation	27
CHAPTER 5: Conclusion	32
REFERENCES	36
APPENDIX A: Additional Bibliography	40
APPENDIX B: List of Festivals in the United States that Show Screendance	42

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my Thesis Chair, John Crawford, for his patience, advice, and openness with this research. All that I have learned from him in these past two years has informed and made my thesis work possible. I am thankful for his intellectual, artistic, and technical guidance. I appreciate his passion for the partnership of technology and dance.

I am grateful for Lisa Naugle and Alan Terricciano for the inspiring and idea-sparking conversations that helped move this thesis forward. Many thanks for believing in my ideas. Their mentorship and enthusiasm for the arts has influenced my artistry and research.

My express my appreciation to Douglas Rosenberg, Martha Curtis, and Greta Schoenberg. I am thankful for the time they took to share with me their knowledge and experience with the ever-evolving field of screendance. I appreciate their dedication to the development of the field. Their help has allowed me to further understand the current state of the field. Because of our conversations, I am inspired to continue theoretical research to continue pushing screendance in new directions.

I am grateful for the University of California- Irvine for funding my education, and making it possible for me to expand my artistic and theoretical insights. I thank the Claire Trevor School of the Arts for providing me with the travel grant that has allowed me to attend the screening of my short screendance at the 2014 Dance on Camera Festival. The trip gave me access to the resources I needed to complete this research.

I have infinite gratitude for the incredible dancers of my thesis performance installation, *Unveil*. They not only put time and dedication into my experimentation with my interactive performance exhibition, but also their unique personalities. Their powerful presence shaped the final product of the thesis concert and completed the work. I appreciate their talent, motivation, and willingness to take risks. Their sense of humor and eagerness has made this process unforgettable and successful.

A huge thank you to the crew of my thesis concert: Lighting Designer Martha Carter, Stage Manager, Gabrielle Koizumi, Assistant Stage Manager Jess Cunha, Sound Designer Hassan Estakhrian. Without all of their creativity, spontaneity, and willingness to take on any challenge, my concert would not have been possible. I am thankful for the many hours of planning, and endless talent towards their art

I am thankful for my cohort, the Dance MFA Class of 2015. This thesis would not have been possible without their support and embrace. I am grateful for their intellectual and artistic wealth, which has inspired me throughout these years.

I am eternally thankful for my family, my artistic advisors without whom all of my thesis would have been impossible. I am thankful for their endless intellectual, artistic, and emotional provision and sacrifice. I am grateful for each of their individual genius and for the conversations that helped forward my research ideas. My accomplishments are a reflection of their support

## **ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS**

The Current and Future Role of Screendance Curation

By

Boroka Krisztina Nagy

Master of Fine Arts in Dance

University of California, Irvine, 2015

Associate Professor John Crawford, Chair

This thesis project is comprised of a written paper and a choreographic work. The choreographic component was presented in the Experimental Media Lab in the Contemporary Arts Center of the University of California- Irvine on May 15 and 16, 2015. The work was presented in the form of an *interactive performance exhibition*, where the audience was invited to participate in certain aspects of the performance. The installation explored the blurring of the line between audience and performer through a linear development. The exhibition started with the space divided by curtains, showcasing live dancers as well as screendance and video projections. The second half of the exhibition opened up into one large floor, which the audience and performers shared.

The supporting paper attempts to find a model for showcasing screendance works that provides an embodied experience, such as an *interactive performance exhibition*. After a brief historical overview of the development screendance and the development of curation, the paper looks at the ways that screendance curatorial practice can function to diversify the exhibition of screendance works. This thesis includes a survey of current screendance festivals, as well as ideas from interviews with current screendance

practitioners to paint a cohesive picture of the current practices in the field. It then proposes that the *interactive performance exhibition* can be an alternative model to present screendance through an analysis of how exhibition space, live performance, and video projection can create a hybrid performance installation.

## INTRODUCTION

In recent years, around the start of 2010, there seemed to be an increase in the size of the screendance community in both artists and audience. This can be seen in the large number of screendance work on social media, dance company websites, and the frequent presence of dance in video commercials in the United States. After reading works and definitions by Douglas Rosenberg, Erin Brannigan, and Sherril Dodds, I have come to use the term *screendance* to refer to a short art film on which a film director and a choreographer collaborate, or in which a choreographer takes the role of the director. In screendance, choreography is created specifically to be shown on screen, and the cinematography and editing are specifically designed for the choreography. Screendance is an interplay of the artistic tools of dance and film. An overview of the rich history of screendance allows us to gain a greater appreciation of the practical and theoretical potential of the genre.

In the digital age that encompasses Generation Z,<sup>1</sup> the presence and acceptance of dance in film has increased. In the meantime, the theoretical and artistic development of screendance has narrowed noticeably. Film festivals are a main source of distribution of this genre (Rosenberg, *Screendance* 5), and a strong and diverse curatorial practice can promote the development of screendance's theoretical position. Film festivals provide a space for continuous and open discourse about the field with workshops and presentations. These sources at festivals lead to engaged and critical dialogue about specific films and the screendance field in general. A critically engaged audience has the potential to carry conversations beyond the theater and into the dance, film, and social

---

<sup>1</sup> Generation Z refers to those people born after the mid-1990s, coined "digital natives" (Prensky).



media realms, where discussions circulate between screendance artists, audience members, and curators. As an alternative to presenting screendance works at festivals, I propose that there would be benefits of showcasing them in live performance installations to promote the breadth of screendance viewership and experience. This thesis reviews the history of screendance, as well as the history of curation, and the ways that the two have evolved separately before their recent convergence. Subsequently, this thesis looks at the current models and practices of screendance, which I use to propose a possible plan for the future of screendance.

## **HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF SCREENDANCE AND CURATORIAL PRACTICE**

Since the invention of the moving image at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, artists experimented with movement on screen: choreographer/dancer Loie Fuller worked independently and made films with the Lumière brothers, Louis and Auguste; Louis Lumiere recorded a variety of African dance forms; George Méliès created fantasy films with dancing bodies; and the silent era hosted a myriad of dancer/actors such as Charlie Chaplin and Buster Keaton (Dodds, 4-5). By the 1930s, a new genre of dance on film developed—the musical—and Hollywood became the center of film production. Film musicals were a prominent part of the Hollywood film industry, generating star performers with extravagant dance and song routines until the late 1950s, when the invention of television and the disbandment of the large studio system lead to the decline of the movie theater fanaticism. Stars like Fred Astaire, Ginger Rogers, Gene Kelly, Eleanor Powell, Cyd Charisse, and Ruby Keeler (Dodds, 5) dominated the screens with virtuosic tap, jazz, and social dance numbers.

In the middle of Hollywood’s enthusiasm for film musicals, avant-garde filmmaker Maya Deren’s career began to take root. Experimental film had a strong surge around 1945 and Deren was “the first since the end of [World War II] to inject a fresh note into experimental-film production,” straying away from sound and long productions of the earlier avant-garde period of the 1920s (Smoodin, 6, 29). Her work was instrumental to the resurgence of the experimental film genre and her investigations with merging dance and film opened up new communication between filmmakers and choreographers. This blending was the beginning of a new experimentation in dance and film.

Screen dance theorists including Claudia Kappenberg, Douglas Rosenberg, and Sherril Dodds claim that Maya Deren was one of the most influential forerunners of screen dance (Kappenberg and Rosenberg, 1). In her short film, "A Study In Choreography For Camera," she demonstrated that with the use of film, movement can remain unbroken while the background setting of a dancer could change. Time and space could be manipulated and the body could appear to be moving free of gravity (Deren, "Cinematography" 165-166). In that film, dancer Talley Beatty executes a grand développé high into the air. He is outside in a wooded area. As he descends his leg midway down to the floor, Deren cuts the film to the inside of an apartment. Although this seems irrelevant for a moment, Beatty's foot soon enters the frame as though it was a continuation of the same movement. This change of scenery while in the act of moving, done through the use of editing, signaled how technology and the use of film editing could overcome the temporal and spatial constraints of dance. Film editing added a layer to choreography using the enhanced time and space made possible by the camera (Smoodin, 31).

Erin Brannigan's *Dancefilm* highlights some of Deren's significant film techniques: "multiple exposures, jump cuts, slow motion, negative film sequences, superimposition, match-on-action, freeze frame, and acute camera angles" (Brannigan, 100). Many of these have become regular techniques for screen dance artists today. Deren's research created a new way to look at dance choreography on film, "a virtually new art of 'choreocinema' in which dance and the camera collaborate on the creation of a single new work of art" (Smoodin, 31).

Over time, the concepts she experimented with spread. As a result, the efforts of the choreographer and the filmmaker began to converge and screen dance started to become a

balanced collaborative effort between the two. Several filmmakers experimented with incorporating dance into their work, and numerous choreographers, primarily modern dance choreographer, collaborated with filmmakers to create works similar to Deren's choreocinema: Wendy Toye (1917-2010), Yvonne Rainer (1934- ), Sally Potter (1949- ), Merce Cunningham (1919-2009) (in partnership with filmmakers Charles Atlas (1958- ) and Elliott Caplan (years active 1970s-2010s), Amy Greenfield (1940), Anna de Manincor (1972), Wim Vandekeybus (1963), and director David Hinton (active years 1990s-2010s) through his work with DV8 Physical Theater, Clara van Gool (1962- ), and Jordi Cortès Molina (active in 1990s-2010s).

Technological developments in the history of film have altered the way screendance has been showcased. In the late 1800s, vaudeville houses were the main source of entertainment for many Americans. In the 1890s, both Thomas Edison and the Lumière brothers were separately developing a way to record and replay moving image from a single camera with the new invention of film.<sup>2</sup> Edison was the among the first to exploit this "seemingly miraculous achievement of moving pictures" by making them available for the public to see with individual coin-operated arcade machines often found in vaudeville houses. In December 1895, the Lumière brothers projected their films on a screen before a paying audience and created an immediate sensation (Jacobs). During this time, dance films were shown in small travelling exhibitions and projected onto portable projection surfaces in front of an audience.

---

<sup>2</sup> George Eastman invented the film, which is a long strip of flexible plastic base for the emulsion (Jacobs).

Soon after, nickelodeons turned into larger theatres that screened feature length films of the Silent Era (Jacobs).<sup>3</sup> The end of World War I was the beginning of the age of movie palaces. Big theater chains were owned by the “Big Five” movie studios in a monopolistic, vertically-integrated model (where the manufacturing and distribution of a company is under single ownership to maximize profits): Paramount, Warner, Loews (Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer), Fox, and RKO (Jacobs). From the 1920s-1950s, huge theaters were the primary means for film distribution and viewing films, in particular; Maya Deren, meanwhile, favored independent production and distribution over the Hollywood studio system, and presented her films at independent theaters (Dodds, 7). The 1960s presented a growth in the popularity of television and the viewership for dance on screen was extended to the home. Various stage performances were broadcast along with the occasional experimental screendance works. By the 1970s and 1980s, videodance gained more recognition, and experimental works were being made specifically for the television screen, running in a series called *Dance on 4* (broadcast on Channel 4) (Dodds, 9-12). These decades also saw the introduction of the screendance festival, with the birth of the Dance on Camera Festival in 1972.<sup>4</sup> The screendance festival became a new outlet for screendance makers to view and showcase works, with screenings at makeshift venues, underground cinemas and later in dance spaces such as The Dance Theater Workshop in New York (Rosenberg, “Curating the Practice” 8). It brought together filmmakers, choreographers, and theorists, creating a venue for discourse.

---

<sup>3</sup> Nickelodeons were small theater houses showing short films that were most popular during 1905-1915 (Jacobs).

<sup>4</sup> Further Discussed in Chapter 3

Meanwhile, broadcast television continued programming various dance on camera works. The 1980s and 1990s saw further technical developments that would change the way films were presented: consumer camcorder, Betamax, Super VHS, Hi-8 video format, 35mm widescreen camera. Those technological advancements promoted a higher quality preservation of films, more efficient and far-reaching mass distribution, and easier theatrical presentation across the country.

During the 1990s, audiences had access to screendance through various television series<sup>5</sup> and VHS distributions (Dodds, 9-12). Later, in the 2000s, the continued advancement of consumer technologies (such as affordable camcorders and DSLR cameras), along with vast social media venues for showcasing work (such as YouTube and Vimeo) promoted the solo filmmaker-choreographer, or screendance artist. The switch from film to video cameras and the development of digital and high definition equipment, along with the viewership shift to the Internet have altered the modes of production, delivery, and the venues for screendance dramatically over the past 10 years. Two of the main venues for screendance today are the Internet and festival theaters, but neither venue provides an effective forum for dialogue; therefore, curation must play a pivotal role.

Curating screendance merges two fields with different forms of artistic direction and opposing presentation styles. Dance concerts and the performing arts are traditionally programmed, while film/video and the visual arts field are most frequently curated. In a programmed concert, works by one artist or multiple artists are shown in the same event. The programming process for these works often delegates the choice of works to the choreographer and focuses instead on an effective, theatrical, overall experience through

---

<sup>5</sup> BBC's *Dancehouse* and *Dance for the Camera* and Channel Four's *Tights Camera, Action!* Series all broadcast dance on film (Dodds, 9-12).

thoughtful ordering, yet “the underlying similarities between artists sharing the same programme may be vague or not entirely apparent; often they appear together for reasons wholly outside of the content or style of their work, reasons which may be pragmatic or otherwise (Rosenberg, “Curating the practice/the practice of curating” 76). A curator focuses more heavily on the work itself, culling selections from a larger pool of work in order to create a meta-narrative between the pieces (ibid). Curation has taken such a wide variety of practices, however, that it can be difficult to effectively put it to use. For this reason, an examination of the history, development, and function of curation is beneficial to further discussion of the screendance field.

Curation, as a profession, surged in the late 1960s (Benedetti). During this time, Conceptual Art—where the idea presented by the artist is more important than the aesthetics of the end product— was on the rise and installations and exhibitions were a prominent part of visual arts presentation (ibid). Exhibitions and curation come hand in hand:

Exhibition involves imposition of order on objects, brought into a particular space and a specific set of relations with one another... [It] is necessarily rhetorical in calling attention to artifacts brought together to be subjected to visual scrutiny. Exhibition commands visual attentiveness. (Wells, 29)

Curators pay close attention to the intention of the artists, and through visual alertness they classify exhibitions to establish and communicate a greater idea to viewers. A curator is closely bound to the gallery space, functioning as a mediator between the exhibits, the content, and the public (Benedetti). According to Paul O’Neill, a curator, writer, and artist, exhibitions “uphold identities (artistic, national, subcultural, ‘international,’

gender-to-race-specific, avant-garde, regional, global, etc.); they are to be understood as institutional ‘utterances’ within a larger cultural industry” (16). The exhibition space is where curators bring together the works of art that connect cultural and community notions; curation is directly connected to social and technological developments.

The Latin etymological root *curare*, means to *take care of*, and the *curators* of ancient Rome were responsible for taking care of the necessary function of the empire, such as overseeing public works: aqueducts, bathhouses, sewers (Obrist, 24). By the medieval period, however, the role of a *curatus* related more to the metaphysical aspect of human life, for example a religious attendant responsible for taking care of the souls of a parish (ibid). In the late 18<sup>th</sup> century, the term *curator* shifted closer to the definition we know today: somebody who looks after a museum’s collection. In the 1700s, these collections represented the cultural and financial position of various countries, states, and empires (Obrist, 25). Even though the role of the curator has changed to accommodate the needs of the people, the job remains surprisingly close to the original *curare* of “cultivating, growing, pruning and trying to help people and their shared context to thrive” (Obrist, 25).

According to Hans Ulrich Obrist, a curator, historian, and art critic, there are four functions that a professional curator’s role encompasses: preservation of a nation's heritage, selection of new work for collections, contribution to art history, arranging the art and ultimately “the making of exhibitions” (25). Many current curators (including Obrist, Paul O’Neill, Liz Wells, Geoff Cox, and Joasia Krysa) agree that creating meaning for art related to the public audience is the central focus of their job. Geoff Cox and Joasia Krysa, both international freelance curators focusing on the intersection of art, technology, and cultural politics, suggest:



The practice of curating, subjective and taxonomic by nature, can be viewed as the practice of constructing meaning by exerting control through selection, clever arrangement, labelling, interpretation and so on – a certain recognition of the ambiguity of the object in the first place. (Cox and Krysa, 2)

Accordingly, meaning accumulates as the relationship of one work is related to others through a cultural lens and a frame of reference.

While gallery curators were establishing their profession in museums, screendance artists were also experimenting with collecting and organizing works in a similar fashion. Amy Greenfield and Elaine Summers were two artists in the 1960s and 1970s stretching the boundaries of what is considered screendance (Rosenberg, “Curating the Practice” 11). By the 1980s, Greenfield, Summers, as well as James Byrne, were curating various screendance and interdisciplinary works in both showcases and essay catalogues with clear curator statements that described the underlying meaning they were aiming to portray through the collection of works (ibid). These early screendance curators used their curatorial practice to push the field forward, described in their curator statements. For example, Byrne co-curated the 1989 Dance Theater Workshop with Elaine Summers. His curator statement began with:

“Featured in this program are dance films and videos that demonstrate bracingly innovative approaches to constructing cinematic choreography from disparate and minimal movement sources...This fascinating selection of new works presents a range of possibilities that push and expand the edges of dance video.” (Rosenberg, “Curating the Practice” 12)

Summer's curator statement for a catalog she curated closed with clearly stating that the collection of essays all aimed to "further help to articulate the varying and changing nature of filmdance" (Rosenberg, "Curating the Practice" 13). These examples portray how early screendance curators drew from the historical and theoretical aspects of gallery curation as described in this chapter and applied it to screendance.

Douglas Rosenberg<sup>6</sup> is a current screendance curator who ties concepts that Cox and Krysa discuss in terms of curation and links it to screendance. He proposes that curation builds master narratives about the field regarding things that may not be visible otherwise (Rosenberg, "Curating the practice/the practice of curating" 75). Curation allows for an additional underlying meaning to be created through classification of works.

Thorough organization of screenings at screendance festivals will continue the development of screendance. Rosenberg uses the recognition of genres within screendance as a possible method for future screenings. He follows the logic that "if both disciplines that make up the whole of a screendance have traceable affiliations with genres, then we should also be able to name the resulting genre into which the new work falls" (Rosenberg, *Screendance* 110). Genres add a new layer of film theory lens to screendance which can aid in the analysis of screendance by including a set of visual and contextual themes and motifs that create new areas with which to work for curators. Sherril Dodds, in her book *Dance on Screen: Genres and Media from Hollywood to Experimental Art*, breaks down the various categories of screendance in order to create genres. Her genres (Hollywood, TV advertising, music videos, theater-dance on screen, dance for the camera in experimental works and video dance) facilitate classification and a deeper analysis of the field.

---

<sup>6</sup> Screendance director and theorist Douglas, founding editor of the *International Journal of Screendance*, is further discussed in chapter 4.

Erin Brannigan, another curator who explores the benefits of creating screendance genres, speaks extensively about the importance of looking at screendance with a critical film theory eye (in addition to the more obvious “choreography” eye). A filmic approach provides new ideas about the relationship between a performer and the screen, cinematic presence, and gestural articulation, such as framing, editing, notion of spectatorship and voyeurism, and historical context like the film avant garde (Brannigan, *Dancefilm* 6). Genres create a link between screendance and categories of cinematic movement, framing, editing, spectatorship, and the avant-garde film movement (ibid). Brannigan suggests that connecting current films to historical ones ignites additional discourse about film theory within screendance. This extends the historical focus of dance and choreography and considers a new side, film history, to promote for a diverse point of view of analysis.

According to Gritta Wigro, a freelance programmer and curator in screendance, curators are responsible for organizing programs that are beneficial to the screendance community. Since the “body of work that we refer to as screendance rarely comments on socio-political issues,” curation provides the opportunity to address underlying social conducts, ideologies, and other matters embedded in the films. This notion links the role of curation to the creation of meaning that is not inherent in the works (Wigro, 1).

An examination of the development of both screendance and curation in their separate contexts elucidates how curation *within* screendance evolves. Screendance as a visual art form (film) can be curated in ways similar to exhibitions. Finding ways to blend the programming ideas of theatrical dance with the curatorial practice of exhibitions would form a beneficial model for screendance curation.

## **SURVEY OF CURRENT SCREENDANCE FESTIVALS**

There are 21 film festivals in the United States operating today that highlight dance for the camera (See Appendix B). Within the screendance festival circuit, several recurring models have formed. The following four current screendance festivals in the U.S.A. –Dance on Camera, Dance Camera West (DCW), Utah Dance Film Festival, and San Francisco Dance Film Festival (SFDF) –represent a cross-section of the variety of current festival models. In addition, I provide an examination of a recently closed festival, Dances Made to Order, because it stands as an example for the online film festival model. Furthermore, Dance Screen (founded by the IMZ International Music + Media Centre in 1988), an international screendance and video competition in Vienna, Austria, is worth attention for its curatorial aspects.

### **Dance on Camera Festival**

The annual Dance on Camera Festival in New York City, founded in 1972, has developed as a robust forum for creating theoretical conversation about screendance. The five-day festival showcases a variety of documentaries, short films, experimental works, music videos, and feature length films on the topic of or spoken through the language of dance. It celebrates the “intimacy of dance combined with the intimacy of film” (“Festivals Archive”). This festival represents a model for dance and film in the context of community. Dance on Camera aims to break expectations by exploring new genres and crossover artists who bring a unique perspective to art (ibid). The festival successfully brings together filmmakers in curated events during which they discuss the general growth of the field and new ideas for its further development. These events happen in formal and informal settings

like meet-and-greets and panel discussions with the filmmakers. There are about six organized events available for festivalgoers during Dance on Camera each year.

The Dance on Camera festival is geared more towards professional and established filmmakers, with an emphasis on documentaries about significant choreographers and filmmakers from the past. In 2014, noteworthy dance makers Paul Taylor, Rudolf Nureyev, Martha Hill, and Pina Bausch were highlighted. The festival also showcased films dealing with movement not traditionally seen in Western dance, such as dancing with horses (“Hästdans på Hovdala”) and Bharatanatyam dance (“The Unseen Sequence”) (“Dance on Camera 2014”). Every year, the festival selects a number of short films that push screendance in an unconventional direction either thematically or technically. The festival, however, chooses not to provide direct historical context because it does not regularly screen works of Maya Deren and Loie Fuller, for example.

With many successful active years, the Dance on Camera festival became prestigious in the film festival circuit. The New York City location hosts public events that help form a local screendance community. Selected short films portray movement practices as a way to shape community life. The absence of awards encourages multiplicity in the films and frees the festival of formal restrictions. Most screenings are curated with societal, historical, or experimental links between the films. There are follow-up question-and-answer sessions with audience members, filmmakers, and other relevant participants to initiate dialogue in the theater.

Dance on Camera sells various pre-curated film sets as part of the Dance on Camera Tour program. This offers thought-out programming to tour organizations, museums, universities, and other educational institutions to help cultivate a larger audience (“Dance

on Camera 2014”). These pre-selected shorts and panel discussions promote screendance education. In the last few years, Dance on Camera initiated a program that provides an opportunity for high school students to investigate the relationship between dance, the camera, and the ways to link them in innovative ways. In this program, New York City high school students are invited to submit films and participate in workshops that guide them through the dance filmmaking process (“Capturing Motion NYC 2014”). Their films are then screened in a moderated competition. One film is selected to screen on the closing night of the Dance on Camera festival.

### **Dance Camera West**

Dance Camera West (DCW), the Los Angeles based non-profit organization, has been hosting the annual Dance Media Film Festival since 2001. DCW aims to bridge the gap between the “uniquely influential LA film community and the significant local dance populace” (“Dance Camera West: Dance Media Film Festival”). It also uses dance as a non-verbal art form “to reach across cultural, geographic, and socio-economic divides by making a special effort to engage a wide range of Los Angeles audiences of varying ethnicities and interest” (ibid). DCW provides both free and ticketed events in a wide range of venues (indoor and outdoor), showcasing a wide selection of films with a strong cultural commentary emphasis. In 2014, the DCW shorts winner, “Snap Into It,” used a voiceover soundtrack featuring a Langston Hughes poem coupled with an abstract compilation of American idioms to describe the concept of “cool” (Jilly Meyers). This voiceover, alongside the dance elements embodying the American cool aesthetics of jazz, resulted in compelling commentary about American culture in comparison to other cultures (for example the French culture). An overview of the winning videos from previous years reveals that DCW

focuses on combining traditional performance with screendance. The setting for both “Snap Into It” and the 2013 winner, “Ingenué,” was on a stage in a theater without any audience; yet, even with the lack of an audience, the presence of the theater still was dominant.

The effort of DCW to use screendance to communicate diversity and interconnectedness can be seen in DCW’s awards. There are four categories: Best Documentary, Best Short, Honorable Mention, and an Audience Choice Award. The focus for DCW is more on the audience and in creating diversity through screendance, and less on the filmmakers and the content of the films. In addition to the Dance Media Film Festival, an Emerging Artists competition for high school and college students allows them to compete only with other students, thus encouraging younger artists to create and submit works. The first and second place winners receive a monetary prize. Additionally, DCW works with the Los Angeles Unified School District’s Arts in Education program to provide dance media programming in local schools.

### **Utah Dance Film Festival**

The Utah Dance Film Festival is a new screendance festival in the circuit. Founded in 2014, there is little information available on plans for the future of the festival. It seems to be developing into a venue where both students and professionals are able to showcase work in a collaborative setting. By bringing together emerging and established filmmakers and choreographers, new screendance artists can make connections, build a network, and work in partnership. There is an emphasis on creating new work through collaboration (“Utah Dance Film Festival”).

Various educational workshops occur during the festival. The Utah Dance Film Festival is geared toward providing a place for students to have their work screened and where emerging artists can showcase their work and have their voices heard. Their website provides links to various useful resources like equipment rental and places to find other artists: dancers, editors, and cinematographers.

The Utah Dance Film Festival encourages collaboration also through its 24-hour film competition, "MOVE." The competition spans only one day, when filmmakers check-in and create for a full 24 hours ("Utah Dance Film Festival"). The resulting films are then screened at a local cafe the following day. All of the films must incorporate physical movement to show the human body and what it is capable of (ibid).

The Utah Dance Film Festival should not be confused with the bi-annual Screendance Festival and Workshops hosted by the University of Utah, which is geared specifically towards students internationally. The festival is directed by Ellen Bromberg (founding director of the Graduate Certificate in Screendance and a professor at the University of Utah's Modern Dance Department, as well as an established dance, media, and screendance artist), and features selected student films and films of visiting guest artists who also host workshops during the festival ("University of Utah International Screendance Festival").

### **San Francisco Dance Film Festival**

SFDF, established in 2010, has a stated goal "to bring dance to wider audiences and supports interdisciplinary collaboration among artists by providing opportunities for education and creative exchange" ("San Francisco Dance Film Festival"). The six



submission categories<sup>7</sup> are different from the other festivals, as it is not organized by artistic style but rather by length and film category. Short experimental films and more traditional interpretations of dance on camera are all pooled together based on length. SFDFFF also hosts a student competition. Several non-monetary awards are given each year: Best Documentary, Best Student Film, Best Cinematography, Best Editing, Best Screendance Short Over 10 Minutes, Best Screendance Short Up To 10 Minutes, Best Screendance Short Under 5 Minutes.

Although the submission categories are more general than at other film festivals, the programming at SFDFFF is more specific. Programs are created based on thematic context (such as love, redefining dance, and rhythm). Many of the short screendance works that are screened at the festival, however, are abstract in nature, and often take place in emptiness (simply blackness or whiteness surrounding the dancer) or an abandoned room, warehouse, or studio. For example, the SFDFFF 2014 shorts under 5 minutes winner, “Home Alone” by the Batsheva Ensemble, exposes an abandoned house void of everything but the dancers. In 2013, in the shorts under 5 minutes category, 8 out of the 19 submissions had a similar trend, whether it was dancing in seeming nothingness—like “White,” “Skizm,” “Lion- The Night and Day,” and “Written in the Margins”—or dancing in an empty space – like “The Mushroom Cloud,” “Dervishes,” “Drawing Blank,” and “Contact.” This short, experimental type of screendance, where the motivation is a singular idea portrayed through abstraction (as if on stage, but in emptiness), is a popular category for the SFDFFF.

During the five-day festival, events and receptions provide a platform for conversation about screendance. In addition to the screendance festival every autumn,

---

<sup>7</sup> Screendance under 5 minutes, screendance under 10 minutes, screendance over 10 minutes, documentary under 10 minutes, and documentary over 10 minutes, and live performance.

SFDFFs's annual Co-Laboratory is designed for local San Francisco professional filmmakers and choreographers to collaborate on a short screendance over the span of one week, showcased on the closing night of the festival. The intention is to create an atmosphere for professional artists "that challenges them to think collaboratively and explore possibilities for expression outside their fields, hopefully inspiring future creative relationships among local artists" ("San Francisco Dance Film Festival"). SFDFFF offers occasional workshops every few years, on skills that develop choreography for camera, pre-production, cinematography, and postproduction, to enhance the quality of work being created.

### **Dances Made to Order**

Dances Made to Order was a monthly screendance series exclusively available online and organized by various curators in cities around the United States. Each month, three artists were challenged to create a five-minute screendance in two weeks. The film's topic was chosen based on audience suggestions. When the films were completed, they were showcased online only. Various organizations and freelance curators from different cities curated this virtual festival.

Dance Made to Order was unique in its commission-based ticket sales: a portion of the profit went to the artists. Sixty-five percent of the sales<sup>8</sup> went to the artists who created work and ten percent went to the curators. Providing payment for the artists and curators demonstrated that their work was significant.

The Dances Made to Order Vimeo page illustrates the diversity of the works that were shown in the series. One can find a variety of dance and film styles. According to the their Facebook page, in the span of two and a half years, more than 130 artists from around

---

<sup>8</sup> Season tickets for the online festival were available for \$50 or \$10 for the month.

the world participated (“Dances Made to Order”). In addition to their monthly online series, Dances Made to Order coordinated the annual En Route Dance Film Festival to stream screendance to a global audience. Since the festival was exclusively online, the audience made their own program order individually, either watching all of them in sequence, or spreading it out over several days (“En Route Dance Film Festival”). It also enabled the audience to watch the films from any location and any device, which created a unique experience for each viewer. The seven-day festival was screened in 51 countries for an audience of approximately 1400 people in 2013 (“Dances Made to Order”). Online streaming expanded the audience number and virtual curation promoted global discussion and brought the international screendance world closer together.

### **Dance Screen**

Dance Screen, a screendance festival founded by the Austrian-based IMZ International Music + Media Centre in 1988, takes a different approach to film festivals. IMZ is a global networking platform dedicated to directing international production companies, TV broadcasting and distribution institutions, opera houses, cultural and educational institutions, festivals, and music labels (“About The IMZ”). It promotes and distributes music and dance within audiovisual media through events like its Dance Screen festival (ibid).

Dance Screen, an international screendance, video competition and festival, aims to create dialogue between filmmakers, dancers, choreographers, distributors, and broadcasters. The objective of the festival is to bring audiences in touch with dances from around the world (“San Francisco Dance Film Festival”). Dance Screen functions as a floating film festival, collaborating with existing film festivals and companies to present

selected works. In 2013,<sup>9</sup> IMZ co-presented their festival with the San Francisco Ballet and the San Francisco Film Society. It gives out jury awards for the best overall film, the best overall student film, and to a winner in each of the following categories: live performance relay, camera re-work, screendance, and documentary. The jury decides whether special mentions are awarded to individual achievements in choreography, directing, or performance (“Dance Screen”). The best overall film and the best student film receive cash prizes.

The 2013 winners in each category were films diverse in theme and style. All of the winning films (except for the documentary winner), exemplified the high production value appearance of mainstream cinema, with close ups and rapid cuts for added tension, the use of dollying (where the camera moves smoothly on a set of wheels), the use of digital video as opposed to film, and supplementary lighting to even out the images and add definition to the body. The contextual frameworks and the film styles of the winners have been diverse. There was an abstract short, free of narrative, exploring movement through two blurred bodies floating in the screen space. In comparison, the documentary that reflected on the creation of "Desh," a solo show choreographed by Akram Khan, was filmed in a fragmented, portrait-like style (“Dance Screen”). These two illustrate how wide the aesthetic spectrum can be at a festival.

---

<sup>9</sup> 2013 was the last festival that Dance Screen presented. The next festival will be in 2016 in cooperation with BalletBoyz.

## PRACTICES OF CURRENT PRACTITIONERS

This chapter discusses the thoughts and ideas of three major figures currently shaping screendance: Douglas Rosenberg, Greta Schoenberg, and Martha Curtis.

### **Douglas Rosenberg**

The material in this section is partly based on a phone interview with Douglas Rosenberg in April 2015. Rosenberg is internationally recognized as a pioneer in screendance both as a director and a theorist. He organized the first international symposium on screendance and is a founding editor of the *International Journal of Screendance*. His contributions to the field have been extensive, particularly looking at screendance theory and screendance curation. Rosenberg has seen the field grow since the 1970s in both technical maturity and in popularity.

The growth of screendance has two parallel narratives, one from the video art perspective (that developed into experimental screendance), and one from the film and television world (that developed from the entertainment branch of dance in film, such as Hollywood). In our conversation, Rosenberg pointed out that although most screendance festivals highlight non-entertainment films, it is in the music videos and Hollywood movies that the most advanced and modern technological designs are utilized.

Rosenberg believes that a curator's job is to take the wide view of a field of activity and to create an overarching thesis within the works. The art pieces the curator gathers could support or oppose the thesis, but it should take a clear stance. Rosenberg compares the job of a curator to that of an archeologist: by digging and finding, he/she makes an overarching statement about the findings. From his experience, he finds that screendance

curatorial practice has become narrower in focus more recently to almost entirely festival curation. Rosenberg notes this separation of screendance: the venues that showcase works have become so specific in its layout that it has become isolated from the rest of the dance and film world. He attributes this to the linear development of the form.

During the 1960s and 1970s, the start of the video era introduced new collaborations, such as that between video artist Nam Jun Paik and choreographer Merce Cunningham. In video dance, cinematic and choreographic elements were equally represented. The 1980s and 1990s showed a growth of experimental television. Programs such as *Alive from Off Center* publicly broadcast works by unusual artists in various disciplines, including screendance. The inclusion of screendance with other art forms expanded the audience and brought attention to the field. In the 2000s, festivals dedicated to screendance followed in Dance and Camera's footsteps. Although festival support raised popularity, screendance's development declined at the same time because the festival model became so overwhelmingly prevalent.

In my conversation with Rosenberg, he claimed that the festival exhibition format is so successful because of its accountability. Festivals today promise something and live up to their promise; expectations are fulfilled and there is little room for experimentation. Along the same lines, he believes that works focus too much on entertainment. Screendance visually looks a lot like dance with its limited display of diversity in body types and choreographic styles. Screendance has become homogenized to fulfill these expectations.

Rosenberg's reaction to finding an alternative way of curating screendance references back the historical lineage of collecting screendance. He talks about the need for

the unexpected, but maintains that it is not possible for it to happen at festivals. When approached with the suggestion of screening work in a gallery setting, he responded with interest, but emphasized the need for commitment. He observed that this type of curatorial practice (collecting work in a gallery) requires a higher level of trust from the audience because the audience is not fed what they should look at. It pushes the audience to question where screendance can be viewed.

### **Greta Schoenberg**

The material in this section is partly based on an email interview in April 2015 with Greta Schoenberg, Artistic Director of the San Francisco Dance Film Festival. Schoenberg says that it is a young and growing festival that is attempting to push traditional boundaries. Schoenberg entered the field in 2003 as a dancer exploring choreography and first presented a complete evening of her work in a local San Francisco gallery exhibition soon after. The first SFDFFF took place in 2010, with a full weekend of showcased works, lecture demonstrations on dance history, interactive media installations, feature documentaries, and screendance shorts. From the start, SFDFFF incorporated supplementary educational material and installation work. The festival is unique for connecting past and present works in order to build a knowledgeable audience.

While Rosenberg considers curation an act of archeology, Schoenberg compares it to the act of editing: “In the end, it is like editing a big (often unruly) film, seeing what has a place and what doesn’t fit... Still, it feels like an artistic process rather than a completely linear or logical one.” In contrast to Rosenberg who sees the curator as someone who creates a central meaning for the films, Schoenberg sees the organization of a screening as

a creation of a whole new piece where intuition overpowers reason. It is logical, then, that she prefers the festival curatorial model. She states that through festivals, she interacts with the audience in the same moment and space. She compares the position of the audience at a festival screening to the audience experience at a live dance concert. At the same time, she acknowledges the legitimacy of alternative modes of curating screendance: gallery setting, live stage projection, and online platforms. Although there can be room for experimentation, Schoenberg would like to see an improvement in both dance and filmmaking quality in the next few years of screendance.

### **Martha Curtis**

The material in this section is partly based on a phone interview with Martha Curtis<sup>10</sup> that provided another perspective of the current state of screendance. Her path to merging dance and film shaped her attitude towards screendance. Her first interactions with the field were through videodance. She recorded her own choreography as a way to remember and share her work. In collaboration with her now husband Bruce Berryhill, a video artist, the two aimed to heighten the quality and style of their recordings. As a result, Curtis still finds screendance in its ideal form to be an honest merger of the two fields (film/video and dance). She states that this equal merging is achieved through collaboration (ibid).

Curtis has a unique view on screendance curation, differing from the ideas of Rosenberg and Schoenberg. She sees screendance as a time-based medium, unlike the visual art shown in galleries. In a visual arts exhibition, the viewer has the liberty to come

---

<sup>10</sup> Martha Curtis is a teacher, choreographer, and video producer/director who served from 1996-2006 as Chair of Virginia Commonwealth University's Dance Program.



and go. At a screendance screening, the convention is to stay for the duration of the entire show. Curtis believes that screendance functions best when the audience is compelled to stay for the entirety of a curated program.

Like Schoenberg, Curtis looks for one or two supplementary themes to curate screendance festival sets. She is influenced by the spectators in her curatorial decisions and aims to find a balance between audience expectations and stretching their perception of screendance. Curtis accepts that “there is more than just pleasing an audience; there is the discussion of the values we are looking at and how they relate to the progression of the field;” She takes on a more didactic approach to the showing of screendance.

Curtis highlights the importance of proper training in both video and dance to avoid the creation of substandard work. Within the next few years, she, like Schoenberg, hopes to see more professionally produced work with greater quality in both cinematography and dance. Rosenberg’s ideas about the need for experimentation and risk contradict Curtis and Schoenberg. Curtis anticipates the growth of animation, motion capture, and 3D technologies to take a stance in the screendance world. These technological advancements are most likely to enter screendance from the Hollywood and music video branch due to the sheer cost of the necessary technological equipment.

## SCREENDANCE AND INTERACTIVE PERFORMANCE: PRESENTATION AND CURATION

This chapter proposes that new modes of presenting screendance will benefit the field's development and briefly describes *Unveil*, my interactive performance exhibition. The physical relocation of screendance from traditional theater context to *interactive performance exhibitions*<sup>11</sup> brings a new aspect to the curatorial practice of screendance. To foster screendance's continued evolution as a contemporary art form, the means of curation needs to shift accordingly, "exhibitions are the main means through which contemporary art is now [2007] mediated, experienced and historicized" (O'Neill, 15). The installation setting changes film from a presentational format to an interactive format: the audience has additional contexts embedded within the experience, such as a surrounding live performance, proximity to live dancers, and the option to participate in the performance. The audience has the freedom and control to see the film how they want to. They can choose to stay and watch the full film or merely glimpses of it. They can enter midway through, and leave after a few minutes. They can join in at the end and see the film end first then continue on to the beginning and the middle. Screening a film in this setting breaks the stigma of leaving a screening early or entering late. When curating screendance to be shown in an installation setting, the arc of the evening as a whole, the program order, and the experience of the viewing are usually less fixed than in a traditional festival setting. Both the experience of creating and watching the screendance is altered, evolving into a new practice of screendance for the performance space.

---

<sup>11</sup> Gallery-type presentation of various performance genres where the audience can enter the performance space and might be given opportunities to participate

Screendance in an interactive performance exhibition generates collaboration, opening both the performance field and the screendance field to new opportunities for interpretation. Both the live performance and the screendance performance becomes a situated act (embedded in social and cultural context) for a specific audience. The exclusion or inclusion of the performer from the social context of the audience, thus, depends on the given time and place, whether it is virtual or live. Sociologist Erving Goffman calls this a “staged performance,” saying, “[The] correctly staged and performed scene leads the audience to impute a self to a performed character, but this imputation—this self—is a product of a scene that comes off, and is not a cause of it” (252). That is to say, the scene and the setting very much define the performer’s opportunities to inhabit the character he/she is performing. Since there are essentially limitless possibilities for locations on film, the audience’s experience is greatly altered when watching screendance versus a dance performance: the audience is removed from the theater through the setting of the screendance, but still experiences the fully embodied movement.

Live performance, for both the performer and the audience, is connected to bodily experiences. Identity is marked by “bodily experiences and discursive forces of sex, race, class, age...and so on” (Langellier and Peterson, 157). Experiencing performance is inseparable from the life experiences inscribed in the body, memory, and emotions of the performers and the audiences. The proximity of the performer gives an opportunity for the audience to connect the performance to their own bodily experiences.

The relationship of the viewer to the screendance is altered when viewing in an installation setting as opposed to the theater setting. In many ways, the spectator has more control over his/her experience, and so, the experience becomes interactive and reactive to

each specific moment. There is more control over image scale, proximity of the viewer to the image and to other people, and the overall situation in which the experience is occurring. In an installation, each viewer has his/her own individual experience.

As in an art exhibition, the audience in an installation becomes a part of the performance space, so he/she is experiencing the work from the inside, not unseen and separated as in a theater. An audience member has power over his/her own experience, and also influence over the experience of others. A viewer might decide to stop and watch a screendance projection at an installation, which in turn may encourage other spectators to stop. Someone intrigued by small details on the screen might watch the projection up close, prompting others to do likewise.

In an installation, the audience can roam around within a uniquely selected or created space. Within that space, they are free to build their individual timing and phrasing for how they view the program, while confined to the influences of other audience members in the space. The viewing process in an installation and an exhibition, thus, becomes an individual experience within the context of a community: an individual experience created by each viewer for him/herself through decision-making. The effect of the community, the influence and proximity of groups of people is a stark contrast to the isolated theater seat experience.

While the exhibition gives more freedom and control to the audience, it also significantly alters the creation process for the artist and the performers. The director or curator can guide the audience, often unknowingly manipulated, through a space with lights, audio, and performers. Live dancers and their proximity to the audience may

become uncomfortable for or fascinating to the viewers. Sharing the space with both virtual and real dancers merges the real and the virtual dimensions.

On May 15 and 16, 2015, I presented *Unveil*, an interactive performance exhibition that situated dance performance and screendance within an installation setting. The Experimental Media Lab (xMPL) of the Claire Trevor School of the Arts at the University of California- Irvine was transformed into a gallery venue by dividing the space with the use of semitransparent curtains. Each of the 4 dance quadrants had different choreography presented simultaneously. Two of the quadrants had music associated with the choreography. There was one screendance being projected, which was visible from three of the four quadrants. The screendance explored the same theme as one of the live dance quadrants. This connection was emphasized by the use of video projection in the live dance concert that matched the visual content of the screendance (footage shot from the front windshield of a moving car).

In the middle of the concert, one dancer physically ripped down the curtains to open up the space, thus allowing the audience to realize that by that point, all quadrants and dancers were performing one cohesive piece of choreography. The audience, as a result of previously being spread out amongst the quadrants, was interspersed within the dancers. The choreography included displacing the audience with the use of large movement and physically ushering them new spots. Select audience members were invited to participate by learning one simple gesture from the choreography that they were about to see the dancers perform. Later, the audience was invited to dance in a community circle, dancers and audience members cheering on the dancers who entered the circle. The audience participation was then reduced by the continuation of the choreography.

The exhibition was set up in a linear fashion, exploring the relationship between the performers and the audience, aiming to lead to the revelation of each participant as a unique individual, minimizing the split between audience and performer. To highlight this idea, one dancer walked around looking at the audience as if they were the main attraction. The curtains were a metaphorical 4<sup>th</sup> wall of the concert. When they were ripped down, the focus of the dancers shifted from internal or in the world of each quadrant to external, inviting, and incorporating the audience in their environment. This was furthered by physical contact with the audience, and finally performing with the audience.

The closeness of live dance and screendance in the space inevitably heightens the tendency to compare and contrast the two fields. This type of analysis truly highlights the opportunities present in screendance that are not available in real life: zooming, instantaneous angle changes, cuts/cross dissolves and other edits, demonstrating distance through long shots, guiding the viewer's eyes with close ups and camera movement, demonstrating physically impossible things such as slow motion, sped up motion, stillness, and reverse movement. These technical elements are tools for creating compelling fixed works and help recognize where the virtual and live dancer spilt or merge in a hybrid performance exhibition. The proximity of the two fields also shows what real dancers in the space add to screendance (things that spectators who would go watch screendance at a festival would not usually experience): heightened energy, risk and danger of speed and closeness, human involvement of breath, eye contact, physicality, nearness/intimacy, sometimes even touch.

## CONCLUSION

In search of a screendance presentation model that provides an embodied experience, this thesis attempts to find a new way to show screendance works, which shifts away from the traditional festival model. Curation plays a pivotal role in the presentation of screendance and therefore, an understanding of the curatorial practice was of primary focus in this thesis. The curator constructs meaning through the collection of various works of art. He or she is bound closely to the presentation space (such as the screen in a film festival, or a gallery in a museum), functioning as a mediator between the exhibition, the content, and the public. In exhibitions, curators can connect collected works of art to cultural and community notions. In tandem with this idea, curation is directly connected to social and technological developments. Since screendance is so closely tied to technology, it is important to keep the practice of curation within screendance evolving with the technological and social changes that occur.

Following the analysis of screendance curatorial practice, this thesis examined what currently exists in screendance presentation to paint a picture of what is not yet being explored in the viewing experience. A survey of 6 screendance festivals provided a representative cross-section of the various models that exist in the United States. Interviews with Douglas Rosenberg, Great Schoenberg, and Martha Curtis fleshed out the ideas of what the current view of screendance curation is from within the screendance field. Their perspectives at once clarify and open up future plans and goals: further conversations between present and future artists can support continued experimentation in the field.

By connecting the gallery practice of curation to screendance, an alternative to the screendance festival model to showcase, experience, and interact with screendance works can develop. Showing work in what I call an *interactive performance exhibition* can push screendance viewing to become an embodied experience. I define *interactive performance exhibition* as a gallery-type presentation consisting of various performance genres where the audience can enter the performance space and might be given opportunities to participate. This thesis proposes that the exhibition model is a possible alternative for presenting screendance. In this model, viewing changes from a presentational to an interactive format, with amplified audience freedom and control. In this installation type viewing, each audience member has a uniquely individual experience. Additionally, the audience becomes a part of the performance space and the line distinguishing the audience from the performers is blurred through a dialogic experience. Presenting live dance and screendance in one performance space extends the world of the screendance to the stage, and merges the live dancers into the world of the screen.

In the theater, audience viewership is detached, distant, and seated in the dark. At festivals, programs often consist of a series of short films between 5-7 minutes in length, with a 16:9 aspect ratio, and a uniform size on a single screen. Showing screendance in an installation setting has the potential to break this habitual pattern and to provide some variety to filmmakers, curators, and audience members.

Expanding the practice of screendance to the exhibition setting can also widen audience demographics by entering the performance realm; spectators who attend a live performance can have a chance to engage with video art. Screendance festivals in traditional theaters provide a mainstream media experience. A curated exhibition setting



can inject the field with a renewed air of experimentation and variety, as it provides different styles of viewership (theater versus installation). The installation setting gives the spectator more power over how much or little of the screendance they want to see or interact with; it allows them to create their own order of events and in general to customize their experience.

The provision of variety within an exhibition, along with the satisfaction of decision-making during the performance can seem enticing for the audience. The interactive performance exhibition setting can become an important factor in benefiting the development of screendance presentation.

There can be more experimentation with interactive performance exhibitions. In future projects, I will highlight fully developed screendance works by creating a separate curtained off section for the screendance work. This might draw in audience members to watch the screendance for longer periods of time, while simultaneously bringing more fully developed and traditional screendance ideas to the exhibition setting. Since it is hard to compete with the power of live dancers, it would be interesting to try to project screendance with life-size dancers. Virtual dancers the same size as live dancers may put added weight on the screendance screening, more cohesively blending the screen and the real world. Additionally, I would like to extend the exhibition to the lobby, where I introduce the dancers' individualities and personalities through one minute screendance works which would be screened as a way for the audience to get to know the dancers before entering the exhibition. This, too, would provide an opportunity for a more traditional type of screendance viewing to exist in an installation space.

In the future of screendance, it is important to continue to showcase works in the screendance festival settings as it is already established as a successful model with a dedicated audience. However, in an effort to create an embodied viewing experience for screendance, increasing the number of hybrid showcases, such as interactive performance exhibitions, would provide a wider range of options for showcasing and viewing screendance works. In order to successfully showcase hybrid concerts, special attention needs to be paid to connecting the visual and performing arts models of curation to encompass both the qualities of video and live dance. Screendance does not need to exist exclusively in the interactive performance exhibition setting; however, this exhibition style would expand on the types of experiences that accompany screendance presentation.

## REFERENCES

- "About The IMZ." IMZ International Music Media Centre. n.d. Web. 5 Mar. 2015.  
<<http://www.imz.at/index.php?id=13>>.
- "Capturing Motion NYC 2014." *Capturing Motion NYC 2014*. n.d. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.  
<<http://www.filmlinc.com/films/on-sale/capturing-motion-nyc-2014>>.
- "Dance Camera West: Dance Media Film Festival." *Dance Camera West*. n.d. Web. 6 Mar. 2015. <<http://www.dancecamerawest.org/index.html>>.
- "Dance on Camera 2014." *Dance on Camera 2014*. n.d. Web. 8 Mar. 2015.  
<<http://www.filmlinc.com/films/series/dance-on-camera-2014>>.
- "Dance Screen." IMZ International Music Media Centre. n.d. Web. 8 Mar. 2015.  
<<http://www.dancescreen.com/index.php?id=306>>.
- "Dances Made to Order." *Facebook*. n.d. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.  
<<https://www.facebook.com/dancesmade>>.
- "Festivals Archive." *Dance Films Association*. 18 Feb. 2015. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.  
<<http://www.dancefilms.org/festivals-archive/>>.
- "San Francisco Dance Film Festival." *San Francisco Dance Film Festival*. n.d. Web. 6 Mar. 2015. <<http://www.sfdancefilmfest.org/>>.
- "University of Utah International Screendance Festival." *Facebook*. n.d. Web. 7 Mar. 2015.  
<[https://www.facebook.com/pages/University-of-Utah-International-Screendance-Festival/263143633817681?sk=timeline&ref=page\\_internal](https://www.facebook.com/pages/University-of-Utah-International-Screendance-Festival/263143633817681?sk=timeline&ref=page_internal)>.
- "Utah Dance Film Festival." *Utah Dance Film Festival*. n.d. Web. 7 Mar. 2015.  
<<http://utahdancefilmfestival.org>>

"En Route Dance Film Festival." *Facebook*. n.d. Web. 6 Mar. 2015.

<<https://www.facebook.com/events/510783425613088/>>.

Benedetti, Lorenzo. "Seth Siegelaub." *Cura* 17 June 2013. Web. 25 Apr. 2015.

<http://www.curamagazine.com/?p=9267>

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

--. "Thinking Deren." *International Journal of Screendance*. 2.1 (2012): 121-126. Web. 7 Apr.

2014. <<http://journals.library.wisc.edu/index.php/screendance/issue/view/46>>.

Curtis, Martha. Personal Interview. 26 Mar. 2015

Deren, Maya. "Maya Deren - A Study In Choreography For Camera." Online Video Clip.

YouTube. *YouTube*, 18 Apr. 2007. Web. 6 Apr. 2014.

<<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eKAOs400ReY>>

--. "Cinematography: The Creative Use of Reality." *Daedalus*. 89.1 (Winter 1960): 150-167.

Web. 5 Apr. 2014. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/20026556>>.

Dodds, Sherril. *Dance on Screen: Genres and Media from Hollywood to Experimental Art*.

Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave, 2001.

Goffman, Erving. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday, 1990.

Print.

Jacobs, Christopher P. "Development of the Cinema." *Guide to the Silent Years of American*

*Cinema*. Greenwood, 1999.

Jilly Meyers. "Snap Into It." *YouTube*. YouTube, 4 Feb. 2014. Web. 5 Mar. 2015.

<<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WnjUIVifITc>>.

Kappenberg, Claudia, and Douglas Rosenberg. "After Deren." *International Journal of Screendance*. 3.1 (Fall 2013): 1-5. Web. 5 Apr. 2014.

<<http://journals.library.wisc.edu/index.php/screendance/article/viewFile/673/684>>.

O'Neill, Paul. "The Curatorial Turn: From Practice to Discourse." *Issues in Curating Contemporary Art and Performance*. Ed. Judith Rugg and Michèle Sedgwick. Bristol, UK: Intellect, 2007. 13-28.

Langellier, Kristin and Eric E. Peterson. "Shifting Contexts in Personal Narrative Performance." *The SAGE Handbook of Performance Studies*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2006. 151-68.

Prensky, Marc. "Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants." *On the Horizon* 9.5 (2001): 1-6. MCB University Press. Web. 14 Dec. 2014.

<<http://www.marcprensky.com/writing/Prensky - Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants - Part1.pdf>>.

Rosenberg, Doug. "Curating the Practice/The Practice of Curation." *International Journal of Performance Art and Digital Media* 5.2&3 (2009): 75-87. *Taylor & Francis Online*.

Web. 15 Oct. 2014. <<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1386/padm.5.2-3.75/1?journalCode=rpdm20#.VK4ZaCvF-So>>

--. *Screendance: Inscribing the Ephemeral Image*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. Print.

--. Personal Interview. 7 Apr. 2015.

San Francisco Dance Film Festival. San Francisco Dance Film Festival Presents Dance Screen 2013 in Association with San Francisco Film Society and San Francisco Ballet. San Francisco Dance Film Festival, Sept. 2009. Web. 25 Apr. 2015. <<http://www.sfdancefilmfest.org/2014/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/SFDFP-Press-Release.pdf>>.

Schoenberg, Greta. Email Interview. 25-26 Mar. 2015.

Smoodin, Eric Loren, and Ann Martin, eds. *Hollywood Quarterly Film Culture in Postwar America, 1945-1957*. Berkeley: U of California, 2002.

Wells, Liz. "Curatorial Strategy as Critical Intervention: The Genesis of Facing East." *Issues in Curating Contemporary Art and Performance*. Ed. Judith Rugg and Michèle Sedgwick. Bristol, UK: Intellect, 2007. 29-43.

Wigro, Gitta. "Tutus and Bonfires: Screendance Curating and Social Theory." July 2008. Web. Oct. 15, 2014. <[http://dvpg.net/docs/Gitte\\_Wigro\\_June09.pdf](http://dvpg.net/docs/Gitte_Wigro_June09.pdf)>

## APPENDIX A

### ADDITIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

- "MAYADEREN.ORG." MAYADEREN.ORG. Ed. Moira Sullivan. The Maya Deren Forum, 21 Dec. 2013. Web. 14 Dec. 2014. <<http://www.mayaderen.org/>>.
- Beugnet, M., and E. Ezra. "A Portrait of the Twenty-first Century." *Screen* 50.1 (2009): 77-85. Oxford Journals. Oxford University Press. Web. 14 Dec. 2014. <<http://screen.oxfordjournals.org/content/50/1/77.full>>.
- Chameckilerner Dance. "Samba." YouTube. YouTube, 05 Oct. 2011. Web. 14 Dec. 2014. <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=m1meDdejc94>>.
- Deren, Maya, and Ron Rice. "Amateur Versus Professional." *Film Culture*. Ed. Jonas Mekas. Vol. 39. New York: Anthology Film Archives, 1965. 45-46.
- Cleghorn, Elinor. "Epilogue: After Deren." *International Journal of Screendance*. 3.1 (Fall 2013): 159-162. Web. 5 Apr. 2014. <<http://journals.library.wisc.edu/index.php/screendance/article/viewFile/673/684>>.
- Dixon, Wheeler W., and Gwendolyn Audrey Foster. *21st Century Hollywood Movies in the Era of Transformation*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers UP, 2011.
- Healey, Sue. "Dance Film: Capturing the Intangible." *Dance Forum*. 15.3 (Spring 2005): 10-11. Web. 6 Apr. 2014. <<http://search.proquest.com/docview/2377963?accountid=14509>>.
- Irons, Kingsley. "Dances Made to Order- The New York Edition." *Arrow Root Media*. Dance Films Association. Web. 7 Mar. 2015. <<http://dancefilms.arrowrootmedia.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/nycfebpressrelease2012.pdf>>.

Shim Sham, Cari Ann. "Two Seconds After Laughter Trailer." Vimeo. 17 July 2011. Web. 14 Dec. 2014. <<https://vimeo.com/26543017>>.TenduTV. "Essential Dance Film - There Is a Place." *YouTube*. YouTube, 15 Nov. 2012. Web. 8 Mar. 2015. <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DicA-jC1gS8>>.

Tranouli, Eleni. "About Maya Deren." *International Journal of Screendance*. 3.1 (Fall 2013): 128-132. Web. 5 Apr. 2014. <<http://journals.library.wisc.edu/index.php/screendance/article/viewFile/673/684>>.

"vertical integration." *Merriam-Webster.com*. Merriam-Webster, 2015. Web. 24 May 2015.



## APPENDIX B

### LIST OF FESTIVALS IN THE UNITED STATES THAT SHOW SCREENDANCE

Festival Name	City, State	Website
Cucalorus Film Festival	Wilmington, NC	<a href="http://www.cucalorus.org/">http://www.cucalorus.org/</a>
Dance Camera West	Los Angeles, CA	<a href="http://www.dancecamerawest.org/">http://www.dancecamerawest.org/</a>
Dance on Camera Festival	New York, NY	<a href="http://www.dancefilms.org/festivals-archive/">http://www.dancefilms.org/festivals-archive/</a> <a href="http://www.filmlinc.com/films/series/dance-on-camera-2015">http://www.filmlinc.com/films/series/dance-on-camera-2015</a>
International Screendance Festival at American Dance Festival	Durham, NC	<a href="http://www.americandancefestival.org/projects/isf/">http://www.americandancefestival.org/projects/isf/</a>
EMPAC Dance Movies	Troy, NY	<a href="http://empac.rpi.edu/events/2015/spring/dance-movies">http://empac.rpi.edu/events/2015/spring/dance-movies</a>
San Francisco Dance Film Festival	San Francisco, CA	<a href="http://www.sfdancefilmfest.org/">http://www.sfdancefilmfest.org/</a>
Sans Souci Festival of Dance Cinema	Boulder, Colorado	<a href="http://sanssoucifest.org/">http://sanssoucifest.org/</a>
Movies by Movers	Boone, NC	<a href="http://moviesbymovers.org/">http://moviesbymovers.org/</a>
caBiennial Symposium on Arts and Technology	New London, CT	<a href="http://www.conncoll.edu/academics/majors-departments-programs/majors-and-minors/ammerman-center-for-arts-and-technology/">http://www.conncoll.edu/academics/majors-departments-programs/majors-and-minors/ammerman-center-for-arts-and-technology/</a>
New Dance Cinema	New York, NY	<a href="http://www.newdancecinema.com/about/">http://www.newdancecinema.com/about/</a>
The Outlet Dance Film Festival	Hamilton, NJ	<a href="http://www.theoutletdanceproject.com/">http://www.theoutletdanceproject.com/</a>
Oklahoma Dance Film Festival	Tulsa, OK	<a href="http://www.okdancefilms.com/Oklahoma_Dance_Film_Festival/ABOUT.html">http://www.okdancefilms.com/Oklahoma_Dance_Film_Festival/ABOUT.html</a>
Third Coast Dance Film Festival	Reno, NV	<a href="https://thirdcoastdancefilmfestival.wordpress.com/">https://thirdcoastdancefilmfestival.wordpress.com/</a>
University of Utah International Dance for the Camera Festival	Salt Lake City, UT	<a href="http://dance.utah.edu/screendancefest/">http://dance.utah.edu/screendancefest/</a>
Topanga Film Festival	Topanga, CA	<a href="http://www.topangafilminstitute.com/#welcome">http://www.topangafilminstitute.com/#welcome</a>
Utah Dance Film Festival	Provo, UT	<a href="http://utahdancefilmfestival.org/">http://utahdancefilmfestival.org/</a>
Newport Beach Film Festival	Newport Beach, CA	<a href="http://www.newportbeachfilmfest.com/2015/festival/">http://www.newportbeachfilmfest.com/2015/festival/</a>
Athens International Film + Video Festival	Athens, OH	<a href="http://athensfilmfest.org/">http://athensfilmfest.org/</a>
Dance@30FPS –at Ohio State University Dance Annual Festival of Dance Film	Columbus, OH	<a href="https://dance.osu.edu/events/dance30fps">https://dance.osu.edu/events/dance30fps</a>

Tiny Dance Film Festival	San Francisco, CA	<a href="http://www.detourdance.com/TDFF">http://www.detourdance.com/TDFF</a>
ScreenDance Miami	Miami, FL	<a href="http://www.tigertail.org/event_screendance.html">http://www.tigertail.org/event_screendance.html</a>