Screendance for Adult Dancers: A Research Creation Project on Digital Dance

EMILY NOTON
University of Alberta

The purpose of this research creation project was to engage in and analyze a process of creating a digital contemporary dance composition. To do this, the researcher completed a choreographic process with a video component for a live performance at a theatre. Observational field notes were collected and analyzed through an interpretive lens to identify the unique challenges that arose during this process. The findings provide insights into the choreographic process, the challenges of navigating technology use within a limited budget, and the uncertainty inherent in a creative process. Furthermore, the project sought to provide an alternative to the weekly technique class in order to further engage adults and the audience in the art form.

Keywords: research creation, dance, choreographic process

As a dancer and an educator, I am deeply invested in the continued pursuit of physical fitness and health. Consequently, I have focused on teaching technique and choreography-based classes to teenagers and adults. Their enthusiasm contributes greatly to my sense of fulfillment from teaching and I often receive positive feedback following class when the dancers let me know that it made their week better, salvaged a bad day, or enabled them to sleep better. I have also considered new ways to increase adult engagement through alternatives to the traditional class experience. Thus, I began to think of how I might create a dance piece for performance with dancers of various levels, ages, and backgrounds. Providing a non-competitive, low-pressure performance opportunity or a chance to participate in a creative process can be a way to increase participation in physical activity (Kolb & Kalogeropoulou, 2012). I also considered the use of creative tools, such as a video component, to enhance the experience.

As its popularity grows, many scholars are optimistically suggesting that digital dance more effectively communicates narrative and emotion and thus, can increase audience understanding and connection to the art form (Birringer, 2013; Johnson, 2014;

Rosenberg, 2012). To investigate the possibilities for experimenting with technology in a choreographic process, I engaged in a research-creation project that explored the intersection of digital technology with dance performance. To describe my research process, I first present literature detailing different ways to approach the choreographic process as well as research on engaging in various forms of digital dance. I then discuss my method, the research-creation process, and provide an analysis of my results.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this section, I have included literature regarding the closed and open structured choreographic processes and dance technology interfaces that informed my research creation project.

Choreographic Process

The literature on the choreographic process centers around the challenge of composing original movement, a deeply personal process that can be difficult to articulate (Ashley & Nakamura, 2011; Bacon & Midgelow, 2011; Barr, 2005; Bloom & Chaplin 1982; Burrows, 2010; Delahunta, Clarke, & Barnard, 2012; Farrer, 2014; Kloppenburg, 2010; Morgenroth, 2006). I have, however, identified two broad categories—closed-structure and open-structure choreographic methods—that I now discuss in detail.

When engaging in a closed-structure, also called a hierarchical approach (Barr, 2005), the choreographers design and teach the movement and the dancers take direction only from them. Consequently, the choreographer controls the process to create the dance without direct input from the dancers (Ashley & Nakamura, 2011; Barr, 2005). An unspoken influence from the dancers in the form of embodiment and interpretation of the movement phrases is, nevertheless, acknowledged as each dancer may interpret a passage given by the choreographer differently (Barr, 2005). This choreographic process is valuable and is used in classical ballet choreography, remounting existing works (like *Sleeping Beauty*), and making commercial dance for amateur studios and the film/tv industries (Farrer, 2014). In the closed-structure process, the choreographer acts an external eye to then make decisions about small technical incongruities and flaws that affect the overall form of the piece (Farrer, 2014). These serve as valuable choreographic tools.

Open, or improvisational, structure, is often associated with creating contemporary stage dance in college dance programs (Ashley & Nakamura, 2011; Bannerman, 2010; Barr, 2005, Farrer, 2014), by independent contemporary

choreographers (Delahunta et al, 2010), or by contemporary companies doing stage work (Farrer, 2014). The major characteristics of open-structure choreographic process include: democratic collaboration and equality, post-control rehearsals, choreographic thinking tools, and the importance of the dancer (Ashley & Nakamura, 2011; Bannerman, 2010; Barr, 2005; Delahunta et al, 2010; Kloppenburg, 2012). The democratic collaboration and equality in the open-structure choreographic process is often discussed in connection with college dance programs where students collaborate to generate choreography (Ashley & Nakamura, 2011; Bannerman, 2010; Barr, 2005). In these programs, students, as part of their training, are instructed to experiment and work together (Ashley & Nakamura, 2011; Barr, 2005). In such an open-structure process, the choreographers do not control the rehearsals similar to the closed-structure (Kloppenburg, 2012, p.189), but relinquish some of the creative process to the dancers who often use improvisation to provide movement vocabulary 'in the moment' (Delahunta et al, 2010; Kloppenburg, 2012). Kloppenburgh (2012) labels this approach 'post-control,' because improvised movement and the sense of not being in control guides the generation of new movement vocabulary for both the dancers and the choreographers (Kloppenburg, 2012). As this approach is often used to allow the dancers to react in real time, the resulting movement can be seen as more genuine than preplanned choreography (Blom & Chaplin, 1982). Kloppenburg (2012) adds that in the most radical of these post-control moments, choreographers start to discourage the use of codified technique because they see it as restricting creativity. However, following the open-structure process, the choreographer may select movement phrases for a set choreography that are then reproducible or may juggle the chronological order of the phrases (Kloppenburg, 2012). Despite the process being open, many choreographers use distinct tools in their open-structure process. For example, improvisational tasks, physicality, or narratives can generate movement in open-structure rehearsals (Delahunta et al., 2010).

The research illustrates, however, that choreographic strategies are continually being disrupted in the dance creation process. As a result, the hierarchical boundaries between choreographers and dancers are also constantly shifting (Barr, 2005; Delahunta et al., 2010; Farrer, 2014). In my research, I chose to use a mixed process (Farrer, 2014) due to the advantage of embracing a fluid approach to composition. While the choreographic process was a large part of my project, I also wanted to experiment with including a dance technology interface in my creation process.

Dance Technology Interfaces

As advances in digital technology are now integral parts of our daily experiences, they are also increasingly integrated into the choreographic process (Johnson, 2014). The

relationship between dance and technology is complex as it includes many modalities from film to media to interactive sensors (Birringer, 2013; Johnson, 2014; Rosenberg, 2012). While there are several terms that describe the relationship between technology and dance performance, I have grouped them into two broad categories: digital dance environments and screendance. I discuss both in detail before defining my approach to using technology in my research creation piece.

Interactive digital environments include multimedia, electronic, or computer-assisted interfaces as artistic strategies to engage audiences in dialogue (Birringer, 2004). Use of these strategies requires the relocation of some of the composition process into a laboratory-like setting (Birringer, 2004). Derived digital technologies refer to the capture and projection of movement phrases, most often during live performance (Mullis, 2013). For example, the dancers' movements are videotaped and cast on a screen behind them during a performance. Immersive technologies allow dancers to participate in virtual reality environments where they can use data gloves, goggles, and bodysuits to send motion data to a computer (Mullis, 2013). Dancer-camera dyad is a digital dance technique that utilizes the dancer as a controller of a camera (Markula & Nikolai, 2018). As a hand-held digital camera is carried by the dancer, the camera becomes a co-improviser and therefore, a participant in the dance creation (Markula & Nikolai, 2018). These digital dance environments can engage an audience in various new ways but are typically expensive to acquire (Birringer, 2004; Reid, 2001). Screendance, nevertheless, is a more commonly available technology interface for choreographers.

Rosenberg (2012) uses screendance as a broad term that encompasses all work that includes dance and film/video as well as other screen-based configurations. Within screendance genres, I distinguish between dancefilm and dance for camera. While Brannigan (2011) defines dancefilm as choreography adjusted to film, Kloetzel (2015) characterizes dance for camera as dance designed to be filmed, not merely captured from a studio or stage performance. The category of screendance can also refer to a dance composition created as a stand-alone piece to be presented with a projected video component (Rosenberg, 2012). I was interested in creating a piece with a video component, mainly for my own experimentation but also as a way to help the audience connect to my planned narrative. This was my first attempt at incorporating video in a dance creation process and I was eager to explore the possibilities. Following Rosenberg (2012), I situate my project in the category of screendance as it resulted in a performance on a proscenium stage theatre where I used the cyclorama for my video projections.

RESEARCH METHODS

I engaged in my dance creation project through an interpretive lens that enabled me to understand my own subjective experiences and their meanings while acknowledging that there can be other meanings deriving from the same project (Markula & Silk, 2011). My experiences, although unique to me, contribute to our understanding of what it can mean to engage technology in a dance making project. I directly participated in the research-creation process as a choreographer and observer-researcher.

I also entered this research aware of my distinctive background as a dancer/choreographer. I acknowledged that this background shaped the way I designed my choreographic process in this research project. Consequently, my position as a researcher through this process was influenced by my understanding of dance within a Western concert tradition. Hence, my values and assumptions about what constitutes 'good' dance came from my technical background rooted in the codified steps of ballet. In my research, I aimed to be reflexive about my preference for dancers with technical proficiency and ballet foundations and to be aware of the type of movement vocabulary I offered them during my choreographic process.

Methods

Research-creation is marked by experimentation where the theoretical, technical, and creative aspects of a research project are pursued simultaneously (Chapman & Sawchuk, 2012). I engaged specifically in what Chapman and Sawchuk (2012) label as *Creation as Research*. This type of research creation refers to a 'creation process' from which the research emerges. Although the 'results' include the creative production, research is the end goal of the project.

In my project, I choreographed original material for a nine-minute contemporary dance piece and compiled video footage to be included in two performances in a theatre. The piece was divided in three distinct sections with different contemporary dance styles, costumes, music, lights, and video footage corresponding to the shift in sections. As each section showed a scenario in which the dancers reacted to being in a crowd, I named the piece 'Crowds.' The video footage ran throughout the whole piece and was cast on the cyclorama of the stage. I edited the music using the Garageband software after purchasing the tracks through Apple Music.

To reflect my experiences during the process, I collected field notes that I analyzed through a 5-step technique (Markula & Silk, 2011; Sparkes, 2014).

Participants

I used a purposeful criterion-based sampling technique (Markula & Silk, 2011) to obtain local recreational dancers 19+ years old with a ballet skill level greater than beginner. My final sample included 11 dancers. I also enlisted the help of two volunteer video collaborators with whom I had worked previously. When I refer to people involved in my research creation process, I use pseudonyms.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of my reflective field notes resulted in four themes: the planning process, uncertainty, the choreographic process, and the technological interface.

Planning Process

My choreographic process was significantly influenced by the rehearsal spaces we used. It was difficult to find affordable studio space that was suitable for a large group of adults. I managed to locate two rehearsal studios that were different in size and thus, impacted the choreographic process in several ways. One of the studios was with R-C, a local dance studio that was located in an area where most of my dancers lived. I disliked creating work in this studio due to its spatial dimensions and lack of natural light. "The studios are so shallow," I wrote in my notes, "I have no perspective on the piece." I couldn't sit at the front of the studio (downstage, as if I were an audience member) and see all the dancers in one glance. This impacted my ability to make creative decisions, as I was unable to picture what the piece would look like on a stage. I started to look forward to rehearsals held at the university studio.

I had access to a second studio at the university that had windows and better equipment. Since it was a large studio, it was my preferred location for the rehearsals. Occasionally, when I knew the university studio was available but no reply to my booking request had been received, we held rehearsal regardless. Although we were prepared to share the space with others, it was preferable not to do so. I noted that "I think morale was high and everyone was in a good mood because of the gorgeous space." The dancers were happy to be in the university studio instead of at the R-C studio. Not only was the university studio bigger and with better light, it also contained equipment that was valuable to the choreographic process. This was a frequent topic in my notes: "Having a great studio with resources to rehearse in has vastly helped the creation process!...[t]he whiteboard came in very handy for this because we could plot it out on the board and refer back to it while dancing." Another wonderful resource was the sound system that

included a 50-foot audio cord. This enabled me to walk around the space with my laptop remaining plugged in.

In addition to securing rehearsal space, planning the content of rehearsals and managing the logistics of the creation process was very time consuming. Typically, I underestimated how much time these tasks would take. I had to manage my collaborators' time contributions, make a timeline for delivery of the rehearsal content, edit my music track, collect fees from the dancers, and project forward after each rehearsal how many more hours of rehearsal would be necessary to finish the piece in time for the show. Early on in the process I was trying to be sensitive to my dancers' time constraints by keeping rehearsals as short as possible. However, it might have been more effective to plan longer rehearsals (2.5 hours instead of 1.5 to 2.0 hours) to work with dancers with varied technical abilities and dance backgrounds. I mentioned the following in my notes: "by the time everyone filters in and gets warmed up, we lose a fair amount of time. I always try to minimize rehearsal time for everyone but perhaps sticking with a strict 2 or 2.5-hour rehearsal would be best. With our current approach, rehearsal ends up being closer to 1.5 hours." It was difficult to make these time predictions, because I had to explain movement phrases in different ways for different pods of the dancers (i.e., simply verbalizing technical movements to the advanced dancers, but demonstrating and practicing them with the beginner dancers). This took extra time and I noted that "we lose valuable rehearsal time due to working on technique that I shouldn't have to be correcting them on." In my situation, I was aware that "I have taken on extra tasks to help out the dancers and prevent them from having to leave the project." Taking on extra tasks obviously increased my workload, but I didn't want any of the dancers to drop out of the process.

Uncertainty

Many components of the choreographic process led to a fair amount of uncertainty because they were largely out of my control. I was navigating the unpredictable nature of the sign-up process for the dancers to join the project, and injury, absences, and lateness at rehearsals. While I aimed to think ahead and plan for absences and the possibility of injuries, these issues were unforeseeable and continued to occur.

Before the rehearsals could begin, the dancers had to agree to a few terms in order to participate such as the payment of fees, schedule, general time commitment, and production week at the theatre. Not knowing how many dancers would be able to participate in the process created a lot of uncertainty for me. Although the process was open to an initially large pool of dancers, there were significant barriers to participation. For example, because I didn't have any outside funding for this project, I had to charge a fee to cover the rental of studios for rehearsal and the honorarium paid to me for my

time managing the project. In addition, the show produced by the university dance performance group with which my piece was performed, was an expensive performance. Hence, the university group had to charge a membership fee from every performer. I wrote in my notes that:

we discussed the fees that they [the rest of the dancers] have to pay and this was difficult because it is a barrier for some people. Having to pay the university group membership is logical and we want to support them but it is another hurdle because some of our dancers aren't on campus regularly.

Consequently, there was a combination of financial and organizational barriers.

Scheduling the rehearsals around other time commitments added to the uncertainty I felt as a choreographer. Before participating, the dancers had to check their schedules to see if the time commitment was possible for them. After I had assembled a prospective group of dancers, I spent a lot of time trying to accommodate everyone's schedule requests in order to maximize participation. Finally, production week was a serious commitment as it included a technical rehearsal, dress rehearsal, and two shows. Some dancers had to decline, because they were not available during the production week.

Enthusiasm, or the lack thereof, was a topic I wrote about frequently. It became apparent that enthusiasm and energy in the studio during rehearsals was dependent on the people present (or not present). Injury, absences, and lateness were the main causes for a lack of energy during rehearsals:

this rehearsal was disappointing, as many dancers were missing and/or late. The traffic was really bad, so that didn't help. I was disappointed nonetheless and I think some frustration started to grow for the dancers who were always there on time.

Here I also refer to the slight tension that developed amongst the dancers. Although attendance at rehearsals was always mandatory, there were absences and lateness that could not be avoided. This caused some strife. The level of excitement in the room diminished when people were late or absent.

In addition to the dancers' energy, I noticed that mine changed when there were fewer people in the room: I was less enthusiastic and I worked slower. For example, I observed that "[i]nitially I was quite excited for rehearsal but then less so when I only had 5-6 people there." One of the main causes of absences was injuries. For example, I wrote about the complications resulting from one of the absences:

She [one of the dancers] was sick enough and in so much pain that she had to go to the hospital ER. Another dancer drove her there. This meant that one dancer was late and the other didn't make it to rehearsal. I think this may have dampened people's enthusiasm and shed some negative energy over the whole thing.

The news that one of the dancers ended up hospitalized was shocking and there was an intense emotional reaction. This resulted in a difficult rehearsal in which a lot of concentration was required to stay upbeat, enthusiastic, and productive. Another dancer negotiated a serious injury:

Dancer A did not show up and I later found out that she had torn something in her supraspinatus and biceps. She wasn't sure how she did this...I was disappointed to find out that she will not be able to perform.

My disappointment stemmed from the fact that she had put a lot of hard work in, and that I had already finalized all my spacing and formations to include this dancer. There were other minor injuries that affected our rehearsals: Dancer R slipped on ice and hurt her foot, Dancer V broke her foot, and Dancer B and some others were sick. I wrote:

Absences have hindered the rehearsal process to some extent because we do spend a fair amount of time on review every rehearsal (20 minutes?). However, there is no way I could create a piece if I made 100% attendance a policy. Adults typically can't do this.

The uncertainty created by potential absences had further consequences for me:

I am constantly thinking about when I can fill people in and get the soloists to learn the new choreography for the birdsong transition. This is occupying an increased amount of space in my brain, but I wouldn't say that I am stressed yet.

In order not to waste precious rehearsal time I often took extra time to work one-on-one with a dancer.

Choreographic Process

Throughout the rehearsal period I alternated between using an open- and a closed-structured choreographic process, eventually settling into what I call a mixed process. Working with the dancers' diverse training backgrounds and experience levels

was challenging and therefore, I needed a process that would be effective for composition. It had to be accessible for the beginner dancers, but also challenging enough for the more experienced dancers. Moreover, having the ability to use an open, democratic approach in certain rehearsals saved me time, because I didn't have to choreograph each dancer's part when they had to react to the video projection during performance. In my field notes, I often discussed the planning process necessary for implementation of these approaches, as well as the scenarios that occurred when I switched between the two approaches.

Initially, I used a closed process for teaching the movement phrases that I set, because I couldn't predict how quickly the dancers would be able to collaborate and/or learn my technical movement phrases. I then shifted to an open process to generate characters for the dancers as a part of the narrative. In this structured improvisation approach, I followed Morgenroth (2006) to employ a task to guide the improvisation process. The dancers were directed to walk across the stage in their character (e.g., abrasive, or nervous, or shy) while reacting to being in close proximity to each other (crowded). Furthermore, there was a corresponding scene cast on the cyclorama of crowded urban sidewalks that they could glance at during this task-based improvisation.

My approach was closest to Kloppenburg's (2012) strategy that relies strongly on the use of improvisation in the rehearsal process. In this open-structure process, the rehearsal was driven by the dancers' use of improvisation in the moment. During most of the improvised segment, the dancers struggled with the open-structure process. I reflected:

I was trying to figure out how I could make everyone's dance phrases look cleaner, confident, more intentional and have them be more invested in the movement. They had been looking kind of haphazard; maybe due to the improvisational quality of the two phrases. I am realizing that while my dancers can execute set choreography fairly well, they are not comfortable being creative and improvising on the spot. I think I need to continue setting choreography quite meticulously.

I guessed correctly that my less experienced dancers would feel uncomfortable and potentially be unable to contribute in an open process rehearsal. It was only near the end of the rehearsal process that the dancers were able to confidently make some of these creative decisions on their own. Towards the end of the rehearsal process, I also used, following Burrows (2010), a more hierarchical approach to quickly teach set phrases to then cut and paste them together. When I pivoted to a closed-structure process, several indicators suggested that the dancers felt more comfortable with me in charge giving them choreography. We tended to move faster, the dancers were more excited, and were

more engaged in these rehearsals. They asked more questions, requested to repeat the sequence again, wanted to know counts, and exact details of technical positions. I reflected:

We accomplished all of these goals and it seemed like the dancers really had fun with the faster, choreographed section, which made me relieved and quite happy. I was hoping that this part would be fun for them. They seemed to really get into it.

The success of these rehearsals and the dancers' reactions could indicate that they deferred to my expertise and enjoyed having a clear leader who gave instruction.

Technological Interface: The Video Footage

As I engaged in a digital dance creation process, the video footage became an integral part of the performance. It was designed to help the dancers with the open-structure choreographic process, to support the narrative of the piece, and to increase audience engagement. I obtained the footage from open-source stock footage available on the internet. It was then cut and edited to be displayed synchronously with the choreography.

One of my video collaborators was very helpful in troubleshooting flaws in the narrative of the piece and then explaining how to mitigate them with changes to the video footage. Removed from the rehearsal process, he could see linear problems of the narrative (e.g., a transition scene not corresponding to a mood change). This was a huge help for me. I continued to reflect that

we can use stock footage for some sections and then might film a dancer and put it in slow motion for Part A; juxtapose the pedestrian crowds with a solo dancer moving freely by themselves. We discussed using video of scenery for the transition between Part A and Part B (frozen prairie, or a forest) and the dancers would come across the stage one at a time (not all of them). And then they will start setting their positions on stage for Part B.

Eventually, the three of us decided to use a combination of original footage and stock footage. Because my collaborators were not a part of the original choreographic process, they were not as familiar with the content, narrative, and goals for the piece. We usually ended up discussing these things for 30-60 minutes after rehearsal on Friday nights. Sometimes there were late nights, but their help, nevertheless, was valuable and resulted in a higher quality process. Having three people watching rehearsal and collaborating on

the video was central to the process. The dancers would do a run through of the piece, while the three of us watched. My collaborators then made edits to the video track while I worked with the dancers. We then repeated this process a few more times until we did a final review of the new footage and discussed further changes. Once we had a full draft of the video footage, work began on editing it for quality, narrative continuity, and timing to match the dancers.

In this phase, my process closely resembled post-control and democratic open-structure process for choreography (Delahunta et al., 2010; Kloppenburg, 2012). I surrendered some control to my video collaborators and dancers by democratizing the rehearsal and discussions. This resulted in a final product that was arrived at in collaboration. In these moments, I had reduced the hierarchy in our group and replaced it with equal opportunities and voices characterizing the open-structure choreographic process (Ashley & Nakamura, 2011).

Out of all the challenges related to video creation and technological interfaces, the production week was the most stressful, probably because I had the least amount of control over it. The performance venue had its own technical crew that did not always provide clear answers to my questions and my uncertainty and stress mounted. Getting this information was vital as it influenced my choices for the lighting design and therefore, impacted the choreography as well. In addition, it was the stage manager who was going to call the three components (video, music, lighting) during the show and I was concerned if these were coordinated correctly.

Another challenge was projecting the video footage and coordinating the dancers' movements during the performance as the dancers had never seen a full projection casted behind them. Our first time doing the piece with the video was at the technical rehearsal. I was concerned that it might not go smoothly and reflected:

the only other stressful thing at this point was the video footage, because we hadn't run the dance with the dancers being able to see the footage yet. This would happen for the first time at tech rehearsal and then dress rehearsal. I am looking forward to seeing the piece with the video running simultaneously.

All of these technical challenges during the creative process leading to a performance are not uncommon and can be solved with funding and/or human capital (Birringer, 2004; Mullis, 2013). However, the reality with my project, and many dance creation projects, is that sufficient funding was not available and hence, there were limitations on access to a perfect technological set-up (Birringer, 2004; Mullis, 2013).

CONCLUSION

In my research creation project, I collaborated with adult dancers to experiment with different types of choreographic processes and the integration of a technological component. As with many dance creation projects, I encountered challenges of which stress from uncertainty was a substantial one. Absences, injuries, and a lack of information from the technical crew at the theatre were hard to predict and thus, created the largest amount of uncertainty and stress for me. It was also difficult to preplan the creation process and its outcome. I was not surprised by this as it is common during open-structure choreographic processes to relinquish control during rehearsals and resist the urge to script an end product in advance (Delahunta et al., 2010; Kloppenburg, 2012). Other challenges were predicting the amount of time it took to complete the composition and anticipating all of the additional tasks that came with managing a creative process. Last, I reflected, following Kloppenburg (2012), that working with others in a creative scenario is fluid and difficult to control. My findings highlighted that the dancers preferred more direction from me, the choreographer, as opposed to using an improvisational process that required their input. Consequently, I suggested that dancers with varying experience levels can benefit most from a mixed choreographic process during which they receive direction from the choreographer while also learning how to generate material through structured improvisation.

The technological component of video footage added complexity to the research creation process and I reflected that help, in the form of my video collaborators, was useful and increased the quality of the end product. Given more time and a larger budget I likely would have hired assistants for the production of the video component and/or taken the time to train myself on the subject.

Despite several challenges, I was happy with the outcome and the overall process. Informally, I received positive feedback from the audience about the dual approach: the video component added clarity to the narrative and held their attention throughout the whole piece. Additionally, the dancers were excited to interact with a video while on stage. The video, they reflected, created a more robust on-stage atmosphere adding to the lights and music. I was also pleased that my dancers interacted fluidly with each other and were excited to learn new choreography in rehearsals. Furthermore, they were supportive of my choreographic experimentation when working on new sections of the piece.

My project was driven by my belief that dance, both as an art form and a physical pursuit, enriches people's lives. While I analyzed my own experiences as a choreographer, a deeper look at my participants' experiences would have lent the study more depth. I drew some loose conclusions from their behaviour, reactions, and comments about my

choreographic process, but participant observation and interviews would have allowed for a deeper analysis. Furthermore, I was interested in audience engagement in dance and thus, interviews or focus groups would highlight their perceptions of performances that integrate technology. I can only hope that this may be one of the paths by which dance can continue to gain traction with audiences and further engage adults to be active.

I finished writing this capping project during the COVID-19 shutdown, where performing arts of all forms have largely been halted. Many companies and individuals have turned to video as a way to disseminate their material making the use of technological interfaces widespread. The digital component of my choreography work, thus, further made my project relevant to the future of dance as a performing art.

REFERENCES

- Ashley, L., & Nakamura, A. (2011). Finding a balance: Dance making on a bachelor of dance programme in New Zealand. *Research in Dance Education*, 12(3), 221–236.
- Bacon, J. M., & Midgelow, V. L. (2011). Articulating choreographic practices, locating the field: An introduction. *Choreographic Practices*, 1(1), 3–19.
- Bannerman, H. (2010). Choreographers' reflexive writing – A very special practice. *Forum for Modern Language Studies*, 46(4), 474–487.
- Barr, S. (2005). Reconstructing contemporary dance. *Journal of Dance Education*, 5(1), 5–10.
- Birringer, J. (2004). Dance and interactivity. *Dance Research Journal*, 35/36(2/1), 88–111.
- Birringer, J. (2013). What score? Pre-choreography and post-choreography. *International Journal of Performance Arts & Digital Media*, 9(1), 7–13.
- Blom, L. A., & Chaplin, L. T. (1982). *The intimate act of choreography*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Brannigan, E. (2011). *Dancefilm: Choreography and the moving image*. New York, NY: University of Oxford Press.
- Burrows, J. (2010). *A choreographer's handbook*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Chapman, O., & Sawchuk, K. (2012). Research-Creation: Intervention, analysis and “family resemblances.” *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 37(1), 5–26.
- Clarke, G., Cramer, F., & Müller, G. (2010). ‘Minding motion’. In I. Diehl & F. Lampert (Eds.), *Dance Techniques 2010* (pp. 199–229). Leipzig: Henschel Verlag.
- DeLahunta, S., Clarke, G., & Barnard, P. (2012). A conversation about choreographic thinking tools. *Journal of Dance & Somatic Practices*, 3(1/2), 243–259.
- Farrer, R. (2014). The creative dancer. *Research in Dance Education*, 15(1), 95–104.

- Fortin, S. (2018). Tomorrow's dance and health partnership: The need for a holistic view. *Research in Dance Education*, 19(2), 152-166.
- Johnson, P. (2014). Science, performance and transformation: Performance for a 'scientific' age? *International Journal of Performance Arts & Digital Media*, 10(2), 130-142.
- Kim, N. (2016). Identifying choreographic knowledge: Choreographic techne and phronesis. *Research in Dance Education*, 17(1), 42-59.
- Kloetzel, M. (2015). Bodies in place: Location as collaborator in dance film. *International Journal of Performance Arts & Digital Media*, 11(1), 18-41.
- Kloppenber, A. (2010). Improvisation in process: "Post-Control" choreography. *Dance Chronicle*, 33(2), 180-207.
- Kolb, A., & Kalogeropoulou, S. (2012). In defence of ballet: Women, agency and the philosophy of pleasure. *Dance Research: The Journal of the Society for Dance Research*, 30(2), 107-125.
- Lehoux, N. (2013). Dance literacy and digital media: Negotiating past, present and future representations of movement. *International Journal of Performance Arts & Digital Media*, 9(1), 153-174.
- Markula, P. & Silk, M. (2011). *Qualitative research for physical culture*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave
- Mayan, M (2009). *Essentials of qualitative inquiry*. London, UK: Routledge. ProQuest EbookCentral.
- McPherson, K. (2006). *Making video dance : A step by step guide to creating dance for the screen*. Abingdon, UK and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Morgenroth, J. (2006). Contemporary choreographers as models for teaching composition. *Journal of Dance Education*, 6(1), 19-24.
- Mullis, E. (2013). Dance, interactive technology, and the device paradigm. *Dance Research Journal*, 45(3), 111-123.
- Mullis, E. (2016). Motion and representation: The language of human movement. *Dance Research Journal*, 48(2), 121-124.
- Preston, H. (2006). Choreographing the frame: A Critical investigation into how dance for the camera extends the conceptual and artistic boundaries of dance. *Research in Dance Education*, 7(1), 75-87.
- Reid, D. (2001). *Cutting choreography: Re-defining dance on screen*. Unpublished master thesis. Deakin University, Australia.
- Rosenberg, D. (2012). *Screendance: Inscribing the ephemeral image*. New York, NY: University of Oxford Press.
- Sparkes, A. C. (2014). *Qualitative research methods in sport, exercise and health: From process to product*. New York, NY: Routledge.