Registration Form (basic details)

1a. Details of the main applicant

Name:	Prof.dr. T.A.C. (Tamara) Witschge
Affiliation:	University of Groningen, Media and Journalism Studies

1b. Co-applicant
Dr. Yael de Haan, Applied Professor, Crossmedia Journalism Hogeschool Utrecht

1c. Institutional environment
X   WO and HBO together

1d. Title of the research proposal
Documenting complexity: Intersections of Documentary, Activism and Technological Innovation

1e. Summary

This project researches how documentary makers employ innovative technologies to capture and represent complexity in cities and empower citizens to act. Documentary makers, particularly those with artistic *and* activist motivations, are crucial creative actors when researching societal complexity. Since cinema's invention in the 1880s, filmmakers question reality, truth and representation. These questions have become even more pressing given society's complexity and new technologies allowing the recording and presenting of the world in highly specific and omnipresent ways: Virtual and Augmented Reality (VR/AR), 360°-cameras, drones, action-cams, and 24/7 live-streams.

How do innovative technologies impact the artistic and activist strategies of documentary makers?

To answer this question, we aim to:
- Research aims, motivations and everyday work practices of makers who pioneer technological advances in documentary production, using interviews and visual methodologies;
- Gain a maker's perspective by co-producing a documentary around Richard Sennett's 'Open City,' employing VR/AR, drones and 360°-cameras;
- Provide insight into the changing and complex role of knowledge producers, by theorising the impact of innovative recording and presentation technologies on the role of makers in complex societies.

Employing a multi-methodological approach, in which we combine visual methods, interviews and action research, we gain a complex, bottom-up understanding of how new and more established makers use technology for their activist and artistic aims. With consortium members, we co-produce a documentary using innovative technologies. This provides a unique maker's perspective on the challenges, hopes and desires that makers experience when documenting and impacting increasingly complex societal issues within cities.

1f. Main field of research

Code	Main field of research
	Music, theatre, performing arts and media
	Sub-disciplines
32.80.00	Media Studies
32.60.00	Film, photography and audio-visual media
32.70.00	Journalism and mass communications

1g. Public summary

Ook dát kan met documentaires
Hoe zien documentairemakers hun maatschappelijke rol en hoe gebruiken zij nieuwe opname- en presentatietechnologieën als *Virtual Reality*, 360°-camera's, en drones? Samen met partners doen we actie-onderzoek: we coproduceren een documentaire over de open stad. We onderzoeken de

veranderende werkwijzen en rol van documentairemakers in het representeren van complexe maatschappelijke issues.

English public summary
What societal role do documentary makers strive for, and how do they employ new recording and presentation technologies like Virtual Reality, 360-degree cameras and drones? Together with our partners, we conduct action research: we co-produce a documentary about the open city. We research changing working methods in how documentary makers represent complex societal issues.

Research proposal

2a. Research programme

X Artistic research is part of the proposal

1. Focus and research aim

This project researches how documentary makers employ technology to capture and respond to societal challenges within cities and empower citizens to act. Documentary makers, particularly those with artistic *and* activist motivations, are crucial creative actors when researching societal complexity. Since the invention of cinema in the 1880s, filmmakers raise questions around reality, truth and representation. These questions have become even more pressing given society's complexity and new technologies allowing recording of the world in highly specific ways: Virtual and Augmented Reality (VR/AR), 360°-cameras, drones, action-cams, and 24/7 live-streams.

We ask how documentary makers strategically employ technology to capture the perceived complexity within cities and empower citizens to act on the basis of these creative productions. That is, what is the role of technological innovation within the production processes of contemporary documentary, and how exactly does the use of such new means affect issues around representation, immersion, authorship and advocacy?

Since the invention of cinema in the 1880s, filmmakers challenge notions of reality, truth and representation (Bruno, 2018). This is relevant now more than ever. Societal complexities raise fundamental questions about the sustained relevance of documentation and the types of knowledge that citizens need to operate in these societies. In a time described as 'postnormal', where 'facts are uncertain, values in dispute, stakes high and decisions urgent' (Funtowicz and Ravetz, cited in Brüggemann, 2017: 58), and where journalism plays a new role, it is crucial to consider how and with what aims knowledge is produced.

A growing group of documentary makers use technologies that record and present the world in an innovative manner: *Delicate Balance*[1], for example, uses drone footage to challenge the ecological implications of gentrification. In 2015, Spanish activists demonstrated against the Citizen Safety Law, not by marching past Madrid's parliament building, but via a projection of a holographic video. *Pre-Crime*[2] subverts the meaning of live-stream footage gathered from security cameras. The availability of innovative forms of making (AR/VR, 360°-cameras, drone/action-cam recordings and live-streams) seem to suggest visual anthropologist Margaret Mead's (1975: 9) prediction that now life can be documented 'without the intervention of the filmmaker or ethnographer and without the continuous self-consciousness of those who are to be observed'. However, we lack insight into the motivations behind the employment of these technologies.

These technologies go beyond simplistic means to 'record everything and everywhere', and raise new ethical questions: can activism be combined with notions of 'truth' and representation? Who can be said to control the self-moving AI camera Obsbot Tail; what are the ethical consequences of documenting a socio-politically laden subject via 360-degree cameras that record everything in its proximity in ultra-high definition; and what does it mean to livestream via consumer-friendly underwater drones? We propose this research to gain deeper insight into the significations of such technologies for makers and how they aspire to impact citizens and their urban context via these innovative technological means.

To gain such understanding we propose to:
- Research aims, motivations and everyday work practices of makers who pioneer technological advances in documentary production through interviews and visual methodologies;

---

[1] Garcia Lopez, G. (2016). *Delicate Balance*.
[2] Heeder, M. and Hielscher, M. (2017). *Pre-Crime*.

- Gain a maker's perspective by co-producing a documentary around Richard Sennett's understanding of 'the open city' by employing VR/AR, drones and 360°-cameras;
- Theorise the impact of innovative recording and presentation technologies on the role of makers in complex societies.

Within this project we will focus in particular on cities, as a space in which societal complexity comes to the fore in exemplary ways. There is a stark contrast between how we want cities to be and the cities we actually live in. Urbanisation is one of the most complex issues facing urban societies, affecting citizens in their everyday lives. As renowned sociologist Richard Sennett states: 'The cities everyone wants to live in should be clean and safe, possess efficient public services, be supported by a dynamic economy, provide cultural stimulation, and also do their best to heal society's divisions of race, class, gender and ethnicity. These are not the cities we live in' (Sennett, 2018, online). Instead, cities are complex, unpredictable and uncontrollable (Alvarez, 2015).

Documentary makers, particularly those with artistic *and* activist motivations, are crucial creative actors when researching complexity in society. Whilst documenting 'reality' via the medium, they grapple with challenging societal issues: How do we discern a city's complexity, and urbanisation more specifically? Who are the involved actors, and, relatedly, who have the skills to fathom the implications of ever-expanding and constantly changing cityscapes?

The ultimate aim is to research how documentary makers use of innovative recording and visualising technologies impact the artistic and activist strategies of documentary makers.

2. Academic contributions

In this project we provide a makers' perspective on the role of technology and activism in documentary making. We theorise the way in which new media technologies allow to address societal challenges and complexity, and the role that documentary makers using these technologies aim to play in public knowledge production. In doing so, this project addresses three prominent academic and societal challenges and questions:

a) How can we do justice to the complex role that technology plays in media making practices, avoiding both human and technological determinism?
b) How can we understand documentary makers' roles in a media and knowledge production landscape characterised by increasing hybridity?
c) How do we identify and classify the variety of makers that engage in documentary to capture the complexity of the city and related societal challenges?

Below we discuss these prominent academic challenges and discuss how our proposed practice-based approach allows us to address these.

a) Researching technology in media making through the lens of imagined affordances.
Whilst it is clear that technology is a major factor in media making, we still lack an adequate way of addressing technology's role without overemphasizing or simplifying it. Indeed, though 'terms such as "materiality", "sociomateriality" and "sociotechnical systems" are slowly replacing the simple concern with technology' (De Maeyer, quoted in Wagemans and Witschge, forthcoming), there is still a lack of a vocabulary and understanding that does justice to the complex role that technology plays (Witschge and Harbers, 2018: 105). Much of the current research either focuses on the makers or on technology (Siegelbaum and Thomas, 2016), but it has proven difficult to address the role of technology in a more comprehensive, holistic manner. Indeed, as Westlund and Lewis (2014: 12) observe, there is 'a relatively narrow approach when defining and studying those agents involved in shaping media innovations.'

So, whilst it is clear that technology is relevant for new creative documentary practices, especially when documenting the complexity of urbanisation and the city at large, we know little about the motives for employing these tools in documentary making, e.g. is technology used as an activist tool for emancipation and empowerment within complex public debates? We research technology use from the perspective of 'imagined affordances' (Nagy and Neff, 2015). As such, we ask how users, in our case documentary makers, perceive and use technologies: what do they consider technologies can do for them, how do they use it and with which aims? Such an understanding of technology use in its context allows us a rich understanding of how these technologies are employed to document and/or effect change in cities.

This, we argue, is vital in understanding the complex and ever-changing impact of technology on documentary, precisely because it is an experiential craft that exists by the grace of (non)human to (non)human relationships *and* the interactions between maker, technology and environment.

b) Understanding media making beyond binary distinctions
There are long-used binary oppositions to understand media practices: objective vs subjective; fiction vs non-fiction; art vs activism. Current documentary making practices challenge this by moving beyond traditional conceptualisations of the filmic genre (Sniadecki, 2014). That is, the societal role of filmmakers can be fluid, complex and contradictory, insofar as these makers might aspire to be both investigative journalists and activists, combining formal and aesthetic aims with technological means and essayistic forms of storytelling (Rascaroli, 2017).

We highlight how increasingly makers are important but also contested knowledge producers, as many do not simply aim to mirror society, but rather *move* society (Gyldensted, 2015). The increasingly participatory nature of documentary has further strengthened hope that they function as 'democratic empowerment of noninstitutional voices' (Reestorff, 2015: 12). Documentary making is exceptionally positioned to address complex issues at play in modern-day cities and take on the role of activists as well as artistic makers (Rosario and Alvarez, 2018).

However, previous classification of media practices would try to understand these practices in either/or terms. Here, we argue that acknowledging that media making process transcend the binary distinctions we have previously used to theorise and classify them, means building new research approaches, theories and vocabularies to do full justice to this. If we acknowledge that the media field is characterised by hybridity, 'contradictions', and messiness (Witschge et al., 2018) how do we research this in a way that we do justice to it rather than explain away such phenomena intrinsic to the media landscape?

We propose that it is through the complexity that we can understand the practices: New media actors marry values and aims that were previously deemed contradictory, whether it is engaged and detached forms of storytelling, aims of activism with telling the truth and blurring the genres of fiction and non-fiction (see also Wagemans, Witschge and Harbers, 2018).

c) Identifying and classifying the variety of makers who engage in documentary making
There are a number of issues that make it hard to identify makers in current documentary production. First, authorship is contested in documentary making, as becomes clear from recent activist films such as Visual anthropologist Minh-ha's *Forgetting Vietnam*[3] and Peck's *I Am Not Your Negro*.[4] Who is an author and who is the subject are important yet challenging questions, particularly when we consider that even the genre of documentary is challenged –when 'truth' and 'reality' are contested terms, what is it that is being produced in documentary (Minh-ha, 1990: 76)?

Second, even if we accept for now documentary as a specific genre, the question who counts as maker and who as subject and/or audience, is complicated further given the participatory practices that have increasingly included non-professionals in production. Though there may be an increased tendency to move towards co-creation and co-production with the affordability of handycams and other recording devices, as pointed out by Reestorff (2015), this does not necessarily lead to co-*authorship*. Participants and subjects are 'rarely involved in the architecture of the project and the film remains embedded in hierarchical structures' (ibid: 12) and the question remains: who is a maker and with what aims do they make?

Third, and as indicated above, the increasing role of technology in media production has led in documentary making as in other media genres, the growing importance of technologists in the making process (Lewis and Zamith 2017). We need to consider which other actors, beside those traditionally deemed as makers are part of the making process (see also Becker's concept of 'art worlds', further developed for journalism by Lewis and Zamith (2017) to identify the role of technologists in the making process).

Last, considering the genre of documentary to include not only the 'product' but also its context, whether they are audiences, festivals, critics, or other, for our research it becomes crucial to include those that play a role in the advocacy process of documentary. For instance, in the US-based *Tales from Planet Earth* festival, sponsors didn't 'buy' a credit' 'in the festival trailer, a logo on a swag bag and an ad in the catalogue', but rather, their 'contributions and commitment went directly to the engagement projects and community partner organisations' (Iordanova and Torchin, 2012: 255). Human rights, environmental activism, feminism and other forms of advocacy have merged with documentary and festivals, so as to decidedly address issues of representation and global power relations, including how political activism may be implicated in these artistic and cinematic systems of knowledge (Tascon, 2015).

---

[3] Minh-Ha, T. (2016). *Forgetting Vietnam*.
[4] Peck, R. (2017). *I am not your negro*.

In this context, the question becomes, how do we theorise who is a 'maker'? How do we distinguish between different types of roles, hierarchies, aesthetic and activist contributions and when do we consider technological actors as part of the creative process?

Practice-based research
We argue that these specific challenges ask for a bottom-up, immersive and innovative research approach. To address the complexity of documentary practices – doing justice to the complex role of technology, contrasting values and aims, and the variety of makers involved – we propose a practice-based research approach and incorporate a maker's perspective through action research. As highlighted in Ahva (2017) and in Witschge and Harbers (2018), practice-theoretical approaches allow us to engage the complexity of the current media landscape. Furthermore, action research – co-producing a documentary – enables us to not only observe, but also *experience* the making process as it is ongoing (see Wagemans and Witschge, forthcoming).

The particular practice-based research approach developed in this project has three specific features to address the above-mentioned challenges:
- *Researching making processes within their context*: By immersing ourselves in the process, we can research the role of material and human actors as the making process is ongoing. This means we move beyond separating different actors *a priori*, and can adopt an iterative research strategy that follows actions as they transpire. As such we are able to provide a 'holistic inquiry dealing with highly dynamic and complex research settings' (Grubenmann, 2016: 171);
- *Experiential approach allowing for non-binary understanding of practices*: Understanding documentary making as complex and as featuring inconsistencies and dissonances, we break away from previous either/or distinctions that have long governed our understanding of making processes. In doing so, we can provide an understanding of the making process that does better justice to the 'realities' of makers' experiences (Witschge et al, 2018). The experientialist approach (how do makers experience making?) provides insights into 'feelings, aesthetic experiences [and] moral practices' [Lakoff and Johnson, quoted Witschge et al, 2018: 6), which not always easily fit these binary distinctions and require more fluid research strategies.
- *Bottom-up understanding of the making process:* We do not define *a priori* who is a maker of documentary and who is not. Rather, we let the process and people speak for themselves. Including 'practitioners as partners in the work of knowledge creation' (Bradbury-Huang, cited in Wagemans and Witschge, forthcoming), we draw in the knowledge of those involved in the making process. Complementing the action research, we use visual methods and interviews to gain this bottom-up perspective: We ask participants to draw network maps to indicate who (and which technologies) are involved in the making of documentaries, and ask them to take pictures of moments in the making process that are relevant to understand the role of activism and technology.

Such practice-based, action research approach does not only allow us to adequately address the academic challenges, but also, and most importantly, allow us to address them in a way that provides *actionable knowledge*. Researching the making process using an immersive, experiential and bottom-up approach brings about insights that are most relevant for makers: we co-produce the knowledge gained, design the research approach together with makers and other stakeholders, and adopt our knowledge utilisation activities to allow for maximum relevance and impact in the field (see below). By including questions around the making process, the output makers create, the role of other stakeholders in the process and the societal impact of documentary, we address the three themes of the Smart Culture call: Product, Sector and Society.

We build on our previous experiences from researching through making, drawing on action research projects 'Entrepreneurship at Work: Analysing practice, labour, and creativity in journalism' (NWO VIDI project, PI: Witschge, 276-45-003) and 'Exploring Journalism's Limits: Enacting and theorising the boundaries of the journalistic field' (NWO Smart Culture project, PI: Witschge, 314-99-205).

3. Research plan

Our research revolves around three key phases:
a) Identifying and classifying actors, technological use, aims and outcomes through interviews;
b) Analysing the role of technology and activism in documentary through co-producing and disseminating a documentary;
c) Analysis and academic deliverables (for public outreach see knowledge utilisation).
a) Identifying and classifying actors, technological use, and aims (February – July 2020)
To gain insight into the variety of actors involved in documentary, the aims with which they use technology and the values driving such practices, we conduct interviews with a wide range of people in the field, and identify and classify their practices and products. Adopting the view that there are many involved in the 'world of documentary making' (see Lewis and Zamith, 2017), in the first stage we focus on identifying and interviewing actors, their practices and understandings of technology and their output.

During the first six months of our research, next to a thorough literature review, our aim is to identify relevant interviewees within educational contexts, with the help of our industry partners. This includes documentary students, makers involved in teaching, programme directors, and recent graduates. Moreover, Sound and Vision have close connections with IDFA's Doclab, which not only showcases interactive and innovative documentaries, but also has its own academy and masterclasses. We will conduct interviews during Doclab Academy events, summer schools and workshops. These interviews will take place in between December 2019 and August 2020.

We combine interviews with visual elicitation methods. We ask participants in our research to take pictures in their work, in particular those that indicate the use of technology and those indicative of how they view documentary's role in society (photo elicitation). We also ask participants to draw network maps in which they indicate who is involved in the making of documentaries. Semi-structured interviews are used to follow up these visual data collection methods, to ask more about participants views on the role and use of technology and the societal role of documentary.

Research participants are:
- *Makers* (20): To identify new actors (growth hackers, animators, scholars, activist collectives) and to do justice to the flux of documentary-making, we move beyond the well-outlined definition of the involved actors and agencies and work towards a new typology of those involved in the genre's production processes.
- *Educational actors* (10): As these are important actors who are involved in teaching ethical stances and skills are taught, we ask how non-traditional recording devices feature in educational programmes, such as at Filmacademie, Leiden's MSc Visual Ethnography, and workshops/master classes at festivals (Movies That Matter, IFFR, IDFA).
- *Technological actors* (10): To fully comprehend the complexity of technological innovation, we interview a range of technological actors that we identify via the makers and educational actors, specifically those developing and working with new recording devices.
- *Actors involved in dissemination/distribution*: In order to gauge the intended impact of documentary making, we interview curators, distributors, festival directors, broadcaster and critics.

b) Co-production of documentary (August 2020 – July 2021)
One of the main features of this research is the co-production of a documentary. We argue that such action research allows for a makers' perspective needed to address the academic challenges mentioned above. Being (bodily) *involved* in the activity of image-making, we not simply observe, but rather *experience* the working processes of documentary making. As anthropologist and filmmaker Sarah Pink (2015) claims, *making* documentaries is arguably the most insightful method to rethink and understand the process of documentary making as such. It will allow us to work in close collaboration with makers, producers, technologists and other stakeholders, and thus provide us with unique insights into the process as it is ongoing (Wagemans and Witschge, forthcoming).

This co-production will be contextualised by drawing upon the archive of our partner Sound and Vision, to analyse and categorise the use of the specified recording technologies (using a quantitative methodology tracing this for a sub-sample of the past 20 years). We will also do a qualitative analysis made in the last 10 years to activist aims present within documentaries available in the archive. We do so in order to fully comprehend the historical background of new technologies and advocacy in documentary making.

The envisaged postdoc researcher, Sander Hölsgens,[5] is a trained visual anthropologist and will –in collaboration with our partners at WORM, MU, Sound and Vision, Verspers and Journalism Lab at Hogeschool Utrecht (see below for all partners)– co-produce a documentary around Richard Sennett's understanding of 'the open city.' He will record his experiences using a research diary, and field notes, complemented with interviews with the others involved in the documentary making. We will specifically focus on the experiences using recording technologies such as VR/AR, drones and 360°-cameras and question the various perceptions on documentary's role in society.

To gain insight into the specific makers' challenges in using technologies to record and respond to societal complexity, we focus the documentary on the concept of the open city. Cities, Sennett (2018) argues, are structured around and flourish because of chance events, mutating forms, unpredictable designs, fragmented communities, and spontaneous interactions. Documentary making arguably allows for meaningful representations of and interventions in these environments. Indeed, many makers focus on the city as an object of documentation, from Vertov's *Man with a Movie Camera* (1929) to Haemmerli's *I am Gentrification* (2018).

---

[5] Sander Hölsgens has been centrally involved in the co-developing of this research proposal, precisely due to his knowledge of and experience in documentary making.

The theme of the open city has been personally chosen by the envisaged maker, Sander Hölsgens, allowing him to consider the role of his own activist and artistic aims in making. Simultaneously, it is a theme that holds relevance for several of the consortium members. It is, for instance, currently one of the thematic foci of our consortium partner WORM and allows us to speak more broadly to issues of makers' impact and challenges in the creative industry. VersPers has longer considered issues around urbanisation and MU is looking to expand a more structural research programme on this theme.

As one of the central methods, this action research approach is aimed at complementing the interview and visual elicitation research, to incorporate, test and reflect on working methods, technologies and ethical stances. That is, action research allows us to gain deeper insights into the state, place, nature, role implications of documentary making (Banks and Zeitlyn, 2015). Ultimately, we seek to gain insight into the kind of knowledge that is embodied and enacted by practitioners and how technology is integrated into their creative practices to address and impact the complexity of cities.

c)   Analysis and academic deliverables (for public output see knowledge utilisation)
Next to extensive knowledge utilisation activities, this project seeks to contribute to the academic understanding of documentary making in the current digital age, where we deem the output relevant beyond the field of documentary and spilling over into the domain of media innovation, other non-fiction public knowledge production (such as journalism) and broader questions around action and artistic research.

4. Composition research team

Three core strengths of our proposed research team are:
   a)   Collaboration between researchers of HBO (University of Applied Sciences) and WO (University);
   b)   Actionable research insights through artistic research;
   c)   Building new and strengthening collaborations.

a)   Collaboration between researchers of HBO (University of Applied Sciences) and WO (University)
This research project brings together researchers from HBO and WO and advances their combined research experience from the action research project 'Exploring Journalism's Limits' (funded in the NWO Smart Culture call 2017; December 2017-November 2019). This project is run by Tamara Witschge; Sander Hölsgens (Media and Journalism Studies, University of Groningen) and Saskia de Wildt (Research Centre Crossmedia Journalism, University of Applied Sciences Utrecht, supervised by Yael de Haan) are working as embedded researchers in the media production team located at VersPers.

Our proposed research builds upon our experiences of the difficulties and strengths of action research by further developing the ties between these research institutes. The joint approach combines academic and practice-based research, bringing forth academic insight as well as more applicable knowledge.

b)   Actionable research insights through artistic research
In this project, research consortium partners feature prominently as co-producers, not only of the artistic output, but also of the research insights. They have been actively involved in the development of this research proposal, and will feature centrally in the research design. We will organise monthly meetings, and address key elements of the research design, research analysis, output production and knowledge utilisation activities. Via this approach we address the aim of this Smart Culture's call to gain a maker's perspective. We undertake academic challenges (see above) whilst engaging issues that are directly relevant to makers, their output, the sector and society at large.

c)   Building new and strengthening existing collaborations
This project decidedly builds on existing collaborations, so as to benefit from our experiences in the two-year embedded research project 'Exploring Journalism's Limits' (VersPers, University of Applied Sciences Utrecht, University of Groningen). Simultaneously, we bring in new partners that provide a unique combination of expertise (see below). It allows us to expand research relevance and build a network that is able to maximise outreach: the partners have extensive networks amongst makers, which is crucial to the data collection, as well as amongst other stakeholders. These new and existing collaborations provide the foundation for relevant and rigorous societal impact.

Table 1: Timetable and work plan for requested personnel

Activity	Staff| Month	1	3	5	7	9	11	13	15	17	19	21	23
1 PROJECT DESIGN													
1a. Literature review	RS	▪	▪										
1b. Research design	All	▪	▪										
2 DATA COLLECTION													
2a. Visual methods (photo elicitation)	RS		▪	▪									
2b. Visual methods (networks maps)	RS		▪	▪									
2c. Qualitative interviews	RS			▪	▪								
3 PRODUCTION DOCUMENTARY													
3a. Filming / Fieldwork during filming	SH, SdW, TL						▪	▪	▪				
3b. Film editing	SH, SdW, TL								▪	▪	▪		
4 ANALYSIS / ACADEMIC OUTPUT													
4a. Conference papers	RS							▪				▪	
4b. Journal articles	RS								▪				▪
5 KNOWLEDGE UTILISATION (see below for information)													
5a. Production of documentary	See # 3				▪		▪			▪			
5b. Knowledge exchange events	RS, MB				▪		▪						
5c. White paper for makers	RS, MB											▪	
5d. Exposition at MU	RS, AS								▪				
5e. Summer school for makers	RS, GvH										▪		
5f. Workshops for educators	RS, GvH						▪						
5g. Session at *Field Recording Fest.*	RS, MB												▪
5h. Screenings co-produced doc.	All												▪
6 PROJECT MANAGEMENT													
6a. Supervision project	TW	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪
6b. Coaching postdoc	TW	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪
6c. Contacts with industry	RS	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪
6d. Managing media contacts	TW, YdH	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪
6e. Administrative tasks	TW	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪
6f. Research coordination	SH	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪	▪

* RS = Research Staff; MB = Maarten Brinkerink; YdH = Yael de Haan; GvH = Geesje van Haren SH = Sander Hölsgens; TL = Tim Leyendekker;AS = Angelique Spaninks; SdW = Saskia de Wildt; TW = Tamara Witschge (see next section for consortium)

Key deliverables academic output
Conference papers: The research participants will each seek to produce and present one (co-authored) conference paper per project year.
Journal articles: Envisaged output is three articles in peer-reviewed journals: one co-authored by YdH, SH, SdW, STW; one co-authored by SH and TW; one single-authored by SH.

2b. Knowledge utilisation/valorisation/relevance to the theme of the call for proposals

1) Network creation
One of the unique contributions of this project is that we set up a solid network between both small and more established organisations, this allows for maximum cross-fertilization and strengthening of contacts, ideas and impact that these organisations each individually already establish. Given that they each address their own publics, the network will allow for a fruitful combining of the different reach and spread of their activities and allow for solidifying of their individual activities. MU and WORM are both institutes that advance the impact of art in the public space, VersPers is a training ground and publishing house for documentary journalism, Sound and Vision is an archival and research institute. Each of these organisations, as well as the University and University of Applied Sciences applicants, have a wide network that will be actively engaged throughout this project (see below).

In order to facilitate the network building, we will set up monthly meetings with the partners involved and collaborate closely with them for the activities mentioned under 2 below.

2) Knowledge utilisation and implementation of project results
To ensure maximum knowledge utilisation and integration of the project results in the field, we organise the following concrete activities:

a) With WORM, production of documentary (see above);
b) With Sound and Vision, knowledge exchange sessions at various events / institutions (IDFA Doc Lab, NFF Interactive, Dag van de Persvrijheid, IFFR Pro, Media Future Week);
c) With Sound and Vision, White Paper that advises makers adopting new technologies and storytelling formats about how to sustainably archive their work;
d) Two-week exposition at MU Eindhoven with film-installation, invited speakers (makers and researchers);
e) With VersPers, workshops for educational organisations on the role of technology and activism;
f) With VersPers, a ten-day summer school for documentary for educators, aspiring documentary makers and media platforms;
g) Session on activism and technology in documentary making at WORM's *Field Recordings Festival*;
h) Screenings of co-produced documentary with Q&A with makers / researchers at various festivals.

Roadmap Smart Culture
We research the social relevance of documentary making, focusing on makers, technology and their impact. We consider the changes in resulting output (product), education, collaborations and production and dissemination settings (sector), and societal impact (society).

3) Societal importance
This project is highly relevant to society given documentary makers' roles in producing public knowledge in complex societies. We provide insight into how activism and innovative visualising and recording technologies affect documentary making. Our solid and diverse knowledge utilisation strategies, experience in action research and dissemination and the combined network allow for a maximum impact of the research insights. We address key issues of the Smart Culture Roadmap, particularly addressing the NWA theme of 'Art: Research and innovation in the 21st century' and the 'Topsector creative industry' theme the 'Human touch': we research the role that technological advances play in artistic processes, and how artistic and activist aims are combined in meaning making processes in our societies.

2e. Literature references

1. Ahva, L. (2017). Practice Theory for Journalism Studies: Operationalizing the concept of practice for the study of participation. In: *Journalism Studies*, 18(12), 1523-1541.

2. Alvarez, I. (2015). *Documenting Cityscapes: Urban Change in Contemporary NonFiction Film*. New York: Columbia University Press.

3. Banks, M, and Zeitlyn, D (2015). *Visual Methods in Social Research*. London: Sage.

4. Bruno, G. (2018). *Atlas of Emotion: Journeys in Art, Architecture, and Film*. London: Verso Books.

5. Brüggemann, Michael (2017): Post-normal journalism. In Berglez, P., Olausson, U. and Ots, M. (eds), *What is Sustainable Journalism?* New York: Peter Lang.

6. Grubenmann, S (2016). Action Research: Collaborative research for the improvement of digital journalism practice. In: *Digital Journalism*, *4*(1), 160-176.

7. Gyldensted, C (2015). *From Mirrors to Movers: Five Elements of Constructive Journalism*. Online; Createspace Independent Publishing Platform.

8. Iordanova, D and Torchin, L (2012). *Film Festivals and Activism*. St Andrews: St Andrews Film Studies Press.

9. Lewis, SC, and Zamith, R (2017). On the Worlds of Journalism. In PJ Boczkowski and CW Anderson (eds.), *Remaking the News: Essays on the Future of Journalism Scholarship in the Digital Age*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

10. Mead, M. (1975). Visual anthropology in a discipline of words. In *Principles of Visual Anthropology*, Paul Hockings (ed.). The Hague: Mouton.

11. Minh-ha, T (1990). Documentary Is/Not a Name. *October, 52*, 76-98.

12. Nagy, P and Neff, G (2015). Imagined Affordance: Reconstructing a Keyword for Communication Theory. *Social Media + Society 1*(2).

13. Pink, S (2015). *Doing Sensory Ethnography*. Second edition. Los Angeles: Sage.

14. Rascaroli, L (2017). *How the Essay Film Thinks*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

15. Reestorff, CM (2015). Unruly artivism and the participatory documentary ecology of The Act of Killing, *Studies in Documentary Film*, *9*(1), 10-27.

16. Rosario, F and Alvarez, I (eds.) (2018). *New Approaches to Cinematic Space*. London: Routledge.

17. Sennett, R (2018). The Open City. Available online via: https://www.richardsennett.com/site/senn/UploadedResources/The%20Open%20City.pdf.

18. Siegelbaum S, Thomas RJ (2016) Putting the Work (back) into Newswork. *Journalism Practice*. 2016;*10*(3), 387-404.

19. Sniadecki, JP (2014). Chaiqian/Demolition: Reflections on Media Practices. In: *Visual Anthropology Review*, *30*(1), 23-37.

20. Tascon, S (2015). *Human Rights Film Festivals: Activism in Context*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

21. Wagemans, A and Witschge, T (2019, forthcoming). Experiencing convergence: Examining digital innovation in journalism through action research.

22. Westlund O and Lewis SC (2014) Agents of media innovations: Actors, actants, and audiences. *The Journal of Media Innovations*, *1*(2), 10-35.

23. Witschge T and Harbers F (2018) Journalism as practice. In: Vos, T (eds) *Handbooks of Communication Science: Journalism*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, pp.101-119.

24. Witschge T, Anderson CW, Domingo D and Hermida A (2018) Dealing with the mess (we made): Unraveling hybridity, normativity, and complexity in journalism studies. *Journalism*.