

Towards Creative Citizenship: Collaborative Cultural  
Production at *CBC ArtSpots*

Mary Elizabeth Luka

A Thesis in the  
Department  
of  
Communication Studies

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
For the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy (Communication Studies) at  
Concordia University  
Montreal, Quebec, Canada

September 2014

© Mary Elizabeth Luka, 2014

**CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY  
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES**

This is to certify that the thesis prepared

By: Mary Elizabeth Luka

Entitled: Towards Creative Citizenship: Collaborative Cultural Production at  
CBC ArtSpots

and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy (Communication Studies)

complies with the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the final examining committee:

\_\_\_\_\_ Chair  
Dr. Marcie Frank

\_\_\_\_\_ External Examiner  
Dr. Catherine Murray

\_\_\_\_\_ External to Program  
Dr. Alice Ming Wai Jim

\_\_\_\_\_ Examiner  
Dr. Kim Sawchuk

\_\_\_\_\_ Examiner  
Dr. Leslie Shade

\_\_\_\_\_ Thesis Supervisor  
Dr. Monika Kin Gagnon

Approved by \_\_\_\_\_  
Chair of Department or Graduate Program Director

August 25, 2014 \_\_\_\_\_  
Dean of Faculty

## ABSTRACT

### **Towards Creative Citizenship: Collaborative Cultural Production at *CBC ArtSpots***

**Mary Elizabeth Luka, Ph.D.**  
**Concordia University, 2014.**

This dissertation develops the concept of creative citizenship, which suggests that artists and creative workers who engage in collaborative media production and dissemination practices – particularly in public broadcasting and digital media – are also preoccupied with the dynamics of civic engagement. Their responsibility is to their artwork and to audiences through networked flows of social relations and production approaches. Revisiting literature on cultural citizenship (Hermes 2005, Murray 2005, Uricchio 2004) and the precarity of creative work in the broadcast business (Cunningham 2013, Mayer 2011, Spigel 2008), creative citizenship concerns itself with production practices linking narrowcast audiences, media workers and cultural facilitators to a range of participatory creative activities in mediated sites of engagement. A nuanced understanding of collaborative practices in the long-running television and Internet Canadian public broadcasting project, *CBC ArtSpots* (1997-2008), helps rethink recent cultural studies of production. The research involved attends to convergence culture concerns, grapples with gender issues, investigates the activation of policy, and animates artistic interventions. *ArtSpots* was an innovative, collaborative public broadcasting initiative that produced over 1,200 short videos, several long-form documentaries and a substantial array of virtual and media-based materials for exhibitions, online and mobile devices. It involved more than 1000 cultural leaders and creators in its production and dissemination and featured over 300 artists.

The investigation of *ArtSpots* in this dissertation generates insights into the transition to a digital media production and multi-modal diffusion environment in the realm of the Canadian media industry at the turn of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Contextualizing this work in relation to the cultural economy of creative labour and media production helps show how media and art is produced and shared in public broadcasting. The author's own professional and reflexive work and networks as the founder of *ArtSpots* act as catalysts to crystallize the research, grounding analysis in a distinctive expertise about the relationship of Canadian art to the broadcasting industry, and pointing to exciting implications of creativity and collaboration as core commitments and practices in media production and distribution today.

Keywords: creative citizenship, cultural production, media studies, public broadcasting, creative labour, innovation, collaboration

## Acknowledgements

My funding acknowledgements start with the generous Vanier Canada Graduate Scholarship, not just for much-appreciated financial support but also for its signal about intellectual capacity and research potential. That scholarship wouldn't have been possible without the confidence of my initial two-year Concordia Arts and Science Fellowship, or the expert guidance of those in the department who provided feedback and pushed me to articulate my goals in new ways for funding proposals. Travel and other specific research funding from the department, the International Communications Association, the Concordia Faculty of Arts and Science, the SSHRC-funded York-Concordia Universities' Expo '67 Expanded Cinema research project, and Hexagram-CIAM made it possible for me to go and present, experiment with, and absorb a variety of academic approaches. Teaching, and Research Assistant projects such as the Expo '67 Korsakow database documentary editing, CINER-G website content development and workshops added other important dimensions, as did co-leading the Intersections Conference (2010) and coordinating the D|N|A Symposium (2011).

In terms of intellectual development, I want first and foremost to thank my remarkable supervisor, Monika Kin Gagnon, whose professionalism, sense of humour and incisive insights have made me a more capable academic in ways I will unpack for years, and given me a colleague upon whom I know I will continue to rely and hopefully be helpful to. I acknowledge many other mentors, teachers and colleagues in the Concordia Department of Communication Studies, whose collegiality and capacity for mobilizing resources and modeling strategic scholarly work not just for themselves but also for all the students around them, is a rich inspiration. The opportunity to work in a bilingual joint program added a complex dynamic that

reminded me of the importance of civic engagement and discourse at practical levels and in terms of scholarly lineages.

On a more personal level, I want to thank my doctoral forum cohort-slash-study-group, Jacqueline Wallace, Mélanie Millette, David Madden, Constance Lafontaine and Renaud Carbasse, and “extended” cohort members Sam Thulin, Shirley Roburn and Brian Fauteux, whose unstinting encouragement continues to get us all through the tough moments and provides an able celebratory group for any accomplishment, big or small. As for my artist group, book club and other members of the incredible wolf-pack of collaborators, research sounding boards, and colleagues with whom I work to change the academic, social and business worlds, thank you. I cannot wait to do more.

I would be remiss if I left out the artists, producer-directors, crews, curators, and partners at ArtSpots, in the culture sector and the creative industries with whom I continue to work, as well as the CBC and all the other institutions which support creativity and the arts. It’s not just that the dissertation would have been completely different without ArtSpots, but that a whole era in arts and media development would never have come to be.

To family and friends in Montreal, Toronto and Halifax, all across the country and elsewhere: you are the best, and I’m grateful for your love, no matter what boundless idea I come up with next. As for you, Brian Downey: forever and a day. Road trip anytime.

I dedicate this dissertation:

To my mother,

Whose fearsome intellect challenged me and  
Whose egalitarian sense of humour made me laugh.

To my father,

Whose illimitable compassion guided me and  
Whose facility with words was ever at hand.

And to their mothers,

Whose spirited sociability,  
fiery democratic ideals and  
always-open doors  
inspired and comforted me.

# **Towards Creative Citizenship: Collaborative Cultural Production at *CBC ArtSpots***

## **Table of Contents**

<b>List of Figures.....</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>List of Tables .....</b>	<b>x</b>
<b>Introduction: The genesis of <i>ArtSpots</i> .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Chapter One: A working definition of creative citizenship .....</b>	<b>17</b>
Creativity in media production.....	18
Technology, identity and convergence studies: Citizenship and access .....	36
<b>Chapter Two: Mediating interviews and narratives (methodology).....</b>	<b>54</b>
The dialogical advantages of interviews .....	64
<b>Chapter Three: Networked relationships and collaborative structures.....</b>	<b>91</b>
Transforming an artist residency into a series of working relationships.....	91
Making it work: The networked ArtSpots structure and roles .....	101
<b>Chapter Four: Activating pluralism at <i>ArtSpots</i>.....</b>	<b>131</b>
The broadcasting and arts landscape .....	132
Activating the public broadcasting mandate .....	147
<b>Chapter Five: Trailblazing creative practices at <i>ArtSpots</i> .....</b>	<b>167</b>
“How to”: From media literacy to user-generated content and co-creation.....	188
<b>Chapter Six: Moving away from creative citizenship .....</b>	<b>204</b>
<b>Conclusion: Moving on with creative citizenship .....</b>	<b>232</b>
<b>Bibliography .....</b>	<b>245</b>
<b>Appendices.....</b>	<b>274</b>

## List of Figures

Figure 1: <i>The ArtSpots experience – the thirty-second version</i> .....	2
Figure 2: <i>The ArtSpots experience – adding the website</i> .....	63
Figure 3: <i>The ArtSpots experience – the Advisory Group meeting</i> .....	107
Figure 4: <i>The ArtSpots experience – exploring ArtSpots</i> .....	171

## List of Tables

Table 1: Comparison of Canadian Broadcasting System mandate, CBC mandate, Canada Council for the Arts, Ethnic Broadcast Policy, and <i>ArtSpots</i> Value Statements and Objectives .....	323
---	-----

## **Introduction: The genesis of *ArtSpots***

This dissertation is situated at the centre of the intersecting relationships between the arts, public broadcasting and digital media in Canada at the cusp of the twenty-first century – a period of substantial industrial and social transition. *CBC ArtSpots* is examined as an exemplar of a relatively uncelebrated, yet explosively experimental period in the transformation of media production practices. The remnants of *ArtSpots* that can be seen on TV, in the archival documentation and on the internet shimmer more brightly as suggestive indicators of a large and vibrant network of more than 1,000 artists, curators, and arts-related producers, commentators, and presenters that took place with public broadcasting resources between 1997 and 2008. These suggest not only how media and art were produced and shared in Canada at the time, but also point to limitations and evolutions at the junctures of policy and technology that have arisen since 2008. The concept of creative citizenship developed in this thesis helps elicit these limits and opportunities moving forward, including elements involved in the expression and activation of the concept itself. Creative citizenship proposes that creative workers in media and the arts activate a fluid blend of civic and artistic approaches and tools to generate cultural media production focused on a wide spectrum of narrowcast audiences and presented across a range of media platforms and venues. By digging dialogically and creatively into the video art and public broadcasting roots of *CBC ArtSpots*, I aim to cast light on what *ArtSpots* was, why and how it went about its business, and how that relates to larger questions in the domain of communications and media studies. From the archives comes evidence that *ArtSpots* aspired to conduct itself from its first days in three interlocked ways: as a value-based effort to connect the public broadcaster with the culture sector; as a community-centred art intervention on public

broadcasting; and as a media program drawing on traditional and emerging business practices in the field. It is not easy to find a quiet place to rethink creative practices and spaces: to find productive pathways through archival materials and contesting narratives about the work of art and artists in relation to broadcast and digital media. Probing the labour involved in the *ArtSpots* television and internet project – including my own involvement as artist-in-residence, founder and producer – helps to foreground the relationship of art and artists to public broadcasting historically and in the present.

*The ArtSpots experience – the thirty-second version*

Imagine yourself sitting in front of a television at home in the spring of 1998. It's a Thursday night in Canada during the hockey playoffs on CBC, and you are watching a local documentary before the game. Then, in the middle of the inevitable advertisements, the television drops in volume. The sound of a tea party full of laughing people fills the air. Saturated, luminous colours reflect the sunlight pouring onto tables and shelves full of shapely cups and pitchers. As the camera moves languorously around a series of close-up views, you find yourself mentally reaching for one of the brilliant pieces of pottery on the screen. Your cynical self waits for the sales pitch and your social self can't help but smile at the laughing you hear, and the vibrant colours you see. After only a few seconds, the name, artistic discipline and hometown of an artist comes up on screen, along with their smiling face. You have just had your first ArtSpots experience, featuring ceramics artist Sarah MacMillan.



*Figure 1: The ArtSpots experience – the thirty-second version*

Initially, *ArtSpots* took the form of thirty-second interstitial “spots” played on the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation’s (CBC’s) English television channels during unused commercial breaks. Each spot featured artwork selected by a particular artist, and each artist’s work was featured on three or more thirty-second items. Artists were identified and prioritized for selection by regional, volunteer curatorial Advisory Groups, and local arts producers were hired or assigned to work closely with the artists selected and with regional production crews to generate material for television and internet broadcast. Within *ArtSpots*’ first months, the CBC.ca/*ArtSpots* website was in development to feature video as well as text and still images at a time when few artists had their own websites, and few websites dealt with visual art or video. When *ArtSpots* began in 1997, Fred Mattocks was the CBC Regional Director of Television for the Maritimes who had decided to support an artist residency for a post-secondary fine arts student at NSCAD University in Halifax, which led to *ArtSpots*. In a 2012 interview four years after *ArtSpots* ceased production, he commented on his own uncertainty about the potential scope and impact of *ArtSpots*, and how it defied his expectations in its ten-year existence:

I was preparing myself for, when we took it outside Nova Scotia, that it would kind of fall flat. And it didn’t. There was a reinvention every place it went...[b]ut...it always ended up looking pretty much like what we’d started with...and I thought that was kind of an interesting acid test. (Personal interview with Fred Mattocks, February 7, 2012).

By 1999, *ArtSpots* began incorporating the production of short profiles of artists (two to five minutes), full-length documentaries, and archival and exhibition content, which was used by galleries, schools, and other artists. It also participated in institutional partnerships involving specific audiences interested in cultural content. Although *ArtSpots* ceased production in 2008, when CBC and partnership resources were withdrawn or ended, *ArtSpots* material continues to appear sporadically on late-night CBC Television. Currently, almost none of the video links work on the website, but a multitude of other fragments remain. The last of the explicitly arts-

centric “mandate” programs of the time, the project’s final act was the formation of a fulsome archive. Though inaccessible except by contracted agreement, seven-hundred field tapes, a sixty-five tape master set of all the edited *ArtSpots* materials, several boxes of documentation and two backup drives lived on at the CBC Maritimes’ corporate archives in Halifax until November 2013, at which point they were moved to the CBC’s national corporate archives in Toronto. Several hundred additional original master tapes and copies of *ArtSpots* field tapes are held in the CBC Halifax program library as current and historical programming available to air.

The *ArtSpots* story formally begins in late 1997 at the regional television offices of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation in the Maritimes, catalysed by a set of unique circumstances reaching well beyond the region and are the subject of this thesis. With the agreement and support of Mattocks, several curators, artists, arts administrators and media producers became involved in developing goals and objectives that autumn for what would become *ArtSpots*. At the time, the only regional broadcast times available on an irregular but generous basis were thirty-second advertising timeslots unused either by advertising sales or for standard PSAs (public service announcements). Through the creation of *ArtSpots*, these “spots” made possible the construction of a marginal space within which creative media producers and artists could intervene consistently in television programming, and experiment with the presentation of artwork on the World Wide Web.

By 2008, the national *ArtSpots* television and internet program featured the work of over 300 Canadian visual artists in more than 1,200 short videos; several documentaries; a website called [CBC.ca/ArtSpots](http://CBC.ca/ArtSpots) with thousands of pages; exhibitions in Gros Morne National Park, the Canadian Museum of Civilization and elsewhere; and an academic research experiment with sound artists. Half of the artists featured on *CBC ArtSpots* were women, more than fifteen per

cent were First Peoples, and at least twelve per cent were visible minorities. Many artists' work dealt with feminism, race, identity, and social and political concerns. Eventually, *ArtSpots* involved over twenty producers and forty technical crew in more than twenty locations, and more than 1,000 curators, gallery directors, cultural organization and artist co-op leaders in regional curatorial Advisory Groups and partnership projects.

In this dissertation, *ArtSpots* is analysed as a case study of media production deeply invested in public cultural identity, situated within theoretical communications and media industry literatures. From this analysis, the concept of creative citizenship is developed as a contribution to knowledge within these domains. The dissertation mobilizes a richly networked assemblage of insider information about how a decade-long program regarded as innovative and collaborative emerged, evolved and waned. Animated through my own professional expertise and networks as the founder and executive producer of *ArtSpots*, this thesis draws from the historical account to establish a framework for the concept of creative citizenship itself. It shows that the interlocked nature of personal and professional relationships generated by the uptake of technology in public broadcasting (and potentially in other public service institutions) are crucial at a time of transition. Emerging from policy shifts made during the transformation from analog broadcasting to digital broadcasting, and from identity politics to equity practices in the arts, *ArtSpots* set out to achieve specific social and creative goals based on the articulation of shared values. Reinvolving some of those most closely involved in the cultural production practices of the time (such as artists, curators, media producers, production crew, and creative partners) through the dissertation research helps to define and reshape the initiative, then and now. The examination of *ArtSpots* undertaken in this dissertation shows that the residue of linked collaborations, creative interventions, skill-sharing relationships, leveraged partnerships and

embodied memories help to tease out specific elements comprising creative citizenship at the intersection of the arts, digital media and broadcasting.

*ArtSpots* was a forerunner among the prolific number and types of cultural forms that generated artist and audience innovations with digital creative works and storytelling – and though presented on a national stage, its roots were regional and its reach was international. It bridged video art, culture sector peer assessment, visual art curation and performing arts programming with public service broadcasting decision-making and production practices to generate new media programming and dissemination strategies. In doing so, it sought to reconnect television to its artistic roots including earlier popular culture programs *Take 30* (1962-84), *The Lively Arts* (1961-64), *Adrienne at Large* (1974-75), *Arts* (1973-75) or *Impressions* (also in the 1970s), and even the regional variety entertainment hit *Don Messer's Jubilee* (1957-69). Simultaneously, *ArtSpots* was established to act as a media arts experimental laboratory for CBC's ambitious future broadband strategy and its contemporary commitment to developing a diverse workforce.

Critical to the creation of knowledge in this dissertation is the extensive investigation of collaborative creative control and cultural citizen participation in program creation, diffusion and response at *ArtSpots*. The dissertation contextualizes multi-modal media production and distribution in a number of ways, including its relation to the creative economy of cultural labour as well as cultural policy development and execution. Additionally, reflections arising from participant immersion in visual culture and creative practices – including diverse expressions of national identity by individual artists as well as by cultural institutions – address contemporary concerns about artists' and audience access to technology. *ArtSpots* staked out a space on the World Wide Web for artists, producers, broadcasters and the institutional partners involved, but

exceptionally for artists at a transformative moment: the transition from analog television to digital broadcasting.

### *Research questions*

In this thesis, I address the following questions: What factors contributed to the emergence, evolution and decline of *ArtSpots*? As an in-depth case study about the relationships among creative practices and practitioners, cultural media production processes, and narrowcast audience engagements, how does *ArtSpots* demonstrate the transition to a multi-modal broadcasting system in Canada? Moreover, how can *ArtSpots*, as a cultural production situated in a particular historical moment, shed light on the concept of creative citizenship, particularly the relationship between creativity and the public sphere?

The thesis begins in the archive of the *ArtSpots* multi-media project, and describes its formation, production practices and social relationships across broadcast and artistic spheres. The dissertation is grounded in a feminist stance, reflecting on and incorporating both scholarly and professional creative concerns. Specific foci emphasize how gendered labour and the creation of a cultural space for under-represented voices and narratives in media through cultural media policy and artistic interventions were brought into the public sphere in unprecedented ways.

There are two time spans addressed in this dissertation. The first is the *ArtSpots*' "era", incorporating its genesis and production, from 1997-2008. The second time period includes the research for the dissertation, which spanned 2010-2014. During the original *ArtSpots* production period, approximately 300 interviews were conducted with Canadian artists across the country from 1998-2008. Most of these interviews were used to develop or provide content for television, digital or exhibition purposes; many of the field tapes from this period are on the shelves of the

corporate *CBC ArtSpots* archives. For the 2010-2014 dissertation research concerning the *ArtSpots* case study, a select number of these original *ArtSpots* artist interviews and edited materials were accessed. I also conducted new interviews and discussion groups between 2010 and 2012 with thirty-two participants, including twenty-five with previous *ArtSpots*' experience. During the *ArtSpots* era, interview material was used in traditional and novel ways, including television documentaries, art gallery exhibitions and digital internet projects. During the dissertation research period (2010-2014), interview and programming material from the *ArtSpots* era was combined with the newly recorded interviews to generate themes and insights through traditional and emerging qualitative interview methods, including transcript analysis and video editing. This combination of time periods and approaches offers an exploration of the meaning, value and practices of the interview itself, including an interview's ability to challenge assumptions, reveal contradictions, and indicate how understandings evolve over time.

#### *Creativity through innovation and collaboration*

My interest in examining the *ArtSpots* case stems from recognition that my involvement in the regional operation of public television made me privy to distinctive media production practices for emerging creative expression. My involvement in such practices was not limited to the *ArtSpots* project, but was shaped by it, and also contextualized by my extensive work with CBC's Atlantic Region program development.<sup>1</sup> I facilitated the collaborative development and production of programs in a number of genres, each telling stories and developing talent in different ways, for regional and national audiences. The innovative professional and creative practices that came to be known as *ArtSpots* were generated by a combination of systemic

---

<sup>1</sup> Between 1997 and 2008, the region sometimes included Newfoundland and Labrador (in which case it was called the Atlantic Region, approximately 2001-2007) and sometimes didn't (in which case it was called the Maritimes Region). Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island comprised the Maritimes Region.

conditions, individual agency, ongoing negotiations and creative work. My initial idea to blend regional broadcast programming structured like PSAs with the history of video art incursions into regular broadcast programming was meant to tell visual stories about art and artists. With the enthusiastic participation of artists, production crews and volunteer Advisory Group curators alike, a decade of art production for television, the internet and the Canadian gallery system followed. In hindsight, the precarious nature of this marginal scheduling commitment also contained the seeds of its demise: without a regular timeslot, it was difficult to gain a regular television following, despite its heavy use on the internet. But in the fall of 1997, that the group of pivotal individuals involved was able to seize this opportunity and fill a creative, productive space with it for so long warrants investigation. Linking together television production, gallery exhibition, internet websites, discussion groups, artist promotion and creative input, and broadcast technical creative expression for so extended a period was an intriguing experience that resulted in a complex diversity of programming from 1997-2008. I am curious to see what is salvageable: what can be mined from the media arts programming generated during that time, and the dialogues that have since taken place about it. My goal has not been to recuperate everything that was produced in the making of the project. Instead, using a series of research strategies that includes interviews and discussion groups as well as digital media presentations that delve into them, I aim to find original ways to activate the conversations, collaborations, and curation of visual and media production that occurred in 1997-2008 and afterwards. Perhaps the reverberations of the *ArtSpots* project can be felt along the trajectories created during this time period through the continued interactions and engagements among those involved.

*Pluralism through knowledge and content sharing*

The networked relationships between local and national production and distribution nodes of activity were crucially shaped by national policy commitments to equity in the visual arts and broadcasting, and to sharing knowledge. Despite its positioning as a professional media program once production got underway, *ArtSpots*' beginnings from an artist's residency raises interesting considerations about intellectual property and creative media production at the public broadcaster at the time. It is clear from my archived notes during the fall of 1997 that my three-month artist residency was the core development phase for the project. The goals were two-fold. Primarily meant to explore if and how it would be possible to produce the concept called "*ArtSpots*" – visual arts programming for use in regional broadcasting – with the help of external volunteer curators, the residency also opened doors to sustained conversations inside CBC about how to rethink the relationship between television and the arts. I attended journalism and entertainment production meetings to ask questions and offer comments about how media production worked at the time. During those first three months, the formation of the first volunteer expert *ArtSpots* Advisory Group ensured the articulation of a pluralistic mandate, value statements, and artist selection criteria. However, the first phase of actual production – the pilot project application of the concept I brought to the artist residency – only took place once I became a part-time temporary employee for CBC in January of 1998, under a standard contract giving CBC copyright in the media materials produced. Consequently, the concept for the project remains my intellectual property, while the program material is CBC's.

That first phase of production early in 1998 also set the tone for how to mobilize the creative resources and practices available at the public broadcaster. Multi-year plans held in the formal archives, combined with the 2010-2014 research interviews, confirm the temporary, often

part-time nature of the work of those involved as employees and freelance personnel, as well as the knowledge-sharing practices at play. Key personnel such as local producer-directors and crew members were hired as freelance employees or assigned on a piecework basis to produce the television and internet content required. Artists were provided with a nominal license fee for the use of their artworks, creative input throughout production and a veto over the media material produced. Additionally, the multi-year plans in the archives show that production practices incorporated audience analyses and Broadcast Act mandate-driven programming input from volunteer expert Advisory Groups. Reading through my personal notebooks and calendars from the unpaid months of development work in 1997, the next seven years of often short-term renewable contracts, and the last three years of “permanent” employment at CBC, is an exercise in observing how the industry shifted during that time period. On average, I was employed on *ArtSpots*-related work for about half the time most years, except for a three-year period around 2001-2004, when several full-time contracts were signed almost back-to-back, mostly to work on *ArtSpots*. The amount of content generated and shared across several platforms during each of these time periods reflects the variable levels of employment commitments to all the individuals involved.

At *ArtSpots*, it was clear that the constant renegotiation of how to move forward logistically year-to-year was attached to *ArtSpots* goals, expressed primarily in terms of cultural community engagement, production practices, programming outcomes and the social relations required to achieve these goals, only limited by the resources available. *ArtSpots*' goals sought to create conditions for representatives from the broadcasting sector to work fruitfully with artists. Both kinds of creative workers were vital members of what was then emerging as a broader, more cohesive creative labour force, as Stuart Cunningham (2013) and Vicki Mayer (2011) have

argued. *ArtSpots*' pluralistic policy foundations and the innovative production approaches analysed in this dissertation reveal the combination of creative elements – and creative workforce – desired at CBC at the time, including competitive market-positioning combined with artistic and social responsibility endeavours in Canada.

The concept of creative citizenship that emerged from investigating *ArtSpots* imbricates *ArtSpots* as part of the transition to digital media production and diffusion in the industrial environment. The analysis, then, holds promise as a consolidation of theory and research in the communications domain, particularly among traditional media production, identity, technology and convergence studies. Critical to the creation of knowledge in this arena is identifying how collaborative creative control and culture sector participation in program creation, diffusion and feedback intersected. Contextualizing this work within the creative economy of labour and the study of media production practices helps to show how media and art are produced and shared in Canada and could activate further theoretical and practice-based discoveries. This goes beyond my previous professional work, which grounds me in a distinctive expertise about the relationship of Canadian art to broadcasting and a passion to engage citizens in art and media production, and profoundly reshapes the contributions I have made, deploying my professional skills and access in pursuit of scholarly knowledge while mobilizing artistic and media production analyses and outcomes.

### *Chapter contents*

This introduction sets out the parameters of the dissertation, including my guiding research questions. Two major themes are proposed, emerging from the research: creativity through innovation and collaboration; and pluralism of creative genres and identity through knowledge-

and content-sharing. Traces of the excitement of the time become evident, engendered by changes in technology and resources assigned to equitable presentations of art in Canada.

In chapter one, the concept of creative citizenship is formulated in the context of industry and scholarly media and production studies literature, and then in relation to identity, technology and convergence studies. Three linked elements of the literature are explicated. First, ideas around creativity in relation to media production in the public broadcasting sphere are explored. Second, the work of artists and creative workers in relation to broadcasting and the creative economy are delineated. Third, the interpretive and productive contributions of narrowcast audiences and co-creators in a technologically convergent environment is incorporated by rethinking the related concept of cultural citizenship, including that concept's considerations of identity, pluralism of genres, and activating the public sphere through audience engagements with programming.

In chapter two, the methods employed in the analyses are explained, including both *ArtSpots*' original methodology of interviewing artists and featuring artwork, and how the current research used open-ended, in-depth interviews and discussion groups. The significance of the archival video material and documents made available by CBC is complemented by a discussion of digital data management techniques employed in the present-day research. The process-oriented nature of both the 1997-2008 *ArtSpots* era and the 2010-2014 research period becomes evident. Investigating archival and new interview and other data through video editing and other digital media production and analysis strategies as well as traditional transcripts proves to be an important component to develop rich findings from the dissertation research.

In chapter three, the concept of creative citizenship is further developed through evidence emerging from the *ArtSpots* archives and interviews from both time periods. In particular,

*ArtSpots'* complex and mutable operational structure is analyzed in the context of the media and programming landscape within which it was situated as a broadcast project. Two brief examples of the personal nature of the innovative and collaborative characteristics of the project introduce *ArtSpots'* key operational roles, as well as setting the scene for the subsequent examination of policy and particular pluralistic commitments and outcomes that follows in chapter four. The distribution of *ArtSpots* programming materials by 2008 to many different *ArtSpots'* participants (not only artists), as promotional, exhibition and archival materials, established a crucial content-sharing pattern that would shape knowledge-sharing strategies at *ArtSpots*.

Chapter four triangulates identity, self-representation and pluralism as core commitments at *ArtSpots*, expressed in the broadcast and arts policies and practices which so strongly influenced *ArtSpots'* goals and program outcomes, especially those related to under-represented artistic genres and groups in mainstream media. The chapter scrutinizes the particular policy conditions out of which *ArtSpots* was able to first emerge and from which it drew strength for longevity. The chapter also demonstrates how the documented policy discourse of the time offers crucial insights into the foundational equity, collaboration and stewardship commitments of *ArtSpots*.

Chapter five is an in-depth examination of interviews from both periods (1997-2008 and 2010-2014). An elaboration of the crucial role of reflexivity during both periods reinforces key recurring themes embedded in the creative citizenship framework: innovation and collaboration, and pluralism through knowledge- and content-sharing. Initially, the focus in this chapter is on a detailed understanding of creativity at *ArtSpots*, including co-creative production practices involving individual artists, production crews and volunteer Advisory Group members, and the emphasis on narratives of innovation that arise. Extending this initial analysis to *ArtSpots'*

involvement in one internal and three external complementary production experiments points towards what would eventually weaken *ArtSpots* in creative citizenship terms. The last section of chapter five advances arguments about the importance of how and why knowledge was shared with narrowcast audiences, and how the multi-modal distribution systems at *ArtSpots* suggested new ways forward for public and cultural broadcasting on the internet with digital material. Together, the component elements of these networked forms of creativity and distribution establish civic engagement as crucial in the activation of potent cultural production. The concept of creative citizenship is shown to be a dynamic framework for in-depth enquiries into the *ArtSpots* case study.

Chapter six elucidates the growing number of multi-modal partnership projects and commitments that drew *ArtSpots* away from creative citizenship as a mode of operating. These projects highlight the depth of affiliation with *ArtSpots* expressed by members of the expanding groups of narrowcast audiences involved, while analysing shifting resource management strategies within public broadcasting. Such shifts involved relationships with other CBC programs and with cultural institutions such as National Parks of Canada and the Canadian Museum of Civilization (now the Canadian Museum of History). The chapter synthesizes vital knowledge generated during both time periods (1997-2008 and 2010-2014), and summarizes insights into the transition to the multi-modal and co-creative digital media production and broadcasting system arising from the *ArtSpots* experience. The creation of *CBC ArtSpots* is shown to have acted for a time as a collaborative, networked way to bridge visual arts, public broadcasting and innovative media production from the late 1990s through the 2000s.

Overall, the dissertation closely scrutinizes the relationships between the major production players and narrowcast audiences, analysing innovative production and distribution

practices in order to develop the concept of creative citizenship. Creative citizenship itself, a term to which I now turn, emerges as a concept to analyze what happened at the intersection of art, broadcast and digital media at the turn of the twenty-first century.

## **Chapter One: A working definition of creative citizenship**

The key concept of creative citizenship emerges as an original contribution to the field of communication and media studies through the research and analysis for this dissertation project. Creative citizenship demonstrates how and why the ability of creative workers to operate effectively at the intersection of media and the arts materializes from their fluid, contingent, and networked practices of cultural production and distribution. To develop creative citizenship as a term in a more meaningful manner, I work through crucial understandings of creativity, which encompass intrinsic and economic values, creative control, collaboration and co-creation, and relevant components of citizenship such as identity, policy and activating the public sphere.

Delineating the theoretical influences shaping understandings of the modes, flows, and networks over time within the cultural space that was *CBC ArtSpots*, prepares for my close analysis of *ArtSpots*. Three central components are theorized in this chapter: creativity as innovation and collaboration in media and art production practices, including the specifics of working conditions for artists and creative citizens; the context of creative industries in relation to media production, technology and convergence studies; and mobilizing the production of identity and meaning for artists, peer groups and narrowcast audiences alike. This will help to illuminate *ArtSpots* and assess its relations as illustrative of the broader transition from the conventional television broadcast environment to a multi-modal, co-creative cultural media production and dissemination structure.

## ***Creativity in media production***

To understand the *ArtSpots* program initiative, it is helpful to consider how it can be situated in relation to broader research in the culture sector and creative industries, specifically broadcasting. Creative industries represent growing components of the global and Canadian economies (World Bank 2010; Conference Board of Canada 2010; National Governors Association 2012). A substantial body of work in television and media studies – particularly in the United States and Canada – emphasizes corporate consolidation and national and international policy implications (McChesney and Schiller 2003; Middleton 2009) while also exploring audience reception (Hermes 2005; Miller 2007). This is compatible in many ways with political and art history's emphasis on national identity (Anderson, Benedict 2006[1983]; Becker 2008[1982]; Whitelaw 2006). There has been a great deal of study internationally in the last decade about the impact of digital media production and consumption, and the open source movement in the creation of a digital commons (Moll and Shade 2011; Raboy and Shtern 2010; Rushkoff 2003; Tapscott and Williams 2006). There has also been an influential flowering of theoretical and qualitative studies on creative workers in urban environments involved with applied arts such as fashion, graphic design, architecture, and web or games development (Gollmitzer and Murray 2008; McRobbie 2002, 2012; Neff 2005). Complicating matters, intellectual property and copyright are highly contested and the subject of on-going international negotiation and national debate regarding access, digital locks and geo-fencing (Geist 2010, 2013; Scassa 2005).

To grapple with production and dissemination practices and outcomes of programs in relation to creative workers, however, the foundational literature employed in this thesis is a combination of industrial and in-depth (often ethnographic) scholarly case studies involving

extended exposure to particular broadcast and digital media environments. Collected professional wisdom about creativity in media production has tended to emphasize extractable essence over process: the importance of the “pitch.” An impactful short trailer is often used as a demonstration of the potential for the longer story that the trailer represents. It is valued for its ability to suggest a narrative crying out for the telling. The formulaic and technical nature of storytelling (how many scenes, minutes or beats, what kinds of characters, which storylines, etc.) is a paradigm of creativity and innovation within the field (Douglas 2007; Frank 1996).

Mentioned incidentally in these analyses – but of great import for an evaluation of the dynamic within a creative production team – is how to build trust and expertise among significant decision makers and creators. With a few exceptions, populist mediums such as television and radio have most often acted as interpreters (often as simplifiers) of visually-based art rather than as curatorial guides and prompts or simply presenting cultural content. To be a successful director or producer for culture in broadcasting often means, in other words, to mediate other people’s work rather than create new art. However, the potential of film, television and particularly internet and mobile media forms to be produced as collaborative media also includes the possibility of creating and presenting new work directly, to both narrow and broad audiences. Examining how *ArtSpots* was generated and evolved helps illuminate points of access and impact for specific creative workers and diverse audiences. Documenting production practices and presentations of media productions in a variety of settings contributes to this understanding. Conditions and practices of media production and its relationship to creativity are usefully examined in ethnographies of American broadcasting such as Barry Dornfeld (1998) and John Thornton Caldwell (2008). These are more plainly analysed in relation to race, gender and interdisciplinary concerns within television production in the work of Georgina Born on the

British Broadcasting Corporation (2004) and Mayer (2011) in Brazil and the United States, as well as in historical analyses of the contribution of creative personnel to television production approaches in the mid-twentieth century, such as that offered by Lynn Spigel (2008) about the intersection of American broadcasting networks with visual arts institutions and disciplines. It is in relation to such scholarly work in production and media studies that the *ArtSpots* case study can best be situated.

*The relationship of the creative economy to the culture sector and media studies*

Artists and creative workers who engage in practices of day-to-day creativity and who are simultaneously occupied with the dynamics of civic actions and interventions beyond simple participation in an art practice or creative product generation (including media arts) are engaged in what I refer to as “creative citizenship.” Their responsibilities are concurrently to their artwork and to the networked flows of social relations at both local and transnational levels. For example, artwork may express political positions, identity concerns, or be placed in service of social values and relations, whether or not it serves a more decorative or abstract function. Artwork can be presented in a range of environments from private to public, contextualized with artist or curatorial statements or commentary, and may be intended to generate reactions from small to large audiences. Sites of interaction for professional and amateur artists to meet their publics become important. This may include, for example, artists who rarely exhibit, or those who exhibit in non-traditional spaces such as learning through the arts classes held in elementary or secondary schools such as the Nova Scotia Artists in the Schools or Ontario Artists in Education programs or The Royal Conservatory of Music’s Learning Through the Arts programs. Canadian public festivals such as the five-city annual *Word on the Street* events in September, or television PSAs created by artists to promote their own work on local television, are also examples of

cultural meeting spaces.<sup>2</sup> Such activities carry intrinsic social value, sometimes in tandem with an economic goal. In Canada, data from the Conference Board of Canada (2008) supports the findings of a literature review for the creative economy in Nova Scotia (CNSLC 2012) and a discussion document (2013) that advocates for the development of a provincial culture sector and creative industries strategy. Each highlight the interdependence of economic and expressive values internationally.

[A] 2010 United Nations report states: adequately nurtured, creativity fuels culture, infuses a human-centred development and constitutes the key ingredient for job creation, innovation and trade while contributing to social inclusion, cultural diversity and environmental sustainability” (p. xix)...[T]his ... underlines how expressive value is concentrated in the core creative fields, recognizing how it permeates into the creative industries and the economy as a whole (CNSLC 2013, 42).

In other words, artists produce work for economic benefit and social inclusion, expression and development. Creative economy theory that emerges from cultural studies often insists on the importance of non-economically-driven creative production, placing it at the generative core of cultural activity, for example, as David Throsby (2008, 2012) has done with respect to the creative economy in Australia and internationally, and Gerhard Fischer and Elisa Giaccardi (2007) have analysed in relation to the concept of creativity. However, a narrower focus has developed over the past decade with an emphasis on the economic advantages of creative industries, for example, as discussed in the recent American National Governors Association (NGA) 2012 report. The NGA is a bipartisan public policy organization supported by funding from each American state. It seeks to find common ground among state governors on “matters of national importance.” The NGA emphasizes job creation in the creative economy:

---

<sup>2</sup> Information about these programs can be found, respectively: [http://www.ednet.ns.ca/files/art\\_programs/Artists\\_in\\_Schools\\_2012-13-Broch.pdf](http://www.ednet.ns.ca/files/art_programs/Artists_in_Schools_2012-13-Broch.pdf), <http://www.arts.on.ca/page631.aspx> programs, <http://learning.rcmusic.ca/lta>, and <http://www.thewordonthestreet.ca/>. Accessed July 6, 2013.

This report focuses on the ways that arts, culture and design can assist states as they seek to create jobs and boost their economies in the short run and transition to an innovation-based economy in the long run. In particular, arts, culture, and design can produce economic growth because they can:

- Provide a fast-growth, dynamic industry cluster;
- Help mature industries become more competitive;
- Provide the critical ingredients for innovative places [i.e. creative people and infrastructure];
- Catalyze community revitalization; and
- Deliver a better-prepared workforce.

(National Governors Association 2012, 43).

Efforts to balance the interwoven concerns of creativity and the economy are widely reflected in culture sector literature that incorporates both qualitative and quantitative data available about the sector. For example, in a report commissioned by the Canadian Dance Assembly in 2010, which included an examination of the United Kingdom dance mapping project, I observed that:

[Suzanne] Burns and [Susan] Harrison elected to develop a combination of narrative and data mapping in order to generate several specific pieces of information, including: a picture of arts council funding for dance; clarifying what kind of national database existed by drawing on statistics and information from across the field; identifying (for future leveraging) the cultural and economic impact of the field, financial and otherwise, including citizen participation; and pinpointing trends including how these intersected with other major areas in the community (Luka 2012b, 35).

The NGA and United Kingdom dance mapping reports make efforts to analyse economic measures and outcomes generated by creative practices as well as themes and insights focused on social relations in the culture sector arising from ethnographic work.

In media production studies, authors such as Dornfeld (1998) elucidate similar efforts to acknowledge the intersection of creativity and economic concerns. Dornfeld draws on the concept of the “cultural field” in Pierre Bourdieu’s work (1983) and the concept of “imagined communities” in Anderson’s (1983) to articulate the importance of potential audience reception during the production of a public broadcasting childrens’ television show. The professionally

anticipatory nature of producers in relation to desired interpretations by target audiences, which Dornfeld identifies, is a foundational idea for the study of production cultures in the late 1990s.

In what it hopes is a strategic response to its vulnerability in the shifting media landscape, the Public Broadcasting System [is] attempting to construct a new public profile for themselves. Critical to this profile is the projection of a loosely defined community of viewers, identifiable in certain demographic slices, loosely sharing an identity based on this community's consumption of like programs that appeal to its base of interests and knowledge.... This construction shares a great deal with processes that Benedict Anderson (1991) identified when describing nations as "imagined communities" formed through communication media, but with [American] public television we are speaking of a limited slice of the national pie (1998, 61).

The instrumentality of reflexivity in the professional media environment is taken up more explicitly in Caldwell's (2008) analysis of Hollywood production cultures:

Reflexivity emerges as part of both corporate macrostrategies and human microstrategies. That is, reflexivity operates as a creative process involving human agency and critical competence at the local cultural level as much as a discursive process establishing power at the broader social level... [This] generate[s] relatively little anxiety at national policy levels because they have, apparently, mastered the responsiveness, nuance, user-friendly demeanor and self-conscious textual sophistication characteristic of very legitimate local cultural expressions (2008, 34).

Caldwell proceeds to discuss case studies providing evidence about how creative labour can be understood from their broad discursive and textual practices. He investigates production crews as well as above-the-line writers, directors and producers, and places them in relation to one another through behavioural and psycho-social characteristics. His typology of trades-based gossip and storytelling practices provide the foundation for the professional understanding and sharing of work requirements for particular types of above-the-line and below-the-line positions (Caldwell 2008, 37-68, particularly the typology starting on 38). Caldwell further suggests that production companies, media corporations and trade unions have negotiated the creation of particular types of "turf-marking" activities including the annual program marketplaces and professional conferences to promote new technologies and pitch processes (2008, 81-104). This is meant to

delineate and preserve the media business as a particular cultural business space within which insider knowledge and personal networks are required in order to have access to the spaces where actual media production takes place. Finally, he uncovers how above-the-line personnel make conscious connections to distribution and marketing priorities in the context of carefully integrated media financial structures, the use of media content in multiple modes, and the alacrity with which the use of emerging technologies is taken up as “innovative” (2008, 279), or at least, discussed as if it will be taken up, even if it is not taken up (2008, 274-279). Interestingly, it is a truism in the media business that most television producers and directors boast that they don’t watch television. It appears that the same cannot be said of social media, where information is broadly shared for promotional purposes, finding cast, crew or set pieces, or for circulating parodies or informational videos. That is, early social media practices may make transparent the kind of formerly hidden, professional storytelling and turf-marking activities that Caldwell (2008) documents in his mid-2000s study of the American television environment. It will be interesting to see what future studies will show about this shifting of the hidden professional dialogue to a global, seemingly public space. In chapter two, I rethink the instrumental, anticipatory nature of reflexivity in a professional media (or arts) environment that Dornfeld and Caldwell analyse, by mobilizing an interview-based methodology to open up reflexivity to include analyses of past creative practices and future potential practices.

A consideration of precarity in relation to creativity in the media production field leads to a similar expansion of what is meant by creative labour. In recent work, Caldwell (2010, 2011) addresses the rise of the precarious co-creator, particularly in digital media production, through a discussion of (professional) worker-generated content, a repositioning of optimistic expectations around (primarily amateur or fan-based) user-generated content through the mid- to late-2000s.

In media production studies, observations about the degrees of precarity, and modes of operating that individual and collective creative workers exhibit, result from understanding the influence of political economy and sociology of art analyses on cultural studies. By examining patterns concerning workers' everyday social and productive relations, a complex understanding of what is meant by creative labour within cultural media production is generated. Most critically, the role of each creator in cultural media production is rendered important in terms of economic and cultural relations, as well as on aesthetic and expressive terms. For my purposes, then, the spectrum of creative workers potentially included for analysis is quite extensive, including curators, crew members, funders and camera operators for example, as well as artists, advisors and media producers. This is consistent with Caldwell's work, and especially the work of Mayer (2011), who analyse professional interactions across a wide spectrum of professional undertaking. This analysis also underpins my own research. The proficient involvement of artists, advisors and producers at *ArtSpots* in negotiating networks, tensions and social relations with potential viewers and peers while engaged in cultural production carries weight here. For Mayer, listening to practitioners and discussing how production practices develop is a crucial research method, as her discussion of spending time with fifty producers of soft-pornography in New Orleans demonstrates (2011, 68-69). At *ArtSpots*, this means that the media production staff, the volunteer advisors, resource-managers, project partners and the artists involved occupy particular power positions about which they are able to speak, and which can be examined using creative citizenship. Caldwell's analysis is generated through an evaluation of formal and informal documents and interviews, weighing the self-reflexive positions of producers, directors and crew members in media production environments from an outsider's perspective. Mayer's

analysis, however, emerges more clearly from periodic immersions as a participant in the creative production processes she studied.

In part through her “insider” exposure to the media production system, including as a member of the cable television regulatory body in Davis, California, Mayer convincingly argues for an extended understanding of creative production throughout the media production industry, including civic engagement in the production processes (2011, 139-174). She includes creative – often subversive – responses to managing factory work in Brazil by television assembly workers, a highly female workforce (2011, 31-65) “to deconstruct our received notions of creativity and to reconstruct a notion of creative action that is both social and individual in [production] practices” (33). She also analyses the production practices and self-positioning of soft-pornography videographers as the latest in a series of aspirational “professional” producer-directors (2011, 66-100). Her analysis signals the contradictions between the “casualization of television work” from the 1970s onwards (67) and the ambitions of emerging creative practitioners through to the present day. This indicates the growth of what would be called co-creative work in the 2000s, or what Axel Bruns terms “produsage” (2007). Such work is predicated on the change in working conditions precipitated by the advent of the digital media production and distribution environment (e.g. Bruns 2008). Mayer suggests: “The other side of professionalism, then, is the instability that marks the realities of labor markets in the new television economy” (67). For all of these individuals and groups, involvement in cultural media production activates and brings under their influence popular culture systems such as television and digital media broadcasting with a relationship to the arts. Mayer builds on studies of historically more narrowly defined groups of artistic workers in the television industry.

In Spigel's (2008) discussion of media production jobs and sites in the United States from the 1950s and 1960s, she draws evidence of the influence of art and artists through their direct production functions as set and brand designers, as well as the influence of artists on the very architecture of the then-new technology. Spigel discusses the careers of designers such as William Golden and Ben Shahn at CBS as indicative of the integrated relationship between "high" art, design and television in the 1950s, enabling the upstart mass media technology to position itself as an important cultural player (2008, 72-109). She also discusses the close relationship between designers drawn from the fine arts world and television executives, including the way in which set design was extended to include the design of production lots and buildings, particularly the cutting-edge architectural work commissioned, for example, by CBS Television (110-132):

[They] wanted to create a [television] factory capable of fostering artistic creativity, and they therefore charged the architects with communicating the twin goals of art and industry... (p.121). CBS Television City... communicates the experience of television as a design concept. Not only is the façade a giant glass screen, like a 1950s television program, Television City's exterior is black and white... so that the overall effect is high contrast and sharp focus (which perhaps not coincidentally were also two of the most often promoted and desirable qualities in TV reception (128).

Interestingly, Spigel also draws attention to the recognition of a fairly narrow, and primarily female, audience base through the hiring of women as guides in programs about the fine arts at the Museum of Modern Arts (164-168): an early iteration of narrowcast audience identification. More broadly, she comments on the active involvement of museums in television production about the arts during the technology's early years.

In the late 1940s and early 1950s, museums in New York, San Francisco, Detroit, Dallas, Boston, Buffalo, St. Louis, Los Angeles, Toledo, and other cities tried to use television as a form of popular pedagogy, hoping to teach viewers about their collections and encourage museum patronage... These institutions also tried to increase their "fem" appeal by using entertainment formats aimed especially at women as the guardians of the arts (145).

By the 1990s, the residue of each of these historical influences is subsumed to the industrial business model, including in the public broadcasting environment, as demonstrated by Dornfeld, Caldwell and Mayer. This is formalized in the broadcast licensing requirements of the time, even while openings for the arts on television begin to reappear through the promotion of interculturalism, multiculturalism and regional reflection in Canada, as will be shown in my discussion of the *ArtSpots* policy and pluralism contexts.

*Individual artist practices and precarity in relation to cultural industries*

Turning from a preliminary consideration of how the groups and individuals involved in media production such as *ArtSpots* might connect creatively and in response to the public good, this section of the chapter considers ways to understand the nature and value of the creative labour involved. Timothy Havens, Amanda D. Lotz and Serra Tinic (2009) suggest that by stepping away from the over-determining parameters established by industrial models, it is possible to better understand the critical nature of the term “culture industry” originally proposed by Theodor and Max Horkheimer in the 1940s (1944, 94-136). Their reading of Adorno and Horkheimer asserts a significant level of agency for the individual artist to mobilize in relation to their own cultural production, and also regarding engagement with the communities within which they exist as creative workers is (Havens, Lotz and Tinic 2009, 246). Although creative workers have been studied globally, little has been done, especially in Canada, with collaborative groups of creative workers at the intersection of the visual and performing arts and media production. Exploring the theoretical underpinnings of the fluid and contingent articulations of creative work that are constitutive elements of cultural and media production requires an examination of individual artistic involvements, including at *ArtSpots*.

In the early 2000s, the centrality of the urban creative worker as an economic engine for the western world was just beginning to show its new shape in analyses of the loose collection of cultural industries that would purportedly employ individuals in a rewarding and fulsome future of creativity and play-at-work (Florida 2002a, 2002b). The era of the creative worker was promulgated throughout the first decade of the century, particularly English-speaking nations such as Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, but also in Western Europe. Business and culture sector studies of the growth of the cultural industries enumerate the advantages of living in such a technologically-advanced and innovative society. Important discussions about cultural industries include du Gay and Pryke (2002); Hartley (2009); and in Canada, Andrew, Gattinger, Jeannotte and Straw (2005). These works draw on a blend of cultural and political economy studies, sociology and economics. They incorporate the systematic measurement of the attributed value of individual creative expression through economic innovation including through studies of artists, curators, etc. that draw on sociology of art research including foundational work by Howard S. Becker (2008[1982]). Such studies rely on a consideration of creative workers in media production that emphasizes economics and pinpoints the tensions between individual artistic agency, and systemic limits and structures. Creative economy analyses are – by definition – primarily driven by the economics of culture rather than the value(s) of civic imperatives or the actions of individual artists. As a result, a creative economy analysis is not particularly concerned with the possibility of engagement beyond or before the marketplace. Telling examples of such approaches include the research conducted by David Hesmondhalgh (2007); Hesmondhalgh and Sarah Baker (2008); and Mirjam Gollmitzer and Catherine Murray (2008) in Canada. These studies respectively employ or criticize data that emphasize systemic parameters and limits rather than seeking an understanding

of working practices. Understanding these limits is important but not sufficient for understanding creative practices themselves. Attempts to mobilize innovative business or science practices in the creative economy are strictly systemic, even when expressed through the relative – and changing – positions of individuals, as Keith Negus (2002) and Garry Stevens (1998) have so capably explored. Like Throsby (2008, 2012), Negus draws attention to the need to establish understandings of art practices not dependent on economic outcomes for creative work to occur for individual artists as well as groups of artists. He nuances Bourdieu's concept of cultural intermediaries as entities that create multiple pathways to and from creative production and consumption, including the networking and relations required to develop collaborative – and not always economically shaped – strategies.

#### *Equity and precarity in Canada*

Creative economy analyses often subsume non-economic considerations, even if such considerations provide key components for economic analyses. In Canada, this has led to observations of systemic inequality in the job market for specific demographic groups (e.g. when women make seventy-five per cent of what men make for the same job), or in terms of role models or access to opportunities. Scholars such as Gollmitzer and Murray have analyzed artist income and time commitments in Canada including by gender (2008), while K. Bateman and Karim Karim have analysed the dismal lack of on-screen cultural diversity in the Canadian broadcast system (2009). Notwithstanding the insights such findings offer to understanding deficiencies in civic values and goals (i.e. equity), a discussion of these matters in relation to the larger economic and civic framework incorporating media and cultural studies has built more slowly into creative economy analyses concerning media and artistic domains. There has been little discussion in the last fifteen years about the implications of having artists and media

producers activate dialogue and engagement among themselves and with specific communities, cultures and subcultures through their own production practices. The scholarly scrutiny applied to identity discussions and changes in the arts in the 1980s and 1990s to make diversity visible and equitable in terms of access or works produced has rarely been rigorously applied to the production and diffusion practices of artists and media producers at the intersection of art, digital media and broadcast in the 2000s. This is intriguing, considering how clearly cultural production has been shaped in Canada by the avant-garde, politically-expressive thrust of the artistic and media worlds of three recent time periods (civil rights in the late 1960s through the early 1970s, feminism by the mid-1980s, and race and identity critiques of the early- to mid-1990s). The eruption of social issues and analyses into general debate – and specifically mainstream media representations and productions – that had occurred in the 1960s and early 1970s with the growth of baby boomers and the promulgation of civil rights and feminism in the western world was briefly reprised in the mid-1980s and mid-1990s through feminist, race and identity scholarly and policy analyses. This history is important in the analysis to come of policy related to *ArtSpots* and public broadcasting in the 1990s. Examples of socially-aware media productions include programs such as the NFB's much-analysed Challenge for Change program (1967-1980), the upsurge in growth of the experimental film and art communities including in Canada, and the women for peace movements. (For Challenge for Change, see the documentary NFB Pioneers: Challenge for Change (N.d.) as well as the anthology by Waugh, Baker and Winton, eds. (2010)). Additionally, contentious and highly visible debates took place in many publicly-funded environments around how to think about and implement affirmative action and equal opportunity, as shown in Griffen Cohen (1987), as well as Burstyn and Smith (1985). Discussions of race and feminism make such debates more explicit in Mackey (2002 [1999]),

Gagnon (2000), and Robertson (2006), including analyses of equity through work centred in self-representation by artists and in artist-run centres in Canada, particularly through the 1980s and 1990s. These joined specific economic circumstances and human rights to creative and critical expressions of identity, power relations and community engagement.<sup>3</sup>

Unpacking an understanding of the precarious “nature” of cultural work further complicates matters in an important way. There is quite a bit of scholarly and industrial research to provide extensive evidence of the structured precarity of some creative work in media production. Empirical work in Canada bears this out. For example, Hill Strategies Research (e.g. 2004, 2010, 2012) has been analysing Statistics Canada data for several years on behalf of various cultural agencies including the Canada Council for the Arts, Ontario Arts Council, and Arts Nova Scotia. Their findings confirm the precarity of the Canadian artist’s existence. So do studies from the Cultural Human Resources Council (Hermus et al, 2010), Independent Media Arts Alliance (Burgess and De Rosa 2011; ARCA and IMAA 2010) and Canadian Conference for the Arts (Jeannotte and Pineau 2013; Gollmitzer and Murray 2008), among others. It is useful to understand these findings as compelling rationales to undertake collaborative work and negotiations of working conditions in cultural production. In research from a decade ago, Angela McRobbie (2002) speaks clearly about the isolation of creative work and simultaneously the highly networked nature of seeking new work in creative businesses in the United Kingdom. More recently, her research strives to pull together urban studies (neighbourhoods as cultural and

---

<sup>3</sup> In Canada, there was a significant amount of general or popular discussion in the lead-up to and following the repatriation of the constitution in 1982 and new human rights codes and practices. The rewriting of the broadcast act in 1991 reflects those debates as does the work done at Canada Council and other funding bodies regarding incorporating under-represented communities and voices, as discussed fully in chapter four. For examples of feminist art of the period that explicitly addresses these matters, see Levin (2007), and Jones (2008).

working “spaces”), socio-economic backgrounds, and the precarious nature of creative employment as both more normalized and more pervasive than before.

[T]here is a middle ground, where new technology and new media impact across the lives of young and old alike, where flexible working means different working rhythms, where more people seem to be at home during times in the day... It is my intention to draw these strands together, in a bid to think in new ways about the creative industries. I will assess how far [Richard] Sennett’s concept of craft helps us to develop a less inflated and overblown vocabulary for thinking about the rise of the creative sector. Can it provide the basis for a kind of everyday ethics of work, and a counter to the prevailing individualism of the so-called talent-led economy? (McRobbie 2012,156).

Such nuanced work points critically to scholarly fascinations with the 21<sup>st</sup> century creative class, a version of admiring the inventiveness arising from the precarious existence of artists. This is itself a kind of inverted echo of the philosophy of William Morris and the Arts and Crafts movement a century and a half earlier. Alternatively, Richard Sennett’s emphasis on the craftsman (2008) is a case in point about how to ground analysis in the actual day-to-day working environments, networks and outcomes, as McRobbie suggests above.

But understanding who is actually included in the creative industries – and then more precisely, in media production related to the arts, to bring it back to *ArtSpots* – is also influenced by and can shape economic and social policy dramatically. Cunningham’s critique of precarity is useful here. In particular, his observation that many fields outside the occupations generally understood to comprise the creative industries also reflect precarious working conditions is crucial. So is his emphasis on understanding the broad reach of the creative worker in the creative industries, and the existence of creative service workers outside the core creative industries’ occupations (Cunningham 2013, 121-125). Together, these observations call into question the assumption of precarity as the predominant or exclusive terrain of cultural workers. Further, the assumption of conditions of poverty in relation to precarity as a set of rhythms (in McRobbie’s terms) can especially be called into question in relation to the field of media

production, where temporary contracts as a way of life are understood to be balanced by the relatively high-paying nature of these “gigs.” The opportunity to work on auteur-driven, experimental or modestly-funded projects in between formal contracts is also seen to be a part of the creative working terrain. The activity of each kind of worker does not take place in a vacuum. In the case of *ArtSpots*, for example, levels and types of financial remuneration, job stability and the nature of the work varied greatly from person to person over time, in spite of being in a heavily regulated and unionized environment. Although work conditions are influenced by systemic considerations including how technological developments impact creation and diffusion to particular audiences, there is still space for individual intervention, creative practice and risk. As suggested above, this is a more subtle focus on the agency of individual artists and creators in the context of economic systems, which leaves open the possibility of discussions of value other than economic ones, especially in the context of individual practices in relation to production systems as Throsby (2008); Negus (2006); McRobbie (1999, 2002); and Hartley (2006) might suggest. In other words, the temporary nature of the loose ties among artists, social innovators, and consumer-citizens can shake loose and reknit into changed and recharged assemblages of, for example, public service domains such as broadcasting in order for cultural media production and dissemination to materialise, generating meaning in ways that are seen as transformed by technology and sensitive to or conducive to particular audiences. This dissertation investigates whether and how such groups may have done so through (or for) *ArtSpots* during the significant technological transition of the late 1990s to the early 2000s.

It is also critical to understand the role played by unions and legislated creative bodies in promulgating or ameliorating race and gender discrimination as recurrent features of labour

precarity in media production and dissemination. There are several guilds and unions associated with the media business, which have served to negotiate on behalf of large segments of this section of the creative industries, partly explaining higher wages and controlled working conditions, compared to visual artists, craftspeople and some performing artists. In the introduction to this section, industrial studies undertaken in this context were mentioned, showing the dearth of women, immigrants and people of colour in creative and decision-making roles in Canada as elsewhere. These include studies undertaken by the Canadian Unions for Equality on Screens (2013), Murray (2002, 2009), Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (2008) [Equity Report], and Women in View (2013). Among many other reports regarding diversity, also see: Canada (1984), a foundational document from the House of Commons, and more recently, periodic reports on diversity by the Canadian Association of Broadcasters (2008, 2010). The collection of studies indicates the degree to which the general absence of women, immigrants and people of colour in television production had become a broader economic concern addressed through policy from the 1980s onwards, which effected change for a time, including through *ArtSpots*, as will be seen in forthcoming chapters. This is congruent with early attempts in the late 1940s and early 1950s to attract specific audiences, when American television had explicitly hired women to host television programs about the arts because these programs were seen to be targeted at this demographic (Spigel 2008, 145).

Interestingly, Brett Neilson and Ned Rossiter (2008) point out that (understandings of) actual or perceived precarity can generate a new understanding of civic space rooted in the idea of the common. It is expressed in the vernacular phrase “making common cause” and in the creation of a virtual or actual common space or community. The idea of a common space connects the creative practices of media and cultural work to the generation of civic relations and

to specific audiences. What begins to emerge from the idea of the theoretical positioning of *ArtSpots* as a space where the practices of creative people converge, are the outlines of both old and new working and meaning-production relationships. Generated by sometimes-precarious activities of production and engagement in the culture sector, the mostly underplayed and under-articulated non-financial (i.e. social values-based) implications of cultural production practices could be expected to be made more evident. This suggests the fragility and the contribution of the important dynamics involved. In other words, articulating a critique of precarity with creativity and citizenship situates artists, producers, and co-creating groups as powerful although often temporary nodes within a critical – if somewhat tenuous – creative citizenship process involving modes of production and flows of interactions. This set of relations is subject to systemic parameters and historical limits on individual or group innovation and creativity – but it also cracks them open and changes the boundaries, at least for a time. However, since creative economy theorists tend to place a stronger emphasis on systemic limits rather than creative agency or the production of meaning in the hands of producer and audience participants, creative economy theory cannot fully explain what happens in the field. To make this clearer, it is crucial to consider the relationship of narrowcast audiences to practices of production at the time *ArtSpots* was in production.

### ***Technology, identity and convergence studies: Citizenship and access***

Linking broad industrial concerns to a growing body of scholarly work concerned with the navigation of cultural production today are the rapidly expanding fields of technology and convergence studies, especially in regard to digital media production and dissemination. The latter fields can complement the cultural studies foundations of production and media studies but

are also deeply concerned with networked and articulated spaces understood through the lens of technology, open source and internet studies. This is expressed, for example, in analyses of emerging alternative funding models for media production such as crowdfunding as I have done elsewhere (Luka 2012a). It is also implicated in analyses of digital broadcast policy in Canada through technology studies, part of the growing field of linked disciplinary concerns in STEM studies (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) grouped together as priorities established in national scholarly funding institutions such as National Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) and the National Science Foundation (NSF) in the United States. The technology emphasis in production and broadcast studies is crucial for assessing media production, not necessarily as a driver of change but for the way in which discussions about it indicate what is motivating change in the system. For example, Catherine Middleton (2009, 2011) analyses the laggard penetration and mapping of broadband capability in Canada, despite our promising start in the field – this was notably at about the same time that *ArtSpots* was getting underway:

Canada was a leader in encouraging its citizens to use the internet and broadband technologies. In 1997, Canada was the only country in the OECD with a measurable uptake of broadband connectivity by its citizens. Canadians had the highest broadband uptake in the OECD until the year 2000. As of December 2009, Canada ranked 9<sup>th</sup> in the OECD in broadband uptake with 30.5 subscriptions per 100 inhabitants, up marginally from the 10<sup>th</sup> place we had occupied for the past couple of years. ... In 2001, Canada's National Broadband Taskforce ... recommended that a minimum speed of 1.5 Mbps – symmetrical – would be required. Almost ten years later, the same minimum speed is being applied to define broadband connectivity in Canada. ... The rest of the world has not stood still. In Hong Kong, Japan, Singapore and assorted other locations, including Chattanooga, Tennessee, gigabit broadband connectivity (1000 Mbps) is available, offering network speeds more than 600 times faster than our current broadband standard (2011, 5, 9).

This positioning of Canada as lagging in technological capabilities compared to the rest of the digital world is much discussed in government and industry circles in terms of its impact on economic opportunities for Canadians and Canadian companies, as seen, for example, in the

CNSLC documents (2012, 2013), and more determinedly in recent critiques of the long-awaited Federal Digital Media Strategy released in April 2014. Middleton's comparison simultaneously positions Canada as an advanced post-industrial nation at the same time as it suggests that Canada is falling behind in the highly competitive and lucrative international knowledge-economy. Likewise, intellectual property and digital media scholar Michael Geist observes:

Measurable targets and objectives typically guide strategy documents, yet there are not many to be found in Digital Canada 150. In fact, the most obvious target - 98 percent broadband access of 5 Mbps - is slower than many comparable targets around the world and comes years later than the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission's stated goal for the same level of Internet connectivity. (2014, n.p.)

Such critiques point to the lost optimism and excitement expressed in the early 2000s, a time when Canadian politicians, industry leaders and broadcasters were aggressively pursuing digital media experimentation and widespread access to such technology as a central factor impacting on the nation's ability to remain "innovative," "creative," or "competitive."

Technology and internet studies link to the specific policy and media landscape conditions for *ArtSpots* analyzed in chapter four by showing how practices of creativity and the definition of audiences can be affected simply through access to the technology in question itself. The critical work of Marita Moll (2011) and Leslie Shade (2010) regarding uneven access to internet and digital services in communities across the country, particularly in rural areas, paints a picture of an even less successful integration of rural towns and communities into a digital world than Middleton suggests. Moll notes that ameliorating this situation is of crucial importance not just for participation in cultural expression, but also increasingly for the delivery of government, health and education services, for example (2011, 137-141). Shade's critique centres on the prevalence of the term "citizen-consumer" and the open market as a stand-in for the social world

as a whole, rather than on citizenship and social values (2010, 134-137). This makes engagement as a citizen almost impossible to conceive outside of the market and consumer framing:

Many community organizations are rightfully concerned that this avowedly market-based tilt coupled with a belief in open markets (and less foreign ownership restrictions) will not lead to more universality of technology, services and content. Rather, this sensibility ushers in an unprecedented attempt to diminish the ability of Canadian citizens, through regulatory bodies like the CRTC [Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission], to ensure that Canada's telecommunications system meets the needs of all Canadians. . . . The political economy of media in Canada, characterized by increased concentration, conglomeration, and cross-media ownership, privileges corporate voices, thus muffling the diversity of citizens' voices. (Shade 2010, 137).

Raboy and Shtern (2010) provide a comprehensive treatment of the many policy gaps and deficiencies to be found in Canada's converged, computerized, broadband world, as well as potential communication opportunities. The fundamental premise of their analysis is to propose the right of all Canadians to democratic participation through "communication", based on other cultural and human rights in democratic societies. This understanding of civic engagement through media has significant implications for the role of media producers such as those involved at *ArtSpots*, and the development of creative expression relevant to specific communities, as conceived in the idea of creative citizenship. The grounding of their arguments in human rights, policy development, and discussions of specificity echo Geist, Moll, and others, but also suggest the difficulty of the challenge and its long history.

Generally speaking, communication policy in Canada has been intimately tied to cultural development and sovereignty, to the ongoing project of forging a national identity across Canada's linguistic, cultural and regional divides. . . . Media policy making in a globalized and multicultural Canada requires a shift in focus from nation building to the promotion of diversity and the expression of multiple forms of citizenship. Our study repeatedly underlines the need to bring the media closer to the people. Supporting community media is one way to accomplish this: a renewed focus on local media is another (Raboy and Shtern 2010, 23-24).

The enthusiastic uptake about the potential of the internet and later for mobile media to encourage the practice of "democracy" is studied widely and has become considerably tempered

and nuanced since 2010 (Jenkins, Ford and Green 2013; Lovink n.d.; Rushkoff 2003, 2013; Tapscott 2006; van Zoonen 2005). This sprawling domain of developing scholarly and industrial enquiry contributes significantly to the development of the digital humanities through the 2000s by explicitly connecting the arts and humanities to technology. Its ambitious nature and scope is paralleled by the rapid development of STEM scholarship, debates and configurations through the last half of the twentieth century and particularly in the last fifteen years. In the global Web 2.0 context, YouTube's ascendance by 2010 as the leader in worldwide video presentation demonstrates how the industrial level of media production included systematic, often corporatized, moves to meld creativity with technology, including how digital material is organized and presented on the internet.<sup>4</sup> Launched in February 2004, Facebook's growth to a powerful position in (social) media management took place during the same period (Phillips 2007). Nonetheless, the more complex potential of the internet for fluid combinations of collective action, archiving, aesthetic experimentation, and business ventures is made more obvious through the explosion of and then the demise of other websites, search engines, social media platforms and dotcom businesses, which has been documented elsewhere (Bruns 2008; Curran, Fenton and Freedman 2012; Goggin 2008; Jenkins 2004; Jenkins, Ford and Green 2013; Tapscott and Williams 2008; van Dijck 2013; van Zoonen 2004, 2006). Such observations contribute to one of the key areas upon which the emerging scholarly domain of digital humanities depends, suggesting a more general commitment to mobilizing digital media with the potential to incorporate civic engagement. The digital humanities articulate foundational concerns with citizen engagement in social relations, for example, through the Digital Humanities Manifesto 2.0, (2009), a manifesto written by scholars and activists to assert the

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://theutubeblog.com/2006/10/15/the-founding-of-youtube/>. YouTube was founded in February 2005, eight years after ArtSpots began.

rights of individuals to communicate globally and freely using digital tools and approaches. Interestingly, in common with media production and other facets of creative industries, many digital humanities researchers prefer experimental project-based research and production relying on proven professional networks, as suggested in Burdick, Drucker, Lunenfeld, Presner, and Schnapp (2012). They note, however, that digital humanities studies still relies heavily on “design, programming, statistical analysis, data visualization and data-mining,” and yet needs to be “building tools around core humanities concepts – subjectivity, ambiguity, contingency, observer-dependent variables in the production of knowledge”, which the skill sets enumerated may not address well (103-104). Such an approach is generated from an intriguing mixture of entrepreneurial and activist fields mostly concerned with language experimentation, the knowledge economy, design-thinking and innovation – that is, connecting to where creativity and technology intersect, though often without incorporating the interests of or input from citizens, audiences or users.

Moving beyond the seemingly still-limited digital humanities approach, technology studies offers insights into how the articulation of business, economic and social values find echoes in discussions of creativity and civic engagement such as my discussion of the Canadian Broadcast Act (1991) and other influential documents crucial to the emergence of *ArtSpots* in 1997-98 show in chapter four. Then and now, the cost and inadequacies of the digital service system in Canada has its impact on how creative labour can be engaged in media production itself. As Shade (2010), Moll (2011), and Raboy and Shterne (2010) might suggest, its commitments to enabling the full participation of citizens in the social world as a whole enable but are not limited to work required in the economic or experimental spheres.

*Narrowcast audiences and co-creators: from national identity to entertainment and back*

Creative citizenship, then, must incorporate considerations of creativity and civic engagement that reach beyond the artists and creative producers involved, including through technology. To more clearly elucidate what is meant by civic engagement in reference to creative citizenship, I turn now to consideration of the role of narrowcast audiences. In this dissertation, *ArtSpots*' genesis and fit with the public broadcasting mandate incorporates an awareness of several of the culture sector's narrowcast audiences and frames the parameters of engagement with them. David Gauntlett offers a plain explanation of narrowcast audiences in the context of the upsurge of what has come to be known as participatory audiences: focused, almost niche, groups of supporters for specific artists and artistic practices (2011). Peter Bazalgette offers a similar approach in relation to public service broadcasting in the United Kingdom (a service very similar in approach to Canada's), noting that narrowcast audiences must be targeted in order to be successful as a national broadcaster (2009).

A consideration of the potential of creative citizenship in relation to narrowcast audiences to ameliorate or strengthen an otherwise friable set of creative and audience relationships – and *ArtSpots* as an example of this – is useful for understanding the work done by cultural workers and their audiences. In broadcasting, it is generally understood that specific target audiences exist but do not necessarily take an active role in the production of meaning when cultural media production is generated (e.g. those who will watch and understand the programming at various stages of creation and distribution). However, their precise level of activity and commitment depends on a number of factors. For example, at *ArtSpots*, the nature and composition of specific narrowcast audience groups were based on individuals involved in the production and dissemination process yearly, including artists, producer-directors, Advisory Group members,

and crews of *ArtSpots*. Each group comprised and represented specific narrowcast audiences with a great deal invested in the continuation of the program. To a lesser – though still intense – degree, other networked groups of viewers were connected to *ArtSpots* through their personal or professional connections with the narrowcast audiences most closely involved (e.g. artists), or through targeted dissemination of its content in the cultural community (e.g. through partnerships or exhibitions). These several precise sets of narrowcast audience groups act as smaller iterations and entrees into similar but larger audience groups. By the end of this chapter, the influence of cultural citizenship and fan-based reception studies to such audiences in the development of creative citizenship will be clear. First, though, I want to more clearly link the creativity of professionals in media production to audiences in general.

Like Caldwell, Mayer, and Spigel, Born (2004, 2010) activates considerations of professional creative practices to audiences to consolidate an interdisciplinary approach to a study of media, among other forms of cultural production. As with my interest in *ArtSpots* in the late 1990s, her general interest is in studying “and problematizing a critical cultural historical moment in the respective cultural field” (2010, 189). In her 2004 study of the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), Born unearths a complex set of professionally creative and audience-based relationships inside and outside a significant popular culture institution. Born finds that the public service mandate, as it was articulated in the 1990s, depended less on democratic principles and an educational role, and more on an ambiguous and hybrid combination of entertainment and news that appeals to broad audiences and sponsors. The “creative ecology” that Born describes (2004, 491-495), acknowledges the cumulative and sometimes sophisticated nature of television viewing and expectations by various audiences, and attributes this to the range of programming that the BBC has been able to present over the years.

She makes the case for creative autonomy at the production level in order to generate innovative programming that can continue to engage audiences. On the other hand, she identifies the lack of regulation of private broadcasting and internet operations, plus increasing levels of regulatory and competition limits on the BBC as a serious flaw in the system requiring redress “so as benevolently to condition audience tastes” (2004, 492). In her view, the BBC is the only broadcaster in the United Kingdom able to bring about the kind of engagement with democracy and with cultural expressions that she sees as necessary “to fulfil its primary public responsibility: creativity” (2004, 495). Born’s interview-based approach, like Caldwell’s, is backed up by textual analysis and discussions with programmers and producers, but to that is added some specific audience research, and an analysis of the industry’s technologies and economics as well as the cultural policy of the British broadcasting system. In the end, she emphasizes the failures of the British system, and the BBC in particular, to respond to the needs of audiences in terms of political and cultural engagement. Born reminds us that Stuart Hall called on the BBC in 1993 “to embrace cultural diversity and to become a forum for the negotiation of ... common life. [I]t must succeed in mediating not only national, regional and local, but transnational and international cultural and political currents” (2004, 509).

Liesbet van Zoonen (2005) understands the role of television (and more generally, creativity in media production) as even more influential in the “negotiation of common life.” The dynamic suggested by Born’s analysis of the BBC’s creative practices and their impact on audiences is more tightly linked by van Zoonen (2005), in relation to the blending of politics and popular culture. Whether audiences watch television dramas about politics or engage in viewer voting on reality programming, van Zoonen proposes that these popular culture activities are the simulated performance of democracy. She further suggests that entertainment-based vernacular

practices (e.g. television watching or reality programming voting on any media platform) might enable viewers to become better citizens: “they invite a hospitable surrounding for the performance of citizenship” (2005, 147). Similar arguments have been made in the past (Anderson, Benedict 2006 (1983)), suggesting that vernacular practices – such as church-going in your own language, newspaper production and reading, and the very practice of shifting the meaning of words in language by using them in day-to-day contexts – can impact shared (national) identity concerns (68-71, 73-82, 101-111). Today, discussions of particular forms of popular creativity and innovation of this nature must also take into account the impact of the global Web 2.0 context. Interventions such as those exercised in *ArtSpots* can challenge and/or extend contradictions and expressions of identity among popular culture, the digital domain, and the arts, through the actions of creative citizens as producers and as narrowcast audiences. Arguably, this would optimally be reflected in participation levels with political parties and/or at elections, a trend that has not been shown in the Western hemisphere, where voting rates have been dropping for decades. Alternatively, it could be shown in increases in participation in social media: one of today’s public spheres. This has been made evident in studies of Facebook, YouTube and the increases in comments on websites (Bruns 2008; Hartley 2009b; Langlois, Elmer, McKelvey and Devereaux 2009). Nonetheless, discussing creative representations of political systems – such as those in television dramas or online fan forums – and performing citizenship through day-to-day responses to media programming (radio, television, internet, and mobile devices) must commit to an understanding of audience.

To reconnect narrowcast audiences with the arts world from which *ArtSpots* emerged, it should be noted that the importance attributed to generating a civic commitment to the production of national identity by arts audiences is evident in recent culture sector discussion

papers such as *Public Engagement in the Arts* by Canada Council for the Arts (2012). Here, not the least of the challenges is concerned with the meaning of public engagement itself:

The term “public engagement” springs from a broader discourse about democracy, civic responsibility and social capital. It has been adopted in recent years by the arts community in Canada and other countries to encompass a number of ideas around the relationship between art, artist and citizen. However, these ideas are understood quite differently around the world and within Canada. What is common is a shift from a focus on the art and the artist to the *public as the central driver of cultural and arts policy and actions*. (Canada Council for the Arts 2012, 4, my emphasis).

This is a remarkable shift suggested by the Canada Council, implicating the organization in evaluations of how well audiences are engaged rather than focusing on development and creative opportunities for artists. The terms audience and public engagement in this context sit beside but do not connect to textual analyses of national identity and democracy evident in cultural artefacts or programming, potentially shifting responsibility and intention *to* audiences *from* artists. Prior to the advent of audience reception studies, the emphasis on artist’s intent (in art or television alike) and more generally on textual analysis in cultural studies and art history, tended to gloss over the relationships behind and around cultural production. Such a lens – though crucial for “picturing” the intended meanings of actual artworks – can only hint at the processual importance of civic engagement within the production of culture and the reception of the multiple meanings generated, including the generating of identity. For example, scholarly research by Sherrill Grace (2001) and Marusya Bociurkiw (2011), among many others, addresses forms of national identity creation and management in regard to art and television respectively, in Canada. Grace concerns herself with the discursive nature of Canadian creative artworks primarily through a focus on formal, textual elements rather than on the making or reception of them, while Bociurkiw emphasizes emotional connections related to the reception of meaning and the consequent relationship of the viewer’s body to television programming, incorporating

an analysis of affect in her research. Grace points to the ambiguity and confusion evident in a profusion of visual and textual representations of Canada's identity "as a northern nation" (2011, 46), while simultaneously suggesting that Canadians cannot understand this identity, except by mapping the relationships ("interdiscursivity") of art production at textual levels:

From the set of *discursive* characteristics that emerge in and with the *discourse* [of Canada as "North"]... one must be stressed above all others: the blurring and overlapping of boundaries that creates a complex, duplicating *interdiscursivity* of North. ... Of the dozen or so features that I see in this *discursive* landscape, none is more intriguing than the emotion with which the most scientific of scientists and social scientists speak of the North. ... Amazingly, and despite thousands of volumes – explorers' narratives, novels, poems, geographical studies, historiography, popular fiction – written about the North, despite the maps, the art, the films, the flights of impassioned rhetoric and the imaginative tropes, we persist in believing, we repeat it until we believe it, that we fail to understand ourselves as a northern nation. (2011, 45-46, my emphasis).

The emotion and discursivity imbricated in Grace's analysis of identity embedded in artwork is reshaped into a consideration of affect at the individual audience member level in Bociurkiw's emphasis on the fragmentation and reconstruction of the identity of specific audience groups.

I write about the nation from where I live: from my living room, with its Panasonic flat-screen TV next to bookshelves with their weight of theory; from the narrative of my so-called "ethnic" identity and its necessarily othered relationship to Canadian identity. My own critique of roots, and of the terms of power embedded within the nation, intersects with desire: for roots, for citizenship, for power, for home. *In this way, I too become national*. Affect theory, with its emphasis on change and relationality, is a useful tool with which to discern how people become part of a nation... Rather than engaging in traditional audience analysis, [however,] I am interested in the affects that proceed from the text. I wish to examine the television text in relation to bodies, and those bodies, in turn, in multiple relation to one another. (2011, 21, my emphasis).

Combining these scenarios, the study of textually-based meanings (intent and discourse, as Grace suggests) is augmented by a study of audience members not involved in production (as Bociurkiw undertakes), but the contributions and influences of specific narrowcast audiences involved in production itself are skipped over. Although contributing to the importance of recognizing that cultural and identity production is at stake, the complexity of an examination

that considers both the artists involved and the audiences is outside the scope of their methods. Creative citizenship, on the other hand, is more clearly grounded in shared reciprocal relations, nodes and flows of activities, and actual cultural content production that has the potential to engage specific narrowcast audiences, including those from whence the content came. As a result, creative citizenship challenges but also has much in common with analyses of *cultural citizenship*.

### *From cultural citizenship to creative citizenship*

The importance of drawing the idea of narrowcast audiences into the concept of creative citizenship arises from the concept of cultural citizenship. Both cultural and creative citizenship acknowledge the important place of varied interpretations and understandings held and generated *by audiences* rather than only by artists or media producers in the production of meaning in relation to creative production. At a fundamental level, analyses incorporating cultural citizenship highlight the how and why of the decoding half of Stuart Hall's encoding-decoding model (1980), as represented in the work of Joke Hermes (2005), Toby Miller (2007), and William Uricchio (2004). Since the 1980s, how the agency of audience has been exercised through "decoding" activity has been analysed in scholarly research including Janice Radway's research on Harlequin romance readers (1984), as well as that of David Morley and Ien Eng, who are also taken up in Hermes. More recently, audience authority over the generating of meaning has been expressed in work undertaken by Henry Jenkins about ACA fan groups (2006) and danah boyd's analyses of youth in relation to social media (2007, 2014).

To be more explicit about how cultural citizenship informs creative citizenship, consider what audiences do when practicing cultural citizenship. Research conducted by Couldry (2006), Hermes, Miller, Murray (2005) and Uricchio analyses popular culture (including fan-based)

audiences and their practices or performances of cultural citizenship. Consistent with my framing, Murray and Couldry draw attention to the broad and inclusive meaning of “cultural” incorporated into the research involved in citizenship. More explicitly, Hermes explores the sense of belonging that is generated for audiences through discussions of programming content with each other and with researchers. Like Bociukiw, Hermes suggests that citizenship is performed by dedicated audiences on an everyday basis by engaging with popular culture affectively, although neither positions engaged audiences as co-creators. These emotional resonances help viewers to make sense of their social networks and relations, creating community and a form of identity-based citizenship around shared experiences and values, rather than influencing the productions themselves (Hermes 2005, 146-158). Miller has a keen interest in identifying and measuring levels and types of social relations among producer/artists, distributors/presenters and audiences/users. The contingency of meanings within and through “technologies” (meaning forms of cultural production) is key, although still dependent on the discursive nature of the actual programming or productions considered (Miller 1998, 256-263), similarly to Grace. Hermes and Miller persuasively argue that dedicated audience groups incorporate what they see as relevant to their own stories or behaviours in the world *in response to* popular culture, including how to interpret and make use of media programming, but Hermes and Miller do not address active participation in the creation and distribution of such stories, leaving the position and work of the artist-participant and producer-director mostly unattended. For *ArtSpots*, it is worth investigating whether and how the narrowcast audiences also act as specific collaborators involved in production, including producers, artists, volunteer experts and cultural leaders. How creative action is regenerated on an ongoing basis can therefore not be satisfactorily answered through the mobilization of the concept of cultural citizenship in relation

to broad audiences, but can be assessed through the specific ways in which participatory curator-programmers and co-creator artists and production crew operate with producer-directors as narrowcast audiences. Certainly, cultural citizenship research adds a more nuanced understanding of audience relations to Hall's model, and to textual analyses undertaken by Bociukiw or Grace. It complements the work done by Born, Caldwell, Mayer and Spigel to broaden understandings of practices of creativity. Cultural citizenship examines the production of meaning after artistic production is completed and while media programming is in circulation to various audiences. By investigating the citizenship work implicated in the pre-production and production stages of *ArtSpots* media generation, it is possible to examine the production of meaning for and by a set of primary narrowcast groups involved in its production and in its reception.

#### *Convergence culture and narrowcast audiences*

The concept of creative citizenship moves beyond the scope of cultural citizenship analyses, in part through consideration of artistic production practices but also by linking to the generative nature of convergence culture. This can include specific interventions by fans, or by aspirational artists, or groups of creative workers who influence the interpretation of cultural content, remix it, comment on it or otherwise reshape iterations of the programming or content in question.

Recent theoretical work by James Hay and Couldry (2011) in relation to convergence culture helpfully grapples with understanding audiences as producers, and opens the door to understanding creative producers, artists, and curatorial Advisors (as at *ArtSpots*) as constituting narrowcast audiences themselves. Hay and Couldry exhort scholars to reevaluate the work of media studies *vis-à-vis* cultural studies in audience terms. However, in their discussion of the history of cultural studies in relation to media studies and how that has influenced the

development of convergence studies, Hay and Couldry palpably omit creative workers as either audience or participants; an absence leaving an indelible mark. As in the work of Born (2004), Caldwell (2008, 2010, 2011), Havens et al, and Mayer, Hay and Couldry emphasize the many registers where meaning is generated (the individual, the industrial and the audience-based). They support a consideration of the importance of citizenship understood as active engagement by a variety of players, but critique the confinement of convergence studies to a political economy framework that simply oppresses “media consumers” (479):

To the extent that the most well-known of these media studies venture into discussions about political activism or citizenship (e.g. Jenkins’ *Convergence Culture* (2006), Hartley’s *Television Truths* (2008), Burgess and Green’s *YouTube* (2009)), they tend to emphasize the virtue of “interactivity” and to cast the non-professionalism of DIY media, and the “grassroots” of media mobilization, in terms of a generalized, universalist understanding of democracy rather than in terms of the messy contradictions and contingencies of democratic citizenship in the historical and geographical production of convergence/cultures and, we might add, in wider politics. (Hay and Couldry 2011, 480-481).

Hay and Couldry go on to encourage “those who are engaged in a discourse about convergence culture” (481) to analyse the specifics of how co-creators and consumer-citizens are enmeshed, but the omission of the contributions of creative workers to media production in their discussion and in cultural citizenship – either as authors or as co-creators – is a significant one.

In creative citizenship, however, the presence of the creative worker in a variety of roles is central, and considers the potentially generative nature of their work as the most passionate and informed of narrowcast audiences, as well as through the creative production itself. This enables the incorporation of the crucial – and increasingly complex understanding of co-creation from the professional end of the spectrum, as an element of production that (re)emerged in the late 1990s in a multi-platform environment. Bruns helpfully proposes the concepts of “produsage” and “producers” (2007, 2008) to bridge emerging relationships between certain

narrowcast audiences and media producers during the 2000s. Producers are the aspirational though still-amateur stage of Mayer's soft pornography videographers before they are commissioned as producers to provide piecemeal programming. Versions of this are seen throughout the 2000s, including at CBC through, for example, the television and internet program, *ZeD*, a co-creative project that emerged once *ArtSpots* was well underway.<sup>5</sup> Slightly more cynically, Caldwell (2011) proposes an understanding of this relationship in a fully professionalized environment as one of worker-generated content: a more precarious iteration, and more closely linked to the previous professional structure for media production. His analysis of how media workers operate emphasizes the devolving nature of professional jobs in the media business. Such analysis also complements Mayer's discussion of the professionalization of aspirational videographers, and of Bruns' efforts to indicate an explicit new overlap between audience and producer. These are potentially useful ways of explicating how the relations between artists, producer-directors, citizen-collaborator-consumers overlap and diverge from one another in terms of production practices as well as potential cultural expressions, allowing for the possibility of a close analysis along different levels of dimensionality and participation in the production of meaning through media programming and dissemination.

The produsage relationship remains a relatively binary one between producers and users, however. At its simplest, it only increases the size of the overlapping space between them. It does not necessarily delineate a new distinctive role in the creative domain that incorporates creative practice and civic engagement, though it aspires to provide a position of agency for the co-creators involved. It also does not incorporate a necessary critique about the precarity of

---

<sup>5</sup> *ZeD* was a late-night arts-based television and internet project that ran on CBC from 2002 to 2006, and is discussed in relation to *ArtSpots* in chapter six of this thesis. For some details about the project, see <http://cbc.ca/programguide/program/zed> (accessed July 6, 2014).

creative labour in the arts and media fields in a convergent environment. Finally, although it addresses the relationship between professional producer and a narrow band of narrowcast users, it cannot explicitly address the ongoing dialogic relationship between artistic creators as creators and subjects, broadcasters, funders and policy makers (etc.), *and* narrowcast viewers beyond the immediate fan base.

In this chapter, the concept of creative citizenship has begun to emerge at the intersection of literature addressing broadcasting, digital media production, creative labour and the arts. The collaborative nature of the work that may be scrutinized at *ArtSpots* rests on developing understandings of the fluidly networked relationships among artists, producers, broadcasters and specific narrowcast audiences. During a significant technological transition (such as from analog to digital broadcasting), mobilizing innovation in identity and meaning production by all concerned holds promise for shifting creative and civic engagement practices. Through a consideration of the *ArtSpots* case, the implications of such opportunities in the cultural industries, as well as the position of artists in broadcasting and media production as a cultural industry, will be better understood. The rest of this thesis shows how this opportunity was taken up in *ArtSpots*, allowing creative citizenship as a concept to be fleshed out in considerable depth. The next chapter lodges the concept of creative citizenship in the research design undertaken for this dissertation.

## Chapter Two: Mediating interviews and narratives (methodology)

The multi-disciplinary nature of the *ArtSpots* experience, and therefore the nature of the enquiries required for a comprehensive analysis of it, contains the possibility of drawing on a number of theoretical influences for methodological guidance, including cultural studies, media production studies, visual culture and feminism. Since this investigation is clearly situated in the literature focused on media production studies, a strong emphasis is placed on media materials and the use of traditional transcribing and newer media logging, editing and synthesizing strategies. This approach provides a wealth of material for a successful examination of *ArtSpots* in this dissertation. Investigating the creative and administrative practices engaged methodologically begins to make way for a nuanced understanding of how *ArtSpots* – among other media case studies – can fit within overall media production, dissemination and engagement processes “then” (1997-2008) and “now” (2010-2014), teasing out the concept of creative citizenship.

In this dissertation, *ArtSpots* is presented as a rich, single case study, employing semi-structured interviews and discussion groups. The single case study is usefully applied in the humanities and social sciences when the researcher has unique and comprehensive access to a complex research site that can be deeply interrogated for specific empirical information and relationships that will inform broader research questions, as Robert Yin shows (2009). The use of *CBC ArtSpots* as a case study allows for a revealing examination based on these established social science and humanities approaches and techniques. For *ArtSpots* as a case study, there are three crucial features worth singling out. First is the degree to which collegial dialogue and analysis permeates the original production practices and the dissertation research itself. Second is

the unpeeling of the layered integration of policy, narratives of pluralism, innovation and collaboration, and the structure that networked the individuals involved in the *ArtSpots* project. Third is the scrutiny of the interview as a concept and of production outcomes made possible by the interviews mobilized in both time periods.

The methodology used enables discoveries about how to draw upon web and technology based tools for research, reflecting the core values of a collaborative and technologically-savvy approach. This reinforces the concept of creative citizenship, and is supported by the work of digital humanities theorists such as Hirsch (2012); Kuhn and Callahan (2012, 291-308); Lunenfeld, Presner and Schnapp (2009), each of whom explores the potency of digital forms of data-processing in the scholarly domain of communications and media studies. More traditionally, the development of a middle ground of investigation, involving individual agency as well as systems analysis, is supported methodologically by communications and media scholars Timothy Havens, Amanda D. Lotz and Serra Tinic (2009) in their analysis of critical media industry research strategies. They synthesize a trifecta of influences, sourced from critical sociology, political economy and cultural studies in the United States, the United Kingdom and Australia (with a small nod towards Canada). Most pertinently, Havens et al critique all-encompassing *systems-only analyses* based on sociology or political economy studies, insisting that a mid-range level of investigation combined with a high-level view allows for the ability to observe and study the intensity and shape of local influence and interpersonal relationships (238-239). The combination is crucial in shaping the methodologies used to investigate media:

[O]ur purpose here is ...to acknowledge growing evidence of the disparate perspectives evident at each level and the need to expand explanations of the operations of these industries to better encompass both levels of analysis (2009, 239).

The approach taken by Havens et al does not explicitly introduce the incorporation of visual, digital or research-creation methodologies. However, it enables their constructive integration by making space for a blended cultural studies/industrial analysis complementing the dialogical nature of interviews.

*Access through credibility and professional networks*

My personal and professional knowledge of the *ArtSpots* case study provides me with credibility with the participants (then and now) as well as skills in media and arts production. It is augmented by the maintenance of ongoing extensive networks in the field. Of course, it has been critical to maintain a high degree of awareness about the potential residue of past power relations in regard to my own position throughout the research process. For example, interviewing former employees raises the possibility of replicating past power structures, even though those employees no longer report to me. Additionally, my desire to retain credibility in the tightly networked media and arts fields speaks to the care required when seeking input from former volunteer advisors who sought (and seek) opportunities to promote art and artists on television and the internet then and now. In this, I am aided by considering previous research successes involving interviews and discussion groups arising from cultural studies and communications research concerned with television, creativity and the visual arts. In particular, earlier case study work supporting the concept of creative citizenship, including Born (2004, 2010), Caldwell (2008), Dornfeld (1998), Mayer (2011) and Spigel (2008), suggests the commanding position of credibility and experience in the field as a significant contribution to a deep understanding of the media production studies domain. The theorizing of creative citizenship in the previous chapter is well matched to the methodological approach developed to analyze *ArtSpots* and its relationship to the concept of creative citizenship. Interviews were used in the work of Born

(2004), Caldwell, and Mayer in relation to production practices, and in the work of Hermes (2005) in relation to narrowcast audiences (particularly fan groups).

The importance of the mid-range insights made possible via a shared professional reflexivity among the *ArtSpots* creators and producers is reflected in the findings of the above scholars, each of whom strike an emphasis similar to my own. As with the *ArtSpots* research probes concerning practices of creative citizenship, Born, Mayer and Spigel activate considerations of aesthetics and professional creative practices to consolidate an interdisciplinary (and in Born's and Mayer's cases, an ethnographic) approach to labour and power relations in television and media production complementary to that of Christine Hine in visually-based scholarly research (2005). Like my analysis of *ArtSpots*, Mayer's approach is grounded in a more explicitly feminist stance. Critiques by Born, Caldwell, and Dornfeld about the *prima facie* insights offered by professionals in the field were generated in part by immersing themselves as participant-observers in the field or studying additional visual culture and text-based documents. In comparison, my deep knowledge of *ArtSpots* provides me with a level of participant-observation experience that would be hard to match. Under these circumstances, however, the perspective of other participants becomes crucial, providing me with critiques and points of view that act to verify or reposition my remembered experiences with that of others as well as the programming materials and the archival content. Comparing the responses of individuals and groups involved in the 2010-14 *ArtSpots* research interview processes to one another and to the 1997-2008 program-based materials is an approach that draws from similar data analysed by Caldwell and Born in their respective television ethnographies, of which the latter's was particularly dependent on interviews, and the former's was dependent on the relationship

between interviews and textual interpretations of corollary materials (articles, books, professional presentations and limited video material).

### *Feminist and grounded theory methodological influences*

The work of scholars such as Sarah Pink (2007), Hine (2005) and Annette Markham and Nancy Baym (2009) connects specifically to the feminist, grounded theory approach I employ in this thesis. To unpack this a little further, I consider how a feminist approach generated from a cultural studies perspective finds ways for personal and professional experience and knowledge of participants to shape the research agenda (see, for example, the legacy amassed by Ann Gray, 2003). Feminist methodologies endeavour to make explicit the biases brought to the research environment. Hine characterizes it in this way:

The interrogation of methodological assumptions from different perspectives is not new, of course. The mechanics of methods have been made visible by turning a feminist epistemological commitment not just on to the substance of the research project, but onto the processes by which it generates its knowledge as well, as in Ann Oakley's discussion of reactions to experimental and qualitative methodologies (Oakley 1999). Virtual [and creative] methods could act as interrogators of traditional method in a similar fashion: in pondering on whether a virtual interview qualifies as a real interview, we also can think more deeply about what it is that we valued about interviews as a methodological stance (2005, 10).

It is evident that a combination of established case study and new, media-based methodologies are effective for processing a variety of materials and analyses required in cultural media production such as *ArtSpots*. Probing and repurposing digital and broadcast materials is fruitful, including the corporate and personal digital and analog archives of *ArtSpots*, particularly to acknowledge and organize the insights and dialogues generated by interviews and discussion groups, both old (1997-2008) and new (2010-2014). The methodology directly addresses creative producers' (including artists' and other participants') ability to understand and influence production (then) and research (now) practices. The methodological approach used to investigate

*ArtSpots* complements the discussion of creativity in chapter one about production and distribution practices in relation to creative citizenship, by extending “creative control” to a broad group of participants in media production, and in this chapter, in research production, simultaneously acknowledging pluralistic interests at the table, also crucial to creative citizenship. Mayer’s research suggests similar extensions of creativity to factory workers and videographers. Successful ethical research on social relations is routinely based on understandings that each participant (including researchers) brings their own history and commitments to the process, informing their ability to generate data from particular environments (e.g. Punch 1994). Furthermore, with specific regard to interview situations, “this ethic transforms interviewers and respondents into coequals who are carrying on a conversation about mutually relevant... issues” (Denzin and Lincoln 1994, 354).

A specific example illustrates this, arising from *ArtSpots* discussions during Advisory Group sessions from 1997-2008. During those sessions, the identification and selection of artists was always preceded by discussions about artistic priorities within the specific community involved (usually, by province or urban region). Key goals at *ArtSpots* revolved around diversity and equity, generating a lot of discussion in local contexts prior to identifying and selecting individual artists. Former Advisor Cheryl Sim noted that during the advisory meetings, an emphasis was placed on respectful critical thinking required to influence broadcasting programming, particularly in regard to underrepresented voices and approaches.

There was a lot of encouragement in the room, at a time when no one really wanted to go back [to identity politics] and talk about it. Reinventing language to use in our mandates – inclusiveness, diversity – words that distanced themselves from what was perceived as difficult or hurtful, as a result of racism and how funding worked. So I was happy to see these issues were being raised in ways that weren’t being spun. Very clear, in recognition of these debates. What struck me was that as producers, [you suggested] maybe we need to dig a little deeper. So in terms of underrepresented perspectives, voices, I felt we were not going to get off that easy [laughter]. ‘What else you got?’, you know. That was really

remarkable: the willingness to put those issues on the table, and to maintain their importance. And also to not let us just get away with the most obvious answers [but to develop] strategies and approaches to establish a climate that was critical – that got us to think together more critically, as a group (Personal interview, 11 March 2010).

Likewise, the rich descriptive qualities available from viewing and (re)making significant amounts of media materials can be analysed and critiqued through analyses about process, also a feature of grounded theory (Hine 2005). Not surprisingly, then, the single most intricate element of the *ArtSpots* case study research involves the propagative and dialogical nature of the work involved in selecting, conducting and managing fifteen new interviews and discussion groups conducted with thirty-two people between 2010 and 2014, in combination with analyzing the formal and rather large tape, website and paper archive created during 1997-2008. The richness of the reflexive dialogue generated by interviews and discussion groups from both time periods originates from the consultative approaches favoured at *ArtSpots* and is compatible with the traditional use of interviews in other scholarly endeavours, providing insights into the nature of interviews themselves, in industrial and research contexts. The *ArtSpots* case study methodology suggests that a media production-based processing of interviews and archival materials enables exploration of new ways of knowledge dissemination related to the professional environments from which the subject matter itself emerges. This opens the door to understanding the relationship of reflexivity to technology, without the former becoming over determined by technological affordances.

### *Reflexivity and technology*

Reflexivity is a crucial term in my investigation. Reflexivity in methodology has a helpfully substantial history in the work of visual culture and visual ethnographic scholars, particularly those engaged with digital technology, where those under study are imbricated through digital production elements or skills themselves. Throughout the conversations and analyses conducted

during and after the *ArtSpots* interviews and discussion groups, it became evident that reflections on real world observations and experiences coupled with analysis by and among the erstwhile cultural production professionals involved were an integral part of generative work for the *ArtSpots* project, then (1997-2008) and now (2010-2014), constituting a unique contribution to the field. Reflexivity bridges several components of the case study research design. For example, the web-based field notes, written deliberations and short videos I edited during the data processing phases are reflexive, as are the many critical discussions involving the interview participants themselves during the 1997-2008 production period and the 2010-2014 research period. These layers of reflexivity proved to be a crucial series of ways to process and analyse material, connecting back to the concept of creative citizenship. Scholarly research previously discussed in this respect (Born 2004; Caldwell 2008; Dornfeld 1998; Mayer 2011) also mobilizes discursive analyses of production practices and documentation as well as participant observation, reflection and analysis, to embody a reflexive stance, sometimes as a researcher and sometimes as a media professional. Less fully explored in the literature is the extent to which the centrality of reflexivity emerges at the intersection of the two substantial professional fields involved in *ArtSpots*: visual arts and multi-modal (digital and television) broadcast.

To be more specific about the relationship between reflexivity and technology, rather than using cameras and videos for observation only, researchers place the tools into their own hands as participants as well as directly in the hands of participants (see, for example, Sarah Pink's work with photography as methodology, 2007[2001]). Regarding *ArtSpots*, tools were not placed in the hands of participants during the 1997-2008 period but were central during the 2010-2014 research phase. (A comparable level of creative control was devolved to participants in *ArtSpots* during 1997-2008 through the processes used for the selection of artists, artwork and

what went to air, as analyzed later in this dissertation.) The “prosumer” technology used for data collection and analysis in 2010-2014 enabled a less intimidating and more flexible environment for the research participants and incorporated some of the materials produced during the original 1997-2008 production era. In fact, several of the research participants and many more of the erstwhile *ArtSpots* participants now work with this kind of technology, a significant difference from 1998-2008, and an important development in the day-to-day activity of cultural production. In other words, communities now regularly coalesce in digital environments (including social media or cultural portals): the tools for dialogue now reside as much with the individuals or community under observation as with the researcher. Hine enumerates three phases of internet-based research methodology (“computer-mediated communication”) that have increasingly opened up complex research opportunities demanding a high degree of reflexivity while engaging in research *and* production: as a completely open, experimental field; as an ethnographic cultural field site; and as a mutually dependent site of interaction between research object and methodology (i.e. they shape one another) (2005, 7-8). Such an approach complements creative citizenship’s origins in media production and convergence studies as well as identity politics, as enumerated in chapter one. Thinking about *ArtSpots* and its relationship to technology helps to crystallize Hine’s analysis of technologically-dependent research. Hine points out:

When we talk about methodology we are implicitly talking about our identity and the standards by which we wish our work to be judged. It is no wonder, then, that the breaks with past methods which we declare by calling our new approaches ‘virtual’, ‘cyber’ and ‘online’ methods can provoke anxiety... New technologies might, rather, provide an opportunity for interrogating and understanding our methodological commitments. In the moments of innovation and anxiety which surround the research methods there are opportunities for reflexivity. Seizing these moments of reflexivity depends, however, on not taking the radical capacities of the new technologies for granted, nor treating them as poor substitutes for a face-to-face gold standard. (2005, 9)

There are strong resonances with feminist approaches embedded in this approach, which are also evident, for example, in the scholarly work of Radhika Gajjala with online communities and in research-creation (2009, 2013), and Annette Markham and Nancy Baym (2009) among others. The methodological compatibility between access to technology and reflexivity becomes clearer in relation to the idea of produsage previously introduced. Bruns (2008) formulates his theory of produsage on the basis of the development of consumer-targeted software and hardware, and their use in media production spheres by consumers or users to generate material to be circulated in professional as well as amateur environments, particularly digital and fan-based sites. His alternative theory of cultural production – the “produsage” system – represents a blending of the roles of an enthusiastic narrowcast or fan audience and an artist or media producer. Either can be the maker or the consumer. Today’s forms of media and art intervention evident in this set of media practices helps to explicate these cases as examples of contemporary digital citizen-consumer based cultural practices. Notably, not all “producers” can become a part of the professional network of producers. In fact, the industrial model relies on many producers embracing this hope – the potential to become a professional – but the reality is that almost none will do so.<sup>6</sup> At ArtSpots, the earliest glimmers of this can be seen in 1999, when the ArtSpots website went “live” and the thirty-second spots promoted the website as well as presenting art.

---

<sup>6</sup> For example, throughout the 2000s, the editing software Final Cut Pro (FCP) had been an industry standard for independent filmmakers and artists because of its user-friendly features and its industry-friendly organizational logic. However, the 2012 updated software version (FCP X) featured a significant change in logic to make it look and feel more like iMovie software, marketing it to users of that more ubiquitous and consumer-targeted software. Clearly, the hope had been that a significant portion of the iMovie aficionado-base would aspire to become professionals and “join” the produser community by being persuaded to buy seemingly more “professional” movie-making software such as Final Cut Pro. In produsage terms, it further blurred the lines between professional and amateur, but only for the amateur. It sharpened the line for educators and professionals, who rejected the software’s more decisive move into a

*The ArtSpots experience - adding the website*

Imagine yourself back in your living room, watching television. It's 1999. During a commercial break, performance artist Gary Markle pops up on screen, dressed in a voluminous white gown and an oversized dunce cap. In a serious voice at odds with his costume, he speaks to the discipline required to achieve mental and physical preparedness. You barely have time to register what he's wearing and saying before the scene changes to a longer view of him charging – in slow motion – towards a series of flimsy-looking scrim with brightly coloured targets painted on them. Tinned audience cheers rise and then sigh in disappointment as Markle pulls up short: “Ohhhhh.” He tries again - loping towards the screens, the audience sounds increasing in excitement. Markle bursts through the paper scrim to huge cheers! His smiling voice pops up from below the screen's bottom, laughing in bashful victory, and again you see – for less than two seconds – his name, discipline, and hometown. You also see the name of a website: [CBC.ca/ArtSpots](http://CBC.ca/ArtSpots), where you discover dozens more of these pithy thirty-second presentations of art.



*Figure 2: The ArtSpots experience – adding the website*

***The dialogical advantages of interviews***

The mobilization of interviews helps to unpack the complexity involved in conducting research at the intersection of the disciplines relating to the arts, broadcasting and digital media in Canada. The interview and discussion group, as concept and reflexive methodology, produce

---

consumer environment and turned to other established editing softwares such as Avid or Adobe Premiere Pro as the industrial standard.

vital and original knowledge applicable to scholarly research and to media production. Such a perspective foregrounds the agency of individuals within networked social systems, as theorized above methodologically, and in the previous chapter's framing of creative citizenship. The approach is firmly situated in the middle-range of possible investigations explicated earlier in this chapter, suggesting a productive meeting-ground involving interviews, policy and media programming, where a critical discussion of relatively detailed industry practices and reflexivity about systems of power and social relations incorporate the reflections and impacts of individual or group interventions. To manage the significant amount of information generated in the case study, the use of transcripts, video-editing, digital field notes and Korsakow – an internet presentation software – were employed in particular ways. The timing and scope of specific strategies for processing the interviews and discussion groups in this way from both periods (1997-2008 and 2010-2014) are elucidated below.<sup>7</sup> The *ArtSpots* production practices are investigated without losing sight of the networked nature of the people, power structures, cultural forms and expressions implicated in these combinations (explored in detail in chapter three). The richly layered information generated during interviews and discussion groups allows for analysis that reaches beyond a genre analysis of website and programming content, including the material produced for eight long-form documentaries and the 1,200+ short videos of *ArtSpots*. The methodology enables a deeper understanding of the parameters and perceived value of mentorship and professional development opportunities shared by individual producers and

---

<sup>7</sup> Additional details about many of the specifics involved are included in the bibliography and appendices. Lists of interviewees and discussion group participants are found in the bibliography. The lists of tapes available and accessed at CBC are found in Appendix One, while the list of videos produced during 2010-2014 are in Appendix Two. The website featuring six field notes produced during the research phase can be found at: <http://moreartculturemediaplease.com/towards-creative-citizenship-dissertation-research/> (accessed July 6, 2014).

artists involved in the production processes, which is important in the development of pluralistic and equitable content. Further, the dialogues that take place during both time periods (1997-2008 and 2010-2014) suggest a decisive role for the narrowcast audiences of *ArtSpots* that emerged out of the volunteer Advisory Committee process. (Examples of narrowcast audiences explored later in the dissertation include collaborative distribution opportunities, including the placement of *ArtSpots* content in exhibitions, national parks and museums, commercial galleries and artist-run centres, not to mention the internet, at a time when video was barely available online.) Mapping the articulation of creativity and visual art practice to media production by conducting new research interviews and discussion groups with those previously involved in the *ArtSpots* project highlights specific social and reciprocal relations of creativity in the cultural media production involved. Analogous critical and creative practices at *CBC ArtSpots* from 1998-2008 included the individual artist interviews (which were recorded and used as primary creative material), and facilitated lengthy Advisory Group sessions (which were not video recorded, but were used as primary data collection strategies, particularly for artist identification and selection, and as audience development sites).

For clarity, by *archival interviews*, I mean the previously recorded and edited interviews generated during the active *ArtSpots* production period of 1997-2008. References to the 1997-2008 *ArtSpots* Advisory Group experiences are identified through capitalization (e.g. *Advisors* or *Advisory Groups*) or less frequently as *historical advisory groups* or *historical discussion groups*. By *research interviews*, I mean the interviews and discussion groups conducted during the 2010-2014 research period for this dissertation. If I am referring only to the discussion groups conducted as part of the 2010-2014 research interview process, these are referred to as *research discussion groups* or simply as *discussion groups*.

To generate as comprehensive a set of perspectives as possible from the original target participants for *ArtSpots* (1997-2008), the list of potential research interviewees reflected as many former *ArtSpots* roles as possible. It was a database and logistical challenge to select an appropriate short list of potential participants for the research interviews. Over 1,000 individuals had been implicated in *ArtSpots* during the decade, each with different roles and involvements. The selection of the individual research interviewees or discussion group members was therefore based on factors related to the earlier recruitment of these 1,000+ individuals to assist with *ArtSpots*. A preliminary definition of these roles is useful here. At minimum, an *ArtSpots* artist was a key participant in the creative process, with substantive input over the creative process, including a veto on the material produced. An *ArtSpots* creative producer was actively engaged in the production of meaning through his or her own creative practice, i.e. as someone who produces art-based media for use in public broadcasting (television or internet). More generally, producers in the television environment are key creative decision-makers as well as logistics and budget managers. They also often assume the role of the director, particularly in small unit environments. In projects such as *ArtSpots*, the creative interaction between artists and producers is potentially quite significant. Further, web producers (or developers or designers) involved through the act of digital coding are entangled in similar activities as artists and creative producers. The production of art-based content as digital media arises during the transition from analog to digital broadcasting. Finally, the term curator-programmer in relation to *ArtSpots* Advisors suggests corollary functions between the fine arts and media production. Curators select programming (e.g. exhibitions) in the domain of fine arts, while media programmers do the same in television, radio, film, and digital media environments (including the selection of artists for *ArtSpots*). The potential for considering the roles of the artists, producer-directors and

curator-programmer in terms of creative citizenship resides in environments where each can be seen to be (simultaneously) narrowcast audience, creative contributors and cultural meaning producers. Comparable observations about blurred roles are analysed in relation to open source movements of the 1990s to the present day, including Dale Bradley's analysis of the history of the movement (2004) and Alison Powell's analysis of the Montreal and Fredericton wireless community movements in Canada (2008). Uricchio analyses work of this nature in open source movements as an expression of *cultural* citizenship in regard to "producer/consumer relations" (2004, 1) but not in terms of the roles of producer-directors or curator-programmers, or their relationships to one another as well as to artists. In the *ArtSpots* context, artists were able to be subject and participant, including a degree of co-creator participation as authoritative creative decision-makers, and as audience. This suggestion of the recursive nature of programming production begs questions about what the networked and contingent roles and impacts of various types of creators are in the *ArtSpots* case, analysed in detail in chapters three and five.

The thirty-two people engaged in the primary research stage between 2010-2014, were in four key centres: Halifax, Montreal, Ottawa and Toronto, of which twenty-five had been involved in the original *ArtSpots* development and production period of 1997-2008. They brought *ArtSpots* experience from across the country into the discussions. Additionally, a group of emerging media artists at NSCAD University – who had never heard of *ArtSpots* – agreed to provide an "outside" perspective on the project. Everyone who was asked to join the 2010-2014 research sessions agreed right away to be involved. In total, fifteen individual interviews and three discussion groups (involving seventeen participants) were conducted. Pilot project interviews took place in March 2010, and the rest took place between February and September 2012. Follow-up emails and conversations took place through 2014. Participants in the 2010-

2012 interviews and discussions included former *ArtSpots* artists, Advisory Group members such as curators and artist cooperative directors, media producers and crew who worked on the project for television, websites and digital content, policy-makers and resource providers, digital archives and gallery exhibition and project partners, and audience members.

It was important to reflect the substantial level of geographical representation during the original production period for *ArtSpots* (1998-2008) in the interview base for the 2010-2014 research. Though it was not possible during the research phase to achieve the extensive representation that had been possible in 1997-2008 from 1,000+ individual participants, experience in all of the provinces and territories was represented. My own involvement with *ArtSpots* included work in every province and territory, and some of the other crew and volunteer experts involved in the 2010-2014 research had multi-regional or pan-Canadian experience with *ArtSpots* as well. Different age groups, and different temporal periods were incorporated in both the original program and therefore in the research interviews (i.e. early, middle, or late in the decade of production). Sixteen of the thirty-two people involved in the research interviews and discussion groups of 2010 to 2012 were women (including fourteen out of the twenty-five erstwhile *ArtSpots* participants in the group), in large part a reflection of the significant level of involvement of women in the original *ArtSpots* production project. From its early days, *ArtSpots* was regarded as a training ground for women and culturally diverse candidates. This was particularly true of the producer-directors, a job role traditionally reflecting low levels of participation by women and culturally diverse candidates in the broader media production environment.

The broad swath of participants involved in both time periods crucially assists in verifying findings by comparing different points of view with varying levels and types of

contributions and different temporal involvements. Yin suggests that this is a crucial feature of an in-depth case study such as *ArtSpots* (2009, 116-117). The complexity of the original project was suitably reflected in the choice to assemble a combination sample, incorporating purposive and cross-sectional strategies. Interestingly, some characteristics of a longitudinal sample emerged strongly during 2010-2014 because of the participants' previous involvement in earlier *ArtSpots*' Advisory Group and production discussions and analyses. Additionally, a few snowball suggestions were made, though many of those suggested were already on the list of potential research interviewees. All of the sessions were recorded on video cameras, though one of the sessions was audio-only (by request).<sup>8</sup> None of the participants requested anonymity, and all but one signed and sent back the consent form by the time of writing. I have not used data from the latter. The complete list of participants in the research process and their affiliations with *ArtSpots* is included in the bibliography, while a sample transcript from the artist discussion group is included as Appendix Three and the Ethics Protocol is included in Appendix Four.

Acknowledging the residue of the responsibility and authority consigned to me as the creator of the *ArtSpots* project, and as the representative for CBC on the project from 1997 to 2008, my role in the research interviews and discussion groups of 2010 and 2012 evolved into a combination of facilitator and participant. This allowed for a comfortable tone to be readily established and a critical analysis arose among participants quite quickly. This is consistent with the narratives of collaboration that emerge from analyses of production practices discussed during the interview and discussion groups of 2010-2014. For me as a facilitator in 1997-2008 and as a researcher in 2010-2014, the approach contributed to an active flattening of the

---

<sup>8</sup> Likewise, a recording of York University Master of Arts student and former *ArtSpots* intern Emma Frank's interview of me was primarily an audio recording though this was a function of the logistics required to record over Skype rather than a request by Frank or me.

hierarchy implicit in both time periods, requiring careful listening and responses to questions, critiques and suggestions for future action. These are markers of the grounded theory and feminist approaches and methodologies elucidated earlier in this chapter, particularly including Hine, Mayer, and Onyx and Small.

*The Wild West: Into the archives*

My primary interest in dialogical documentation in this dissertation lies with rethinking the *ArtSpots* project in terms of creative citizenship. What that means is to situate the program materials, and the production and distribution practices, in the larger context of cultural media production and cultural engagement generally, both at the time, and as it continues to impact today. Not incidentally, the research undertaken is predicated on historicizing the original *ArtSpots* production. Combining video and document archives with new interviews makes the undertaking more visible and accessible than the *ArtSpots* archives alone can, including the original, now moribund, *ArtSpots* website. The media-based elements of the investigation can be replicated and extended by others examining *ArtSpots*, especially by the artists and producers involved, many of whom still own copies of the program materials produced based on their work. This is an advantage in the context of media production and digital humanities studies: the capacity for many interested parties to activate visual, audio and time-based contributions and enquiries.

It is quickly evident from interviews in both eras that *ArtSpots* rapidly developed as an experimental space as a result of a series of certain shifts in policy, technology, artistic and business practices. *ArtSpots* broke ground on the use of new technologies in the public broadcasting and visual arts domains. Many of the research participants remarked on the productive opening generated in broadcasting production, but also the complexity of

maintaining this experimental space to do the work. The nature of the language used by participants throughout the research reveals this, including that of Jere Brooks, long-time web developer for *ArtSpots*, who started her career as a computer programmer, trainer and website designer. By the time she joined CBC, Brooks had already worked for several years in a burgeoning digital field. She characterizes the promise of the burgeoning digital media environment and the resulting experimental nature of the work undertaken at *ArtSpots* between 1997-2008, this way:

When I got hired I was the first of six regional web developers across the country, and it was CBC's first attempt to put some kind of structure around new media in the regions, and simultaneously at the broadcast headquarters. We called it the Wild West...and we were going to take advantage of everything we could. .... (Personal interview with the author, February 4, 2012).

Brooks notes that the optimism of the technological and distribution opportunity is quickly tempered by practical concerns:

We actually realized very quickly that online gave us so much more room and ability to dig deeper if we wanted to. What became the issue was budget and being able to add all that [potential] value – to utilize a lot of the work that was done around the thirty-second items and never saw the light of day in their final edited version. More about the artists themselves, and their process and so forth, that the viewer, seeing the thirty-second item on TV, would never get to experience. But the issue with that became exactly – how do you manage all that additional content, what format. What obligation are we imposing on the artist to deliver this additional content for us. (Personal interview with the author, February 4, 2012).

These kinds of concerns were also expressed in research interviews and discussion groups, asking how artists and other presenters find the time, skills and resources (at an individual or small group level) today to manage and present content on the many digital platforms available for promotion and expression. Finally, a realization of the extensive support structure required to maintain production and digital broadcasting opportunities arises in Brooks' observations:

When we started to put the online stuff together, it became pretty evident pretty quickly, that we may be biting off a bit more than we can chew, in terms of being able to realistically keep up with the amount of content – that we knew would be great and we knew would add a lot of value. But always that balancing act between how do I get what I need, what I think I want to do, with what is realistic, accomplishable, ... (Personal interview with the author, February 4, 2012).

Similarly, the sheer volume of the programming material in the *ArtSpots* corporate archives suggested early on in the research processes of 2010-2014 that an in-depth analysis of all of the material generated during 1998-2008 would not be possible for this research project. It was crucial to develop methodological strategies in 2010-2014 that would allow important, overarching themes to emerge from the available evidence. To understand how this was managed, it is helpful to consider the scope of the *ArtSpots* archives.

#### *Finding a focus in the archives*

Throughout the research for this dissertation project, I have been able to draw on the archival materials developed during the decade of *ArtSpots* production, now stored in personal and corporate archives. The amount of material available is, not surprisingly, overwhelming. From the first visits to the *CBC ArtSpots* corporate archives in 2012, and from dipping into my own personal archives from the time that *ArtSpots* ceased production in 2008, it was obvious that I would need to find a focus that would allow me to probe the archive without having thousands of hours to view and review all of the millions of details of ten years of documented art, curatorial and television production interactions. There is plenty of documentation in the *ArtSpots* archives suggesting the desire to leave behind robust traces of creative work and social relations. For example, the stashing of *ArtSpots* field tapes in production offices, and the sharing of notes, storyboards and production processes with the subjects of *ArtSpots* productions as well as the advisors, are indicators of *ArtSpots* as a knowledge-sharing environment from its early days.

My personal *ArtSpots* archives consist of a small contingent of four plastic bins featuring an intensely creatively-focused and detailed daily record of the time period. From those personal archives, I draw on fifteen personal notebooks, eleven day timers and calendars, several hard-copy files, a printout of more than 1000 pages of the website, a dozen or so administrative digital files and folders, samples of the merchandising paraphernalia produced and a full DVD set of the sixty-five master tapes of *ArtSpots* documentaries and program content. Notes and drawings were consulted from 2010-2014 for writing field notes and providing accurate timelines for this dissertation. Some of the 1,200+ edited *ArtSpots* program videos were redigitized for use during research. This isn't the only time this material has been redigitized. In 2007, the year prior to production's end and the preparation of the formal *CBC ArtSpots* corporate archive, the entire collection of videos was repackaged and redigitized for use on a database-driven interactive software. This was a complete relaunch of the site that never happened; the program was shut down just after the wireframe was approved.

As for the formal *CBC ArtSpots* archives, there are thirty-one cardboard "bankers" boxes sitting in a CBC archive storage space in Toronto (these boxes were originally held in Halifax, until October 2013). They contain much more than my personal archives: artist lists, editing logs, multi-year plans and program storyboards and proposals, the project bible, correspondence and meeting notes. Above all, they contain tape. Betacam SP, Betacam SX, and Digital Betacam were the main formats used, with a little bit of mini-DV (digital video) thrown in towards the end of the project. Included in Appendix One is a list of all of the field tapes and edited masters kept in those thirty-one boxes. This archive isn't simply a physical one, however. As one of the earliest digital media projects at CBC, a rather comprehensive digital record remains on the CBC's servers in the form of the edited video programming for television and the website,

additional born-digital website material and its structural programming files (i.e. coding) as well as the *ArtSpots*' administrative files. The MySQL (structured query language) and administrative files are also backed up on two portable drives created during the construction of the formal *CBC ArtSpots* corporate archive in 2008. There's enough there to salvage everything that was produced, and much that never saw a television or digital screen. The two identical drives contain the coding for the newly revamped and redigitized videos prepared in 2007-08 for an anticipated migration to a database structure, as well as a full copy of the then-existing website. Everything is on the drives except the videos themselves, which are duplicated on the master set of sixty-five digital tapes. When first visiting the corporate archive in May of 2012 (then in Halifax), I was able to review the website content in two forms. First was its template-based form of more than 2000 pages of content, corollary images, text, and video on these stand-alone hard drives. Second was the MySQL file for the putative database version of the new and completely revised *ArtSpots* project that was to be launched in mid-2008. This aggregative curatorial initiative was to include user-generated content, including the capacity for curatorial interactivity for the narrowcast audiences involved and a much deeper degree of interactive capability for general audiences.

Additionally, I was able to review and confirm benchmark dates in the program, reports on accomplishments, correspondence, and program materials relevant to the case study. These three initial visits confirmed that there was a full Digital Beta copy of the master set and a Digital Beta SX dub (duplicate) of the field tape collection in the climate-controlled CBC tape library archive, alongside a substantial number of earlier *ArtSpots* master tapes (and master tapes of all other programming generated out of CBC Halifax in the same period and earlier). While on site, I composed hand-written and typed notes and copied information about the distribution of the

*ArtSpots* material across the country from the library digital database. While looking at the various inventories of tapes, I also shot some preliminary footage that showed where the archives were being stored, as a form of note taking. This initial foray into media-based note taking provided an early inkling about how to mobilize media for this dissertation project, in conjunction with the interviews and discussion groups mobilized as the primary research method. The notes and footage collected provided background material for website-based field notes and other written reflections.<sup>9</sup>

Seven additional visits to the *CBC ArtSpots* corporate archives and the CBC Halifax tape library were undertaken to secure additional footage and information in the spring and fall of 2013. The climate-controlled formal *CBC program library* at Halifax consolidates about 1,100 original field tapes and variations of master tapes from the full ten-year period. These include multiple compilations of material prepared for regional broadcast, national and digital channel broadcast, for events, exhibitions and film festivals, and for corollary projects. However, the formal *ArtSpots* archives themselves were stored in various locations at CBC Halifax between 2008-2013, none of which were climate controlled. The storage locations tended to be unused offices and storage spaces that otherwise held sealed paper records, or unused props or furniture. In addition to hundreds of field tapes in the formal *CBC ArtSpots* corporate archive now housed in Toronto, and the hundreds of master tapes in the CBC Halifax program library under the

---

<sup>9</sup> See, for example, <http://moreartculturemediaplease.com/towards-creative-citizenship-dissertation-research/ArtSpots-field-notes/> (accessed July 6, 2014). This section of my website describes the dissertation research parameters and six field notes reflecting on the strategies used in the research. Together with conference presentations and drafting material for publications, this was a space for thinking through conundrums, observations, and discoveries. During the research phase, I also documented my own understanding of the *ArtSpots* chronology and contributions in an interview (Hogan and Luka 2013) published in a commissioned article for an online journal in 2013, which can be found here: <http://nomorepotlucks.org/site/archiving-ArtSpots-with-mary-elizabeth-luka-mel-hogan/> (accessed July 6, 2014).

*ArtSpots* name, another sixty-nine programs or stock footage collections within CBC were documented by Halifax program librarian Douglas Kirby during 1998-2008 as recipients of *ArtSpots* materials, including regional news programs, CBC's then-burgeoning digital channels, and national programs focusing on culture (*CBC ArtSpots* corporate archives). As a result, the *ArtSpots* materials are widely disbursed even within CBC. Each of the artists received a VHS or DVD copy of their own edited material, for which permission was granted by CBC to use the work for promotional, non-profit, and educational purposes, though many artists no longer have a working copy. Each of the producers involved in creating the work was also provided with waivers and review copies allowing for similar uses of the material. Often, members of the Advisory Groups and their extended networks would request thematic compilations to use in exhibitions or cultural events, usually a combination of a particular set of demographics and art genres. Many of the individuals or organizations involved in the eight long-form documentaries (including the Canadian Museum of Civilization, Canada Council for the Arts, National Parks of Canada, and the Samuel and Saidye Bronfman Family Foundation) were also provided with DVDs or Beta tapes of the programs and relevant offline portions of the website.

From these records, it is obvious that content sharing was an early practice at *CBC ArtSpots*. The program materials produced from 1998-2008 were also duplicated and distributed throughout the exhibition networks that existed during the *ArtSpots* era, as the archives confirm. Content sharing acted as a kind of recognition that arts audiences and diverse demographics not often portrayed on television tended to go elsewhere to see themselves reflected: including galleries, artist-run centres, national parks, and at community events. The echoes of this rather massive and organic distribution system are easily observed among the fluid and still-existing residue of networked *ArtSpots* relationships from 2010-2014. For example, John Hobday and

Nancy Rosenfeld (former Executive Directors of The Samuel and Saidye Bronfman Family Foundation) – provided *ArtSpots*-related files to me during the summer of 2012 to assist with the analysis of the *ArtSpots* era. Other erstwhile partners still employ individuals who were influenced in some way by the connections enabled from 1997-2008. Several Canadian galleries, curators, artist co-operatives, and educational institutions still use their copies of various compilations, often in a range of formats. The documentation for the work produced and distributed is included in the formal *ArtSpots* archive as well as in the business affairs records of the CBC. These memos and contracts do not elicit a strong reaction from erstwhile participants, but the visual content does. So does discussion of processes and practices.

Original “evergreen” (i.e. does not date quickly) content produced for *ArtSpots* can also be found on websites, including [CBC.ca/ArtSpots](http://CBC.ca/ArtSpots), the Canadian Museum of Civilization (now Canadian Museum of History), artists’ websites and YouTube. One particular piece of the *ArtSpots* website exists within another formal archive through multiple versions of it captured for the Internet Wayback Machine (see Hogan 2012, for a thorough analysis of using the IWM for archival probes). More than 50 snapshots or iterations of *ArtSpots* html-coded pages and elements of the *ArtSpots* website are listed on the IWM website, though the links to the videos do not function here either. Even with the considerable investment made to “save” the World Wide Web that the IWM represents, there is no way of fully “recovering” these crucial time-based media components of *ArtSpots* production and shared experiences.

The richness of the *ArtSpots* archives suggest that *ArtSpots* is particularly suited to its sustainability as a site of scholarly investigation and industrial re-use of the interviews and artwork documented, for television, the internet or mobile devices. The material reflects the day-to-day existence of artists at that time, in terms of how they produced and thought about their

artwork. Media scholars Ann Cvetkovich (2002) and Pamela Wilson (2009) argue that the vernacular, or “day-to-day,” nature of media production archives is telling and persistent: there is plenty of evidence in the *ArtSpots* archives to support the persistence of Canadian artwork from that time. That CBC makes the predominantly tape-based *ArtSpots* program content archive available for educational, exhibition, and promotional use by the artists in perpetuity and for many of the participants is pretty unusual. The public service mandate and the discourse around the arts embedded in the content or the processes used have the potential to be re-thought or re-worked. The wide diffusion and substantial depth of the *ArtSpots*’ edited program documents and even more extensive video field tapes suggest that fairly extensive research could be conducted here, whether or not CBC continues to allow access to the core corporate materials. Kim Sawchuk (2007) points out that media theorist Harold Innis provides a number of cautionary signposts when considering what is already in an archive, where it’s located, and how it’s accessed and understood. In the same collection of essays, Terry Cook (2007) notes that Library and Archives Canada, in the person of archives director Hugh Taylor, only began systematically accepting non-document forms of archives in the 1970s, even though it had accepted “non-textual media...arriving as part of larger accessions of private manuscripts or governments records” since 1872. The dominance of analog tape and digital media content in the *ArtSpots* archives suggests a growing emphasis on this kind of archival material, even while its fragility as physical artifact ensures a relatively short lifespan for archival activity related to it.

*Dialogue and digital technology: Logging, transcribing and editing*

In my study, visual and aural elements contribute to pivotal observations and narrative(s) through analyses of new and archival interviews, discussion groups, and arts documentary programming for television and digital media platforms. Artworks and text, as well as recorded dialogues and

flows of material, engender a “thickness” of data, (to update Clifford Geertz (1973)), based on a multi-sited approach begun by George E. Marcus (1998). Big data and thick data are not mutually exclusive.<sup>10</sup> To be clear, in terms of data management, I am not referring to the impressive ability of computer-based algorithms to calculate audience and market findings from “big data warehouses” for “business intelligence” management (Eckerson 2011).<sup>11</sup> I am, however, referring to the ways in which digital data helps generate particular narratives by parsing patterns and visual cues. Of course, the processing of big data is a remarkable development that has become progressively more available to researchers in the social sciences related to STEM (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) studies, as well as to large corporate concerns.<sup>12</sup> Most of these applications are built for applied uses: informative and often visually impressive, though always in need of interpretation, particularly in terms of tone, themes and social relations and therefore often used in combination with other qualitative data generating strategies.

In contrast, the digital logging and transcribing methodology begun in February 2012 for the dissertation project provides an emphatically qualitative and creatively rich ground for the *ArtSpots* case study. Mimicking the prioritizing, selection and editing processes used in the

---

<sup>10</sup> A smart, scholarly discussion of this point is made by ethnographer Tricia Wang (2013) in a blog post: <http://ethnographymatters.net/2013/05/13/big-data-needs-thick-data/> (Accessed July 6, 2014).

<sup>11</sup> “Big data warehouses” is a phrase commonly used in business environments to refer to data collected—often automatically—by computerized systems in everyday transactions including sales, social media, etc. “Business intelligence” is a phrase commonly used to mean generative data management for business purposes, for example, to target a marketing campaign (Eckerson 2011).

<sup>12</sup> Quantitative language and text analysis has reached new heights in data visualization applications that can process and present graphs and images of how frequently and, to some degree, in what context massive amounts of words, phrasing and rhythms are used or found. For an example of in-depth analyses of historical language and writing, see the work undertaken by Geoffrey Rockwell, Garry Wong, Stan Ruecker, Megan Meredith-Lobay and Stéfan Sinclair (2010).

production and dissemination of the original *ArtSpots* materials became a productive strategy to deal with the sheer volume of potential material. Narratives of pluralism, innovation and collaboration emerged early on in the research period through transcribing interviews and video editing, as will be discussed fully in upcoming chapters. By May 2012, six full transcripts had been completed and, in all, thirteen full transcripts were produced. By then, it was clear that logging video material and editing videos would be a complementary and even more productive way to draw out essential themes. The digital underpinnings of the transcription and logging technology embedded in the word processing and video editing systems used for processing the dissertation research enabled a flexible and adaptable sorting of interview segments into themes, quotes or prioritized feedback that could be resorted into multiple categories. This allowed the various types of media used to be edited into short videos, grouped for analysis in word clouds, or analysed through excerpting and quoting. The flexibility of the flows of information and analyses that these explicitly digital affordances offered were crucial media deconstruction and (re)production strategies mobilized to interrogate *ArtSpots*. The digital nature of this methodology holds potential as a deliberative embodiment of the theoretical, historically-based “remediation” endeavour that Jay David Bolter and Richard Grusin (1999) suggest may be inevitable as technology develops, drawing from Marshall McLuhan’s legacy of measured, or purposeful, engagement with materiality in/and media. The *ArtSpots* materials’ usability at the prosumer or individual (research or production) level connects back to the discussion of how important access to technology is for individual audience members or creative producers, explicated in chapter one (Moll 2011; Raboy and Shterne 2010; Shade 2010), and foreshadows how important this turns out to be for the development of the concept of creative citizenship, as will be seen in forthcoming chapters.

By the time the last formal research discussion groups and interviews took place late in 2012, and the last set of visits to the *CBC ArtSpots* corporate archives began in 2013, it became clear that the most efficacious way to make progress was to produce short, themed videos. These videos pulled content from the research interviews and discussion groups conducted in 2010 and 2012 as well as historical interviews, artwork treatments and web content created at *ArtSpots* between 1997-2008. To connect the different time periods in the video materials I was collecting or generating myself, and to deepen the findings of the research interviews, I looked for material in the archives that explicitly related to the people re-involved in the 2010 and 2012 research sessions. So, for example, I viewed field material from 1998-2008 that dealt with the six artists involved in the 2012 discussion groups and interviews and the field material produced by the three producer-directors and two web designer-producers involved in the 2010 and 2012 research interviews.

Cultural media production at *ArtSpots* incorporated particular considerations of artistic practice and accessibility, including the management of intellectual property rights and an ongoing dialogue among the artists, producers, curators and other narrowcast audiences involved. Notably, artists involved with *ArtSpots* maintained moral rights and a significant degree of creative control over the presentation of their work on broadcast media, including a veto of the edited material. When the research for this dissertation began in 2010, permission was secured from CBC to push the boundaries of further uses of the material originally generated (1997-2008), as well as activating and illustrating continued participation in the *ArtSpots* dialogue from erstwhile *ArtSpots* participants as cultural producers and audiences. To ground this in a particular example, consider the involvement of former *ArtSpots* artist Ursula Johnson

then and now. Johnson participated in the 2012 artist discussion group, as well as an artist in the mid-2000s.

During 2012 and 2013, I produced four videos concerning Johnson, incorporating material from the 2012 discussion group material as well as footage from Johnson's archival interviews and from her great-grandmother's archival interview, to see if a dialogue "between" the two time periods could take place. In one of the "new" videos produced, Johnson recalls the discovery embedded in the *ArtSpots* process she went through with Caroline Gould, her great-grandmother (also a former *ArtSpots* artist):

Tonia [di Risio, then director of the Anna Leonowens Art Gallery at NSCAD University, where Johnson was graduating] talked to me about what *ArtSpots* was... she told me I should go to the website. I went on and browsed through the list to figure out what *ArtSpots* was. (Luka: Did you figure it out?). A little bit. They were all very different. At the time, my great-grandmother and myself were going to do an ArtSpot. And we weren't sure if it was going to be together. Or if it was going to be separate. I don't think [producer-director] Johanne [Gallant] knew either, until after the interviews and the photo sessions. And then it was decided it was going to be two separate *ArtSpots*. But because we mention each other, they're tied together. [An excerpt from *ArtSpots* plays]. So for a while, if you googled Caroline's artspot, then a link would come up to mine. Then if you googled mine, Caroline's would come up. Which was kind of neat, how [*ArtSpots*] put them together. (Ursula Johnson, artist, artist discussion group, February 28, 2012, and "UJ-Seq04-DG1-Ursula-experience" video, 2013).

Viewers of these videos find them easy to understand as part of an ongoing discussion Johnson has with her work.<sup>13</sup> This outcome is exciting. Generating edited videos and organizing them in relation to the research interviews and discussion groups processes data and simultaneously acts as explorations of themes and questions for analysis during case study research. In chapters four

---

<sup>13</sup> One of the four videos produced during the *ArtSpots* research (2012) and three of the archival videos from the mid-2000s can be found in a multi-media interview I developed with Johnson in 2013: <http://nomorepotlucks.org/site/nujitateket-one-who-does-it-an-interview-with-ursula-johnson-m-e-luka/> (accessed July 6, 2014) and <http://moreartculturemediaplease.com/interview-ursula-johnson/> (accessed July 6, 2014).

and five, this has implications for better understanding how collaboration and creativity may be understood to contribute to the concept of creative citizenship.

Useful observations about the *ArtSpots* chronology emerged through the process of sifting my own narrative from artist-in-residence to executive producer in interviews conducted by others. This allowed me to reflect on innovations in creative business practices via an accounting of the ten-year trajectory of the *ArtSpots* production period. Excerpts from these interviews were incorporated into a multi-modal project that contextualized my own position in relation to the project's innovative and collaborative approach by juxtaposing written commentary and the video excerpts with some archival material (Hogan and Luka 2013).<sup>14</sup> It had been evident from the moment that the *ArtSpots* dissertation research project was conceived that a way to explore my own positioning and contributions as founder would be needed to develop a critical perspective on the project. The profile mobilized a helpful set of analytical strategies including editing video, transcripts and other material that could accommodate storylines about creative practices and the development of skills and networks beyond the biographical for many of those who had been involved. As a result, the profile was an effective solution to the question of how to analyse my own imbrication in the *ArtSpots* project itself. Initially intended to be a historicizing of the *ArtSpots* project and an exploration of its relationship to archive studies, the profile also references *ArtSpots*' broader role as an incubator of non-traditional production roles in excerpts discussing the disproportionate number of women involved as producer-directors and editors. The stand-alone nature of the 2013 multi-modal profile supports a roughly chronological and deeply insider-inflected account from a single perspective, while testing and making more robust the iterative process of producing and reflecting on themes and findings that connect to

---

<sup>14</sup> The profile can be viewed at <http://nomorepotlucks.org/site/archiving-ArtSpots-with-mary-elizabeth-luka-mel-hogan/> (accessed July 6, 2014).

creative citizenship as a concept. The profile works on the internet, as a paper printout and on mobile devices. This is evidence of the effective use of interviews strengthens case study data, as Yin (2009) suggests is vital to rich research analysis.

### *A digital world*

By drawing on media materials in the *ArtSpots* archives as well as through the new discussion groups and interviews, I was able to generate a substantial amount of rich data. Transcribing, logging and reviewing the research interviews and discussion groups together with sampling the archival interviews and program materials was a time-consuming though rewarding process. Between 2011 and 2013, over one-hundred short videos incorporating material from the fifteen interviews and discussion groups conducted were logged, edited, assigned keywords, and arrayed in digital presentations as an investigation of the original decade-long television and internet broadcast project. Of these, eighty-five were analysed using the internet presentation software, Korsakow, including twenty-seven early videos, and fifty-eight later videos, enumerated in Appendix Two. Since the research conducted for the project was developed for a doctoral dissertation, it was of crucial importance to create, develop and manage as much of the data and analysis using only my own skills and abilities, to maximize the original contribution made as an individual scholar. Although this placed some limits on the work that could be done, the framework and the availability of prosumer technology also provided a clear set of parameters about how much work could be accomplished on my own in a limited amount of time. Strategies included the redesign and restructuring of my own website to accommodate illustrative field notes and visual material (video, text and still images) mentioned earlier, as well as the digital editing and production of videos noted above, many further developed through their placement in Korsakow.

Segmenting archived *ArtSpots* materials embedded with high production values (e.g. excerpts of videos of artworks and interviews, website screen captures, and documentaries), and editing these into the excerpts from the newly-recorded investigative conversations reveals rich research processes and potentials but also disjunctures between the eras and formats. This deliberative workflow incorporated digital software applications Evernote, Excel, Final Cut Pro, Wordpress, Korsakow and Adobe Premiere Pro, among others. Following the production of new videos in 2011 and 2012, a structure was required to organize and compare the content generated on a thematic basis rather than on the basis of new interviews conducted or on archival materials. Korsakow was enlisted to help with sifting the densely qualitative findings. In particular, the keyword function of Korsakow was used to generate pathways through the edited material. Eventually, more than 300 minutes of content in eighty-five videos was organized for analysis through two major iterations of a Korsakow documentary undertaking.

The beta iteration of the Korsakow incorporated twenty-four videos in the spring of 2012, while the final iteration testing the inclusion of all eighty-five videos was produced in the winter of 2013. Based on the initial success of the beta iteration, I had anticipated that it would be desirable to generate upwards of 100 videos to provide the robustness needed to explore the case study. In hindsight, although all of these materials could have gone into one large Korsakow project, a more accurate reflection of the iterative nature of the original program (1997-2008) could have been better served by new research-based media production in 2010-2014 that created a series of smaller projects over time, each relating to the project as a whole but not standing-in for it. Given attention spans, traditional television wisdom would suggest that one-hundred short videos in a lone non-linear project would be almost inaccessible to any potential audience interested in *ArtSpots*, arts in Canada or related topics, no matter how carefully

considered and evolved the organizational themes and keywords become. Unlike the experience of creating a television or film documentary – meant to pithily express a cohesive storyline and potentially unified set of conclusions – generating groupings of archival and research material constellated around themes leads to an almost infinite viewing experience. The very open-endedness closes off the depth of experience waiting to be plumbed in the video materials themselves, from both the 2010-2014 and 1998-2008 periods.

The Korsakow format as a presentation software can easily serve up cultural content in bite-sized pieces ready for easy consumption through its visual design and database structure. It *looks like* a combination of television and the internet, rather than an organizing database, and indeed, it performs *visually* rather than as a database system. During the *ArtSpots* data processing period, however, it became evident that as well-suited as Korsakow may be to disrupting a traditional documentary structure, it does so by presuming that such a structure exists or is implicit in the material that it is delivering. To actually accommodate large amounts of archival material requiring multiple points of generative access requires a *database logic* beyond the basic structure and design of the Korsakow software. These findings are consistent with Hogan's findings based on her work with a digital media archives project built at the Brakhage Center at the University of Colorado – Boulder in 2013, and were helpfully discussed both during my March residency there, and later at the 2013 HASTAC conference in Toronto, along with key members of a Korsakow research and artist production working group.<sup>15</sup> Although Korsakow

---

<sup>15</sup> I was fortunate to receive funding for the Boulder residency and attendance at the HASTAC conference through a Hexagram-CIAM Internationalization Grant in 2013. A brief account of the HASTAC session can be found here: <http://www.a-r-c.ca/2013/05/hastac-2013/> (accessed July 6, 2014). Adventures in Research Creation is an ongoing collaborative research-creation project at Concordia University, with the current iteration titled Proof in Process, funded by Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. Co-directors are Drs. Monika Kin Gagnon and Matt Soar. Information about HASTAC (Humanities, Arts, Science and Technology

was a useful structure for sifting through the themes emerging from the processed visual and aural content of both the historical (1997-2008) and new (2010-2014) interviews themselves, its genesis as a *narrative-based* software (albeit a database or nonlinear narrative software) rather than as a database *management* system, results in a less than compelling viewing experience for all but the most committed researchers interested in the subject at hand. In the final analysis, the granularity of the concluding iteration of the Korsakow project, so helpful for sifting through the material, made it unwatchable.<sup>16</sup>

These strategies contribute to the drills required to process the themes and questions that arise through tilling the verdant soil of discussion groups and in-depth interviews. One of the recurring messages in the 2010-2014 discussions about the 1997-2008 production methodology was how deeply *ArtSpots* is missed in the community, as this exchange by former Advisory Group members in 2012 suggests:

Ray Cronin [CEO of Art Gallery of Nova Scotia]: The real thing I found disappointing is that it was invented as something that wasn't supposed to replace coverage of the visual arts on CBC. They treated it, eventually, as something that *did* replace coverage of the visual arts on CBC. [Nodding around room]. And the excuse is always the same – either that it's not visual enough or the producers don't know enough about it, or it's not interesting. There's about four or five excuses that I've heard for twenty years, and they always come down to the fact that someone just doesn't want to do it. And when you look at the way visual arts are covered on Radio-Canada and the way that CBC English television has insisted on ghettoizing them, either into incredibly expensive [some nodding in room], elitist 2-hour or 1-hour productions that last for six or seven episodes until they can't afford to do them anymore. "Adrienne Clarkson Presents" being an example of how the arts were treated. Or *ArtSpots* which were as guerilla and cheap as possible.

Sarah Fillmore [Chief Curator of Art Gallery of Nova Scotia]: ...Luxuriously cheap [laughter erupts in the room]

---

Alliance and Collaboratory) can be found here: <http://www.hastac.org/> (accessed July 6, 2014). I was a HASTAC Scholar from 2012-2014, part of an international network of scholars working in the digital humanities.

<sup>16</sup> A low-resolution version of this work-in-progress can be found at <http://moreartculturemediaplease.com/kmovies/process.apr21/> (accessed July 6, 2014).

Cronin: Comparatively so – right. With the minimum of commitment to the genre as possible. Can you get to less of a commitment than 15 or 30 seconds? So that was the disappointing thing. It seemed in the end that it became a kind of self-fulfilling prophecy. You create this thing and filled the space and ...[pauses]

Luka: You think you're building the floor and it turns out to be the ceiling.

Various: Mm hmm./Yup./That's it.....

[Discussion continues for some time, expressing regret about *ArtSpots*' cancellation and its possible reintroduction as a somewhat user-generated project in the future].

Luka: ... I'm conscious of the time; are there any final comments?

Peter Dykhuis [Director of Dalhousie University Art Gallery]: Did we cover all your questions? One way or the other?

Luka: Yes!

Fillmore: We want to say – be brave! Be bold! [Laughter and general agreement]... Bring it back. (Discussion group, former Advisory Group members, March 26, 2012).

The research strategies of 2010-2014 reflect and elicit the processes used at *ArtSpots* from 1997-2008 itself, and are reflexive about them as practices and as indicators of the flows of power and resources with the media industry. In other words, this project probes *ArtSpots* as a multi-modal, networked centre of production, curation and connection, in part, by renewing that networked centre of connection, production, and curation for analysis. However, this dissertation does not attempt to replicate *ArtSpots* – to make an arts documentary project out of the research about an arts documentary project. That would suggest more than simply a comparative parallel between the professional work I undertook for over a decade, and the research itself. Instead, digital methods help to unpack whether, how and why the arts documentary project based at the public broadcaster in the late 1990s became something more singular than simply a set of over 1,200 arts documentary programs generated for mass media audience consumption.

To ground creative citizenship more fulsomely in *ArtSpots* itself, the next chapter delineates how the *ArtSpots* players worked within its production and distribution systems. Creative citizenship starts to become visible in details drawn from the case study, including an analysis of two examples of innovation that arose early at *ArtSpots* in the context of the specific programming landscape within which *ArtSpots* found itself. Visits to the archives and conversations during old and new interviews help delineate specifics about the *ArtSpots* structure in relation to creative citizenship. Details about the distribution of *ArtSpots* video programming to its participants (noted above) prefigures the emergence of content-sharing patterns that later evolve into knowledge-sharing at *ArtSpots*, particularly in its constitution of pluralism and equity.

## **Chapter Three: Networked relationships and collaborative structures**

In this chapter, the networked and collaborative nature of the overall working relationships at *ArtSpots* is examined, including ways in which the *ArtSpots*' model acknowledged or acted to ameliorate the precarious nature of employment in the media field, and to a lesser degree, within the broader culture sector. Examples focus on initial articulations of technological transformation and equity in programming at CBC through *ArtSpots*, including the early uneven progression towards becoming a national initiative that incorporated partnerships and empowered artists and Advisors in disparate ways. The uncharacteristically wide distribution of *ArtSpots*' material to crucial groups of participants reveals efforts towards content (and later knowledge) sharing that became such a strong (innovative, collaborative) component of the *ArtSpots* mode of operation.

### ***Transforming an artist residency into a series of working relationships***

To better understand how *ArtSpots* came to exist as an innovative and collaborative project during this period, it is useful to consider the specific programming context. Canadian content was the heart of the programming mandate at CBC in the late 1990s, based on the requirements of the 1991 Broadcast Act, particularly in view of the then-upcoming license renewal of 1999. Employment and production resources were fairly widely dispersed across the country, including several regional offices responsible for news and entertainment programming for local consumption, and sometimes for national consumption. In Atlantic Canada, a vibrant homegrown filmmaking industry was fairly integrated with the broadly artistic community emerging from NSCAD University and similar organizations, including the fields of music,

media, fine craft, visual and conceptual arts and performance. The film festival business across the country was growing, and the Atlantic Film Festival had established itself in Halifax as a comfortable environment to do some business and see original, sometimes cutting-edge work. The CBC Maritimes office headquartered in Halifax was known as a terrific incubator of popular national television programming such as *Street Cents*, *This Hour Has 22 Minutes*, and *Theodore Tugboat*, among others, and to a lesser degree, regional programming, particularly music, short films and documentary. The personal nature of professional relationships in the media business, as shown earlier in the work of Born (2004), Caldwell (2008, 81-104) and Mayer (2011), was evident in Halifax and integrated through what emerges in this dissertation as creative citizenship. At *ArtSpots*, this trait was mobilized towards the sharing of creative control for the artists' and Advisors involved.

But before *ArtSpots*, the CBC Maritimes' office of the time was not well-connected to the broader artistic community, so starting in 1997, then Regional Director of Television, Fred Mattocks, began to pursue a strategy of public-private partnerships with community organizations, and for production projects.<sup>17</sup> In Halifax in the late 1990s, local and regional operations were split between two buildings: one accommodating radio production, the music library, finance and human resources, and the other television production and the video library. At the time, CBC's local and regional operations had been consolidated through recent resource cuts, resulting in a certain amount of unused corporate office and production space. Several non-

---

<sup>17</sup> The feasibility study conducted to determine the parameters of the partnerships program was conducted by me as a freelance consultant for CBC Maritimes in the winter of 1996-97, reporting to Mattocks. Mattocks set up the program and some pilot activity with John Nowlan, then the producer for youth television program *Street Cents*. It was later expanded by its subsequent long-time senior manager, Jennifer Gillivan, becoming an entire national department with responsibility for regional communications, branding and related community-based connections.

profit media-based organizations were invited by Mattocks to be housed in the CBC's Radio building in these unused spaces at low rents, including the Atlantic Film Festival, Atlantic Filmmakers Co-operative, Centre for Art Tapes and others. CBC employed a number of full-time production crew members year-round, and from time-to-time, a lull in regularly scheduled or seasonal production would make crew time available for pilot projects or exploratory initiatives. In Halifax, the decision was made to place some of what would have been otherwise expensive television production and editing resources in the Television building at the disposal of emerging producers and artists as a contribution towards short videos that could be aired on CBC. This is the context within which the artist residency I undertook was transformed into a ten-year artistic intervention on television and the internet, headquartered in public broadcasting and shaped by it.

To more precisely contextualize the *ArtSpots* television and internet broadcast project, it is useful to clearly situate *ArtSpots* as a forerunner among the prolific number and types of cultural forms of the late 1990s that generated artist and viewer/user engagements with digital creative visual works and stories. Within five years of *ArtSpots*' founding, this included television- and internet-based visual and performing arts productions such as CBC's *ZeD* (2002-2006) or internet-only *ArtsCanada* (2000-2004) and protozoan social-networking fan websites of the period including *MySpace* (2003), as well as documentary video blogs beginning in 2000. It is difficult to find traces of some of these relatively short-lived, mostly born-digital projects. The archiving of the born-digital world has already proven to be elusive (Hogan 2012; Wilson 2009). This is productively complicated by the subsequent development of an initially broad (and now narrowing) spectrum of internet and digital exhibition portals that span the reach of YouTube (founded eight years after *ArtSpots* began) and the games industry, to thoughtful curatorial

practices on gallery-based web-sites such as the use of audio (and later video) on the website for the Museum of Modern Art in New York from the early 2000s onwards. The digitization of photographs and other documentation of artistic works such as that found on the Virtual Museum of Canada website, founded in 2001, or CBC's own Digital Archives (CBC.ca/archives), were both funded by then-innovative Canadian Culture Online Funding Program, which carried budgets of \$65 million by 2003 (Bairstow 2003, 2004), all of which were cut by 2010. The explosion of mobile applications that followed internet development in the 2010s has been much more highly marked by its commercial and, to a lesser degree, its public service applications than the experimental work that flourished in relation to the internet through the mid-2000s. This backdrop of aspirational innovation goals in the media industry and particularly in what was then emerging as a "multi-platform" (later "multi-modal") environment shaped the *ArtSpots* structure and processes irrevocably. How and why that happened in the Canadian Maritimes, at the public broadcaster, is worth unpacking.

*Multi-platform media needs: Innovation and collaboration*

In 1998, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) was just beginning to explore the potential of producing programming that could be produced to air on television *and* the internet. In the fall of 1997 and early winter of 1998, Mattocks, who saw nothing but opportunity in what was then-described as "New Media," spent time considering what had happened to the synergistic relationship between art and television that had seemed to disappear over the decades. He had a conversation with the head of the local art college that resulted in an agreement for an artist residency at CBC.

There was a perception in the community that somehow CBC was divorced from aesthetics, which I always found hard to deal with, given all the programming we'd done. So, I started out by figuring out who thinks about this: the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design was the answer. Alice [Mansell, the president] and I had a long and productive

conversation about it, [including how artists were] wrestling with that question... Artists always have to deal with technology, but how you use the technology with the artistic impulse and ability to execute in the right place and in the right relationship: how do you get it in the right place, so you have the [creatives] driving the bus. What came out of that was a decision to create an artist-in-residence at CBC... (Personal interview, February 7, 2012).

Mattocks then arranged for office space and access to almost everyone within the regional production operation (several dozen employees) for a senior student from the college as an artist-in-residence: I was that senior student. About his thinking at the time, Mattocks notes:

The start of *ArtSpots* for me was the question: what was the place of aesthetics in television, and how do you connect an aesthetic sense in your portrayal of a community, or your portrayal of a reality with the factory that is television... So I asked you the same question when you arrived. Given the medium that is television, how do we connect aesthetically-based expression, aesthetic enterprise, with this in a way that an audience will enjoy. (Personal interview, February 7, 2012).

Mattocks' observations resonate with Spigel's examination of the role of artists in television in the 1950s and 1960s in North America, but goes beyond it by focusing on the growing creative worker audiences. Almost immediately upon my arrival, I declared to Mattocks that one place to start exploring this question was to simply present art on television, in as unmediated a manner as possible, and in consultation with the community involved: a curatorial process for broadcasting.<sup>18</sup> Mattocks agreed to a series of meetings as a conceptual and practical developmental process with the provincial visual arts community and a select number of production crew from within the CBC Regional operation.

[Y]ou went off and did a number of activities, [including developing] the proposition for *ArtSpots*. I wasn't really in love with it until I actually talked through the process with you. The whole idea of what was a new word for me in terms of active interaction with content,

---

<sup>18</sup> Beryl Graham and Sarah Cook (2010) explore similar implications for the concept and practice of curation in relation to "new media," from the perspective of gallery and museum requirements, interpretations and practices. It is within this sense of curation in a media environment that CBC Maritimes embraced the *ArtSpots* project.

was curation. Because *ArtSpots* is all about curation. ... And you identified very early on, that one core, I was going to call it a process, but it's more than a process, it's a value, a very accepted value in the art community. (Personal interview, February 7, 2012).

The residency was a success. In addition to working with a variety of personnel in the Maritimes office on a number of (mostly television) programs, the fundamental proposition for the *ArtSpots* format was developed. Several artists and curatorial community members had been involved in what was essentially a visioning process, including goals, value statements and criteria. Once the artist residency had been completed, Mattocks and I were faced with a decision: whether or not to proceed to a pilot project, which would mean hiring me on a part-time freelance basis as the producer. The conclusion was positive, resulting in a pilot project involving the work of six artists from across the province of Nova Scotia, comprising fourteen items of thirty seconds' duration each, storyboarded, shot and edited in the winter of 1998. They were transferred to a VHS tape and taken by Mattocks to a CBC Senior Management meeting in Toronto, about which he noted:

I remember the first time that I showed *ArtSpots* in a network television environment. It was at a network senior management meeting. So it was all the heads of English television from across the country, all the regional directors, and all the creative heads from the network. Sitting in a room. I played them our first *ArtSpots*... This is a pretty cynical and hardbitten group, and at the end of it, and this is the only time this has happened in my career, I got a standing ovation. Holy shit. And it's just that the concept was so powerful and so clear. And what's interesting about that is that I didn't start by telling them about the journey that we'd traveled to arrive there. I simply started by saying ... this is a series of interstitials [and] why we picked interstitials. I described our thinking. I gave them television talk, I didn't give them talk about curation, I didn't give them talk about intention. I didn't give them a lot of background about the connection with aesthetics. And in television terms, they loved it, and I thought that was an incredible vote of confidence in the concept. (Personal interview, February 7, 2012).

Although the course of *CBC ArtSpots'* decade of production would see the involvement of hundreds of artists, curators, independent filmmakers and media programmers, this initial pilot

set the tone for the commitment to how an innovative conceptual arts approach to working with artists for television and digital media production worked. The creation and dissemination of more than 1,200 short videos about the arts in Canada, eight long-form documentaries, and many exhibition and programming partnerships centred on the internet, museums, galleries and embassies as well as on television. Although *ArtSpots* became a decade-long television and internet collaboration between CBC and artists, curators and culture sector partners, for which I was the founder and executive producer, *ArtSpots* was also a rare entry point within broadcasting to feature a closely networked relationship with the culture sector. About this, Mattocks would note:

[W]e renovated, in one year, the CBC's relationship with the arts community. And we had entrée into rooms at the Canada Council and other places that we'd simply never had before... *ArtSpots* was seen as evidence of our integrity. Because what [the film, television and visual arts community] saw was a broadcaster engaging on an artistic and aesthetic level, and that's something they never imagined they would see. (Personal interview, February 7, 2012).

The enthusiasm with which the concept and the actual production of the original fourteen *ArtSpots* was greeted in both the visual arts and broadcasting communities in Nova Scotia propelled it in a specific way onto to a newly emerging stage for innovation, resting on a successfully renewed set of personal networks. *ArtSpots* became one of the first programs for CBC that was produced explicitly for the internet, as well as for television. Indeed, it was the ability of *ArtSpots* to break ground in this area consistently over the following decade that improved its place in the increasingly challenging television environment within which it found itself trying to operate.

*Innovation for the internet and non-traditional career paths for women*

On the cusp of the twenty-first century, the media industry began to visibly respond to its own transition to a digital environment. *ArtSpots* was an early experimental site bridging video art of the 1980s with broadcast mandate priorities of the 1990s and the fledgling video-based internet to come in the 2000s. In the fall of 1999, pre-production work formally commenced on the [CBC.ca/ArtSpots](http://CBC.ca/ArtSpots) website (*CBC ArtSpots Corporate Archives*, Luka personal archives).<sup>19</sup> This represented an expansion of new categories of creative workers in public broadcasting, similar to the redefinition of creative workers in media offered in Mayer's (2011) discussion of factory workers and videographers as creative participants in the industry. Through the first half of 2000, designer-programmers Carolyn Gibson-Smith, Jere Brooks, and later Phlis McGregor were able to periodically dedicate time to work with me to develop a crisp visual design and key organizational components.<sup>20</sup> As then-web developer Brooks and I later discussed, the basic *ArtSpots* pages still exist on the CBC servers at [www.cbc.ca/ArtSpots](http://www.cbc.ca/ArtSpots); the simple and aesthetically pleasing templates eventually framed thousands of web pages for the internet.

That look and feel was something I designed. Phlis McGregor [another early web developer] refined it when she started to work with me in our little [digital media] "pod" that got organically created – somehow – at that time. The initial template made a lot of

---

<sup>19</sup> Archival materials accessed for this account include my daily calendars from 1999 and 2000, and two key reports in the *ArtSpots* archives. The first is titled "CBC Television – CBC *ArtSpots* information package (at 3 March 2000)", and the second is "CBC Television – *ArtSpots* projected timeline by quarter (July '98-Dec '01) production, impact research & program development, website, education, distribution (at 28 July 1999)".

<sup>20</sup> Career trajectories for all three are telling. Gibson-Smith went on to work at PBS Washington to set up their web strategy, and is now based in Paris, operating a visual arts consulting digital project <http://cityartinsider.com/> (accessed July 7, 2014). After *ArtSpots* was launched on the internet, Brooks became the manager of innovative digital media-based projects at CBC across the country, and is now a fashion designer <http://jerebrooks.com/> (accessed May 25, 2014). McGregor had started as a sound artist and after her short stint at *ArtSpots*, pursued her career as a radio broadcaster for CBC, based in Halifax, working on several local and national programs, including "Q" and other arts programs.

sense. For its time, I think we hit it right off the bat. (Personal interview, February 4, 2012, and “JB-Seq3-JB-how-to-work-w-audiences” video, 2013).

These components remained more-or-less consistent through the *ArtSpots* era, including a splash page, artist listing, “About *ArtSpots*” section, features section for special projects, an input form, links to supporters and partners, and a site map.<sup>21</sup> They also informed the later development of the packaging used for television programming, since the internet content was longer-lived and easier to find. The practicalities of these mundane design concerns are a good example of how to ground the experimental nature of *ArtSpots* in what McRobbie suggests is “a less inflated and overblown vocabulary for thinking about the rise of the creative sector” (2012, 156).

This trio of women reflected an early commitment by CBC to ensure that gender balance was achieved in the nascent “New Media Pod” work unit. As discussed earlier, then, as now, women and people of colour were significantly under-represented behind and in front of the cameras and other technologies, with CBC providing several exceptions to this rule in the industry (Canadian Unions 2013; International Women’s Media Foundation 2011; Todd 2013; Women in View 2013). The commitment by the then-emerging New Media Pod developed by Brooks to support *ArtSpots* was the ability to enable the presentation of video and still images on the internet rather than just text. This was a radical departure from the existing CBC websites, few as they were, which focused on text-based news reports, program listings, message boards and forums. CBC.ca had only recently launched “local” (either provincial or by city, depending on population sizes and transmission capabilities) listings on the website.<sup>22</sup> One of CBC’s most

---

<sup>21</sup> See <http://www.cbc.ca/ArtSpots/> (accessed July 7, 2014) for details.

<sup>22</sup> Archival evidence can be found on the Internet Wayback Machine. See for example, <http://web.archive.org/web/20000815053910/http://cbc.ca/onair/> (accessed July 7, 2014) and <http://web.archive.org/web/20000815053859/http://cbc.ca/local/> (accessed July 7, 2014) from mid-2000. For a sense of the early visual aesthetics at CBC, see also

sophisticated websites was for the youth program, *Street Cents*, where regular text-based “live” forum discussions were moderated during broadcast times, from the New Media Pod in Halifax.

From January to April 2000, the basic structure of the *ArtSpots* website was put together, in consultation with the volunteer curatorial Advisory Group members, Gibson-Smith and Brooks, and by probing the information technology department at CBC to see what the websites could bear. Still the era of dial-up, the short videos of *ArtSpots* proved to be a great test case for CBC’s ambitious future broadband strategy.<sup>23</sup> By March of 2000, copyright releases had all been updated by CBC’s Business Affairs office in Toronto. By May, senior resource managers at CBC were scrambling to find funding to support the *ArtSpots* trial website and a few other projects. Work on the *ArtSpots* website went on hold while the burgeoning and mighty but still tiny Halifax-based web development team worked on a special website for CBC to feature that summer’s Tall Ships event in July. In the meantime, the *ArtSpots* office began to produce short video profiles (two- to five-minutes) – particularly suited for web presentation – as well as the standard thirty-second items that had been the key feature of the project for its first two years. Initially, these profiles were assembled from still images and audio interviews. Within a year, however, CBC New Media staff were confident that the CBC server could offer video of that length, and the items were quickly redeveloped for digital delivery as well as delivery on television programs. On June 20, 2000, *CBC ArtSpots*’ innovative potential was recognized when it was formally approved as a national program with a home base in the Arts and Entertainment Department of the television operation. On July 20, the Tall Ships arrived in Halifax. On September 10, 2000, I discussed the future of CBC.ca’s broadband capabilities with

---

<http://web.archive.org/web/19980131181022/http://www.halifax.cbc.ca/streetcents/> (accessed July 7, 2014).

<sup>23</sup> The web-based production practices embedded at *ArtSpots* are discussed in greater detail in later chapters.

then-manager Mark Hyland and we agreed that *CBC.ca/ArtSpots* would be a strategic locus for experiments in presenting artwork and video.<sup>24</sup> The soft launches for *CBC.ca/ArtSpots* began in the late fall of 2000, and a new era of visually driven time-based media delivery by CBC was underway.<sup>25</sup>

### ***Making it work: The networked ArtSpots structure and roles***

Although the *ArtSpots* concept matured through an evolving dialogic relationship among curators, artists, creative producers, broadcasters and partners, there was an actual structure that also evolved over time to accommodate these relationships. The involvement of artists and creative workers in negotiating networks, tensions and social relations with potential viewers and peers while engaged in cultural production is a crucial feature of the labour done at *ArtSpots* that could be regarded as efforts towards creative citizenship. At *ArtSpots*, the media production staff, the volunteer advisors, and the artists involved occupied creative citizenship positions articulating popular culture systems (television and digital media broadcasting) with the arts.<sup>26</sup> The unique professional and creative practices that came to be known as *ArtSpots* were generated by a combination of systemic conditions, individual agency, ongoing negotiations and creative work. *ArtSpots* video production *modes* ranged in length from 30 seconds to a full documentary

---

<sup>24</sup> Hyland is now based in Paris, and is Quick Play Media's Senior Vice-President of Global Sales, which includes "product, communication and partner marketing programmes" (IBC.org 2013: <http://www.ibc.org/page.cfm/link=574> (accessed July 7, 2014)). Also see QuickPlay's website: <http://www.quickplay.com/about/management/> (accessed July 7, 2014).

<sup>25</sup> The first capture of the *ArtSpots* website on the Internet Wayback Machine is dated May 2, 2001. <http://web.archive.org/web/20010502180442/http://radio.cbc.ca/programs/ArtSpots/> (accessed July 7, 2014).

<sup>26</sup> Sociology of art analyses have shown that such vernacular practices can impact shared (national) identity as seen in chapter one (Benedict Anderson 2006(1993); Bennett, Tony 1995). Particular forms of digitally-based popular creativity and innovation take into account the global Web 2.0 context (Bruns 2008; Gauntlett 2011).

hour, and in subject-matter from presentation of individual artists' work to profiles of artists to curation of culture sector histories, issues and themes. Program items appeared in unused commercial spots regionally and nationally on CBC, as well as on CBC's regional and digital channel documentary streams and on the internet. *ArtSpots* items were also distributed to the artists, Advisory Group members, film festivals, exhibitions and cultural events across the country and internationally. Funding and co-production partners later received, presented and archived their own copies of the material. At its most optimistic, it was an attempt to articulate a flexible space for artists to create and present work in Canadian public broadcasting in the soon-to-be digital media system of the 2000s. At its most challenging, it was a hard-scrabble negotiation of limited resources in broadcasting for the consideration of cultural production.

There were five networked roles and functions at *CBC ArtSpots*, involving an extraordinary cast of characters from across the country, several walks of life, many artistic practices and multiple generations. These included: the advisors; the artists; the production teams; and the project partners. Howard Becker (2008[1982]) and Keith Negus (2002) both suggest the importance of considering how the individual artist relates to arts and culture production and distribution systems. Negus, in particular, suggests that the individual artist has a significant position of agency in cultural production, including the creative economy. Becker is less convinced of the individual artist's agency, and emphasizes the strength of the system of cultural production. Demarcating this spectrum as a comparison that can be evaluated in terms of innovation, collaboration, pluralism and precarity in relation to the core creative roles at *ArtSpots* (the advisors, the artists, the production teams, and key project partners) provides an interesting examination of *ArtSpots* in this chapter. The fifth (non-production) role – that of the policy and management group involved with *ArtSpots* – is discussed in the next chapter.

*Role #1: Advisory Group members – pluralism as a pre-production practice*

The work of the Advisory Group was not just a consensual curatorial exercise, itself an achievement. It was also a sounding board, and later a narrowcast audience, for pluralism and equity in programming, coupled with artistic excellence. Advisors looked at the existing edited programming and set directions for future programming at *ArtSpots* and in their respective regions. The first set of key players involved in *ArtSpots* from the beginning were approximately ten of the 180 museum and foundation curators, art gallery directors, artist-run and multi-media centre leaders, independent curators, craft association representatives and community representatives (e.g. immigration association leaders, First Nations Friendship Centre leaders) who brought their expertise about the visual arts and fine craft from their local or regional communities into the volunteer Advisory Group process.

Several specific practices employed at *ArtSpots* Advisory Groups suggest ways in which creative citizenship usefully describes what happened at *ArtSpots*, as a set of dynamic social interactions involving networked creative workers. The volunteer expert Advisory Group-based selection processes combined geographic location and personal residency requirements with a broad spectrum of artistic expressions, genres and practices in the identification of artists, placing a priority on pluralism as an explicit goal. Artists were short-listed because they were creating interesting work that communicated the values of – and trends in – the local or regional artistic community from which their work emerged, according to the judgement of the volunteer advisors. Artists had to meet broadly defined criteria of “being” Canadian (for example, resident in Canada for at least a year, landed immigrants, First Nations, born in Canada, etc.). Artists were emphatically not required to “represent” Canada in their artwork. The curatorial community’s dedication to discussing these elements, and to ensuring that underrepresented

groups and voices would be given preference was a fundamental commitment at *ArtSpots*, given specific expression in each community consulted. Earlier, I referred to Cheryl Sim, one of the Advisory Group members, and her reading of what the spirit of those discussions entailed. She continues her analysis this way:

In general terms, I just remember the feeling that I get when I think about what the criteria were. The desire for diverse representation. You gave us an opportunity to suggest criteria – to get a sense of what were the priorities. What are the issues? Debates? Film vs. video. What’s up with painting? These were maybe not criteria, but the desire for a way to have discussions about what were the issues: the pulse-taking you were describing. It wasn’t things like “cutting edge” or “who’s hot”; words like “excellence” or “quality” weren’t used. More like what’s exciting, relevant, who’s making work pushing buttons, and what were those buttons? This was very much articulated, you know, through you and through the process... (Personal interview with Cheryl Sim, March 11, 2010).

Volunteer Advisory Groups in most provinces and territories would meet about once a year (during the most prolific periods) for two to four hours of discussion, usually at the local CBC building. These locations included: Halifax, Charlottetown, Fredericton, Moncton, Saint John, St. John’s, Corner Brook, Vancouver, Montreal, Ottawa (for the National Capital Region), Saskatoon, Regina, Winnipeg, Yellowknife, Iqaluit, Inuvik, Calgary and Edmonton. It did not include Toronto, since there was never an Advisory Group put together in the Metropolitan Toronto area. Additionally, the organization of CBC outside Toronto was highly regional in nature, while Toronto operated as central television and internet headquarters for the English programming units. Even the way in which budgets and resources were calculated was significantly different, with a “cash” system in place in Toronto, and an “in-kind” system operational in most regions.

The responsibility of the Advisors was to help identify several artists in that region doing great work, and to share that information with CBC *ArtSpots* staff. The *ArtSpots* office would collate the input along with suggestions gleaned from the *ArtSpots* website, emails, phone calls

and mailings received in order to develop a “long list” of approximately one- to three-hundred artists in each region at any given time. Annotations about upcoming exhibitions or commissions were also made. It was extremely rare that actual images of work would be shared, as the knowledge base around the table was quite comprehensive, including the CBC producers involved. Research interviewee Johanne Gallant played several part-time or temporary roles at *ArtSpots* over the years, including web content manager (equivalent to associate producer), administrator and producer. She also paid close attention to some of the challenges implicated in organizing a curatorial approach in a television environment:

We asked people [on the Advisory Groups] to do some homework. Help us create a long list, and then help develop priorities for a short list. We had criteria, [including that the artists must have a] body of work that we could shoot. Within the structure of the advisory group, their help involved giving us heads up on an upcoming show. Or access to a body of work. And they talked about why it was a good time to work with this artist. It was great; a good process, though quite involved. It sometimes weighed down the admin[istration because it] took a lot of time to organize and gather together. The backend of supporting those meetings took a long time – a lot of phone calls, emails. Many sheets of paper. (Personal interview with Gallant, March 21, 2010).

Once the “long list” was collated, the Advisors would meet to discuss the kind of work taking place in the region that was the most compelling or necessary to document – without specifying particular artists – and then develop priorities for the selection process that included artistic genres, demographics, and unique qualities from the area. As noted above, from that discussion, a short list usually comprised of eight to ten artists would be assembled which matched the priorities agreed around the table.

First as the founder and only producer, and later as the executive producer, I would facilitate almost all of the Advisory meetings, to provide continuity and an overview of achievements nationally. My own commitments to diversity and equity, emphasising the inclusion of under-represented constituents, were combined with the goals of the individuals

around each Advisory table, and the burgeoning CBC commitments of that era to diversity in front of and behind the camera. As a result, CBC *ArtSpots* was highly reflective of the demographic makeup of the country as a whole, much more so than any other program on television or the internet, as analysed in detail in the next chapter.<sup>27</sup> Involvement in these discussions was generally enjoyable and productive for the volunteer experts. In 2010, former Advisor Cheryl Sim noted:

The spirit of those committees was to develop a generous space and to foster a generosity on each of our parts. So it's not like, I represent this and I do that, and that's why my opinion is important. No, we're contributors and everybody's ideas are welcomed and considered. The mandate, the goals. So if we're clear on that, then we can have a meaningful conversation. If it becomes like a jousting fest, or who is going to have the winning idea – that's not the spirit of this. (Personal interview, March 11, 2010).

Reflecting on the processes used at *ArtSpots*, former producer Gallant noted a key benefit to executing the project in a consultative manner meant to generate pluralistic results.

Within the larger artistic community, there was a high level of knowledge and enthusiasm about the project. The idea that it was collaborative engaged them immediately... People knew we were careful and collaborative. Respected. They always wanted to participate. (J. Gallant, personal interview, March 21, 2010).

Following the Advisory Group meetings, the local producer would contact the artists on the short list, as resources allowed, and proceed to production in groups of three to five artists at a time. During the dissertation research phase of 2010-2014, I made specific efforts to ensure that former Advisors from a range of fields and eras were consulted, as well as *ArtSpots* producers other than myself. During *ArtSpots* production, local producers would often identify key potential Advisors from their own comprehensive networks, and over time, this was

---

<sup>27</sup> One of my “other duties as assigned” during the last four years of my association with CBC emerged from these practices: to assist in the documenting of benchmarks towards diversity goals at CBC in the Atlantic Region, as well as to manage the diversity plans for programs and projects in development in the region.

augmented by suggestions from national organizations such as the Canada Council for the Arts, CARFAC (Canadian Artists' Representation/Le Front des Artistes Canadiens), the Independent Media Arts Alliance and others, as well as additional representation from artists at the Advisors tables, who had been through the *ArtSpots* experience and had networks of their own. During the 2010-2014 research sessions, former Advisors consulted included curators who had associations with independent artist-run centre Oboro and the privately-funded DHC Foundation in Montreal; university art galleries; fine craft associations and scholarly institutions; provincially-funded art galleries and the privately-funded Sobey Art Award. Additionally, input was sought from representatives from the former Nova Scotia Arts Council, the Canadian Museum of Civilization (now Canadian Museum of History) and The Canada Council for the Arts. With the help of volunteer Advisors and *ArtSpots* artists, additional program material generated during the final few months of *ArtSpots* included the production of "How To" videos and documentation for use by students, professional or aspirational media makers about how to develop, direct and produce *ArtSpots*-like documentary materials for television and the web. The video clips included input from additional Advisory Group members (particularly from artist-run centres) that were also useful during the 2010-2014 research.

*The ArtSpots experience – the Advisory Group meeting*

Imagine that you are a curator at a university gallery. One day, you walk into a meeting room at CBC Television in your city, where you encounter several of your curatorial colleagues, a couple of academics, a couple of artists who have already had their work profiled on ArtSpots, the local ArtSpots producer-director, and the executive producer of the program. You look at a short reel of 30-second items featuring artwork from across the country, a five-minute profile of a local artist, and excerpts from a longer documentary or website project undertaken in the ArtSpots program during the previous year. Over the next two hours, you have a wide-ranging conversation with your colleagues about the amazing art in production in the region, evidenced by the collective list of about 150 potential ArtSpots artists suggested by group members. Together, you identify several priorities (e.g. desired artistic genres; age groups or levels of experience; cultural background; or regional idiosyncrasy, etc.) to emphasize during the selection of artists for this year's ArtSpots production. It quickly becomes clear what the shared priorities are, and then the hard work of agreeing on which artists best provide a combination of work and backgrounds that meet those priorities takes place. There's at least one artist whose career is ending; whose contributions "need" a mass media airing. Or, several emerging performance artists have an upcoming exhibition that could benefit from a documentation project with the CBC crew. By the end of the meeting, there are eight or ten artists that most in the room agree it would be great to see on television and the internet in the coming year. Out of that number, at least six will be profiled on ArtSpots. You leave the room excited about the new and renewed professional contacts you have made, a couple of side conversations about potential exhibitions or collaborative projects, and knowing a lot more about the work of several artists in the region. You have just experienced a typical ArtSpots Advisory Group meeting.



*Figure 3: The ArtSpots experience – the Advisory Group meeting*

*Role #2: Artists – collaboration and precarity*

Although the volunteer Advisory Group came first chronologically, without the artists, no work would have been done. More than 300 artists were involved at *ArtSpots* (*CBC ArtSpots* archives), of which some 240 were involved through the “regular” *ArtSpots* experience ([CBC.ca/ArtSpots/html/artistslist.html](http://CBC.ca/ArtSpots/html/artistslist.html)). Putative members of this latter group would be identified during what became regional Advisory Group selection processes, and recruited to work with a local *ArtSpots* producer to document work of the artist’s choosing. An average of three thirty-second presentations of their work would be produced (some artists and production teams were so prolific that up to seven short items would be generated), plus a two- to five-minute profile of each artist. This was achieved in a day’s shoot and a day’s edit. This could only be accomplished by preparing well in advance of the shoot day, including having the producer-director work closely with the artist for the equivalent of about a day (over a period of days or weeks) to determine themes, brainstorm possible shooting narratives or ideas, and select the work to be shot. Each producer-director would then draft notes or storyboards for the shoot, share them with the artist and then with the production team, check them with the executive producer, and proceed to shooting. Although each producer-director involved at *ArtSpots* had the authority to make significant creative decisions, each artist was consulted early and often on how to portray the work. Additionally, each artist was provided with a veto over the completed work, in case the items produced did not turn out to their liking. One of the artists characterized it this way, several years later:

For me, it was excellent. I still think I really was honoured to be chosen, and that it was such a great experience for me. That kind of distribution of one’s work across the nation. I can’t think of a better venue than television, these *ArtSpots*, to do it. I was let in on the process the whole way, and I appreciate that. They took the footage and information [I gave them] and he asked me to come back and look at it again [when it was edited]. Was there anything I didn’t like? What did I like? How did I feel about the music? I felt

involved. And I think it benefited my career a lot. (Personal interview with Kim Morgan, March 22, 2012).

*ArtSpots* staked out a space on the World Wide Web that was unique in its evocation of creative identity and its invocations of collaborative creative practices for media production and broadcasting. Those involved in *ArtSpots* had access for a period of time to the internal workings and resources of the CBC and were able to focus on what was important to them about their work for the television and internet airwaves. The artwork and artistic processes documented on *ArtSpots* were aimed first at curatorial leaders, then the artists themselves, and next at broader cultural groups. The mandate and stated values of the project plainly meant to advance the artistic community's own understanding and expression of their work in relation to the Canadian public broadcaster's mandate around identity – including its audiences – and *vice versa*, as discussed in detail in the next chapter. As a result, the creative space generated by the program enabled artists to engage in a flexible dialogue with peers, including other artists, creative producers and crews within the media production industry and broader consumer-citizen audiences that was subsequently reflected during the 2010-2014 research. In the 2012 discussion group conducted with artists, one of the participants characterized this relationship as explicitly discursive:

[W]hat I thought was really thrilling about *ArtSpots* was that it...was about the visual arts discourse, regardless of how performative or conceptual or grounded...  
[W]hat people were doing was ... being stewards of a kind of conversation or questioning or inventive exploration that didn't really have another location...  
(Frances Dorsey, Artist discussion group, February 28, 2012)

Such a positive perspective must be balanced against the precarious nature of *ArtSpots*' resources and scheduling, a condition consistent with other media case studies discussed earlier (Born 2004; Caldwell 2008, 2010; Mayer 2011). For most of its existence, *ArtSpots* was resourced with the maximum equivalent of two to three full-time people. My own position as executive

producer was only permanent and full-time for three years out of eleven, while other creative producers or crew involved added it to existing workloads or worked on a temporary freelance basis. Additionally, annual negotiations were required with national headquarters as well as in each region to assess the level of support available. At its peak, *ArtSpots* only involved six to eight regional sites of production a year, encompassing approximately six artists in each location, for a maximum of forty-five artists a year (*CBC ArtSpots* archives).

There were a few exceptions to the usual *ArtSpots*' artist identification and selection process. The first twenty-five recipients of the Saidye Bronfman Award for Excellence in the Crafts artists connected to the *ArtSpots* project through a partnership developed with the Canadian Museum of Civilization, the Samuel and Saidye Bronfman Family Foundation, and the Canada Council for the Arts which lasted just over five years (until *ArtSpots*' production shut down).<sup>28</sup> Throughout the duration of the partnership, *ArtSpots* capitalized on the juried process exercised for that award by simply absorbing the production requirements concerning the annual recipient into the *ArtSpots* production schedule of that particular region that year. Following the end of *ArtSpots* production in 2008, the annual activities relating to the Award were turned over in their entirety (including an endowment to support the financing of it) to the Canada Council for the Arts from the Samuel and Saidye Bronfman Family Foundation for adjudication,

---

<sup>28</sup> This annual award was funded by the Samuel and Saidye Bronfman Family Foundation, and was intended to raise the profile of fine craft in Canada, including within the formal gallery system. *ArtSpots*' relationship to the Award is discussed in more detail in chapter six. It is now administered by the Canada Council for the Arts. Details of its history are widely available, including on websites of the partners involved (then and now): <http://www.cbc.ca/ArtSpots/html/features/bronfman/history.html> (accessed July 7, 2014); <http://www.historymuseum.ca/cmce/exhibitions/arts/bronfman/brawa01e.shtml> (accessed July 7, 2014); <http://canadacouncil.ca/council/prizes/find-a-prize/prizes/saidye-bronfman> (accessed July 7, 2014).

administration and exhibition and to formally become associated with the Governor General Awards in Visual Arts.

The remaining sixty or so artists who weren't brought into *ArtSpots* through the Advisory Group process became involved through special projects, including extensions of the project work surrounding the Saidye Bronfman Award. For example, two arts documentaries were produced with resources from CBC Arts and Entertainment as well as *CBC ArtSpots*, and some funding from the Samuel and Saidye Bronfman Family Foundation. The first documentary profiled the first twenty-five Bronfman Award artists thematically, while the second highlighted fine craft collectors, collections and sites where fine craft is collected and exhibited across the country. Additional partnerships and programming experiments are enumerated in later chapters. These featured a certain number of additional artists, each consulted about how to include their artwork and each provided with copies of the programming, if interested. Jennifer Gillivan, former Director of Partnerships, Brand Management and Regional Communications for CBC, characterized the relationship between *ArtSpots* and artists in this way in 2012:

I loved the fact that you were giving this opportunity to artists to showcase their work when they would never have [had] that. And then you say to yourself, well, what's the mandate of a public broadcaster, and that to me, well - maybe we can't afford to put high art of television because it's so expensive, but here was a way to actually practically help an artist get from almost obscurity to "oh I know who you are". So that for me felt connected to what I was trying to do in Partnerships, which was to try and find like-minded, values-driven organizations, who got why public broadcast exists in this country, and then match it together to create something new. And that's exactly what *ArtSpots* was. As it evolved, the work you were doing on the web fit in with what we were trying to do on the web, and that's where we got more creative, looking at how you got more creative. Then we created things like the Book Club, which is now a Toronto project, but it grew from us, its roots, and it grew from that nucleus of that dynamic that you talk about. Let's try it, why not? And it was fearless. I often wonder if we had been totally left to our own devices for another few years, what we would have created. (Personal interview, March 19, 2012).

The artists interviewed during 2012 for the dissertation research about their experiences as erstwhile *ArtSpots* artists represented a cross-section of identity positions and how artists were involved with *ArtSpots* during the ten-year production run. Three men and three women were involved in the 2012 research discussions; there was participation from First Nations, immigrant, visible minority and Caucasian artists. Two artists were from early on in the process (1998-99); three from the middle period (2000-2007); and a final artist from the last year of production (2007-08). As a result, their experiences varied greatly. Gary Markle was a performance artist and one of the first six artists involved in the first round of shooting in 1998; there was no *ArtSpots* production interview with him, since it was two years before *ArtSpots* regularly produced profiles. Gerard Choy was involved initially through a regional web-chat project in 1998-99, and subsequently became a “full” *ArtSpots* artist in the early 2000s – at which point, several thirty-second items were produced featuring his work, plus a five-minute profile. Peter Dykhuis, another conceptual artist involved in the early 2000s, had been a member of the first Advisory Group in Nova Scotia and was also happy to exhibit *ArtSpots* material at the local art galleries with which he was involved. Ursula Johnson, a conceptual artist discussed earlier, came to *ArtSpots* as an emerging artist, was then featured in one of the *ArtSpots* documentaries about craft along with her great-grandmother, and profiled in local news programming and so became an exemplar of *ArtSpots*’ networked program content delivery processes. She worked with multiple producers, multiple programming initiatives and took on multiple roles as an artist. Kim Morgan, an artist from Saskatchewan, was initially involved as an artist and subsequently as an advisor in *ArtSpots* through the “regular” process. She worked with a freelance producer rather than an on-staff producer at CBC. The sixth artist involved in the research discussions, Frances Dorsey, was featured during a partnership with an academic conference being held at NSCAD

University in 2007. Her work was profiled in a kind of “walk-and-talk” style presentation: much closer to a news report format but in the voice of the artist as guide through the exhibition. This explanation of some of the different affiliations with *ArtSpots* provides a sense of the many ways in which artists could remain involved with the project over several years.

*Role #3: Production crew members – culture, innovation and precarity*

The core of the production operation at *CBC ArtSpots* was comprised of the flexible local crews, sometimes on-staff and sometimes freelance or temporary. For each production with each artist, approximately a week’s work would be required from a local producer. Of all the positions on the crew, the producer was most likely to be the freelance one, while the camera operator, sound person (if there was one) and editor would more than likely be a staff person temporarily assigned to work on *ArtSpots*, perhaps one or two shifts at a time. If there were five artists to work with, that producer would have work for five weeks, usually spread over a ten to twelve-week time period on a part-time basis. Initially, most of the producers involved in *ArtSpots* were temporarily or full-time on-staff at CBC, usually assigned in the newsroom but sometimes in arts and entertainment. A portion of their work time would be allocated to *ArtSpots*, negotiated year-to-year. As the decade wore on, and budget cutbacks dictated staff layoffs, there were far fewer resources available with experience or aptitude in the arts. Additionally, the skills and abilities required could more easily be found in local video artists or independent filmmakers.

Increasingly, then, the *ArtSpots* producer-directors would be hired under freelance engagements on an irregular basis, fitting into the schedules of creative workers already used to piecing together their production engagements. For some, *ArtSpots* subject matter was the draw.

It was my first job relating to film, and – I didn’t know such things existed. I was really interested in the fact that it was visual arts but also television, which is extremely rare. To me, I’m interested in all the arts, be it film, visual arts, painting, music – to me it’s all related. So for me, being able to work with diverse artists – sculptors, painters and video

artists, and performance artists – and to be able to bring it to TV was incredible. A big draw. (Personal interview, Karina Garcia Casanova, former *ArtSpots* Montreal producer, February 12, 2012).

Since the remaining crew members – camera operators, occasional sound technicians, and editors – would generally be drawn from staff resources, this had to be negotiated with resource managers from year-to-year within each jurisdiction where production would take place (usually involving eight to twelve locations, eight to twelve Regional Directors, and eight to twelve resource schedulers across Canada). Within any given year, hours and days would also be carefully organized around known pressure points in the annual schedule. For example, off-season periods such as May to September initially meant more availability of resources for *ArtSpots*, although that became less true as the decade moved on and the television “season” became increasingly year-round. The enthusiasm of even this tentative involvement with *ArtSpots* was well-known within CBC. Fred Mattocks described it this way during an interview in 2012 in response to a question about what he heard during his extensive travels across the country on CBC business.

I think I probably heard more about it from the camera people than anybody else, who got to do things that they just normally wouldn't get to do. And stuff they really enjoyed, because it was aesthetic, because it was involved in an aesthetic interpretation of a creative intent by somebody outside their medium, but they had to do it through their medium. And I think some of the best, probably all of the best, camera people you worked with, loved that. So I heard a lot about that. (Personal interview, February 7, 2012).

More generally, once Mattocks had moved from Halifax to Toronto to assume responsibility for the management of English media resources across the country, he would periodically ask about how well *ArtSpots* might or might not be going locally.

In places where the visual arts community and the local management were aligned and the *ArtSpots* thing was working well, I was hearing about it working well, and I was hearing about the value of it, and I was hearing about the distinctiveness of it. And I think people were proud. You know, people were proud to get the artists of their region, to have a – I was going to say a space, but it's more than space – a space and time – a place, an

environment, inside regional television. And [CBC management] people felt good about having a sort of creative outlet for [internal, production] TV people. So where they weren't dealing with freelancers, they were dealing with their own TV people. (Personal interview, February 7, 2012).

Website designers and producers were initially allocated on a periodic project basis, until *ArtSpots* gained a national budget in the year 2000, at which point there was always funding set aside to hire an associate producer whose job it was to help build content for the website, upload the content, and run the logistics of the Advisory Groups. It was an atypical hybrid skill set, exercised over time by half a dozen women (one at a time over the ten years) each of whom arrived with modest website management skills and left with far more robust ones.<sup>29</sup> The exception to this was the first web designer and builder, Jere Brooks, who came to the position of regional web developer at CBC in part to meet the demands of the fledgling *ArtSpots* project, and whose background was in web design (a rare skill set in 1998-99). Brooks went on to run an innovation centre to serve multi-media projects across the CBC, including several projects in partnership with *ArtSpots*. Those additional web-inclusive projects were served by the primarily male web designer-builders who were increasingly employed in the field at CBC, and elsewhere. The employment studies discussed earlier (Bateman and Karim 2009; Canadian Unions for Equality on the Screens 2013; Hermes et al 2010; Murray 2002, 2009; Women in View 2013) underline this trend. During the late 1990s and early 2000s, however, it was possible to conceive of multi-platform media production and creation in a highly optimistic manner. In chapter one, while situating the *ArtSpots* case study in relation to technology and convergence studies, I noted that this inordinate optimism (Anderson, Chris 2006; Jenkins 2004; Rushkoff 2003, 2013; Tapscott 2006; Tapscott and Williams 2008) wouldn't be critiqued in scholarly work until much

---

<sup>29</sup> The six women web producers were (chronologically) Carolyn Gibson-Smith, Phlis McGregor, Jere Brooks, an intern whose tenure was brief and whose name does not appear in the archives, Johanne Gallant, Pam Lovelace.

later (Couldry 2006; Geist 2013; Middleton 2011; Shade 2010). *ArtSpots* as a *site of optimism* about pluralistic, innovative work was a significant draw to the creative individuals involved as (precarious) part-time, temporary and freelance employees. This is consistent with my earlier comments about Cunningham's (2013) critique of precarity, which similarly suggests that a complex balance of advantages and disadvantages is available to creative workers. The advantages arise from a strong sense of financial opportunity despite short-term arrangements, and wide-reaching opportunities for optimistic innovation.

The mobilization of CBC production resources is an interesting realization of goals related to access to technology and the right to communicate that scholarly literature identified as crucial in a convergent media landscape (Raboy and Shterne 2010; Shade 2010). Further, a broad spectrum of business affairs, legal and library services were provided to *ArtSpots* on the same as-needed basis as all other in-house programs at CBC in order to assist in realizing the unusually innovative and collaborative nature of working with artists and production partners at *ArtSpots*. Very early on, business affairs specialists within CBC helped to develop the contracts and waivers required for *ArtSpots* to conduct its affairs, and worked closely with me and the other producers over time to secure music licenses and rights as required. Producers were required to file all waivers, contracts and music reports with the Halifax-based *ArtSpots* office as well as the Toronto-based Business Affairs office. This included securing rights to show the *ArtSpots* artists' material in perpetuity on any broadcasting platform that existed or would be invented:

Licensors hereby grants to CBC the non-exclusive and limited right to incorporate the Works in the Production. CBC shall have the right (but not the obligation) to broadcast the Works in the context of the completed Production over its Television Networks, however distributed, and to transmit and distribute the Works in the context of the completed Production world wide in all markets (including, but not limited to, free, pay, and cable television, satellite, DBS, educational and non-broadcast use, festivals, theatrical exhibitions, trade forums, museums, video cassettes, DVDs, in-flight, computer network, internet, and any broadcast and/or exhibition technology currently in use or which may be

development in the future). These rights CBC shall hold in perpetuity. (CBC Business Affairs, 2007).

Not only were the rights non-exclusive (which would mean the artist could have their work featured elsewhere), each artist was provided with copies of their own edited video productions and allowed to use these edited materials for their own promotional and educational uses.

*ArtSpots* was frequently cited within CBC as an ideal copyright management case study because of the comprehensive and simple nature of its business arrangements: a streamlined “machine” that was participant-friendly as well as efficient for CBC.

From the perspective of a creative citizenship framework and from a business perspective, the development and sharing of new knowledge in the field is particularly laudable, especially in consideration of digital uses of material that were just starting to be imagined, but had not yet been tried or succeeded. By the late 1990s, the internet was just beginning to be structured through search-engines for future narrowcasting ventures. Though the artists, production teams and partners involved in *ArtSpots* were not co-creating or “producing” content as Bruns (2008) would have described it, they were fully engaged in the creative discussions, including shared uses of the completed production material, particularly for web-based projects. The intellectual property management of the edited material was remarkably unguarded and open to almost any use that artists, partners and supporters could propose.

Recall that with commercial mandates and still heavily text-dependent, the internet was full of visual potential not yet realized. Google was incorporated in September 1998: only one of many search engines in operation at the time. It would go on to offer its first IPO in 2004, establishing its dominance in the field only late in the first decade of the twenty-first century.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> <http://www.google.com/about/company/history/> August 13, 2012. The history of Google parallels the timing of the growth of *ArtSpots*.

By then, creative protocols and business models were clearly emerging. Direct content development and distribution by artists and arts organizations was still relatively rare, except for a few experimental artistic websites. Independent media arts organizations across the country broke a lot of ground in this area on behalf of their membership, providing environments where media material could at least be inventoried and sometimes actually played (including GIV, AFSCOOP, CFAT, Oboro, V-Tape, and Vidéographe).<sup>31</sup> In contrast, media content management and delivery was being vigorously staked out by a few non-profit organizations as well as all of the media corporations, particularly broadcasters such as CBC and CTV (now Bell Media). In any discussion of co-creation and shared creative control, the management and ownership of intellectual property and copyright can be vigorously argued; *ArtSpots* proved to be a digital environment where distribution was controlled by both the broadcaster and the participants while creative development and production was controlled by the artists and producers involved, using the resources of the broadcaster. Short of placing cameras and edit suites directly in the hands of artists (which would come by the end of the *ArtSpots* era though not as part of *ArtSpots*), CBC would have been hard pressed to carve a more independent path for the creative citizens involved.

Over the last decade, international as well as national debates have become fierce around legislation regarding access, digital locks and geo-fencing (Bill C-11: *An Act to amend the Copyright Act* is the current version of the Canadian legislation in this area, Canada 2012). This is particularly germane with respect to the monetizing function of the digital environment rather than the role of original creator(s) (Geist, 2010, 2013; Sundara Rajan 2010; Scassa 2005). In

---

<sup>31</sup> For more, see the list of 90 members of the umbrella organization <http://www.imaa.ca/> (accessed July 7, 2014). Additionally, for an account of digital content creation, loss, recovery and analysis in the last decade, see Hogan 2012).

*ArtSpots*' case, this was originally more likely to be relevant to what CBC could do with the content rather than what the artists have or have not done, although many possibilities still exist for future management and use of the edited material by the artists involved. Notably, the main *CBC ArtSpots* program library (consisting of hundreds of master tapes) now held in Halifax, and the formal *CBC ArtSpots* corporate archive held in Toronto (including hundreds more tapes), were created by CBC's program librarians and the *ArtSpots* producers respectively. The CBC librarians were constantly cataloguing and entering material into the system, particularly when it travelled *as programming* (as it often did) to several regions, programs and channels within the CBC family as well as to film festivals, exhibitions and events across the country and internationally. Multiple masters, compilations, and formats were juggled by editors, producers, librarians and programmers alike.

In all, more than 200 individuals within the CBC employment orbit became involved during the lifespan of *CBC ArtSpots*. As mentioned earlier, however, it was rare that the full-time equivalent of staff and freelance time exceeded two to three people, year-to-year. This ensured that it was the most efficient of the arts and entertainment programs on television as well as the internet at CBC, put together as it was from the bits and pieces of precarious though rewarding employment available at the margins of the rather large CBC production machine. During the 2010-2014 research, four producers including myself were interviewed. Among these were Karina Garcia Casanova, a freelance producer; Jere Brooks, the key web designer and producer; and long-time web associate producer and later documentary producer Johanne Gallant. Additionally, interview-based material from the "How To" video materials was reviewed for input from earlier interviews conducted for *CBC ArtSpots*. Comments were offered in these video materials by Asna Adhami, another periodic associate producer mentored through *ArtSpots*

(subsequently a video journalist for APTN, a newscast manager for Vision TV, and now a producer back at CBC Television for the George Strombouloupoulos program); Kendall Nowe, a long-time editor; Rena Moir, one of three female editors mentored in part through the *ArtSpots* program; and David Laughlin, a frequent camera operator.

*Role #4: Networked partnerships and narrowcast audiences*

Aside from the extensive networking of the cultural community that took place through the Advisory Group process, there were internal partnerships to help generate new innovative digital (and sometimes television) programs targeted towards specific, narrowcast audiences, as briefly discussed earlier (Bazalgette 2009; Gauntlett 2011), a core element of creative citizenship. Additionally, there were external national and regional partnership projects that extended the reach of *CBC ArtSpots* into leveraged engagements mobilizing CBC's traditional production resources towards knowledge-sharing. Many of these partnerships resulted in programming for environments other than television or the internet. First among these for *ArtSpots* was the relationship with the Canada Council for the Arts, followed extensively by one involving The Samuel and Saidye Bronfman Family Foundation and the Canadian Museum of Civilization, and subsequently a partnership with National Parks of Canada. Additional endeavours included NSCAD, Acadia, Simon Fraser and Memorial Universities, Pier 21 Museum, both Digital Archives Departments within CBC, CBC Radio for the national Poetry Face-Off project, and several galleries and museums such as the Art Gallery of Nova Scotia, Oboro Gallery, and others. Partnerships are discussed in detail in chapters five and six, but it is important to get a sense of them here to understand their impact on the networked nature of the overall *ArtSpots* structure. As with the early, innovative projects at *ArtSpots*, it rapidly became evident that developing personal connections and goals in common could exert considerable force on the

programs and partnerships. Of the sixteen features still visible on the *ArtSpots* website, fourteen of them represent collaborations within CBC and/or outside it that required more resources than the *ArtSpots* production effort could offer on its own to one-on-one artist relationships.<sup>32</sup> Two early partnership examples relate to how external resources were leveraged into the *ArtSpots* program and how knowledge was shared with the narrowcast audiences involved (Canada Council for the Arts, Samuel and Saidye Bronfman Family Foundation). The latter example also points to a shift in focus away from individual artists that is fully explored in chapter six.

In 1998, then-Communications Head and now recently retired Director of Stakeholder Relations at the Canada Council for the Arts, John Goldsmith, agreed to meetings with Mattocks and me (as the then-producer of the fledgling *ArtSpots* project). From those discussions emerged a commitment from then-Director and CEO of the Council, Shirley Thomson, to help provide a very modest amount of seed funding from Canada Council to support the *ArtSpots* project at CBC. That funding helped pay for the second of my temporary part-time contracts at CBC, which allowed a second round of production to take place within Nova Scotia (approximately six days of shooting and six days of editing). Key among the motivating factors was the philosophical alignment of the *ArtSpots* value-based approach to working with the curatorial and artistic communities in the identification and selection of artists, in a complementary manner to the then-juried peer processes used at the Canada Council for the Arts. Reflecting on that early relationship, Goldsmith noted:

*ArtSpots* provided a way into looking at different means of reaching the public, a broader audience than could normally be reached. With some awareness, appreciation, understanding of the way in which an artist works. And what the provenance looks like

---

<sup>32</sup> The URL for the features is: <http://www.cbc.ca/ArtSpots/html/features.html>. The first two features were from 2000-2001 and concentrated on providing definitions and exploring the potential of the then-text heavy CBC website, using Flash animation, screen grabs from *ArtSpots* videos.

after a process of some kind. To that extent, I think it was a very useful pilot; in terms of exploring that possibility. (Personal interview, September 7, 2012).

Since the funding was sourced from the Communications budget of the Canada Council for the Arts at the time, it seems to have been an early indication of the burgeoning emphasis being tested at Canada Council itself concerning the cultivation and engagement of narrowcast arts *audiences* and key *stakeholder groups* – not just artists’ grants. However, this was not an easy pathway to carve out. Goldsmith goes on to talk about what prevented a long-term relationship:

The challenge from a financial point of view internally within a public funder is ... that no amount of money [that Canada Council could contribute] could cover the country. There would be no limit to the amount of money you could spend trying to do this across the country. How could you measure the results in a sufficiently rigorous way to persuade colleagues, the arts community and others, that this was an effective use of money versus, say, allocating this to creation, production and dissemination: buying artists time so they could do their work, as opposed to generally well-meaning informative but not necessarily delivering the outcomes that would merit the expenditures. So I know from internal discussions that we had at the Canada Council that that was the challenge. (Personal interview, September 7, 2012).

Although even the narrowcast nature of the audience numbers for *ArtSpots* on television and the website were greater than many (perhaps most) of the Council’s funded arts organizations, such information wasn’t yet seen as desirable enough at the Council to warrant ongoing support, even with an audience-building mandate. Goldsmith noted:

It’s fine as a pilot, [in terms of how] we helped them get it off the ground [and] the process that was going to be used. It was very respectful of artists, had a peer process involved in terms of selection. All of that was good. But in terms of measuring its impact and scaling it to a national level, it was going to run into the kinds of attitudes that I’ve been talking about without a basis of proving – other than eyeballs – that there was no way of knowing what kind of impact it could have. (Personal interview, September 7, 2012).

Ultimately, the Council’s logo appeared on two years’ of work that took place at *CBC ArtSpots*, featured prominently on those last two seconds of each thirty-second item, along with the artist’s face, name, genre and town. Frequent discussions with Canada Council staff in the ensuing years usually focused on identifying potential Advisory Group members for *ArtSpots*, given the

extensive national network of juries run by the Council, as well as a subsequent series of relationships through the Saidye Bronfman Award for Excellence in the Fine Crafts. In early 2008, during *ArtSpots*' final days, there was some discussion of the possibility of lending or gifting the edited *ArtSpots* program materials to the Canada Council as a way for them to introduce the use of video on their website. This never went past the preliminary discussion phase for similar reasons as those Goldsmith notes above: the cost of importing, digitizing and maintaining the material would be seen to be taking away from direct funding for artistic production (*CBC ArtSpots* archives).

The initial impetus for the partnership with the Samuel and Saidye Bronfman Family Foundation (on CBC's side) was to bring external resources into the *ArtSpots* production budget and (on the Foundation's side) to find a national media stage for the first twenty-five (and subsequently five more) recipients of the Saidye Bronfman Award for Excellence in the Fine Crafts into the *ArtSpots* television and website program. The partnership itself was initiated by then-Foundation Director John Hobday in 1999-2000, along with discussions involving Patrick Watson, then-creative director of Historica Foundation (the funding source and managing body of the multi-year film and then video-based Heritage Minutes project).<sup>33</sup> Three later features on the *ArtSpots* website incorporated content generated for the long-form documentaries partly funded by the six-year partnership with the Bronfman Family Foundation between 2001 and 2007.<sup>34</sup> Financial contributions provided to *ArtSpots* by the Foundation required long-form documentaries to be produced about the recipients of the Saidye Bronfman Award and about fine craft in Canada more generally, resulting respectively in the award-winning programs *Making*

---

<sup>33</sup> <https://www.historicacanada.ca/content/videos> (accessed July 7, 2014).

<sup>34</sup> [http://www.cbc.ca/ArtSpots/html/features/bronfman\\_artists/index.html](http://www.cbc.ca/ArtSpots/html/features/bronfman_artists/index.html), <http://www.cbc.ca/ArtSpots/craft/> and <http://www.cbc.ca/ArtSpots/html/features/documentary/> (accessed July 7, 2014)

*the Ordinary Extraordinary* (2002) and *Hand Made Hand Held* (2006). The joint endeavour also incorporated the involvement of the Canadian Museum of Civilization (now Canadian Museum of History) as a production partner, primarily through the use of *ArtSpots* materials in national exhibitions mounted related to the Bronfman Award, and the use of some previously existing video documentation from the Museum in the 2002 documentary and in some of *ArtSpots*' thirty-second items about the Bronfman artists.

*Hand Made Hand Held* connected to the broader 2007 Year of Craft celebration internationally, including relationship-building with the Canadian Crafts Federation, and partnerships with CBC Digital Archives (English and French), and reconnected *ArtSpots* to the Canadian Museum of Civilization (now Canadian Museum of History, or CMC/CMH).<sup>35</sup> Additional production partnerships incorporating *CBC ArtSpots* and CBC Digital Archives material were subsequently independently realized with the CMC/CMH for the Cool '60s Design à GoGo Exhibition (2005); and the Unique! Exhibition in 2006-07, also a part of the 2007 Year of Craft celebrations.<sup>36</sup> The long-term impacts of the relationships initiated through these external partnerships are analysed in chapters five and six, but suffice to say for now that the introduction of these artists and partners into the *ArtSpots* production process marked a significant turning point in its operations and on its ability to exemplify creative citizenship.

#### *Fluid and contingent nodes, modes and flattened hierarchies*

*ArtSpots* thrived on a model of temporarily networked nodes of activity that relied on working with individual artists and also on leveraging resources, including through partnerships. Though the temporary nature of the regional teams involved was a common model that emerged from the

---

<sup>35</sup> <http://www.cbc.ca/ArtSpots/craft/> (accessed July 7, 2014).

<sup>36</sup> Respectively, <http://www.cbc.ca/ArtSpots/html/features/60s/> and <http://www.historymuseum.ca/cmhc/exhibitions/cmhc/unique/unique04e.shtml> (accessed July 7, 2014).

film and television industry of the period (see earlier discussions of hiring practices and creative team building, including Born 2004; Gollmitzer and Murray 2008; Mayer 2011; Spigel 2008), it was a much flatter hierarchy than usually found in the media production business. Advisory Groups and production crews would be assembled across genres, formats, regional or national boundaries, stakeholder groups and narrowcast audiences, each contributing a significant portion of the work required to realize the project's goals. As analysed in forthcoming chapters, the expanding demands of evolving partnerships would eventually prove to come into direct competition with decreasing resources internally at *ArtSpots*. But in the early days of partnership projects, there would be additional resource considerations for working with internal and external national or regional organizations, including program experiments. During the annual negotiation about how many camera days and how many editing days would be made available in each region to *ArtSpots* (and which portion would be allocated on an in-kind basis, and which on a cash basis), there would be encouragement to support partnerships as well as the original one-on-one artist-producer-production-crew activity. For example, in 2003-2004, a partnership with National Parks of Canada, CBC's Atlantic Region (English Television) including the regional web operation and *CBC ArtSpots* resulted in the production of an extensive educational and entertainment website, a long-form documentary for broadcasting on CBC, and a multi-year, multi-modal exhibition installation at Gros Morne National Park (also explored in more detail later). The media productions were based on the work of two visual artists and one author (Anne Meredith Barry, Tara Bryan and Kevin Major, respectively) and the limited edition artist book they had produced through Federal arts funding to commemorate the millennial year. Then-website manager Jere Brooks noted:

[*Gros Morne TimeLines*] was one of those planetary alignments if you will; one of those absolutely fabulous, intrinsically Canadian, culturally relevant content [projects]. With the

meeting of technology and design, but also the incredible will and support and understanding and importance that it had for so many people who could sit around those tables. It was critical to be able to reflect and express what those things were all about. That drove the content and pushed us to take technology so that we could express that. But it came down to something that was so much more about the actual project content, art/cultural aspect that drove that. The constellation of people that we put around that project. That's where those sweet spots happen... When it came to certain projects, like *Gros Morne*, we were already heading the ship all in the same direction. There was no need to turn all the little boats – get the flotilla going all the same way. It was already on its way. We just needed to see it. And put our backs to it. There was no conflict, it was so smooth (Personal interview with Brooks, February 4, 2012).

The ongoing but flexible nature of the *ArtSpots* production structure, which allowed for production crews to be built up or taken apart on an irregular basis but involving a consistency of approach and quality, also meant that it was a loosely affiliated internal/external unit to which the Atlantic or Maritimes region would turn for help in executing community-based projects. One of those partnerships was realized with what would become the national Pier 21 Museum of Immigration. In 2002, an exploratory event was organized by the CBC Partnerships and Communications Departments at CBC Maritimes to invite immigrants who had arrived in Canada through Pier 21 in Halifax to come into the Radio Building in Halifax and record their stories on camera, through interviews with news personalities and Arts and Entertainment producers. This one-day recording event resulted in the gathering of dozens of stories on video: stories subsequently used by the Museum, and also edited and anthologized by me as the *ArtSpots* producer into a three-part regional series that aired locally on CBC (*Footprints on the Pier*, 2002).

At a theoretical level, the capacity-building opportunities provided by joining with other experimental programs and partnerships suggests how important it is to strategically map and understand the flows of production and dissemination practices at *ArtSpots* in terms of the intersection of individuals and groups with technological, economic and civic systems. For

*ArtSpots*, this means understanding the networked and inter-dependent nature of and links among the individuals and groups involved as Advisors, artists, production crew, partners, distributors and audiences. Benjamin Lee and Edward LiPuma (2002) discuss similar concerns in the European and American context over the last quarter of the twentieth century, in relation to social capital. Emerging from sociological, anthropological, and political economy investigations, Lee and LiPuma scrutinize modernism to produce a theory of multiple cultures of circulation for social capital, including the creation of value through its circulation. That is to say, social capital is created when it is perceived to be shared (or circulated), as it was at *ArtSpots*. This has interesting implications for mapping creativity and civic engagement. Lee and LiPuma's analysis of social capital and gift exchange draws from Anderson's theory of identity and nation-building through the development of cultural expression such as media and language (2006[1983]), and combines it with Arjun Appadurai's definition of transnational cultural flows within the public sphere (2008[1996]). Anderson suggested that groups (societies) could imagine themselves into being by contrasting themselves with who they were not (2006, 133-135). Even more importantly for the assertion of a specific culture, a narration of that culture must emerge through the selective and/or debated remembering and forgetting of its history (Anderson, Benedict 2006, 194-204). Artwork and popular culture is more-or-less influential at this nexus precisely because it presents and critiques narratives incorporating "flows of media and migration, [including] capital and information made explicit in Arjun Appadurai's discussion of globalized processes of migration, finance and representation" (Jones 2005, 200). This resonates with foundational texts about the activation of citizenship in the public sphere by theorists Jurgen Habermas (1989) and especially Nancy Fraser (1990). Fraser explicitly suggests that the public sphere "...is the space in which citizens deliberate about their common affairs, hence, an

institutionalized arena of discursive interaction... conceptually distinct from the state [or...] the official economy; ... it is a theater for debating and deliberating” (1990, 57). Lee and LiPuma’s analysis of the generating of value in relation to such flows confirms the importance of mapping the values implicit in relationships like those that existed at *ArtSpots*. Implicitly, this analysis also draws on the accountability of media workers in general to audiences in the public sphere including specific value-driven narratives.

In this chapter, I started by mapping some specific interactions and the specific roles that existed at *ArtSpots*. These roles and interactions create assemblages or nodes of activity that exist only temporarily but can still be mapped. At *ArtSpots*, for example, the volunteer Advisory Groups would assemble only periodically – perhaps once every two years. The idea of social capital as a flow allows for the mapping of “real-life” interactions as well as virtual (internet-based) interactions, emphasizing the ability to observe and document social relations. Arising from the work of cultural studies theorists Hall (1980), Jennifer Daryl Slack and J.McGregor Wise (2005), assemblage allows for temporal specificity in identifying alignments in a fluid and evolving set of relationships by identifying nodes and modes of activity. Similarly, Adriana de Souza e Silva and Jordan Frith (2010) analyze how users of mobile devices in urban spaces literally become “mobile” nodes of activity, generating social space “on the move” for interactions on an increasingly contingent and sometimes virtual basis similar to the work conducted, for example, by the Advisory Groups at *ArtSpots*; to a more limited degree, by production teams and partnership assemblages; and most of all, to the increasingly fluid interactions among these groups. This complements earlier understandings about creative citizenship arising from media production studies that incorporate the impact of technology and convergent media in the field. It also does not diminish the significance of the creative control

exercised by the artists involved in *ArtSpots* production and distribution. Interestingly, the precarious and networked position of the producers and crew members involved, which so strongly shaped the highly fluid and contingent nature of *ArtSpots* relationships, is also reflected in the many ways in which content was shared and preserved. This includes the highly diffused repositories of edited *ArtSpots* material and various inventories of content by producers across the country, as well as the depth and richness of the corporate *CBC ArtSpots* archives (encompassing hundreds of field tapes and hundreds of master tapes as well as thorough documentation of these materials).

The mapping of the fluid nodes, modes and networks of the *ArtSpots* structure in this chapter, combined with the substantial traces of production remaining in the *ArtSpots* archives explored previously, resonate with pluralism and equity concerns examined in the next chapter, including through an analysis of the program outcomes by artistic genres and demographic participation. Variations on the data reported below are often quoted as positive features of *ArtSpots* in reports of the time, as well as in the discussions held during 2010-2014. Pluralistic outcomes also suggest how much the policy context can help shape the composition and boundaries of the modes, nodes and maps discussed above. Acknowledging *ArtSpots*' impact on the residue of individual artist and creative citizen agency elucidated above, in the next chapter I scrutinize how pluralism helped set *and support* the parameters for *ArtSpots*, considerations that resulted in *ArtSpots*' significant longevity.

## **Chapter Four: Activating pluralism at *ArtSpots***

In this chapter, I consider how creative professionals involved in the cultural media production processes of *ArtSpots* are also imbricated in practices of political and social engagement, providing insights into the importance of the dynamic between citizen-creators and their media, including public and private broadcasting and the internet. I think through the impact of identity politics of the time on the pluralism narrative that shaped the genesis, structure and program outcomes of *CBC ArtSpots*. More specifically, I am interested in the degree to which *ArtSpots*' emergence and commitment to pluralism was precipitated by cultural and broadcast legislation of the time. This chapter investigates how *ArtSpots* was shaped by its position at the juncture of two keystone cultural institutions in the late 1990s – Canada Council for the Arts and the Canadian public broadcaster, reflecting on its origin and scope as a cultural site. To accomplish this, video art history is considered alongside a comparison of the goals and value statements of *ArtSpots* and the Canadian Broadcast Act (1991), – particularly the part of CBC's mandate concerned with regionally and culturally reflective programming – the Ethnic Broadcasting Policy (1999), and the 1995 Canada Council for the Arts Strategic Plan. This chapter also analyses the artistic genres featured at *ArtSpots* and its inclusion of traditionally under-represented demographic groups, drawing attention to the wistful “archives of feeling” (Cvetkovich 2002) generated at the 2010-2014 research interviews and discussion groups by reflecting on the pluralistic impetus embedded in *ArtSpots*. The broader economic and social patterns within which *ArtSpots* was situated have implications for it as a case study, and for formulating creative citizenship conceptually. Investigating the specific industrial and policy conditions generates insights not

only into why, how, and with whom *ArtSpots* happened when it did, but a scrutiny of such conditions complements forthcoming analyses about *ArtSpots* program outcomes themselves, as well as the creative production practices generated there. To look at the question in another way, did *ArtSpots* – or does Creative Commons, YouTube, Vodpod or Vimeo – offer something not already available through community, public and commercial radio and public television of the time?

### ***The broadcasting and arts landscape***

In Canada, there have been only a handful of broadcast programs on the public broadcaster in recent times that feature a multi-faceted blend of artistic, regional and culture-specific content. These include *ZeD* (2002-2006), sometimes *Opening Night* (2001-2007), *Download* (2008-2014), and summer programs supported by targeted regional commissions through the Regional Programming Development Fund and a “best of” selection curated for late night programming such as *Absolutely Canadian*.<sup>37</sup> There have been even fewer on private networks such as Global and Shaw, or CTV and Bell Media. Frequently experimental in nature, or featuring work by emerging production talent, the goals and content for such programs are often critiqued as elitist and sometimes explicitly framed as educational or developmental rather than understood as derived from the changing vernacular of the times. For artists, producers and other stakeholders involved in cultural media production, exercising citizenship through popular culture systems such as broadcasting is a complex challenge. According to some theorists, it is also necessary: seeming to reside in the mobilization of popular culture and the fine arts in the creation or maintenance of a shared, primarily national identity (Anderson, Benedict 2006[1983]; Bennett

---

<sup>37</sup> See: <http://www.cbc.ca/download/>, <http://www.cbc.ca/independentproducers/regional/> and <http://www.cbc.ca/absolutelycanadian> (accessed July 7, 2014).

1995). In Canada, the primacy of regional and minority rights as part of national identity is expressed in goals relating to popular broadcast media as well as to sophisticated expressions of visual and performing arts. For example, these objectives have long been incorporated as a goal in the Canadian Broadcast Act (1991), and appear even today as key directions for the Canada Council for the Arts in their *Strategic Plan 2011-16: Strengthening Connections* (2010). By the late 1990s, the media production and distribution environment in Canada was a spirited combination of national and corporate identity mandates, human-rights-identity-based movements and emerging transnational economic imperatives. This included the dynamics among arms-length government agencies such as Canada Council for the Arts, the Canadian Radio-television Telecommunications Commission, and some provincial arts organizations as well as the CBC. In Canada, the corollaries between economic recessions, waves of downsizing and the precarious and experimental types of creative production that are generated in these environments suggests an important backdrop linked to my previous discussion of precarity as a feature of employment strategies in the creative field, and the dependence of innovative or expansive cultural expression on social relations in general terms. The late 1970s and early 1980s recession killed the civil rights movements in real life and on media outlets, at least until the economy picked up enough and the pressures and expressions of unfair treatment grew nuanced enough to precipitate feminism's resurgence in the mid-1980s. By the booming late 1980s and early 1990s, affirmative action and equal opportunity champions pushed corporations (including CBC) to hire professionals from under-represented groups (particularly women). Another recession generated corresponding corporate cuts of 1990 onwards. The economic recovery and growth of identity politics through the mid-1990s – generated a rehiring of women and new hiring and portrayals of visible minorities in the industry, transforming into the diversity

programs of the 2000s. But every wave of hiring was followed by cuts: last in, first out, as shown by Cohen (1987), and Burstyn and Smith (1985).<sup>38</sup>

What the *ArtSpots* archives make immediately obvious is the importance of the historical arts and broadcast policy context for its experimental media production practices. In the fall of 1997, video art was just beyond its heyday in North America. Time-based art and media installations were relatively comfortably ensconced in the formal gallery system (Elwes 2005; Hanhardt and Villasenor 1995). Many were situated in artist-run centres or universities, often funded by arts councils, as shown by Robertson (2006). Video art's use in political hot button issues such as how to live with AIDS and HIV (Juhasz 1995), coupled with an expansion of artist-run centres and artist video production facilities – such as Centre for Art Tapes in Halifax, Vidéographe and Oboro in Montreal, VTape in Toronto and VideoOut in Vancouver – deliberately blurred boundaries that had come to exist between commercial and public broadcast television, the gallery system, government funding mechanisms, and the parameters and expression of Canadian cultural identity.<sup>39</sup> Though widespread artist interventions on cable and conventional television were infrequent and gleaned little profile, they were present, even as the media production and distribution system became more consolidated and commercial.<sup>40</sup> As discussed earlier, socially-aware media productions, especially in the 1980s, including at the National Film Board of Canada, took precedence over what would become creative economy concerns in the 1990s. The Canadian arts and media production scenes benefitted from a substantial set of active government, corporate and philanthropic funding bodies, as well as

---

<sup>38</sup> My own research during that era includes a co-authored publication dealing specifically with obstacles to women's success in the job market (Williams et al 1991).

<sup>39</sup> The Independent Media Arts Alliance, an association of media arts organizations in Canada, has a current membership of more than 90 such organizations, and recently celebrated its 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary. See <http://www.imaa.ca/> (noted earlier) for more information.

<sup>40</sup> For example, Paper Tiger was founded in 1981 – and is still going (Halleck 2002).

through individual patronage, yet were increasingly oriented towards the profit potential of creative endeavours. The world art market was on an upswing. Reality television was mostly on the horizon rather than ubiquitous on televisions in living rooms. In Canada, inter-cultural identity politics was gaining a foothold in arts and cultural institutions through the articulation of under-represented stories and the self-representation of artists, including in galleries, at funding institutions and on television (Gagnon 2000; Mackey 1999; Roth 2008; Whitelaw 2006). Not the least of the institutions affected was the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, where the requirements of an upcoming ten-year license hearing impelled the corporation to assess its contributions to this national conversation about pluralism, access and creative control.<sup>41</sup>

To unpack this more explicitly, it is crucial to understand how identity politics functioned early in the 1990s in Canada, when visible minorities and First Peoples allied strategically in the arts, media arts, and broadcast media to effect change. Specifically, priorities were articulated and cultural achievements (or lack thereof) were noted by speaking to the lack of Aboriginal and visible minority exposures and experiences in major cultural institutions, including the Canada Council for the Arts, provincial galleries, and museums, and demanding the amelioration of the situation. By 1992, the Canada Council for the Arts, under the leadership of Director Joyce Zemans, was reshaped to include:

---

<sup>41</sup> See, for example, the requirements embedded in the 1991 Broadcast Act, the June 1, 1999 CBC License Hearings transcripts from the Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission, and the May 28, 2013 CRTC decision for a five-year renewal of conditions of license spanning 1 September 2013 to 31 August 2018 (CRTC 2013-263, 264, and 265 2013). In the wake of the short renewal of license timeline, the Conservative Party of Canada promised in draft materials for its biennial national policy convention to overhaul the Broadcast Act in the foreseeable future, with a view to making the CBC quite similar to a private broadcaster. The national policy convention originally scheduled for July 2013 in Calgary was postponed to October 31 - November 2, 2013. Regarding the proposed policy changes, please see Rowland (2013).

[S]pecial advisory committees, specifically the Advisory Committee of Racial Equality and the First Peoples Advisory Committee that...[were empowered to] exert...substantial reforms illustrat[ing] exactly how a process of shared power necessarily proceeds” (Robertson 2006, p. 126).

This widened and complicated the cracking open of the institutional gatekeeping that had been accomplished particularly by feminist art and curatorial practice of the 1970s and 1980s. In the art world, this meant demanding a place at the table (i.e. in exhibition and touring opportunities), foregrounding the ways in which the often systemic and discriminatory absences and omissions of work by and about significant portions of the population had resulted in a dearth of exhibitions and artwork from visible minorities and First Peoples in the gallery system (Gagnon 2000; Whitelaw 2006). It also meant rethinking what the term “professional” artist intended. For example, the Visual Arts section of the Canada Council for the Arts supported media arts as well as conceptual works, but resisted fine craft. A thriving artist-run community supported individual artists, as well as specific multicultural or other constituency-based groups (Robertson 2006). The idea of television as an experimental art space began to return to the small screen, just as still-smaller screens (computers) were threatening to displace it in turn. The language of policy in this domain deeply influenced the media landscape of the mid- to late-1990s, the period immediately preceding the founding of *ArtSpots*. These sometimes volatile, almost inevitably highly public and productive negotiations, stretching as far back as the latter part of the 1980s and the first half of the 1990s, culminated in the adoption of policy directions, documents and strategic plans, for example, by the Canada Council for the Arts from 1989 to 1995, which proposed significant retooling of the administrative and granting structures that acknowledged this set of issues. The intent (not always successful) was to structure pathways for underrepresented groups and voices through a broader though contested definition of a professional artist, as well as by providing operating funds and structures to continue to support

artist-run centres, restore support to galleries, and increase support to individual artists. The vigilance and participation of previously ignored groups contributed to an environment where visible progress in one arena (e.g. the visual arts and arts funding) could quickly be sought in another (e.g. local, cable television and public broadcasting). In mandates, mission statements, and consultations, language was sought to express a commitment to inclusiveness, and some sense of how that would or could be achieved strategically. Similar debates were taking place within the broadcast system, including media production and dissemination in Canada, where change mandating the involvement of multicultural groups, and ameliorating the absence of ethnicities and specifically of First Peoples on-screen and behind the scenes became embedded in policy and broadcast licensing in the 1990s.

By the late 1990s, then, a unique set of financial and cultural conditions – including identity and civic involvement concerns – shaped the relationships among Canadian broadcasters and the arts. Such concerns were mirrored in the mandates of large national cultural institutions. More generally, public policy related to arts and broadcasting crown corporations exhibits a long history of association with the propagation of Canadian nationalism and identity. The mandate for Canada Council for the Arts (Canada Council 2011; Canada 1985(1958)) affirms the primacy of national identity. By virtue of being Canadian, the work is Canadian, but not all Canadians are represented through the presentation of artistic works in public environments (2011, 10). The Broadcast Act 1991 (2010) also explicitly makes this association, mandating the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (the public broadcaster) to:

...actively contribute to the flow and exchange of cultural expression [;] reflect Canada and its regions to national and regional audiences [;] contribute to shared national consciousness and identity [; and] reflect the multicultural and multiracial nature of Canada... (Canada 1991, n.p.).

More broadly in Canada, the predominance of cultural and regional diversity is embedded in varying expressions of national identities, alternately articulated as desirable public values or studiously ignored in arts and broadcast licensing decisions and policy documents and processes alike, as shown by Murray (2005), Gagnon in the arts (2000), Robertson in regard to community-based arts (2006), Anne Whitelaw (2006) concerning missteps in national arts exhibition practices, and several broadcasting scholars nationally and internationally (Guglietti 2010; Halleck 2002; Rodriguez and El Gazi 2007; Roth 2005, 2008; Tinic 2009). For example, Gagnon (2000) foregrounds how systemic discriminatory absences and omissions of work by and about significant portions of the population had resulted in a dearth of artwork presentations from visible minorities and First Peoples in the gallery system up until the late 1990s. These conditions connect to the critical related communications policy discussed in chapter one, with Moll (2011), Raboy and Shtern (2010), and Shade (2010) considering the legacy and question of the “right to communicate” in Canada, including access to communication tools and networks. This provides a highly useful vantage point for a critical discussion of who has access to participatory media production, drawing from values articulated around narrowcast audience cultural productions derived from diversity and equity objectives that arose out of identity politics and pluralism discussions of the previous two decades. This is illustrated, for example, in the revised mandate of the CBC featured in the 1991 Broadcast Act, and, by the end of the decade, in the 1999 reaffirmation of the 1985 Ethnic Broadcasting Policy by the CRTC, specifically to address the changing composition of the broadcast audience, especially in urban centres.

### *Shared values and goals*

In the winter of 1998, when I was hired as a temporary employee at CBC following the artist residency which developed the concept for *ArtSpots*, I knew it was important to consult with the community directly affected to articulate goals and criteria in language that would make sense to the key narrowcast audiences involved.<sup>42</sup> Arising out of discussions of access and pluralism, community consultation was a frequent practice of the time at arts councils and artist-run centres, though these weren't always successful (Robertson 2006); my own decade-long experience in the not-for-profit world as a trainer and facilitator provided me with skills to help identify community needs and assess resource opportunities in this way. In late 1997, the Advisory Group working process had been quickly established among CBC Television producers and arts community experts, included a virtual who's who of cultural narrowcast audience representatives: university, commercial and public art gallery directors; art scholars and practitioners; leaders of artist-run centres; artists; and the-then Nova Scotia Arts Council, which closed in 2002 (Beaumont 2011). That initial process had generated draft value statements, objectives and criteria for artist identification and selection.<sup>43</sup> Those initial *ArtSpots* value statements and objectives drafted in the fall of 1997 were reviewed and endorsed at the beginning of more than fifty other Advisory sessions across the country over the ten-year period of production. Since discourse analysis is often used to help understand how cultural identity formation is articulated in legislation and policy as well as in cultural production itself, I compare the language used at *ArtSpots* to policies and strategic plans of the time, as summarized in Table One in Appendix Five. This includes comparisons between the 1997-2008 *ArtSpots*'

---

<sup>42</sup> Half my time was spent on *ArtSpots* production during this contract, which was a part-time engagement.

<sup>43</sup> The full version of the 1997-2008 *ArtSpots* value statements and objectives can be found at the [CBC.ca/ArtSpots](http://CBC.ca/ArtSpots) website.

value statements and objectives and the 1991 Broadcast Act, the CBC's Mandate as it was articulated in the Broadcast Act, the CRTC's 1999 Ethnic Broadcasting Policy, and the 1995 Canada Council for the Arts Strategic Plan. The comparison draws attention to commonalities around mandates, dissemination, cultural identity and responsibilities, and definitions of local, regional, national and diasporic groups to be served in Canada (Canada 1991; Canada Council for the Arts 1995; Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC), 1999b). Overall, the language employed in all five policy statements is congruent with one another. Not surprisingly, the language employed in the Ethnic Broadcasting Policy, the Canada Council for the Arts Strategic Plan and at *ArtSpots* is more colloquial in nature than the legislative language used in the Broadcast Act.

Interestingly, the tone and approach of the language used in Canada Council's Strategic Plan and at *ArtSpots* are very similar, indicating a significant level of responsiveness at the public broadcaster at the time to the language of the cultural community to which it hoped to appeal with *ArtSpots*. This responsiveness is also evident in the June 1, 1999 license hearings at the CRTC shortly before *ArtSpots* became a national project:

[Phyllis Platt]: Art and television are not always an easy mix or an easy fit, and finding the best way, I think, to connect the art to the audience is something that many broadcasters have worked on and struggled with...

[Fred Mattocks]: We [CBC Television, Maritimes Region] have a unique project called "*ArtSpots*". *ArtSpots* are short programs produced in collaboration with Maritime visual artists. They are the result of a seminal partnership involving ourselves, the visual arts community and the Nova Scotia Arts Council. And I am happy to tell you that we were joined last year in that project by the Canada Council for the Arts and the CBC Television Network. (CRTC hearings, June 1, 1999, sections 10690 and 11411).

Articulating specific creativity, community and equity values as part of the commitment of the project itself was embedded in the language about audiences and partners with which it was

surrounded, including the then-recent changes in broadcast and arts policy from this era. The policy discourse about the relationship of broadcasting to the fine arts and digital media at *ArtSpots* was firmly rooted in audience and partnership terms rather than creative ones, as reflected in Table One (Appendix Five), framing the work that *ArtSpots* would set out to do. For *ArtSpots*, the policy documents from the end of the 1990s compared in Table One provide some indication of the context experienced – sometimes even authored – by the participants to act on the responsibilities and activities governed or generated by policies and legislation. These documents also elucidate particular stories told about *ArtSpots*' role in the context of public broadcasting.

In the spring of 2000, about a year after the statements made at the CRTC and 30 months after the original *ArtSpots* value statements, goals and criteria had been articulated in terms that made sense to the culture sector participants, *CBC ArtSpots* – then a fledgling regional project – became a full national program with annual funding based in the Arts and Entertainment Department. As established earlier, this included support for its then-pioneering strategy to populate CBC's burgeoning website with video content and attract audiences eager to use then-emerging broadband capabilities. By the mid-2000s, all provinces and territories were involved in production for television and the internet on an irregular basis, and several partnerships were underway.

The discursive indications about cultural specificity and narrowcast audience involvement embedded in the *ArtSpots* language and the Broadcasting Act (1991) are consistent with studies of other cultural sites of production, including Tony Bennett's (1995, 2000) studies of the regulation and management of museology as a discursive indication of how populations are managed culturally. Murray's 2005 essay mobilizing the concept of cultural citizenship,

which clearly informs my creative citizenship framework, analyzes the development of cultural diversity in Canada, the United States and Australia (among other countries). She points to important ways in which pluralism and cultural diversity are discursively promulgated in policy documents – often in relation to economic goals and achievements. Murray also draws particular attention to the discursive qualities of the analytical work on Bourdieuan social capital conducted by Bennett and various of his colleagues in Australia around 1999 and 2000 (qtd in Murray 2005). This is consistent with the mapping of *ArtSpots*' nodes and flows embedded in the earlier investigation of *ArtSpots*' networked relationships, and further complements similar policy analysis work conducted by scholars such as Mackey (2002) on Canadian cultural diversity, as well as other scholarly essay collections (Ashley 2013; Herbert et al 2006). These examinations operate at a high level of rhetorical analysis. Indeed, these debates in their international form would eventually lead to the adoption of declarations such as the 2005 UNESCO Convention of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, sponsored by Canada and France.

*Connecting pluralistic broadcast developments to social capital and creative citizenship*

To help unpack the specific *ArtSpots* policy discourse in relation to parallel developments in the broadcasting sphere, it is worth considering how the relationships of flows of social capital to legislation can be analysed in the broadcast context, as Lorna Roth (2008) does with the 1999/1985 Ethnic Broadcasting Policy. This policy's language-of-origin formula for broadcast services is multi-tiered and complex, and does not require (or even address the possibility of) the conventional networks to present programming in languages other than French or English. Rather, in order to be licensed as an ethnic broadcaster, the CRTC requires the implementation of a complicated series of percentages of Canadian content and ethnic programming in the

various languages on offer at the channel. It also compels each ethnic broadcaster provide programming to at least one linguistic group other than its core audience, but not to too many linguistic groups, and not in competition to the main French and English channels. This results in a convoluted, and shifting, series of calculations required to maintain the correct proportions of how much content can be delivered to a narrowly defined or narrowcast audience (as previously defined) in one language or another (other than French or English). As Roth points out in her discussion of the 1988 Multiculturalism Act, the 1982 Charter of Rights and Freedoms, both versions of the Ethnic Broadcasting Policy, and the attempts by a Toronto businessman to launch a multi-cultural channel in Canada, the Ethnic Broadcasting Policy seems to have resulted in impressive inter-cultural relations among specific linguistic and multicultural groups in Canada. Significantly, though, this has not resulted in a unified multi-cultural broadcast service that can address itself to the nation as a whole (Roth 2008). Nonetheless, the CRTC's desires to enable broadcast services to a broad set of narrowcast audiences is registered in these policy documents. This theme is embedded in the concept of creative citizenship and also emerges from Neilson and Rossiter's (2008) analysis of a creative civic space where often precarious production practices and audience engagement strategies are closely linked in order to generate a common arena for cultural discourse. The mobilization of the Broadcast Act public broadcasting mandate to articulate a carefully defined commitment to visual arts and culture by *CBC ArtSpots* in its endeavours to reach specific creative workers and audiences is reinforced by Roth's analysis.

Another corollary development during the same time period can be found in the case of the formation of the (multi-lingual, multi-cultural, multi-community) Aboriginal People's Television Network (APTN)'s in 1999. The establishment of APTN indicated a policy-based commitment at the licensing level to generate programming on a single cable television channel, addressing

one group of carefully defined ethno-cultural audiences, supported by mandatory subscription fees (Roth 2005). Taking commitments such as the regionally-based arts/cultural communities engendered at *ArtSpots* by the public broadcaster, the APTN commitment signaled a deeper, more autonomous relationship for these particular audiences and producers to the production of media programming relevant to their own experiences. Though both interventions in the broadcasting sphere (APTN and *ArtSpots*) took place at exactly the same time, APTN was able to draw on pre-existing production practices and networks within a broadcasting environment, while *ArtSpots* focused on drawing in networks and expertise from the parallel visual arts curatorial domain.

More explicitly, and unlike APTN, though a corollary network of curators existed in the culture sector for *ArtSpots* to mobilize, it was not already in the broadcasting environment in the way that the APTN personnel and regional broadcasting services had been. The curatorial networks of artistic production and dissemination that existed in Canada prior to *ArtSpots* began to be systematically tapped through the *ArtSpots* Advisory Group process. This involvement transformed them into active, almost co-creative narrowcast audiences. Mattocks acknowledges the importance of this relationship of the public broadcaster to the experimental arts and filmmaker community in his observations about how *ArtSpots* restored that particular relationship. It had been rarely mobilized in the years immediately prior to *ArtSpots* in terms of national presentation and promotion objectives related to the visual arts. As an element of creative citizenship, this illuminates what became the late 1990s version of the lengthy intertwined history of artists and television that Spigel (2008) elucidates concerning the 1950s and 1960s. The subsequent cultural network of narrowcast audiences engendered at *ArtSpots* was provided with ten years' of broadcasting experience – through the *ArtSpots*' Advisory Group

process – by bridging the visual arts curatorial domain with public broadcasting.

Similarly, in *Something New in the Air*, Roth historicizes the founding of APTN by analyzing the conditions and the documentation of how it grew out of the collaborative media production and broadcast system practices (not just television) that had successfully generated indigenous broadcast programming for First Nations people for the previous 25 years. The *ArtSpots* initiative more modestly resulted in the engagement of several hundred curators, gallery directors, arts scholars, media producers and artists as co-creative participants within a small but influential pocket of the CBC, for a time. But the APTN model culminated in a hybrid business model, combining public (mandatory subscription fees for basic cable customers) and private (advertising-based) broadcasting revenues. Nonetheless, the focus on narrowcast audiences in both cases are similar. At APTN, Aboriginal audiences were clearly a priority, as well as specific audiences interested in the genres programmed. The possibility existed at APTN to engender transnational reach through narrowcast program distribution and sales to international rather than national audiences. Like *ArtSpots*, however, the narrowcast audiences involved were a fairly modest component of worldwide media audiences. At APTN, this was evident in the difficulties of raising enough funding to generate a significant proportion of indigenous programming production, while the eventual decline of resources available to *ArtSpots* indicates the same.<sup>44</sup> The promising inter-cultural model that Roth describes essentially calls on the potential for creating dialogues between narrowcast audiences through media programming (including television) in Canada, as well as the moral role of the licensing body, the Canadian Radio-

---

<sup>44</sup> In fact, the CBC Sales Department developed a formatting package based on ArtSpots promotional materials in an effort to explain and sell it to other public and private broadcasters around 2003. In March of that year, Michel Gélinais also made a pitch to the French side of CBC (Radio-Canada) to develop a project based on the ArtSpots model, almost entirely composed of the internal working documents such as the show bible and all the artist website pages to date.

Television Telecommunications Commission, towards inter-cultural identity negotiation and construction:

Television can play supportive, though constrained, roles in addressing the challenge of social cohesion in a multicultural/multiracial society. In order for broadcast producers to be able to contribute to the potential breaking down of stereotypes and the building up of cross-cultural constituency group relations in Canada, the [CRTC] has a broad and visionary role to play in the licensing and regulatory process (2005, 192-193).

Roth usefully mobilizes the concept of Robert Putnam's analysis of social capital (qtd in Roth 2005) in a manner complementary to my prior use of Lee and LiPuma's (2002) use of the concept to delineate value flows in the networked relationships of *ArtSpots*. Roth uses the concept to help illustrate the transition from policy to a specific equity commitment, namely, the establishment of the Aboriginal People's Television Network, as well as the potential for activating the Ethnic Broadcast Policy. The establishment of APTN as a broadcasting equity commitment rests as much on the putative ability to build bridges of inter-cultural understanding among the narrowcast audiences involved than on the CRTC's vision, even though the APTN proposal was expedited by the CRTC, relative to many other proposals for inter-cultural broadcasting. Significantly, the communities proposing that a broadcast license be issued for a First Peoples national broadcaster were able to rally the agreement of a vocal portion of other narrowcast audiences in the Canadian public about the need for a national Aboriginal broadcaster, and particularly of the agreement of opinion leaders in policy management at the CRTC and relevant government departments. Roth's policy-based research analysis is a useful model for contextualizing the emergence of *ArtSpots* from its own more modest policy context and discourse, particularly the validation of narrowcast audiences based on equity goals (in the case of *ArtSpots*, both regional and arts-based narrowcast audiences). Moreover, Roth's focus on the importance of generating pointed policy documents and equity commitments suggests that

analyses of equity-based language are important. The discursive comparisons of core documents influencing and informing ArtSpots at the time of its founding (as discussed above, and shown in Table One in Appendix Five), are a compelling measure of how the concept of creative citizenship could be practiced by policy-influencers and narrowcast audiences involved in *ArtSpots*, APTN and similar initiatives.

### ***Activating the public broadcasting mandate***

If the policy foundations and commitments to innovation, collaboration and equity at *ArtSpots* enhanced professional networks, that enhancement will be visible in the *ArtSpots* visual materials themselves. Additionally, the production of more than 1,200 distinct video-based items for broadcast – cumulatively aired hundreds of times per year on the mainstream public broadcaster for more than a decade – may have generated substantial levels of other forms of engagement. It makes sense to take a closer look at the pluralistic narrative generated by the video and web-based material produced as programming during the decade of *ArtSpots* production, and by the involvement of particular demographics of artists. A consideration of the particular subject matter and genres of the media produced by *ArtSpots* artists as well as the demographics of those involved provides a benchmark set of information that can be compared to other programs of its time or in the present.

Specific indicators of diversity were explicitly incorporated into *ArtSpots* production practices, including the artistic genres and precise populations involved. Counts based on the [CBC.ca/ArtSpots](http://CBC.ca/ArtSpots) website information indicate that throughout the decade of production, multiple genres were featured as credible forms of art practice, including traditional craft and fine craft plus interdisciplinary, multi-media, mixed media, and similar work. From the beginning, this

wide spectrum of under-represented genres was a distinctive feature of the program. Feminist scholars note that a significant broadening of the definition of valid genres of art and artists was strategic and explicitly political for women and people of colour in the 1990s (Butler, Jones and Reilly 2010). The commitment to this principle was reflected in the range of genres of artwork presented by artists appearing on the *ArtSpots* website. Solely traditional Aboriginal craft was presented in seven per cent or sixteen of the cases. Other fine craft was presented in the work of seventy individuals, or just over thirty per cent. Installation, media art, mixed and multi-media and performance art was presented in thirty-three per cent of the cases or seventy-six individuals. Finally, seventy-one artists employing traditional visual art forms, specifically sculpture, painting and drawing, represented less than thirty-one per cent.

In the identification and selection process involving volunteer expert Advisory Groups, emphasis was placed on ensuring that production would promote pluralism by including traditionally underrepresented groups. Pluralism is defined in *Pluralism in the Arts in Canada* as often-innovative examples of work in the performing arts in Canada that demonstrate a wide-ranging cultural inclusiveness by several organizations and cultural leaders (Smith 2012). At *ArtSpots*, Advisory Groups were an important organizational arena where attempts were made to balance representation at the table. That wasn't always easy or fully successful. In 2012, reflecting on the Saskatchewan Advisory Group meetings, Kim Morgan, a former *ArtSpots* artist and Advisory Group member, noted:

Each community was well represented. That's what I noticed looking across that room, that each group was well represented. I don't think there had been anyone left out. From the institutions, the university to first nations groups, to craft. Most of the arts organizations were there... When you opened it up to a wider audience [smiles] that was well-represented by the different groups of people, I think that's probably where the complications came in. Everybody seemed to have their own group of artists that they were putting forth, because we have such diverse groups of people in Saskatchewan. (Personal interview, March 22, 2012).

On the *ArtSpots* website, 229 artists were featured on the individual artist pages. Several dozen additional artists featured in documentaries or special projects are not included in this number.

Of the 229 individual artists, some seventeen and a half per cent (forty individuals) self-identified as First Peoples, either in their artwork, in their interviews, or on their website information. In the 2012 artists' discussion group, Ursula Johnson (a former ArtSpots artist) commented on the impact this had on them in their own community:

It was very funny from a cultural perspective. [I]n my community, once the ArtSpot came on, everybody on the whole rez [asked:]... "Did you see [the artist] on TV?" and then people would want to watch CBC to see if they could see it again...all these native people are showing up there. They wanted to tune in more. (Ursula Johnson, in Artist discussion group, February 28, 2012)

At least twelve per cent (twenty-seven individuals) identified as or appear to be visible minorities, with the remaining population of seventy and a half per cent (162 individuals) not self-identifying as either First Nations or visible minority. Reflecting on the Advisory Group discussions of priorities, looking over notes taken at those meetings, and paying attention to accents, verbal or written signs in the short videos or on the website, suggests that another significant proportion of the artists involved were landed immigrants or first generation Canadian. However, there is no way to establish a firm number associated with immigrant status, or with the specific proportion of visible minorities (particularly those not self-identified), without conducting a new survey of the artists originally involved.

### *The production of pluralism and identity*

Some *ArtSpots* artists' work explicitly dealt with identity, while all the *ArtSpots* short video items were self-presentations of work and stories as selected and prioritized by the artists involved. In the case of women whose work included performance or installation work, a

considerable number dealt with multiple positionalities, (e.g. as immigrant women based in Western Canada or as visible minority women). The artworks of some Aboriginal women articulated a productive tension between Aboriginal artistic traditions in relation to the artist's identity as a woman in the policy-shaped intercultural environment discussed above. Some artists engaged in complex ways with their identity along continuums, including queerness, gender, Aboriginal status, immigration, transnational, or regional positions.

Of the 229 artists, 115 (or just over fifty per cent) were women. Of these 115, twenty-eight (or twenty-four per cent) were artists in traditional art forms such as sculpture, painting and drawing, while the remaining eighty-seven (or seventy-seven per cent of women) self-labelled traditional crafters (five individuals or four per cent of women), fine craft artists (thirty-five individuals or thirty per cent) or interdisciplinary, multi-media, or performance work (forty-seven individuals or forty-one per cent). All female fine craft artists – and all male fine craft artists – had a practice of one-of-a-kind works in addition to or rather than production processes. Many were involved in highly complex craft practices such as glasswork, tapestry and artist bookmaking, drawing on centuries of artisanal tradition.

All sixteen of the artists practicing Aboriginal traditional crafts self-identified as First Peoples artists (men and women). Another five female Aboriginal artists (twelve and a half per cent) practiced other crafts, some of them drawing on Aboriginal traditional crafts, symbols or narratives. About twenty-five per cent (nine individuals) of First Peoples artists practiced classical Western fine arts such as sculpture, painting and drawing, including several additionally influenced by First Peoples' traditional crafts, symbols or narratives, but who did not engage in the latter as the primary creative component of their practice. Of the fifteen First Peoples artists

whose practices included multi- or mixed-media, interdisciplinary, or performance work, nine were women.

Of the twenty-seven artists from visible minority groups, there was no difference in the art genre splits by gender. Five artists (eighteen per cent) were engaged in practices of fine craft (lower than the overall thirty and a half per cent), ten (thirty-seven per cent) were engaged in art practices such as sculpture, painting, drawing and twelve (forty-four per cent) were engaged in forms such as performance, multi- or mixed-media and interdisciplinary work. Both these latter two categories were in a higher proportion than found in the overall *ArtSpots* population. In some cases, the work dealt explicitly with identity, but in many cases it did not. Where it did, a sophisticated, conceptual approach was often taken; acknowledging conflicts and conjunctions embedded in the artist's identity, and sometimes using humour to study this through their work. It would be interesting to look more closely at the long lists of one hundred to two hundred artists at each Advisory Group meeting versus final production lists of six to ten artists – including examples of work – to see if the Advisory Group process disproportionately selected visible minority artists whose work used humour in order for the work to be more comfortable for a “mainstream” audience.

The extensive literature generated by feminist and race scholars in Canada regarding visual culture and media helpfully critique cultural production in terms of agency and self-representation in relation to identity and power relations as well as to the visual culture of Canada. This includes the work of Gagnon (2000) referenced earlier, and a series of essays gathered by Garry Sherbert, Annie Gérin and Sheila Petty (2006) about Canadian culture. The examination of the presence of pleasure, desire and power in visual texts contextualizes and expands ongoing debates regarding colonialism and post-colonialism. The search for and

expression of national and transnational identities – on television, in film and in art galleries – may be in the hands of artists and directors, including experimental filmmakers, video artists and curators, but is interpreted and influenced by narrowcast and broader audiences. Creative citizenship draws from theories that examine the historically specific and contingent articulation and assemblage of values, meanings and conjunctures, within which we can find the artist (filmmaker, curator, etc.) as a key activating figure. Taken together, these theories foreground the criticality of feminist approaches and studies of difference also emerging from visual culture and film studies (Jones 2008; Levin 2007; Shohat and Stam 1994; Woolf 1990). The resurgence of feminist visual and language-based art in the 1980s and 1990s emphasized techniques and strategies of the “domestic” or of (fine) craft and video production. These clearly emerged as priorities in the subject matter and artistic genres featured at *ArtSpots* during its decade of production. Interventions on the streets, in museums and on television were documented and encouraged at *ArtSpots*, perhaps as an echo of video art in the gallery system, though in this case leading to the everyday presentation of artwork in living rooms through televisions and computers, and then back on to the street when played on mobile devices.

#### *The stewardship of the visual arts discourse*

Overall, the *ArtSpots* process represented women proportionately, over-represented the Aboriginal population in the proportion of artists selected, over-represented the self-identifying visible minority population in its first seven years, and then may have under-represented this same population. Notably, in 2001, Statistics Canada reported that the visible minority population had doubled since 1986 by the 1996 census, to eleven per cent of the total population, (nine per cent in 1991; six per cent in 1986) (Statistics Canada 2001). This proportion is slightly lower than the minimum proportion of visible minority artists presented on *ArtSpots*, at twelve

per cent. However, according to more recent statistics released by Statistics Canada (2010), based on the 2006 census (co-incidentally the high point of *ArtSpots* production), about sixteen per cent of the population in 2006 was from visible minority populations. This is anticipated to grow to thirty-one per cent by 2031 (Friesen 2010). Statistics Canada reported that 50.4% of the population were “women or female children” in 2004 (Statistics Canada 2005). This is consistent with the proportion of artists who were women featured on *ArtSpots*. About 3.8% of Canada’s overall population is Aboriginal, based on the same census (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation 2010).

The *ArtSpots* data reveals efforts towards a decision-making process that presumed a nuanced, pluralistic cultural identity that continued to develop in Canada in the late 1990s and throughout the 2000s. Armed with this data, it is easier to see how and why the late 1990s’ policy-making focus on identity in Canadian arts and television policy enabled *ArtSpots* to emerge and to take hold of the responsibility to move the conversation forward in the context of the relationship between the cultural community and the public broadcaster.

The linked ideas of cultural transnationalism and social capital generated by scholars from the 1990s onwards resulted in a conceptual understanding that showed how nation-state borders were transcended through citizenship practices, though still influenced by meaningful cultural, economic, social and political constituency commitments (Appadurai 2008(1996); Carpentier et al 2003; Proulx et al 2003). This helped engender new terms such as the “glocalization” of media production and dissemination (Thussu 2008), and set the stage for discussions of intercultural identity in the arts in Canada as indicated above, including Roth (2005) and “multiculturalism as a terrain of interaction” in transmedia storytelling (Jakubowicz 2003, 209). In Canada, these theoretical concepts aligned with the proactive work of non-profit social justice organizations in

the 1980s such as Women's Legal Education and Action Fund, which had adopted precedent-setting court cases as a strategy to mobilize an inclusive definition of "equality" in the Canadian Supreme Court's interpretation of rights embedded in the 1982 Charter of Rights and Freedoms. This bolstered the positioning of First Nations, immigrant and visible minority populations as legitimate participants in civic life. The projection that sixty per cent of Toronto's population and thirty-one per cent of Canada's population will be comprised of visible minorities by 2031 (Friesen 2010), points to the urgency for relevant engagement in cultural spaces. An example of the civic potency of engagements in cultural spaces is the First Nations youth-led "Idle No More" protests against Canadian government omnibus legislation and alleged treaty violations in Canada in 2012 (Denis 2012). *ArtSpots'* contribution to a historically and visually specific form of cultural pluralism emerging from and for specific narrowcast audiences within Canada contributed to the propagation and expression of that pluralism for a specific time period in the broadcasting milieu. In a discussion with former Advisory Group members, I reflected back to them the kind of anticipation of audience understanding that was sought at *ArtSpots* during production, and which I noted that Caldwell (2008) analysed as the professionally reflexive nature of programming for broadcast:

That is the conversation around television. How do you deal with content of particular kinds? And what is it you think people want to watch? And what do people really want to watch? And what combination of "they think they want to watch" and what you're trying to work on as the legislated requirement in particular for the public broadcaster, which is around reflection. It's supposed to reflect Canada. (Former executive producer M.E. Luka, Advisory Group members' discussion group, February 28, 2012).

The deliberate nature of that statement suggests more than an accidental ambition, resulting in a felt form of agency and stewardship over discourses by more than just the broadcasting employees involved. This sense of responsibility on the part of *ArtSpots* participants arose with some frequency in the 2010-2014 research interviews and discussion groups. Artist Frances

Dorsey's observations exemplify this shared sense of how Advisory Group members, artists and production crew were engaged in citizenship discourses during the 1997-2008 production decade. Dorsey (<http://francesdorsey.com/>) is an established textile artist living in Halifax, Nova Scotia and teaching at the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design. Her work draws from personal experience, and investigates the composition and capacities of cloth and dye. In 2007, she became involved as an *ArtSpots* artist. Dorsey ties together the outcomes of one artist's particular production experience on *ArtSpots* to a broader concern with the dialogic stewardship of the endeavour as a whole.

I was really excited at the idea that something that was unscripted, that was an art form, could pop into your living room in these little chunks. So I was really happy to participate. [Mine] was a walking tour of my exhibition [*Saigon*, mounted at Mount Saint Vincent University Art Gallery during the 2007 NeoCraft Conference in Halifax]... I was interested in the idea that you could present a body of work, moving and talking, as a kind of five-minute survey...

[But] what I thought was really thrilling about *ArtSpots* was that it...was about the visual arts discourse, regardless of how performative or conceptual or grounded... [W]hat people were doing was ... being stewards of a kind of conversation or questioning or inventive exploration that didn't really have another location... (Frances Dorsey, former artists' discussion group, February 28, 2012).

Dorsey's observation during the 2012 discussion about the relationship of her own participation to the responsibility of participants in generating explorations and conversations about culture more generally (through the production and distribution of *ArtSpots*) points to the high degree of individual agency and responsibility for each artist in the *ArtSpots* process. In the context of the pluralistic narrative about *ArtSpots*, this necessarily incorporates a feminist media studies and visual culture stance. Moreover, by conducting the 2010-2014 research interviews and discussions to parallel and simultaneously interrogate the older *ArtSpots* interviews, an analysis of the ongoing influence of popular culture is married to the articulation of the lived experience of *ArtSpots* participants. My own feminist stance (including within *ArtSpots* from 1997-2008,

and during the dissertation research phase of 2010-2014) and that of many of the other participants involved in both processes, informs and insists on potential empowerment and engagement strategies in media production and broadcasting. One former Advisory Group member characterized the presentation of Canadian artists' creative practices at *ArtSpots* in this way:

What *ArtSpots* did well was it taught – maybe taught's not the right word: it *showed* the audience a different way of looking at art. (Ray Cronin, former *ArtSpots* advisor and current President and CEO of the Art Gallery of Nova Scotia, March 2012, his emphasis).

Cronin's observation enjoins an analysis that suggests that *ArtSpots* had mastered television vernacular in service to artistic expression in a way that provided opportunities to both artists and audiences to stimulate discussions about pluralism, identity, and other concerns manifest in Canadian artwork at the time.

As a result, *ArtSpots*' policy documents and pluralistic discursive practices parallel those of policy documents and practices concerning multicultural groups and ethnicities on-screen and behind the scenes that became embedded in broadcast licensing in the 1990s. These included revising the mandate of the CBC in the 1991 Broadcast Act, reaffirming the 1985 Ethnic Broadcasting Policy during the 1999 license hearings at the CRTC, the regulatory body, and launching the Aboriginal Peoples' Television Network (APTN). Visible minority populations and First Peoples effected change through collective action during this time, building on feminist art and curatorial practices of the 1970s and 1980s (Levin 2007), resulting in the adoption of new policy directions, strategic plans and granting structures by the Canada Council for the Arts and other arts funding bodies from 1989 to 1995. The equity outcomes of *ArtSpots* provide corollary evidence of equity commitments, and were dependent on a growing expertise in broadening the range of artistic genres broadcast on television and narrowcast on the internet. Additionally, the

assertion of the validity of self-representation for the artists' involved, particularly including under-represented narrowcast demographic artist groups, including women, people of colour, Aboriginal people and immigrants, contributed to the extension of this particular discourse from the arts to public broadcasting.

*Policy-based decision making: Negotiating day-to-day needs*

The core activity of the first two years of *ArtSpots* concentrated on the development of the networked production and distribution roles involving individual artists, the Advisory Groups and the building of the website. As the years passed, experimental programs and internal/external partnerships were added, often supported by specific regions and occasionally by national operations. Consequently, the most crucial annual decision-making processes took place in each CBC regional operations, as well as at the national Arts and Entertainment Department, where *ArtSpots* was formally housed from 2000 on, (though still based out of Halifax). The early involvement of internal and external partners generated a series of policy-based high-level decision-making discussions within CBC, and between CBC and other significant national cultural institutions, including the Canada Council for the Arts, staff at the federal Department of Canadian Heritage and the Governor General's office, as well as with other broadcasters such as Vision Television.

During its decade of production, *ArtSpots* personnel would periodically come into contact with representatives from the Department of Canadian Heritage (DCH) – the funding body for the majority of CBC's annual budget. Then-policy analyst and now Director-General at DCH, Cynthia White-Thornley took an interest in *ArtSpots* as a project over its ten-year history. At the 2012 research interview held with Ms. White-Thornley, she recalled the collaborative nature of the project, and its relationships with the cultural community, one of only a few experimental

projects at the time particularly engaged with the internet (personal interview, April 18, 2012). Additionally, during the nationally-televised Tall Ships event held in Halifax Harbour in 2000, conversations took place with the staff of the Governor General's office about the possibility of having the *ArtSpots* production teams take on the documenting of artists about to receive the Governor General's Awards in the Visual Arts. This never came to fruition because of the reluctance of the national Arts and Entertainment Department to entertain the kind of partnerships that would have been required to realize the project. However, the conversation was a harbinger of many more discussions that would lead to a thoroughly institutionally networked set of discourses about cultural production, sometimes embodied in partnership relationships. This component of *ArtSpots* operations would first benefit *ArtSpots* and then eventually compete with *ArtSpots*' original commitments to diverse individual artists.

#### *Annual negotiations for resources*

Looking back into my own personal archives as well as into the corporate archives, it is evident that the original policy-level decision-making authority involved in *ArtSpots* was Mattocks, whose transfer to a national stage of resource management in 2000 paralleled *ArtSpots*' growth as a national program with deep regional roots. Mattocks' interest in what he expressed as an interest in aesthetics (or creativity or design-thinking), for the public broadcaster had resulted in the creation of the artist residency that led to *ArtSpots*. This took place within the context of shifting technologies, including a redefinition of the very media involved. In his 2012 interview, Mattocks notes:

Part of what was going on was that the world was shifting from a world where it was easy to define film as opposed or in relation to television. People aligned around them as different worlds, to the point that we actually had two artist-run operations in Halifax: the film co-op which defined itself all about film, and the Centre for Art Tapes, which defined itself all around video. Both were mature organizations with long histories and had their own identities, and that was fine. And broadcasters were [elsewhere]. We were all feeling a

shift in the way technology intersected with human beings, and we were trying to answer the questions, what does this mean for the experience of the viewer, and for the experience of the artist as well. (Personal interview, February 7, 2012).

Many vital outcomes resulted from *ArtSpots*, in his view, including original programming, a commitment to a robust partnerships strategy and, in the terms explored this dissertation, commitments to creative citizenship by its participants. The importance of the opportunities generated by *ArtSpots* in the context of the industrial transition to digital broadcasting from analogue broadcasting in the media business, in combination with policy-based mandates of public broadcasting and the values of a critical cultural community, are evident in his own words:

So one of the great successes of *ArtSpots* was, all of a sudden, we had a whole bunch of people who [were involved in a] much more engaged discussion about what the creative possibilities were, and that led to an enormous flourishing of productivity. We ended up in the five-minute program with AFSCOOP which produced a whole raft of shorts, and in other kinds of experiments, [including] a lot of second window work with what was then called Vision TV... It was stunning. I was getting calls from filmmakers in other parts of the country who wanted to come and work with us because they'd heard about us. Well, *ArtSpots* was the key to that door, in many ways. (Personal interview, February 7, 2012).

More prosaically, the leadership shown in the Maritime region (later reconfigured as the Atlantic region to include Newfoundland and Labrador, and still later, reduced again to the Maritimes: New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia) from year-to-year, as the headquarters and home of *ArtSpots*, was of crucial importance. The regions were allocated a certain number of staff positions and budgets that evolved over time (often downwards through cutbacks). From these resources, a certain amount of programming could be supported, including the mandated news programming and arts and entertainment programming such as *This Hour Has 22 Minutes*, *Halifax Comedy Festival*, local dramas, and *ArtSpots*, among others. From both the corporate *ArtSpots* archives and records contained in my personal notebooks and calendars, it is evident

that the Maritimes region always provided a generous amount of in-kind office space (usually two to four spaces, depending on the annual projects) and office equipment. Regional staff regularly scheduled editing resources and a certain amount of camera and sound personnel support, depending on the annual projections agreed to by the Regional Director. The national Arts and Entertainment Department provided an annual cash budget that had to be negotiated by the Executive Producer each winter for the fiscal year beginning April 1, usually covering about the equivalent of one and a half full-time positions (including a portion of the Executive Director's salary) plus a significant number of freelance or temporary workers, travel funding, funding for thank-you gifts ("swag") for volunteers, community leaders and artists, and artist fees. Additionally, the Halifax media library catalogued, stored and circulated all of the *ArtSpots* edited material over the ten-year period in a combination of in-kind and cash costs.

The Maritime region example could be held up in annual negotiations as a benchmark to strive towards, for each of the other regions. British Columbia joined in early and sporadically. The North (Northwest Territories, Yukon Territory, and Nunavut) committed to the project wholeheartedly but with thin resources on the ground, and a very stretched local news producer; so stretched that the Northern items often had to be completed by editors and producers in Halifax. Manitoba and Alberta provided consistent year-to-year support from 2001 onwards, especially once freelance producers were engaged, while the National Capital Region and Montreal were also enthusiastic participants with a staff Arts and Entertainment producer and freelance producers respectively, each with healthy and significant artist populations which became involved.

Toronto was a different story. Unlike most other regions, a cash-only booking system was used in Toronto, which meant that precious cash resources would have to be spent in Toronto in

order for production to happen there. Given the relatively thin cash resources available to *ArtSpots*, and the emphasis on generating production in regions outside Toronto, involvement in Toronto was often limited to special projects with low production costs such as partnerships with the Digital Archives Departments (English and French). Alternatively, externally-funded projects could also periodically afford the costs of operating with CBC resources in Toronto, for example, when working with artists emerging from the list of recipients of the Saidye Bronfman Award for Excellence in the Fine Crafts. Ironically, the objective to generate external funding had explicitly been added to *ArtSpots* by the Arts and Entertainment department when the program became national, and in the transfer to the Arts and Entertainment department for its ongoing financial core. A relatively low profile and discursive engagement in CBC's Toronto headquarters had its downside, as Mattocks notes, including in relation to the fact that *ArtSpots* never quite made it into the primetime television slot or a primetime budget:

The last hill was to get it into network prime time. We were never able to get it there. And frankly, I think that had a lot to say about where it came from. It didn't start at the network. And at the time, the CBC network was a very chauvinistic place, and if it didn't start here, they wouldn't support it. They supported it in all kinds of ways, but when it actually came to what mattered, they wouldn't follow through. I think that maybe not connecting it to the Toronto community was a fatal flaw, at the end of the day, assuming it was possible to connect it with the Toronto community. At that time in particular, it's even true now to a smaller extent, the people who make the core decisions here are Torontonians. They go to parties with Toronto friends, and they go sit in Toronto pubs and restaurants, and if everybody's talking about something, they pay attention to it... The fact that we didn't have strong, central program sponsorship at the network meant that sometimes [specific regions or the A&E Department] didn't care that what this was really all about was a live relationship with visual arts communities. The obligation, and the *ArtSpots* ethos, was to sit down with the visual arts community [who] would have an opportunity to [weigh in]. So there was that constant tension, I remember you trying to manage that; it would have been easier to manage with the network program head holding the flame of *ArtSpots*. (Personal interview, February 7, 2012).

Given the foundation of *ArtSpots* in the identity politics dialogue and the regional and cultural reflection requirements of the Broadcast Act of the time, it is also worth noting that the CBC

Maritimes region was groundbreaking in its promotion of women to leadership positions, particularly under Mattocks' leadership. This included the Manager of Regional Operations Penny Longley, Manager of Partnerships Jennifer Gillivan, Manager of Regional Web Operations Carolyn Gibson-Smith, and later the Manager of the New Media Pod, Jere Brooks, as well as myself and others in Executive Producer and Producer roles. In chapter three, this commitment was reflected in the composition of the *ArtSpots* producer-directors, camera operators and editors, who were disproportionately female, sometimes visible minorities, and almost always the most precarious of workers: freelance, dailies, or temporary.

### *Bridging broadcasting and the visual arts*

A kind of wistfulness for the equity and pioneering discourse used in the pluralistic approach at *ArtSpots* can be heard in the dissertation interviews and discussion groups (2010-2014) fifteen years after the *ArtSpots* project began (1997) and five years after it ceased production. Most of the *ArtSpots* video content can no longer be accessed online, and it is rarely aired on television or played in galleries. Even the evergreen *ArtSpots* website seems to be more about absence than presence; acting only as a shell left behind by something that has moved on to another life stage. Nevertheless, some of the videos are still periodically aired on CBC, and conversations do still happen around matters related to *ArtSpots* and the arts discourse that flowed around and through it during that decade. Presenting *ArtSpots* archival content at other sites, including on websites and in galleries, does not replicate the activation of the network of creative workers or the public service mandate mobilized during the *ArtSpots*' decade of production ending in 2008. But perhaps the elusive and yet fully present documentary quality of the existing multi-sited archival materials – diffused throughout the narrowcast groups in the culture sector most closely involved in the *ArtSpots* production period – is a wildly productive quality, as Pamela Wilson suggests

(2009). It certainly seems to evoke an expression of a combination of nostalgia and passion, or what Ann Cvetkovich (2002) has described as the “archives of feelings” that develop concurrently with material archives, in this case in remembering the processes and programming of *ArtSpots*. The ongoing, evocative tension between the materiality of the *ArtSpots*’ media content and the immateriality of the remembered experience expressed by the former participants suggests a kind of fortitude for *ArtSpots* as a remembered media production. Ironically, the transition to a multi-channel universe – including today’s use of mobile devices – has meant that a massive amount of archival material has been put back on air because it is cheaper to re-air than to produce new programming. Lisa Gitelman (2008) examines the resilience of media forms through centuries, particularly the last century, finding that threats of obsolescence are often empty. In cases like *ArtSpots*, where there are a large number of influential individuals from several specific demographic groups deeply involved (1,000+ leading and emerging professionals in the field) and holding program traces in their hands and memories, there could be a more impactful sharing of the original creative experience and video content than the faint materiality of the media traces left behind on servers, websites and airwaves suggests. Perhaps this happens through the residue of mentorships, collaborations, creative interventions, partnership agreements and embodied memories. This is the substance from which the theoretical concept of creative citizenship materializes.

More practically, such traces can still or again be augmented by erstwhile participants’ uploading their own material to websites or social media of their choosing, and linking these to the former *ArtSpots* website and to each others’. The research interviews and discussion groups of 2010-2014 generates dialogue that prompts memory, reflecting back on the archived experiences of *ArtSpots*, which in turn become an important affective layer of the research

process. Viewing and reflecting on older edited *ArtSpots* material and information during such sessions evokes not just nostalgia but also generates new exchanges, as I noted previously that Hine (2005), Pink (2007) suggests is useful. The generative quality of such approaches draw on well-established feminist and grounded theory research methods that recognize the lived experience of the individuals involved, as discussed in Chapter Two (e.g. Gray 2003), but also includes memory work and oral histories, as Onyx and Small (2001) suggest.

Although both the dissertation (2010-2014) and archival (1997-2008) discussion groups and interviews expressed an ongoing need for bridging the visual arts community to the public broadcaster through consultation, production and content distribution, it was in a dissertation research discussion group held in 2012 that this became clearest. The session included two former producer-directors, a former artist, and four former Advisory Group members. Remembered and newly-conceived options for entangling narrowcast arts and culture audiences with broader audiences were articulated in the following manner:

Sandra Alföldy: [former Advisor] The other thing that's sad, not to harp about the cancelling [of *ArtSpots* in 2008] but then it becomes this finite project, rather than being fluid. So at what point do they [the video items and website] begin looking outdated, and people say, oh that was when we had money to do this thing. It doesn't become a consistent thing [for] viewers.

Sarah Fillmore: [former Advisor] And there's no ability to check in on those artists and update their profile and their career, especially if it's something that was able to continue online – it wouldn't be too difficult to continue to have that wiki aspect.

Peter Dykhuis: [former Advisor who was also an artist featured on *ArtSpots*]: I see the continuation online as the most important thing. Because it was so random when they came on television. [Hums as if occupied with something, then pretends that a television screen has caught his attention]. Then oh! That's me on television [everyone laughs]. Ahhh! When they're online, they're easily accessible and you don't get kind of sucker-punched by your own voice.

Fillmore: But they're great on TV.  
(Discussion group, former Advisory Group members, March 26, 2012).

The conversation continues in this vein, regretting the loss of *ArtSpots* as a successful venue for artists' work to appear in a "real" way in interested audiences' living rooms, as well as through the website for specific narrowcast audiences that include other artists, curators, and arts supporters (among others). The discussion then moves to the dearth of opportunities to tell artists' stories on a variety of media:

Alfoldy: ... You're not hearing good narratives about artists on radio or TV [anymore].

Ray Cronin: [former Advisor] Visual artists aren't good interviews. I guarantee you that 99% of the producers out there who book an author every day will tell you that visual artists aren't good interviews.

Dykhuis: But that's different when you're working with a producer that can be part psychiatrist [grins].

Johanne Gallant: [former *ArtSpots* producer who worked with PD] You would think so! [People laugh] ...

Alfoldy: What about curators talking about art? I'm just thinking about Peter's story [about how an artist produced a piece of work in a surprisingly systematic way].

Fillmore: But that was what was different about *ArtSpots*. It succeeded – because it wasn't mediated.

Alfoldy: I'm just trying to think through – there's such a void....

Fillmore: But you'd like to hear almost any [artist's] story, because they're all interesting and good. ...

Various: Yes....

Luka: It comes back to what you were saying earlier about an ecosystem. There [was] a working ecosystem in a mediated environment [*ArtSpots*] that doesn't exist anymore.

Various: Yes...

(Discussion group, former Advisory Group members, March 26, 2012).

Questions of access to equitable opportunities for artists' to tell their stories in public broadcasting and media environments more generally quickly arose in the discussions that took place in 2010-2014, building on similar themes in the Advisory Group sessions of 1997-2008.

This wasn't simply about a discourse, however. *ArtSpots* production outcomes reflected the commitment to access and equity for the creative citizens involved. This was earlier suggested to be necessary in a creative citizenship framework, including corollary arguments around access and critiques of digital communication in Canada from Moll (2011), Murray (2005), Raboy and Shtern (2010) and Shade (2010). How the day-to-day practice of this was realized during *ArtSpots*' tenure promises a rich field of analysis from which creative citizenship can be further developed. It is to the details of innovative and collaborative creativity in the production and distribution practices themselves in relation to *ArtSpots* that I now return, including individual artist engagements founded on principles of creative control in the hands of artists, as well as the subsequent "double-edged sword" of leveraging resources through partnerships and experimental programming. The many insights of the people involved in *ArtSpots*' interviews and discussion groups in both time periods helps to generate a deeper assessment of the concept of creative citizenship.

## Chapter Five: Trailblazing creative practices at *ArtSpots*

It is clear from the earlier examinations of *ArtSpots* structures, and the pluralism narrative that helped shape the conditions for its emergence, that *ArtSpots* aspired to be a technologically innovative production and dissemination initiative grounded in a traditional television environment. Influenced by recent interventionist history in media arts (particularly video art) and pluralistic values, *ArtSpots* generated a dialogically-based consultative framework to link visual arts and broadcasting to specific groups of cultural producers involved, who were also narrowcast audiences. *ArtSpots* also mobilized process-oriented interviews with subject-participants (artists) as well as process-oriented discussion groups with curators (Advisors) as a vigorous source and methodology for “data analysis” about artwork in Canada, including trends and developments in genres and subject-matter. The parallel process employed during the 2010-2014 research methods and strategies takes account of the visually rich original program materials from 1997 to 2008, and considers them in the context of discussions of the process-rich production and dissemination practices of both 1997-2008 and of 2010-2014. In this chapter, key participants in the original *ArtSpots* project re-involved through interviews and discussion groups are imbricated in the analyses of the legacy of *ArtSpots*, and discuss the impact that the artistic sector was able to make on shifts in production and broadcasting practices of the time, particularly in relation to emerging digital media spaces and affordances. Rather than trying to synopsise and come to a definitive conclusion about *ArtSpots* and its production practices however, the process-based approach embodied in the research undertaken allows for it to be unpacked and opened up.

Mobilizing then-rapidly evolving technology and “new media” production capacity and commitments – to involve the small but rapidly growing narrowcast internet audiences at CBC – was paramount in the late 1990s. *ArtSpots*’ web developer, Jere Brooks, describes that time period in the following manner:

I remember being really excited about the *ArtSpots* content and thinking about the possibilities. Because at that point, it wasn’t like we had a huge amount of interesting content [at CBC] to work with [on the internet]. So finding where the sweet spots in the content intersected with our new audiences online –we didn’t know what we should be offering. People didn’t know, really, what to expect. We were in the process of trying to figure that out. (Jere Brooks, personal interview February 4, 2012 and “JB-Seq4-JB-audiences” video, 2013).

The initial days of *ArtSpots* offer evidence of crucial early influences on making the idea of digital broadcasting become a reality. Research interviewees spoke to the foundational work that took place at *ArtSpots* for CBC in digital broadcasting between 1997 and about 2002. This was often expressed as exploratory or groundbreaking work done with relationship building through content development at *ArtSpots*, not just in terms of web-based presentations of content. Fred Mattocks, like many other interviewees, considers *ArtSpots* to have been ahead of its time as innovative programming:

I can’t think of many other concepts in my time that had that kind of life and those kinds of legs, and yet, was based and rooted so far outside the commercial television paradigm. ... I think its place isn’t on television, anymore, I think it’s probably in the digital space now. (Personal interview, February 7, 2012).

The narrowcast audiences that form a core element of creative citizenship developed much more quickly on the internet than on television, as shown in my earlier analysis of access to digital technology (Bazalgette 2009; Shade 2010) and Canada’s early lead in broadband adoption and subsequent failure to keep up (Middleton 2011). Mostly urban Canadians had access to broadband content (then and now), pushing the limits of technology in spirit if not in content

consumption in those early days. Urban Canadians were clearly a target audience for CBC in those days, and still are.

Notably, Mattocks and others formerly involved remain intrigued by the original idea of inserting the thirty-second items as unexpected and unpredictable interventions in the television advertising environment, with a view to developing a critical mass of content for digital and mobile platforms, so that the cumulative effect would be noticeable by increasingly narrowcast television and digital audiences. The availability of unused commercial space on TV varied greatly over the more than ten years that *ArtSpots* material aired, which meant that its profile ebbed and flowed on the internet as well as on television. Mattocks notes:

The other concept that I thought was interesting was ...how it would be shared with the [TV] audience. There was that notion of serendipity, the kind of “where’s waldo”. Because they were so distinct, and you [the audience] noticed them when they popped up. And you [the audience] wanted to know when you would see them again. And I don’t think we ever got to critical mass. (Personal interview, February 7, 2012).

The fall of 2001 would also see the introduction of *Opening Night*, the Thursday evening (prime-time) performing arts program slot, which included a relatively long-lived (2001-2007) semi-predictable prime-time slot for airing a limited number of *ArtSpots*, albeit targeted to a narrowcast culture audience. This prime-time space was made available to *ArtSpots* partly through *Opening Night*’s shared commitment to featuring Canadian arts and artists. On a more practical level, it became available because the *Opening Night* timeslot was commercial-free, which usually left about fifteen minutes per hour that needed to be filled with shorter arts-based programming.<sup>45</sup> In the summer before *Opening Night* began, a debate took place over whether *ArtSpots* would maintain its own visual packaging or be repackaged using the *Opening Night* branded look. *Opening Night* won out, and in this one CBC program, *ArtSpots* subsumed its

---

<sup>45</sup> Standard-length programming was produced or acquired at the usual broadcast hour length of approximately 44 minutes.

visual identity (though not its name) to that of another program. The trade-off was that *Opening Night* was the only time *ArtSpots* was able to identify and communicate a specific time that artists' items would play during prime-time on the main channel. *ArtSpots* continued to be aired on *Opening Night* until the latter's demise in 2007. In 2001, discussions had also taken place with *>play*, a Toronto-based popular-culture and entertainment magazine-style television program hosted by Jian Ghomeshi (now host of *Q*, a CBC Radio program featuring popular culture, entertainment and the arts) that ran from 2002-2005. *>play* aired on then-titled CBC Newsworld (now the CBC News channel), and ultimately opted not to include *ArtSpots* in its line-up, which was fortunate for *ArtSpots*, given *>play*'s relatively short-lived existence. More fortuitously, in 2001, one of CBC's first digital television channels, Country Canada (called Bold after 2007), was launched with Corus Entertainment.<sup>46</sup> The digital channel's focus was initially similar to its namesake and its terms of license specified this. Programming included extensive airtime for the growing audiences of soccer and curling, but it also made space for an enormous amount of *ArtSpots*-generated programming, including the short interview-based profiles (two- to five-minutes), and the longer-form productions such as the craft documentaries and *Gros Morne Time Lines* (of which more below).

#### *From the look and feel to innovation and collaboration*

The multiple uses of *ArtSpots* material across regions and CBC channels was partly a result of its sheer availability, its evergreen ("timeless") qualities, and its volume. But, as Mattocks notes, it was also as a result of the signature quality of the *ArtSpots* content itself: its capacity to be viewed on numerous occasions. This was particularly the case with the thirty-second items that

---

<sup>46</sup> Country Canada was named after a long-running popular show on CBC that featured regional stories from across the country. Bold was sold in February 2013 by CBC to Blue Ant Media, a specialty channel management company. <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/cbc-to-sell-specialty-channel-bold-to-ant-media-1.1400004> (accessed July 8, 2014).

launched the program in 1998, and which went on to have a long life on the internet as well as in the hands of artists and curators alike.

At the peak we got to the place, where there was lots of rich content there, and the interesting thing about it for me from a television viewpoint, was all of the things you could pack into an ArtSpot. It was actually kind of amazing. You could watch the same ArtSpot ten times, and given a little space between, for your brain to refresh, see ten different things, and have ten different experiences. And that goes back to the whole power of the creative aesthetic in the first place. There is an awful lot of content that won't stand that test. (Personal interview, February 7, 2012).

Those “creative aesthetic” considerations are important to the complexly technical and reflexive relationship of co-creator(s) and narrowcast audiences to their own cultural media production as well as that of others. Cultural citizenship literature (Hermes 2005; Miller 2007) contributes significantly to creative citizenship conceptually precisely because it works from a premise that audiences seek open-ended content. For *ArtSpots*, and to think through creative citizenship, the ability for audiences to have “ten different experiences” was fundamental. This capacity to offer many potential meanings was also crucial for the particularities of co-creative control at *ArtSpots*, and subsequently of theories of co-creation that abound in convergence literature and fan studies. It is worth unpacking the relationship of the *ArtSpots* visual design to its work as a container for multiple artists, artworks and meanings.

*The ArtSpots experience – exploring ArtSpots*

It's 2006. You've been spending time on the ArtSpots website, picking through several of the short artist profiles available there. Each one opens with the by-now familiar ArtSpots sound signature, a photo of the artist and some information about their location and medium. Today, you've picked Gerard Choy. You hear about how he is thinking through his own identity as a Singaporean, a Canadian and a global citizen. You also hear him think out loud about the degree to which his artwork reflects the questions he wants to ask about transnationalism, language(s) and puns, and the dialogue between eastern and western cultures. His sense of humour shines through in his laugh, though there aren't many shots of him onscreen, while the precision of his sculpture work – which dominates the 2:52 minute segment – is evident from the many angles employed to capture its weight, form and repetition.



*Figure 4: The ArtSpots experience – exploring ArtSpots*

In my earlier discussion of the pluralism impetus of *ArtSpots*, I pointed out that a formal visual culture analysis of visual arts and media production (such as Grace 2001), particularly visual art history as it has been taught in the Western world, emphasizes formal texts and non-participatory audience elements (such as Bociurkiw 2011) to understand and engage critically with the art itself rather than with artists or producers and their production practices. This approach is valuable but incomplete. It tends to treat cultural media content as if the meanings were stable, rather than shifting over time, depending on who was producing it. Born discusses these sorts of shifts in relation to creativity at the BBC (2004) and on who was consuming content, as do Hermes (2005) and many others in relation to audience interpretations of programming in the cultural citizenship context. Like Caldwell's efforts to read the deep texts of media production crews (2008), it is the articulation of production practices to the groups themselves and to creative outcomes or approaches that promise to be more revealing, and the

texts themselves still have a place in the analysis to uncover those practices and approaches. Consequently, having a set of platforms and a set of consistent presentation frameworks within which to activate production practices is essential in a television environment, and even more so in a digital media environment, as became clear at *ArtSpots* within its first three years.

The *ArtSpots* archives show that it was in those first few years that the “look and feel” of *ArtSpots* was debated and more-or-less established to be consistent. This was important to *ArtSpots*’ positioning as a curated space for and by the cultural community, and for CBC, as Mattocks suggests in an expanded version of a quote used earlier:

I asked you [a] question when you arrived: How do we explore the question of the intersection of the aesthetic world and the art world with this factory that we run here. And given the medium that is television, how do we connect aesthetically-based expression, aesthetic enterprise, with this in a way that an audience will enjoy. And we talked about that target experience... And you identified very early on, that one core, I was going to call it a process, but it’s more than a process, it’s a value, a very accepted value in the art community. The whole notion of curation. And it turned out to be very powerful. (Personal interview, February 7, 2012).

Comments like these during the 2010-2014 research suggest the iterative and pliable nature of creativity through direct artist involvements with television. Cook and Graham (2010) enumerate the burgeoning and blurred relationships among artists, curators and audiences that developed during this time period, in relation to the production and exhibition of “new media,” calling into question the very fluidity of curatorial work. Mattocks saw *ArtSpots* as a centre for galvanizing an otherwise factory-like environment of television production by bringing artistically trained professionals into contact with it. These comments are consistent with Spigel’s (2008) history of artists’ interventions in television design and hosting in North America, and Mayer’s (2011) broadening of creative resistance in production to include those building devices required to view the content (e.g. TV factory workers in Brazil), and the motivation of aspirational amateurs (e.g. soft pornography videographers in New Orleans). As both scholars suggest, it is evident that

strategic emplacement of artists and creative interveners in disruptive or developmental positions in industrial media production environments has long been associated with changes in production approaches.

Not surprisingly, then, there were heated discussions during Advisory Group meetings and internally about how closely the project would hew to traditional television formats and how much leeway was available in format and content because of its positioning as a multi-platform project able to take advantage of the exponential growth in urban broadband access. The thirty-second format was familiar to television viewers (as advertisements or as PSAs), and therefore comfortable for watching content without thinking about how long it was or how it was packaged (the “container”). Likewise, the later two-to-five minute profile interviews were comparable in length to other interviews on television at the time but pushed the capacity of most viewers’ (dialup) broadband capabilities, even though they weren’t locked in to a specific length in the way that the thirty-second items were. Until 2001, the video items produced went to air (on television and the internet) without an introductory visual, bowing to its visual arts origins as an intervention on television by artists. By year four, *ArtSpots* superseded the PSA element of its broadcast status and become a program offering. The corporate need to be identified as the supporter of such a project resulted in a compromise where the “*ArtSpots*” wordmark was transitioned in and out during the first one-and-a-half seconds of each thirty-second item. Additionally, the back plate (the last one-and-a-half seconds of each thirty-second item) was changed twice in the first three years, and was being prepared for a third change in 2008. The sheer volume of content available for the website meant that the website led the way in establishing consistency and longevity for the *ArtSpots* visual aesthetic. The two- to five-minute artist profiles introduced in 1999-2000 were initially born-digital, incorporating still images from

the thirty-second videos or other images provided by the artists, and an audio interview laid over top. It was only towards the end of 2000 that the profiles were produced as videos for use on television and in exhibitions as well as on the website. Featuring a two-and-a-half-second introduction that showed CBC's identity, the *ArtSpots* logo, the artist's name, town and (self-selected) genre of work, the technological change that allowed them to exist at all as videos (and therefore to be available for television) was CBC's broadband capability. Given that the interview profiles featuring the artists themselves were conceived to be quite different from the original thirty-second items featuring artwork, the opening was quite appropriately dissimilar to that of the thirty-second items. Nonetheless, the *ArtSpots* wordmark and the much more developed visual aesthetic of the website provided common ground to all the packaging elements developed. Within those first few years, then, at the visual level, *ArtSpots* was established with a set of visual, time-based and related cues led by the website and applied in the television environment, within which broadcasting space and time were given over to artistic practice.

In a 2012 interview, Jere Brooks, the web developer who stayed with the project in one capacity or another for most of the decade of production, (including as head of the New Media Pod that grew out of the expertise developed partly through *ArtSpots* being headquartered at CBC Halifax), talked about how some of the design decisions were made, and how clearly a multi-platform approach had been considered from *ArtSpots*' founding. The emphasis in the first year had been on developing content for a combination of television, artists' portfolios, and gallery exhibition platforms, but the principles were the same when augmenting and developing content for the internet as a curated space. To continue with her earlier quote:

The initial templates made a lot of sense. For its time, I think we hit it right off the bat. Because there was such a great [content and consultative] structure that you had created. And that made it easy, it was almost as if the thinking [for the internet platform] had been done on that other platform. The [flexible] structure of *ArtSpots* meant that it was very easy

to move it into a digital platform. (Personal interview, February 4, 2012, and “JB-Seq3-JB-how-to-work-w-audiences” video, 2013).

The visual imprinting of the website and then the somewhat standardized television containers (the thirty-second or the two-to-five minute items) created a bounded but relatively flexible space within which artists and creative producers could experiment, including the opportunity to discuss and critique Canadian art, artists, popular culture, identities, impacts, etc. Artists, for example, selected the artwork to be featured, discussed and shaped ideas with the creative producer involved in their work, participated in production shoots and had a veto over the final productions. Consequently, even the more television-style interview items focused on the process of art-making for two to five minutes, rather than on the personality of the artist. In this 2012 exchange among former members of *ArtSpots* Advisory Groups, a sense of the rhythms of those interview items, and of the 2010-2014 conversations and the earlier Advisory Group meetings themselves is suggested:

Luka: What really worked about the project for you?

Dykhuys: It was the voice of the artist.

Gallant: Absolutely, that was what I really thought made it authentic.

Fillmore: Mm hmm

Gallant: The message was not filtered at all. There was no bias, which is the tendency of media – to move it and change it. It was limited by the square box, but that was just a parameter. I didn’t find it a limitation.

Alfoldy: And it was the voice of the artist really professionally done. I was thinking about it. The music, the lighting, the camera work. It was nicely done.

Cronin: It was the artist, but it was about their work too [on their own terms]. [Everyone else nods]. It wasn’t a personality piece, it wasn’t fluff filler, it was the [art]work. Artists are incredibly generous and if you ask them to talk to you about their relationship with their grandmother, you know, they will [people smile in understanding]. And you can then spin a [human interest] story that [suggests] that’s what their work is about. But asking

about their work is rare, in any kind of public media thing. For me, it was that combination of the artist's voice, and their work, and their focus.

(*ArtSpots* Advisory Group discussion group, March 26, 2012)

The assertion of the credibility of the artist's voice, and the importance of the artwork presented as the artistic narrative, is reflected in the consistency of the visual branding used. So is the reservation of these containers as a vehicle for arts practices and discourses to be played out, including the packaging and the lengths of video items, as well as the emphasis on artwork and on the artist's voice. The eventual invisibility of the packaging itself as a normalizing framework for artwork presentation at the public broadcaster (on television and the internet) was crucial to *ArtSpots*' acceptance by artists and curators as a time-based space within which arts practices and discourses could be conducted. Within the space created by *ArtSpots*, the dialogical, visual and textual rhythms of the production processes themselves allowed the Advisors, crews, subjects and potential audiences to respond to emerging opportunities afforded by the growth of the use of the internet from 1998-2008, in terms they describe as collaborative, innovative and – later – confined by particular limits.

Research interviewees from 2010-2012, particularly those involved as original *ArtSpots* participants from 1997-2008, simultaneously critiqued “innovation” and “collaboration” as terms, and assumed the experiences they describe using these terms to be shared by everyone involved. For example, in a short video edited in 2013 using material from 2012 and from 1998 related to performance artist Gary Markle, one of the first six artists involved, he noted:

I liked the fact that you were willing to collaborate. You didn't have an idea that you were so stuck with; a matrix that had to be fit. That was good, because when I watched some of them – you were working with the character, almost, of each individual artist. I think the variety is smart too. The only drawback for me was that we did it in such a tight time, it was a bit stressful from that point of view. I hadn't prepped it as much as I could have. It might have been great to have a dry run and then come back to it and pared it down a bit. It looked a little over-the-top in terms of production quality, for who I am truly. Although in

retrospect, I kind of like its CBC qualities, because I would never have that normally. Usually it's bare bones. (Artist discussion group, February 28, 2012)

During her interview, Montreal producer Garcia Casanova, further suggested:

All filmmaking and TV is collaborative in a way. *ArtSpots* had that particularity that you're working with one artist. The spirit of *ArtSpots* was to try to have a collaboration between the artist and the TV producer: to have the artist involved in the creation. (Personal interview, February 12, 2012).

Even during the *ArtSpots* production period itself, Kendall Nowe, one of the editors involved with *ArtSpots*, focused on the practical needs of the collaborative process in the edit suite, in a video documenting *ArtSpots* production processes. His recommendations to the creative producers about to be involved in editing are consistent with the preparation undertaken by artists and producers prior to production.

Have some creative concept to land in the edit suite. Have your materials pared down, and say, can we give this a look. The creative process takes a lot of time, and I don't think we should cut it short. If I've learned anything working with the *ArtSpots*, it's – don't try to get too funky with the gizmos on the edit machine. We always try to show the art. It's about the art. It's about the artist. Keep it pristine, so you can show the artwork. (Kendall Nowe, "How to: editing" video, *ArtSpots*, 2008).

The advice to avoid unnecessary use of "the [digital] gizmos" suggests that the employment of digital material practices in production requires a certain discretion that emerges from the focus of the artist him or herself. At *ArtSpots*, it increasingly required a certain kind of grounding in enabling the artist's viewpoint and combining this with a growing expertise in understanding the advantages of preparing material for ever-expanding digital narrowcast uses as well as for more limited interventions on television. In other words: to edit, know your material, know the artist's practice, *and* know the frameworks within which it is being presented on television and the internet.

*The process-oriented nature of art and ArtSpots: Then and now*

A closer look at the creative process involved in the various forms of *ArtSpots* material helps to “know the material” as innovation and collaboration. Aiming to understand what *ArtSpots* did and how it did it, the research participants of 2010-2014 generated a thoughtful discourse about creative process, contributing to the development of the concept of creative citizenship. In their focus on the program materials generated between 1998 and 2008, they noted that the video-based two-to-five-minute profiles of 2000-2008 were much more likely to feature a conversation about creative process than, for example, the thirty-second original *ArtSpots* items (concurrently produced between 1998-2008), which tended to present artwork directly. In the context of the 2010-2014 research project, this created a kind of hierarchy of the dialogical character of the creative production involved. The research videos incorporating discussions from the 2010-2014 research period were the most dialogical and analytical, and the least connected to actual art or media production. The original (now archival) two-to-five-minute artist interviews and the longer form documentary programs produced at *ArtSpots* between 1998 and 2000 assumed that interested viewers came from narrowcast audience groups that had some literacy or interest in the visual arts discourse. Onyx and Small’s (2001) work in oral histories and the work of audience reception (particularly cultural citizenship) scholars in relation to television, such as Hermes (2005) and Miller (1998), suggest how important it is to consider the latter discrete groups of *ArtSpots* viewers, which included collaborative participants such as other Canadian artists, Advisory Group members and CBC production crews as the leading edge of these narrowcast audiences, and as generators of social capital in this context, as I do below. Finally, the thirty-second items produced during 1998-2008 tended to present more of what erstwhile

*ArtSpots* Advisor and current President and CEO of the Art Gallery of Nova Scotia, Ray Cronin, describes below as “finished object”.

What *ArtSpots* did was *it showed the audience a different way of looking at art*. One of the things we run into all the time in the gallery is that they look at art as a finished object that they’re supposed to read. *Art is all process*. It’s the *decisions they make as they’re making it*. When it’s done, they don’t want to talk about it. They want to make the next one. ... So that was a useful thing [about *ArtSpots*]. Getting people to understand that artists don’t say: I’m going to make something that is about “this” [and then the artwork just “appears”]. (Advisor discussion group including Ray Cronin, former *ArtSpots* Advisor, current President and CEO, Art Gallery of Nova Scotia, March 26, 2012. My emphasis).

The discussion groups and interviews were clearly dominated by reflections on the process-oriented nature of *ArtSpots*. One of the erstwhile Advisory Group members (who had also had the experience of having his artwork profiled on *ArtSpots*) put it this way.

What was important, was being in the artist’s studio, and having the artist speak to it. We’re agreeing *it’s hard to present spatial things over television*. *Rather than the narrative of the rock star artist, the narrative of the artist as maker has legs to it...* Don’t get me wrong, I love the curatorial side of the fence, but there’s *something really primary about being there* – listening to the artist talk about their work. (Advisory discussion group, including Peter Dykhuis, former *ArtSpots* advisor/artist, current Dalhousie Art Gallery Director, March 26, 2012. My emphasis).

The perception of *ArtSpots* as an important creative endeavour where various forms of experimentation and learning took place in a supportive environment is reflected in the observations of the artists, advisors, producer-directors, and web producers alike. Significant to these perspectives was the commitment to regional and national reflection through the localized (Advisory Group, production and post-production) experiences of working with the public broadcaster and the ethical identification, selection and production practices involved in *ArtSpots* processes. For artists, technicians and producer-directors alike, the energizing creative and professional development discourses and cultural production opportunities embedded in this part

of the program were crucial. The following quotes give some sense of this. One of the Montreal producers, Karina Garcia Casanova, put it this way.

I think the advisory groups were pretty interesting. In Montreal, we have a very dynamic arts community. I guess it's a lot more involved in contemporary art than other regions that are oriented towards craft, or more traditional forms of painting. Whereas Montreal has more of a contemporary, experimental scene, and that was reflected in the advisory group, and in the artists we chose. And the art I was interested in often coincided with the choices of the advisory group. So that was really interesting. But I also discovered a lot of artists who it was wonderful to work with. Because you think you know the arts scene, but there's always so many artists here that the advisory group was really able to expand my knowledge of the artistic community. (Personal interview, February 12, 2012, and KGC-“Sequence08-karina-sense of discovery” video).

Sharing knowledge and growing the arts discourse was a form of social capital turned to a purpose at *ArtSpots*, through discussions in the field (that of picking artists to profile, or profiling the artworks in digital media formats, for example). This plainly resonates with the achievements of APTN's founding and the rewriting of ethnic broadcasting policy discussed earlier (Roth 2008), including the telling of previously ignored narratives in the broader Canadian population. Another producer, Johanne Gallant, addressed ethical and responsive production processes with artists as a dominant feature of *ArtSpots*' innovation and collaboration, through a consideration of markers of success. In reference to the difference between imagining what an artist's work was about, and the practice of presenting it on *ArtSpots* with the artist's guidance throughout the process, she notes:

It's interesting, because the word failure didn't come into it. Did it succeed? Did it succeed in saying something? And often, what you set out to do, you may have “failed” in your own mind, oh that's not what I meant to do. But it could succeed on a different level. So successes – they were measured: and we did stand back and we did post-mortems and we talked about what was more successful and what was less successful. And yet, within that, [the use of the term] failure wasn't a big part of it, which was a really interesting way to work. (Personal interview, producer-director Johanne Gallant, March 21, 2010).

Of course, *ArtSpots* also conducted unambiguously technological experiments as part of its remit. In 1999, *ArtSpots* conducted a live chat between two artists and a curator: respectively,

Gerard Choy in Halifax, Nova Scotia, Svava Juliusson in Toronto, Ontario and Gabrielle Kemp from Eastern Edge Gallery in St. John's, Newfoundland. It may be hard to remember now, but this was a rare and innovative way to engage with audiences on the internet at the time. Choy – who would later be featured as an artist on *ArtSpots* in the “usual” way – and I talked about the experience in one of the discussion groups of 2012:

Choy: There was that one we did with Svava – I thought that was interesting. Because I couldn't type and you were typing as quickly as I could talk. And also I couldn't see the screen so I couldn't verify what you said and what was being said to what I said. But the general conversation – I liked that very much. It was the first time I could be talking to someone who was talking about issues that I was interested in, and we were in so many places that it gave a very different perspective to what I had been looking at, at the time...

Luka: It was an experiment to see if that was something we wanted to do long-term... it was very hard to talk CBC into doing something live. Not so much now, it's a bit easier now. (Artist discussion group, February 28, 2012, and “GC-Seq08-Gerard-live chat” video, 2013).

The discursive nature of expanding the arts discourse as shared social capital through media production in this way was suggested as a possibility earlier by combining Roth's understanding of social capital (2005) with Lee and LiPuma's (2002) use of the concept in terms of the flows of social (and financial) capital. In relation to creative citizenship, this reinforces *ArtSpots* as a site for a specific set of flows (professional relations) advancing the arts discourse of the time. This is evident from the perspective of television decision-making too. In his 2012 interview, Mattocks reiterates the importance of instigating a collaborative approach by acknowledging the challenges of bringing the arts discourse into dialogue with television producers; something that was successfully constructed within the cultural community by *ArtSpots*. He notes how much work the first meetings were.

I'll never forget the first meeting we had with the representatives of the [Nova Scotia] visual arts community. What a fantastic meeting that was. They all knew you, and they knew who you were, and where you came from. But I remember when I walked in the room, it was polite, but distant. In some cases, um, bristly, I would say. Nobody was rude,

but it was clear that had they been picking the room, I wouldn't have been in it [laughter]. And that wasn't personal, I knew it wasn't personal. It was my role and the role that they perceived that CBC had filled, at the time.... (Personal interview, February 7, 2012).

Mattocks goes on to emphasize rapid successes with the key narrowcast audiences he mentions (the arts community, the Halifax creative community). These achievements were realized by participating in the creative arts discourse and supporting innovative and collaborative practices that made sense to these communities/narrowcast audiences, rather than the production practices that had been generated by the television industry in recent memory. In my initial discussion of innovation and collaboration as core elements of the values articulated about *ArtSpots* (in chapter three), Mattocks talks about how crucial the processes used at *ArtSpots* were for reconnecting CBC to its roots in the artistic community (personal interview, February 7, 2012).

Such potent endorsements concerning *ArtSpots*' impact are characteristic of many of the former participants in the project. Compare this to, for example, artist Frances Dorsey's earlier enthusiastic characterization of advancing the arts discourse in the public sphere in relation to the networked structures of *ArtSpots*, or Kim Morgan's observation, in the same earlier analysis of artists' roles, about the collaborative nature of working with the freelance CBC producer involved in her artwork.

#### *The limits of innovation and collaboration in the early 21<sup>st</sup> century*

The review and production of different kinds and groups of interview materials during 2010-2014 (including material from 1997-2008) was also crucial for scrutinizing central themes embedded in the concept of creative citizenship, including innovation and collaboration as discussed above. However, it wasn't an entirely open innovation experience at *ArtSpots*, nor did the approaches used always work collaboratively. Quite the opposite: the term "parameters" was frequently employed in the 2010-2014 interviews to indicate certain limits on the creative

processes involved at *ArtSpots*, particularly as the implications of the new digital environment became clearer and the inconstant availability of television “shelf space” was made evident. The difficulties of finding a permanent timeslot, discussed earlier, proved to be an important limitation, and a significant component of the project’s eventual disappearance. Variations on this idea were expressed in artist and Advisor discussion groups between 2010 and 2014, as well as in the Gallant, Luka, and Mattocks interviews. For example, Gallant notes:

I would have liked to have it live in a regular place. The producers did amazing work, polished those jewels to perfection: to see them in a regular [timeslot] would have set them off perfectly. It would have supported the project in a different way, and taken it in a different direction, one which would have had more people within the CBC administration understand it, rather than “just” grassroots community support. (Personal interview, March 21, 2010).

But perhaps the most significant organizational limit expressed during the *ArtSpots* era as well as in the interviews and discussion groups involving producers and other internal creative staff – at least in terms of the digital environment – was the lack of a database. The exchange below characterizes this finding.

Luka: The discussion that never got resolved [at *ArtSpots* was] – can we have a database.

Brooks: That is one of the biggest jokes of all time. Any content management system that we could buy off the shelf and install. Things like PHP which is a server technology that allows you to create templates and content management systems very very easily. There’s a lot of open source material that is readily available. But we were not given permission to run that on our servers, for various reasons. Some they would state as security. Others were more about control. It was simplifying the job for the people who had to look after the hardware on the other end. Or who had to look after the software. And to be fair, we could all run around and poke security holes by downloading any old thing and trying to install it. But the fact is – with stuff like PHP – it was there, and they wouldn’t let us use it. It still boggles my mind. (Personal interview, February 4, 2012).

There were also significant limits on how production work could involve artists inside the CBC building itself, including the use of studios, artists attending edits in the edit suites, and for performance art locations. This was particularly pronounced in Montreal and Toronto, the two

largest production centres with the greatest resources and the most complicated operating protocols, as suggested in a conversation with Montreal producer Garcia Casanova:

Luka: It's interesting because CBC would allow a certain amount of things to happen [in the regions], but not a real intervention in its existence as a media production company [in Montreal or Toronto]. Because it could have. It could have said – ok great, you want to use the studio, super. And we want to turn the cameras around and do it this way. Great.

Garcia Casanova: Yes. There was [little] room for experimentation. You're working with artists who would want to experiment. And in their discipline, you can experiment. It's not that expensive to experiment. But when you're working in a TV format, and getting a studio and all that, that's expensive. You have to come in with a more scripted scenario before starting to shoot. So that was unfortunate. I would have hoped to have more [spontaneous] interaction [on production days]. (Personal interview, February 12, 2012, and "KGC-Seq02-Karina-studio-limits" video, 2013).

There was a complex budgeting and resource management process at *ArtSpots*, with a staffing structure that was marked by the use of freelance and temporary workers both inside and outside the CBC, presenting challenges for building a cohesive, consistent work unit over time. Without the day-to-day working relationships that news programs had, for example, *ArtSpots*' producer-directors and artists often weren't able to request even informal flexibility during production. The precarious nature of the work status of the producer-directors (and often for temporary crew) impacted significantly on the ground for individual artists, producer-directors and for the rest of the crew:

There were limits to what you could do, and I think that disappointed some of the artists. Well, first of all, budgetary constraints, and the fact that you couldn't be more spontaneous or improvise. The crew that had to come in nine to five, they had to have a one-hour lunch break. It was hard to execute the more challenging ideas. And there wasn't the budget to spend time. We couldn't pay the artist much... and we couldn't ask them to just volunteer. (Karina Garcia Casanova, personal interview, February 12, 2012, and "KGC-Seq01-Karina-limits" video)

Such observations are consistent with comments noted earlier, including those of artists Gary Markle and Frances Dorsey, both of whom expressed a certain regret in having not quite enough time for the performance elements of their *ArtSpots* experiences.

Among other discussion groups, I asked a group of student artists at NSCAD University in April 2012 to reflect on the innovative and collaborative practices undertaken at *ArtSpots* between 1997 and 2008. In particular, I was interested in comparing their views to the view of those who had been involved, as well as comparing their knowledge about *ArtSpots* to their knowledge about *Art 21* (2012, 2013), a similar American program. Comparatively, they were quite familiar with *Art 21* and quite unfamiliar with *ArtSpots*, only four years after it ceased production. *Art in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (its formal name), was founded in 2001-02, commissioned by the Public Broadcasting Services (PBS) in the United States, as a television project featuring visual artists in their studios, which later migrated to the internet.<sup>47</sup> It is assertively packaged as a set of educational resources widely used in art education (including art colleges and universities such as NSCAD) in Canada and the U.S., as well as offering additional video-based projects and merchandise for sale on the PBS website, including art books suitable for the “coffee table” market. The promoters of the series are not shy:

Over the past decade, Art21 has established itself as the preeminent chronicler of contemporary art and artists through its Peabody Award-winning biennial television series, *Art in the Twenty-First Century*. The nonprofit organization has used the power of digital media to introduce millions of people of all ages to contemporary art and artists and has created a new paradigm for teaching and learning about the creative process. In addition to its PBS series, Art21 produces short-format documentary series, viewable on multiple online platforms. The *Exclusive* short-format video series on Art21.org highlights the artists previously featured in the PBS series. (PBS *Art in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* website, n.d.).

By 2012-13, its sixth season in ten years, *Art 21* had produced television videos on 100 artists.

Like many arts-based series, the vagaries of production funding and broadcaster time

---

<sup>47</sup> <http://www.pbs.org/art21/>

commitments meant that six seasons were produced during what actually spans a twelve-year period: once every two years (referred to as “biennial” above) for a short burst of intensive production. I draw attention to its claims, because despite its much bigger budgets and audiences than *ArtSpots* could secure in Canada, its production still only incorporates about one-third the number of artists involved at *ArtSpots*, and a belated adaptation of content for multi-modal environments. Nor does it appear to be connected to a dynamic curatorial constituency in the way that *ArtSpots* was, but its profile in the North American art education system is far superior to that of *ArtSpots*. By comparison, however, the broken links on the *ArtSpots* website and the disappearance of the content produced means that only those individuals who were involved with *ArtSpots* still have access to the thousands of minutes of digital material produced.

The NSCAD students were enthusiastic about the idea of both the original *ArtSpots* and keen to consider how it could be done today, reflecting their desires to work in innovative and collaborative media production environments themselves. Their enthusiasm was tempered by the lack of opportunity they perceive in the mainstream media industry and the relegation of art practice and discourse on television to what they interpret as amateur programs on local cable television. However, their assumptions about opportunities in the digital environment are slightly (not significantly) more optimistic. In part, this is reinforced by the low-key and experimental nature of the successes of programs such as *ArtSpots*, which became precursors to the uploading of co-creative work to YouTube, Vimeo, Tumblr and other social media networks. The present-day availability of content about artist production processes and material outcomes, through YouTube videos alone, means that these students cannot readily conceive of a time when programs such as *ArtSpots* and *Art21* would have been seen to be sorely needed. Although the students’ experience and knowledge base was quite different from artist peer groups in the late

1990s, their desire for the kind of entrée and information about creative processes that *ArtSpots* represents is noteworthy.

***“How to”: From media literacy to user-generated content and co-creation***

In a wide-ranging exchange about *ArtSpots* during an interview in 2012 with Jennifer Gillivan, the relationship of broadcasting projects to civic engagement, national identity and the role of artists was explored:

I gave a speech a few years back [at the Atlantic Film Festival, as then-Chair of the Board] and I was more shocked than anyone else at the [positive] response to it. But I said show me a country that has art, and I’ll show you a country that has amazing innovation and technology and scientists. They’re not separated. They go together. Show me a country that supports that, and I’ll show you a very free, democratic expressive society. They go together. And I don’t know why we’ve always tried to separate them and then make it more of an elite, because then people are intimidated to go into an art gallery. They think they can’t possibly know what they’re looking at - but it doesn’t matter. ...It’s about your everyday. How art can become part of your everyday. I think that’s what you were striving to do [at *ArtSpots*]. And it’s about helping those forerunners [the artists] who were trying their best to live in their world with their passion. You were giving artists a leg up [in the transitioning digital media environment]; they didn’t have any other vehicle to do it. (Jennifer Gillivan, personal interview, March 19, 2012).

Gillivan draws a number of threads together related to creative citizenship. Among these is the relationship of innovative, pluralistic, collaborative modes of representations of art to creativity, identity, and more generally to artists within the public broadcasting system and the gallery system. Even more significantly, she links “how art can become part of your everyday” to “a very free democratic expressive society.” Additionally, she points to the work done at *ArtSpots* as a meaningful contribution towards the development of digital audiences who could be or already are interested in culture. Interestingly, Gillivan’s enthusiasm for *ArtSpots* led her to compare it as an antecedent of knowledge-sharing projects in related fields. Her examples included TED Talks for the promulgation of ideas about civic vision and engagement generally,

the Khan Academy for providing broad access to education online (including the arts), and the Tamarack Foundation for its work on helping cities and towns of all sizes develop strategic planning towards transforming communities and the eradication of poverty.<sup>48</sup> The comparisons that Gillivan makes suggest that interventions and contributions by innovative individuals and groups can be networked to a cumulative effect in society through knowledge-sharing, especially as it relates to cultural expression. This is completely consistent with the perceptions of the interviewees involved in 2010-2014 as well as the literature on convergence culture considered earlier. In particular, Gillivan's comments echo in the work of Jenkins (2004, 2006), Don Tapscott (2006) and Tapscott and Anthony Williams (2008). Each of these theorists also emphasizes the active role taken by the communities involved in mobilizing and co-creating the cultural production under discussion, including the positive social contributions this makes to solving problems in society. Gillivan, however, wasn't suggesting that individual audience members participate in television or web production, in the almost utopic way that Jenkins talks about fan involvement or Tapscott and Williams discuss participatory work at Wikipedia. Instead, Gillivan's observations speak to the broadcast mandate's exhortation to reflect cultures of the day, in this case by finding and involving representative members of a group (or narrowcast audience) with rich knowledge, to help shape the articulation of values and

---

<sup>48</sup> TED Talks, which started filming speakers in 1998, but did not start posting to the internet until June 2006 ([http://www.ted.com/pages/great\\_moments\\_in\\_tedtalks](http://www.ted.com/pages/great_moments_in_tedtalks), accessed July 7, 2014), emerged from the TED conferences that began in 1984, <http://www.ted.com/talks> (accessed July 7, 2014). Gillivan gave a TEDx talk in Halifax in December 2013. The Khan Academy <https://www.khanacademy.org/> (accessed July 7, 2014) is an organization set up in 2006 to provide free educational and coaching materials, often using MOOCs – massive open online courses – on various subject matters. It boasts usage in 30,000 classrooms primarily in the United States and high levels of customer satisfaction. The Tamarack Foundation (<http://tamarackcommunity.ca/>, accessed July 7, 2014) is based in Waterloo, Ontario. It is intended to “help people to collaborate, co-generate knowledge and achieve collective impact on complex community issues”.

subsequently the particularities (often, the historical or cultural “accuracy”) of program production. At both *ArtSpots* and the partnership projects that Gillivan spearheaded (including projects discussed in the next chapter), there is considerable evidence of the importance this kind of skill and knowledge-sharing. Prior to the withdrawal of funding for *ArtSpots* production in 2008, and in preparation for a conversion to a new website and programming approach that spring, *ArtSpots* was occupied in 2007 and 2008 with a variety of pilot projects and consultations (discussed below) that emphasized content and knowledge-sharing within culture and academic spheres linked to members of the *ArtSpots* Advisory Groups. Increasingly, these included developing and testing more robust training and “how to” materials and processes. Originally conceived as resources for a user-generated future, these pilot projects instead became a swan song for how work had taken place at *ArtSpots*.

The examination of narratives of innovation and collaboration above illustrates how *ArtSpots* helped bridge visual arts and broadcasting in Canada and advance the transition to co-creative digital media production and dissemination. Probing *ArtSpots* as a dynamic hub of networked activity in the broader cultural community over an extended period suggests how broad the scope was at the time for discourses about civic engagement in creativity and the production of visual culture-based meaning in Canada at the time. Thinking of this work as a set of specific strategic interventions suggests that deliberately networked interventions are important elements involved in the practices of creative citizenship. The examples indicate the deeply engaged position of CBC at the time as a proponent and supporter of creative citizenship as well as the arts more generally. To more clearly articulate how *ArtSpots* built towards co-creation in the media industry, it is also necessary to consider its evolving strategies of content development, content-sharing and knowledge-sharing. Piecing together the history of the show

bible and its connection to *ArtSpots* “How To” manuals through visits to the corporate archive and my own archive was augmented by interview discussions about skill-sharing and mentorship during the 2010-2014 research process. Reconstructing the trajectory from show bible to “how to” materials through content- and knowledge-sharing strategies is a theme embodied in *ArtSpots* production processes. Out of this emerges a crucial component of creative citizenship.

*Knowledge-sharing: Creative business practices and “how to”*

The *ArtSpots* “show bible” was an early example of knowledge-sharing there. Normally an inward-facing book of instruction for the writing and production team, incorporating storylines and beats, character descriptions, locations, key requirements for each episode, and the general formulaic parameters – or rules – for a multi-episode series, the *ArtSpots* show bible was an outward-facing toolkit aimed to encourage exploration and experimentation on air, in the community, and on the internet. Written in the first few months, the show bible was circulated in hardcopy form and on the CBC’s intranet (the internal-use-only website). The bible documented the creative and logistics processes used to create the relationships with the cultural community, internal CBC constituents, and the specific artists involved. It gave examples about how to generate a list of potential Advisory Group members, and how to prepare for and facilitate those meetings, including soliciting and organizing long lists and short lists of potential artists to be involved. The bible suggested ways in which research about artists and arts organizations could be conducted locally and regionally, and provided producer-directors with tips on working with camera operators, editors, schedulers, librarians and business affairs staff. It also provided examples of correspondence, meeting agendas, and administrative forms including waivers and contracts, whether those forms were issued to the artist by CBC or to the CARFAC copyright collective. The latter is a non-mandatory membership association for visual artists which sets

recommended licensing and exhibition fee levels. CBC did not have a formal agreement with CARFAC regarding the use of artwork on its media platforms. However, from the first days of *ArtSpots*, an agreement with the CARFAC copyright collective articulated the fees to be paid to the artists, and the shared copyright that was embedded in *ArtSpots*, establishing a respectful guide for artist involvement. This was a positive and welcome development in the CARFAC copyright collective's relationship with the public broadcaster. Every second year, a strategy conference would be held for all of the producer/directors, and a number of other individuals involved in *ArtSpots*. At those sessions, examples of content were reviewed, creative approaches and logistics challenges were discussed, and expertise and experience was shared. Quite a lot of this latter work was also documented, influencing later editions of the bible.

During the early period of *ArtSpots* production, preliminary discussions took place about potential partnerships with the Historica Foundation (producers of the Canadian Heritage Minutes) through Patrick Watson. Presented confidentially with the *ArtSpots* bible and examples of the videos produced, Watson was interested in having the bible adapted to become a more general "how to" guide for short videos in the arts and culture. He and John Hobday, a board member at the Foundation and later the Director and CEO of the Canada Council for the Arts, were interested in the bible as a knowledge-sharing tool for the broader culture community, including a number of the organizations that the Foundation supported. However, the partnership never materialized, as the decision was made within CBC not to allow the adaptation and circulation of the bible by the Foundation. Although the bible had been developed by documenting the collaborative strategies used at *ArtSpots* with the cultural community and artists involved, the rationale offered was that the *ArtSpots* bible documented a set of competitive business practices, including the audience-building strategies at play for the public broadcaster

(Luka personal archives). This echoes research findings of Dornfeld (1998) and Caldwell (2008) discussed in the first chapter of this thesis, whose work confirms the secretive nature of production practices in the North American broadcasting system. Consequently, the material generated in those early years is not publicly accessible. In later years, however, following a series of educational sessions with secondary and post-secondary students in Alberta and Nova Scotia in 2007 about how to make short artistic videos helmed by *ArtSpots*, CBC allowed the distribution of some of the information generated, through the *ArtSpots* website. The educational initiatives were framed as outreach activities for audience engagement emerging from public service elements of the broadcast mandate. They were part media literacy, part artistic training, and part team-building exercises. The material generated was drawn from the bible and made public on the *ArtSpots* website through the “How To” feature and an accompanying feature celebrating the projects completed by the Alberta students.<sup>49</sup> Specifically, the project mandate, values, lists of artists involved, evidence of the media produced – and a “How To” manual for identifying and documenting artists’ work were explicitly based on the bible. The “How To” manual was later accompanied (in 2008) by seven videos, none of whose links now work on the original *ArtSpots* website, but which served as data during the 2010-2014 research, and was augmented by the production of additional research videos in that time period. The “how to” elements of knowledge-sharing form an interesting component of civic engagement for creative citizenship. The “democratizing” of knowledge that *ArtSpots*’ text and video instructions provides on the internet are consistent with its foundations in shared creative control, and precursors of the massive growth of “how to” videos that populate YouTube, DIY specialty websites and digital device software applications now. Earlier, I noted that Born quotes Hall on

---

<sup>49</sup> [http://www.cbc.ca/ArtSpots/html/features/how\\_to/](http://www.cbc.ca/ArtSpots/html/features/how_to/) and <http://www.cbc.ca/ArtSpots/html/features/highschoolproject/> (accessed July 7, 2014)

comparable matters, calling on the public broadcaster “to become a forum for the negotiation of ... common life” (2004, 509), while she herself finds that the public broadcaster needs to be answerable for “its primary public responsibility: creativity” (2004, 495). Similarly, van Zoonen calls audiences’ uses of entertainment programming “the performance of citizenship” (2005, 147).

Although reflexive in the sense of instructional, the original seven “How To” *ArtSpots* videos were very practical in their orientation. For example, David Laughlin, one of the *ArtSpots* regular camera operators, made the following detailed production comments (in part):

If you want to control light in a room, the best way to do is get rid of the overheads... Light shoots in straight lines. For those of you who play pool, it’s the bounce shot into the board. I angle the board around til I like what I see... [discusses and demonstrates lighting techniques and then moves on to camera techniques]... Let’s say you want to start wide. I’m back this far, because when I zoom all the way in, if I’m too close, I can’t get any better focus without going to macro. Trouble is, [from macro], if you want to move, that’s what happens [shows everything out of focus]... it’s always a good idea to shoot everything safely [e.g. standard tight, medium and wide shots] and then start playing with other ideas... One thing you definitely want to do is shoot something long enough. Because you can take something away but you can’t always add something to it. (“How-Seq19-HowTo-camera-lighting” video, 2013).

The route between the 1998 production bible and the *ArtSpots* “How To” videos and manuals development undertaken at CBC in the winter of 2008 was a circuitous one, and primarily occurred for two reasons. One was that the materials were redeveloped in 2007-08 as relatively innocuous educational materials for students. The 2008 recording sessions for the “How To” videos included students from the Nova Scotia Community College, as well as CBC technical and creative staff. The redevelopment was also seen as a logical outcome of the conversations underway among artists and Advisory Group members about what an interactive and curated *ArtSpots* website would look like; it would certainly include the opportunity for artists and aspirational producer-directors to upload *ArtSpots*-like content that had been produced outside

CBC. As a result, it was important to the cultural community members involved that the integrity with which *ArtSpots* production was conducted be translated for use by the anticipated narrowcast co-creative audiences to come. For example, the “How To” videos incorporated discussions from a Nova Scotia Advisory Group meeting, explicitly advising on the involvement of artists and curators.

The approach taken in the “How To” materials built on experiences documented during a pilot project conducted with three high schools in Alberta in the spring of 2007, which had been facilitated in part by a high school teacher who was also one of the artists involved in *ArtSpots* through a multi-platform production partnership with CBC Radio’s *Poetry Face-off* program. The 2007 Alberta project integrated the development of an extensive manual and workshops, resulting in the production of professional-looking videos by students, featuring artists. The *ArtSpots* website feature notes both the complexities and the benefits of such a pilot project.<sup>50</sup>

The website feature recounts the chronology of the project:

In the spring of 2007, *CBC ArtSpots* worked with several high schools in Alberta to test an instruction manual and workshop with students, to see if this toolkit would help to inspire students to produce their own short videos about the arts and artists in their schools. ... Under the mentorship of the teachers and principals in their respective schools, and with practical demonstration and instruction about making short videos on the arts by CBC personnel, ... the students were responsible from beginning to end for their own productions, including selecting artists, securing all the appropriate rights, organizing shoots, interpreting artwork, interviewing artists, and editing the videos. Through their hard work, and brilliant creative insights, all of the students produced compelling short videos. The students subsequently offered the completed videos to *CBC ArtSpots* to be considered for featuring on the *ArtSpots* website, and here they are. We thank everyone involved for sharing their inspiration. (Alberta High School Students feature, [CBC.ca/ArtSpots](http://www.cbc.ca/ArtSpots) website, n.d.)

Reflecting an attempt to spark what Bruns (2007, 2008) was then starting to name produsage, the uploading of this material, created outside the CBC, was a crucial developmental

---

<sup>50</sup> <http://www.cbc.ca/ArtSpots/html/features/highschoolproject/>

moment in *ArtSpots* production, which activated the students as a prototype co-creative narrowcast audience. By this time, YouTube was well underway, but uploading videos did not yet permeate broadband offerings at broadcasting websites. At *ArtSpots*, however, it was the culmination of the reconfiguring of early bible-sharing attempts, as well as a logical outcome of earlier youth-oriented creative forums at CBC.

YAS (Your Arts Site) was one of those user-generated forums, active for about two years starting in 2001.<sup>51</sup> It was designed and maintained by Jere Brooks and Graham MacDougall in the New Media Pod in Halifax as a prototype for CBC's user-generated content websites to come. Content on this site was intended to be meshed with *ArtSpots* as soon as a database structure made that feasible. The database structure at the later multi-million dollar multi-modal program initiative CBC's *ZeD* (2002-2006) initially closely reflected that of YAS. The structure and approach at YAS was built on audience interaction lessons learned from *ArtSpots* and ground-breaking web forums and internet content management strategies generated at the long-running youth comedy investigative program, *Street Cents*. About that time, Brooks notes:

It was a really interesting time because digital media at CBC was kind of in its infancy. It wasn't very well organized. The technology was just emerging. This would have been the late 90s: I started at CBC in 1998... Basically I was brought in to be one of the regional web developers, and what that meant was that we were responsible for the [online] content for shows in our region [including *Street Cents*], which was in its infancy. Figuring out what to put on our website. Because like I said, no one really knew what we should be doing: we kind of knew we wanted to be, but there weren't any rules, there weren't any definitions, there weren't any structures. We were just trying to figure it out. (Personal interview, February 4, 2012).

In a 2014 conversation with MacDougall, he agreed with Brooks that the digital and internet development work of this period is best characterized as groundbreaking, and recalls the development of YAS with warmth (personal communication, February 1, 2014). The fledgling

---

<sup>51</sup> [www.halifax.cbc.ca/yas](http://www.halifax.cbc.ca/yas)

YAS project featured four creative “zones”, message forums, an MP3 feed for independent music across Canada, links to “how to” pages and to a few other related programs – including *ArtSpots*. The site is no longer active, however, screen captures with several functional links are available on the Internet Wayback Machine. There is even a working “email us” link that connects to an old email address for MacDougall. Notably, the *ArtSpots* feature on YAS is still serviceable, including “how to make an ArtSpot”: an early iteration of the “How To” projects that took place in 2007-08 at *ArtSpots*. The integration of these experiments marks the spirit of knowledge-sharing that existed within the region, and sometimes from one region to another. It also reflects the more general skill-sharing environment for multi-modal production that was developing at *ArtSpots* but not yet at CBC.

The developing trajectory of experimental knowledge-sharing was made more evident by another artist-centred digital media content production project involving quite a different narrowcast audience in the mid-2000s. In 2003, sociologist Jan Marontate (at Acadia and then Simon Fraser University) and ethnomusicologist Bev Diamond (at Memorial University) approached *ArtSpots* to collaborate with them in an advisory and distribution capacity on a sound artist project to be funded by a modest research grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC). The idea was to pilot an outreach strategy for music and sound artists through public broadcasting that would articulate scholarly research findings around music heritage and its relationship to digital technologies, to audiences other than academics. John Hartley (2005) and David Hesmondhalgh (2007) discuss similar creative dissemination strategies in the culture sector, although these are generally motivated by industry concerns and often for-profit motives. Marontate and Diamond expressed interest not just in having CBC broadcast what might get produced – an instrumental dissemination relationship – but also in

building on the specific values and approaches used at *CBC ArtSpots* to produce and distribute the content to television and internet narrowcast audiences interested in sound artists. It took two years to persuasively communicate the strategy and approach for the Sound Stories project to the SSHRC assessment process and to negotiate an agreement with decision-makers at CBC: the language and motivation were quite different in each arena. However, SSHRC funding was secured in 2005 and a memorandum of agreement was signed with CBC; the project was completed by 2007. My role in the SSHRC project on behalf of CBC was to advise Sound Stories on CBC's production and licensing system and to help with facilitation in the relevant cultural communities. The project itself hired former *ArtSpots* producer Gallant, based on her experience with *ArtSpots*, including her expertise in co-creation with artists. Sound Stories turned out to be a viable way to model community consultation and direct production in the academic environment, embodying the principles of creative citizenship, and generating a modest amount of curated content for digital media platforms supported by and also uploaded at *ArtSpots* as a feature.<sup>52</sup> Ironically, the cancellation of *ArtSpots* prevented any further development of this approach, at a time when the digital humanities had begun to seriously advance as a methodological approach and a scholarly domain, and simultaneously, just as CBC became prepared to allow user-generated content.

Another production experiment involving co-creative content-sharing and resource-sharing outside the CBC on a hybrid independent production/artistic video production model was piloted in 2007-08 in Montreal with Oboro.<sup>53</sup> A non-profit artist-driven gallery, media lab and virtual exhibition space, Oboro had been quite closely involved with *ArtSpots* over the years, including through the participation of staff people such as Claudine Hubert, Daniel Dion and the

---

<sup>52</sup> <http://www.cbc.ca/ArtSpots/html/features/soundstories/>

<sup>53</sup> <http://www.oboro.net/>

former *ArtSpots* Advisor quoted earlier, Cheryl Sim (now curator at DHC Art Foundation for Contemporary Art, formerly program co-ordinator at Oboro). Oboro was founded in 1982, and became heavily immersed in onsite media arts production in the early 1990s, quickly evolving into innovators in this terrain in Canada. By the mid-2000s, a state-of-the-art production facility regularly enabled it to video record interviews and exhibitions in the gallery, edit them on-site and publish them on an early web channel: [www.Oboro.tv](http://www.Oboro.tv). Local, national and international artists were involved in Oboro, including local independent filmmakers and video artists. One of the *ArtSpots* producers, Karina Garcia Casanova, had recruited gallery representatives to the Montreal *ArtSpots* Advisory Groups because of their multiple roles as exhibition space, artist production centre, and media presenter, and her history at Oboro as a periodic freelance producer-director. In addition to Advisory contributions, the organization's media production and presentation activities on the internet were of particular interest to *ArtSpots* as CBC moved towards allowing *ArtSpots* to upload and curate externally produced content on its own site. At the time, few galleries were producing their own interviews or video documentation of exhibitions for programming on the internet. Oboro had done it for years. By coming to an agreement for Oboro to produce three sets of *ArtSpots*-like profiles and thirty-second items and then to host the material on both organizations' websites, key elements of a working relationship could be tested. A memorandum of agreement was developed and drawn up in 2007. *ArtSpots* provided some core funding, Oboro juried the artist selection and programmed the exhibitions, and Garcia Casanova was hired to act as liaison and produce the items for presentation on both the *CBC ArtSpots* website and the *Oboro.tv* website. The three artists featured in this project were Stéphane Gilot, Robin Dupuis, and Cynthia Girard. The result wasn't *ArtSpots*, but the content generated was valid on its own terms, and provided a pathway towards future content

commissioning, artist uploads, and the development of new narrowcast audiences for *ArtSpots* and the CBC. Given the shared nature of the work already undertaken by *ArtSpots* and Oboro within their own spheres of influence and activity, the success of this experiment held promise for future innovative resource- and knowledge-sharing arrangements.

As *ArtSpots* moved towards its co-creative, user-upload future to be launched in 2008, and recognizing that the availability of production crew resources would continue to shrink at CBC, there was another effort made to simulate what user-generated content could look like. A curatorial and co-creative affiliation developed in 2007 with the international three-day NeoCraft scholarly and practitioner conference held in Halifax at NSCAD University, chaired by Sandra Alfody. In addition to having existing *ArtSpots* programming focused on the fine crafts installed in various viewing locations throughout the building where the conference was held, a pilot production project including several artists and curators was created, including 2012 discussion group participant and artist Frances Dorsey, quoted earlier. The pilot productions incorporated walk-throughs of several exhibitions affiliated with the conference throughout the city, and a one-day turnaround for the content to be uploaded to the *ArtSpots* website – before the conference was even over. This simulation of user-generated content, with a focus on the artists and their work, but still employing professional producers and camera operators, held promise for future user-generated (or at least, worker-generated, in Caldwell’s (2011) terms) content for the then-imminent *ArtSpots* database. In combination with the student-based “how to” projects, this production initiative also implied the potential for training independent creative producer-directors and digital media practitioners about how to capture the spirit of an exhibition or event in collaboration with artists. The next step would have been to see if some of the artists themselves could have produced their own documentation with the help of a local producer-

director drawn from the *ArtSpots* pool or under their own production standards and terms. Such material could have been uploaded directly to the *ArtSpots* site to be hosted in an established, already-credible national environment. Interestingly, based on *ArtSpots*' decade of success in licensing shared intellectual property management with artists, it seemed possible to conceive of creative commons-like agreements between *ArtSpots* and artists applicable to this producer-like situation. Given the expertise of the artists and curators involved, this scenario suggests a potentially more positive outcome in the middle ground between Caldwell's concept of worker-generated content (i.e. piecework content delivered by experienced professionals for low fees in increasingly precarious conditions) (2011), Bruns' concept of the aspirational producer making user-generated content for free, and Mayer's amateur-to-professional soft pornography videographers to producer-directors.

Today, what all of these projects have in common – besides their connection to *ArtSpots* as examples of jointly-managed creative citizenship commitments – is the high level of resource-sharing for, and knowledge-sharing about, production processes. This substantially nuances the flows of social capital created by content production (analysed previously), and moves such flows firmly into a relationship with distribution. Of course, since then, there has been a remarkable loss of content in the virtual environment. Budget and maintenance decision-making at CBC in the five years since *ArtSpots* ceased production has resulted in broken links or the actual removal of evergreen content from CBC servers that had been carefully developed for use in perpetuity as part of the public service offering based on the broadcasting mandate of the time.

The creative business practices developed within *ArtSpots* and subsequently repurposed for use outside the CBC build on the base of stewardship established in my earlier evaluations of policy and activated pluralism that enabled the creation of *ArtSpots*. This is illustrated by

examining the trajectory of the production bible's development and deployment, and the networked structures at *ArtSpots* that were shaped by operationalizing the broadcast mandate. A great deal of compelling content was produced by simultaneously growing a networked base of creative workers' social and professional relationships. Content iterations varied from platform to venue, and eventually included long-form documentaries, web projects and gallery exhibitions, on top of the core material of thirty-second spots and two-to-five-minute interview profiles. When things were working well, the expansion of the creative content forms connected *ArtSpots* to its own television and visual arts histories of traditional interactive and distribution practices (such as gallery-based exhibitions, documentary broadcast programming, and interventions on television by artists) as well as to emerging practices with co-creators and narrowcast audiences. The focus on co-creation and narrowcast audience engagement in the creative citizenship context also arises through examinations of content- and knowledge-sharing at *ArtSpots*. Collaborating with a sampling of existing and potential digital producer-directors and with narrowcast cultural audiences that were evident from the moment that the website was conceived was a powerful production draw. An evaluation of these practices at *ArtSpots* offers insights into creative citizenship engagements in production and distribution through and often with narrowcast audiences. The linked nature of narrowcast audiences involved were supported by the discrete set of collegial professional relationships examined in the structures chapter as well as this one, including the individual artists involved, Advisory Groups, the production crews, the *ArtSpots* producers themselves, and a distinctive set of "institutional" relationships, both inside and outside the CBC.

In the next chapter of this dissertation, I look more carefully at how and why the evolving *ArtSpots* network of artists, curators, producers, and narrowcast audiences in some ways

overextended its reach, diluting the power of the creative citizenship model that has emerged in the analysis to date.

## **Chapter Six: Moving away from creative citizenship**

Starting around 2000 – once it was formally a national project and had begun to gain traction on television, on the internet and in the consciousness of cultural decision-makers throughout Canada – *CBC ArtSpots* found itself with modest resources and a certain kind of influence over cultural media production in Canada. Special projects began to be developed and models tested, each characterized by hopes or expectations about how decision-making power could be devolved into the hands of a fluid network of pertinent groups, rather than individual curators and artists, to stimulate artistic production in Canada. Most of these projects and relationships emphasized distribution and audience-centred processes. Such projects were operationalized in different ways to ameliorate inequities and drive creativity by involving new groups of creative workers in *ArtSpots*. Drawing and building on co-creative practices, each involved some combination of the existing modes, flows and networks of resources and social capital at *ArtSpots*. The extension of *ArtSpots* resources to a select number of already-curated groups of artists suggest how the emphasis on pluralistic goals and policies bolstered and framed themes of innovation and collaboration in creativity throughout the *ArtSpots* network. Finding ways to leverage and extend resources addresses broader civic engagement with a greater number and type of narrowcast audiences as co-creation and knowledge-sharing, but when taken too far away from the original *ArtSpots* framing, suggests that such work diluted the core elements of creative citizenship that emerged in earlier analyses in this dissertation.

Not all of the partnerships and projects with which *ArtSpots* was involved advanced creative citizenship, even in a diluted form. Sometimes, innovative and collaborative co-creative

practices actively attenuated *ArtSpots*' approaches and the actualization of creative citizenship, even when these activities extended reach and profile. Insights are offered in this chapter into the scope of a select number of the additional co-creative visual and storytelling collaborations led by creative workers inside and outside the original *ArtSpots* production processes, also showing how the day-to-day exercise of cultural power and production at *ArtSpots* is weakened.

The establishment of *ArtSpots* was paralleled by two comparable initiatives at CBC Halifax. The Partnerships Office (led by Gillivan) and the New Media Pod (led by Brooks) started just after *ArtSpots*. The early “under-the-radar” exploratory dynamics of all three are evident in the 2012 interviews with Gillivan and Brooks. For example:

The [early days] were fun [laughs]. It was interesting, because I was at the groundbreaking area of partnerships and you were at the groundbreaking area of *ArtSpots*. And it was kind of like – that's the mission work that you would love to see the CBC have enough resources to be doing forever... That was the great part about Fred [Mattock]'s leadership, because he gave us the playground from which to do that. I was literally building the partnership practice in the dark, going from one step to the next. There was no manual telling me what to do. And so everything was possible. Ok, let's try this, let's try that. And in the same vein, Jere [Brooks] was in the web, and you were in the *ArtSpots*, so there was this kind of [arrangement of] three circles, circling around each other. But the character of what we were doing, and the values, were all the same (Personal interview, March 19, 2012).

This combination of naïveté and optimism of the time (perhaps even a variation on a “make it and they will come” attitude), as well as an awareness of the necessity to constantly compare specific program and audience development strategies in relationship to external narrowcast groups and the operationalization of the public broadcasting service mandate in a digital environment, led to some interesting discussions inside and outside the CBC for all three functional areas between 1997 and 2008. Early on, it was obvious that the shape and scope of *ArtSpots*, the New Media Pod and the Partnerships Office would be linked to building collaborative projects and networked relationships that could remain flexible and responsive in

terms of distribution modes as well as the production practices analysed in previous chapters. Not knowing what the precise outcomes of distribution innovation would be, at *ArtSpots* the goal was to seek outcomes that expressed the fundamental values comprising *ArtSpots*' particular form of social capital: co-creation with artists, community-based curatorial processes and equity-based commitments and program outcomes. The optimism of the three related areas of endeavour at CBC (*ArtSpots*, Partnerships and the New Media Pod) resonates in important ways with the scholarly literature on convergence brought into the conversation earlier, which emerges in the mid-2000s. Hay and Couldry (2011) drew attention to the overly optimistic nature of the conversation about convergence a decade into the discussion, while the work of Middleton (2009, 2011) and Shade (2010) in Canada temper the enthusiasm of earlier, primarily American, research by convergence gurus Jenkins (2004, 2006), Rushkoff (2003) and Tapscott (2006). The latter three (among many others) postulated the internet and interactive digital media as hypothetical opportunities to completely reshape democratic practices in the 2000s, from media consumption and meaning production (including cultural citizenship practices involving audiences) to voting and political participation. Van Zoonen (2005) places a narrower onus on the limited contribution that media-based engagements with democratic principles can make (including television programs that fictionalize North American politics). Articulating the potential for knowledge-sharing and co-creative opportunities were crucial to generating optimism both then and now (in the memories of the *ArtSpots* participants, for example). I draw attention back to these theorists here in order to reveal how bound up the conversation about convergence is with putative democratic and civic engagement practices spanning media, politics, culture and society in general, and how little each actually addresses the creative

workers involved (whether co-creative “amateur” audience members or “professional” artists and producers, etc.). The work done in this dissertation helps fill that gap.

At *ArtSpots*, leverageable partnerships and projects from 2000 onwards became crucial nodes of activity, connected to the creation of content, knowledge-sharing and narrowcast audience(s). Their genesis in a resource management obligation created by the national Arts and Entertainment Department, where *ArtSpots* was housed after 2000, required *ArtSpots* to seek out external sources of resource contributions towards production needs. The imperative to seek partnerships with organizations whose values around artist promotion and engagement were compatible to *ArtSpots* and to CBC’s mandate became a powerful motivator for seeking a specific set of funding and exhibition relationships. Discussions with Advisory Groups across the country made it clear that corporate sponsorships and advertising approaches were, at best, a suspect avenue to pursue and, at worst, could make it seem that the thirty-second artwork presentations and the two-to-five-minute profiles were commercials and infomercials rather than artistic productions. The early support of The Canada Council for the Arts had been regarded by Advisors as a suitable prospect for future support, but despite its commitment to cultivating new audiences for art, the Council itself was unable to funnel funding to another federal agency on an ongoing basis, for the reasons discussed by John Goldsmith in chapters three and four, which was the Council’s emphasis placed on funding artists and arts organizations directly. Consequently, finding support at non-profit foundations and other cultural organizations that expressed alignments with the creative citizenship values articulated at *ArtSpots* became challenging.

Former *ArtSpots* web developer Brooks talks about the growing emphasis on audience development as a core driver of program decision-making and support that *ArtSpots*, the New

Media Pod she managed, and the Partnerships Office gained and were compelled to achieve as part of their remit in advancing digital and multi-platform programming at CBC in this context.

She puts it this way:

There was a learning that we already had and an understanding through that experimentation that allowed us to quickly recognize the opportunities when new projects came along, gave us a baseline so that we could say yes, we've done video, and x, y, z or we could say, yeah, here are the platforms that we could use. That could get us into trouble as well because there were expectations that were created: expectations that you could do that over and over again, regardless of what the content was. *[With] ArtSpots, it was clear: that sweet spot of intersection of content, with an audience that was predisposed. And an audience that was also deep enough*, so you could hit arts lovers on an intellectual level, people who were into local arts and crafts and want to support their local communities, people who were [interested in other ways] ... so you hit that stratification [of the demographics] – but it took the content to be able to do that. The delivery method, we experimented with: the 30-second level lent itself well to the early days of online video. (Personal interview, February 7, 2012. My emphasis).

This combination of content and audience (including co-creators) was not always present in partnership projects in the way that the original *ArtSpots*' production practices had achieved by sharing creative control with the artists involved and networking the curatorial community across the country into advancing the arts discourse in broadcast environments, as discussed in chapter five. However, several partnership projects involving *ArtSpots* were successful attempts to develop supportive new narrowcast audiences by sharing knowledge, and adding genres and production partners, such as with *Oboro* in the previous chapter, even while *ArtSpots* continued to grow its own Advisory Group processes and direct artist involvements across the country.

Nonetheless, there were two significant shifts in production practices arising from such partnerships. The first shift involved the selection of artists outside the *ArtSpots* Advisory Group process. Partnership project artists self-selected, or were selected by popularity competitions run by CBC, or by juries conducted by the Canada Council for the Arts or other culture organizations. Although most of the projects were characterized by the execution of the usual

*ArtSpots'* creative processes in relation to the individual artists (including shared creative control and a veto over the material), each also marked a transition away from the original *ArtSpots* focus on building Advisory Groups from volunteer experts such as individual curators and artists, region-by-region, losing a vital direct connection to some of the networked audiences the original project sought to develop. The second major shift in production practices were the growing opportunities and requirements (through leveraged resources) to collaborate within CBC, and with culture and funding partners, on the building of more complex digital exhibitions and long-form video programs for gallery spaces, the internet and television. These were innovative and collaborative program offerings but not necessarily co-creative with artists and Advisors.

*Creative flows and networked nodes: From individual artists to groups of artists*

By working with groups of already-curated individual artists, *ArtSpots* was able to contribute for a time to a more wide-reaching practice of sharing and evolving production and dissemination practices. But this came at a cost. *ArtSpots'* work with the Saidye Bronfman Award for Excellence in the Fine Crafts included participation from the Canadian Museum of Civilization (now the Canadian Museum of History or CMC/CMH), the Samuel and Saidye Bronfman Family Foundation, and the Canada Council for the Arts. It resulted in the production of two award-winning documentaries (*Making the Ordinary Extraordinary* and *Hand Made, Hand Held*) as well as several video-content-heavy virtual exhibitions hosted by *ArtSpots* and CBC's French and English Digital Archives and incorporated into exhibitions at the CMC/CMH.<sup>54</sup> John

---

<sup>54</sup> The *Hand Made, Hand Held* documentary can still be played at <http://www.cbc.ca/ArtSpots/html/features/documentary/>, one of the few *ArtSpots* video-based projects where this is the case. The related "Love of Craft" *ArtSpots* website feature <http://www.cbc.ca/ArtSpots/craft/> and the "1960s" feature <http://www.cbc.ca/ArtSpots/html/features/60s/> developed in another exhibition partnership with

Hobday is a long-time culture administrator and leader, the previous Executive Director of the Samuel and Saidye Bronfman Family Foundation (1983-2002) and former Director of the Canada Council of the Arts (2003-2006). He was directly involved during 2000-2001 in initiating the relationship between *ArtSpots*, the Foundation, the CMC/CMH, and the Canada Council. During his June 2012 interview about *ArtSpots*, Hobday mulled over that time period.

When we became aware of *ArtSpots*, it was an absolute no brainer, it took three seconds to make up our minds. This was an incredible opportunity to showcase the artwork and feature the [Bronfman Award] people. ... And what it did – it just opened up to the world. Suddenly and dramatically, opened up. .... It's funny. In a sense, we always know the potential for change is there. This was a transformational few years. (Personal interview, June 19, 2012).

The inclusion in *ArtSpots* of a group of professional artists, curators and arts funders in Canada concerned with the reputation and peer recognition of fine craft, was a positive development for CBC and for the artists involved, establishing close links to a broader range of the culture sector's narrowcast audiences for *ArtSpots* (as Mattocks indicated in earlier quotes about *ArtSpots* providing entrée into arts circles), but also weakened the closeness of the initial narrowcast audience involvement from the cultural community Advisory Group process that had helped found *ArtSpots*.

The formal incorporation of the Bronfman Award recipients in the regular *ArtSpots* production processes began in 2001, in time for the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Award, and ended in 2007, just before the thirtieth anniversary of the Award.<sup>55</sup> By late 2000, the potential

---

the CMC/CMH, were both designed and created for ArtSpots by Jeff Bauer in the New Media Pod led by Jere Brooks. Bauer's aesthetics and design sense were particularly complementary to the original ArtSpots web design that Brooks had engineered. See also <http://www.civilization.ca/cmc/exhibitions/cmc/unique/unique04e.shtml>

<sup>55</sup> To give a sense of the impact of this development, note that during the first half of 1998, the pilot phase of ArtSpots involved the first ten-person Advisory Group and produced work involving six artists in Nova Scotia. In 1998-99, work was underway with three Advisory Groups and an additional six artists in Nova Scotia, 8 artists in New Brunswick and half a dozen artists

partnership with the collaborators involved in the Bronfman Award promised – or threatened – to almost double production by requiring the addition of the first twenty-five artists to the *ArtSpots* roster within the next twelve to eighteen months. This was only possible by adding resources and access as well as significant funding from the Foundation to the *ArtSpots* budget and reorganizing the staffing complement at *ArtSpots* (*CBC ArtSpots* archives).<sup>56</sup> The addition of the artists also meant that a much larger swath of the country would be quickly “covered”: almost all of the recipients of the Award were from Ontario, Quebec or British Columbia. This was a significant factor in the decision to incorporate the Bronfman Award winners, providing *ArtSpots* with a knowledgeable core of potential future Advisory Group members, and word-of-mouth leaders in the centre of the country. Notably, the incorporation of this group of twenty-five artists meant making a substantial exception to the barely-established *ArtSpots* peer selection process. This development engendered some discussion at the time and was replicated in similar ways in relation to other projects for the rest of the *ArtSpots* era at several Advisory Group meetings as well as among CBC staff. With the benefit of hindsight, Alan Elder, the Museum’s Curator of Canadian Crafts and Design, pointed out the dangers of this development during an interview in April 2012, comparing it to how he dealt with a similar situation five years prior to *ArtSpots*’ involvement in the Award, when curating an exhibition comprised of work from already-selected Award recipients:

Luka: [*ArtSpots*] got to work with a whole bunch of people that were kind of similar [to the existing base of artists] and had been selected by a [Canada Council for the Arts] jury in some way; that we could just “go and do”.

---

in Prince Edward Island. The British Columbia Advisory Group got underway by 1999, resulting in the first of several *ArtSpots* from there by mid-2000.

<sup>56</sup> As a consequence, there was enough funding for my (producer, then executive producer) position to become almost full-time (though not permanent until 2005). Additionally, an almost full-time contract position could be established at the associate producer level for the organization and management of the web-based material.

Elder: That's interesting, because working on the twentieth anniversary exhibition [for the Museum, in 1995, five years before the *ArtSpots* partnership], when we did Transformation ... it was the same sort of process that I needed to go through. The [juried] selections had already been made, and for me as a curator, that isn't usually the way you approach an exhibition, assuming a group of people who have already been selected... I wonder how that fit in to the whole *ArtSpots* [approach]. Because there was already a system to make those choices, and all of a sudden, a group of people [i.e. the twenty-five existing Bronfman Award recipients] are— I'll use the word imposed, not in a bad way — those people don't go through the same sort of selection. So what does that do to something like *ArtSpots*... From my point of view, how do I select the works that are going to be appropriate and yet hold together in an exhibition. And I would imagine that the same sort of thing holds true for *ArtSpots*. (Personal interview, April 19, 2012).

Leveraging the peer-juried work of another cultural institution was an intriguing development in the panoply of resources and approaches *ArtSpots* began to attract – and court. The involvement of non-Advisory-Group-selected artists and collaborative reuse of non-*ArtSpots* material developed with these previously curated participants became the most consistent cost of securing sponsorship or partnership funding.

The Saidye Bronfman Award projects leveraged a combination of funding and shared resources that helped to exponentially grow *ArtSpots* programming content both within CBC and outside it in a manner that presaged the possibility of having artists upload content directly to the *ArtSpots* website. It also stabilized and made more predictable the amount of work that freelance producer-directors and production crew involved with *ArtSpots* could count on. Growth was realized in terms of the number of individuals and organizations involved (scale) through maintaining *ArtSpots*' production practices (depth) and in terms of internal and external credibility (profile). The productive blend of personal and professional relationships in the relatively small community of creative practitioners involved in the Bronfman Award, and their extended networks, contributes to a more nuanced understanding of the everyday nature of creative engagement with broadcasting by artists. The mix of mostly non-precarious individuals

involved (as Cunningham’s 2013 critique of precarity might suggest) – including artists working above the poverty line, media producers and gallery curators involved in interpretation with relatively steady incomes, the wealthiest of art and craft collectors and supporters of the arts, and policy and power brokers at government institutions – signals the appropriation of the *ArtSpots* reputation as an artist-centred project into mainstream media production. But it also suggests the “less inflated and overblown vocabulary ... [that can reflect] a kind of everyday ethics of work”, which McRobbie (2012) suggests is possible with artists and supporters involved in cultural production today, and imbricated in the content and knowledge-sharing practices of *ArtSpots*, whether at the individual artist level or with groups of artists (weak and strong forms of creative citizenship, respectively). This becomes increasingly evident in other projects.

*ArtSpots as a production unit: Growing narrowcast digital audiences*

Many of the rest of the partnerships and projects with which *ArtSpots* became involved reshaped it as an award-winning arts production unit able to produce multi-platform programming for a growing spectrum of narrowcast audiences. For example, the enormously successful “Design à gogo/Cool 60s Design” exhibition at the Canadian Museum of Civilization featured internet-based archival CBC content also available at stations in the exhibition and attracted a quarter of a million visitors. The CBC exhibition material was produced at *ArtSpots* in collaboration with French and English CBC’s Digital Archives, resulting in features on all three websites at CBC.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> The Museum’s web description of the project is now <http://www.historymuseum.ca/event/cool-60s-design/> (accessed July 7, 2014). The CBC website and the embedded clips can still be found on the *ArtSpots* website: <http://www.cbc.ca/ArtSpots/html/features/60s/> (accessed July 7, 2014), although the URLs promoting the project that also featured them no longer bring you to content pages: <http://www.CBC.ca/archives/60s> and <http://www.radio-canada.ca/archives/annees60/>. The active links are probably maintained because they are also embedded as functioning clips in the still-existing respective English and French Digital Archives. Another related Digital Archives project emerging around that time and linked to the *ArtSpots* project was:

The success of the exhibition marked *ArtSpots*' immersion in exhibition planning without the creative involvement of any artists whatsoever. Notably, it also signalled how networked professional relationships between cultural institutions could be leveraged in service of growing narrowcast audiences.

Likewise, the Halifax Explosion project of 2003 (with which *ArtSpots* became involved as a production unit) was an unequivocally recognized success internally at CBC with high-profile accolades generated for the iterative nature of the storytelling, programming and production processes, but above all for attracting audience. Former Partnerships Director Jennifer Gillivan describes it in these terms:

The Halifax Explosion project: the web component of that, it's still, I think, the largest in the world [on the explosion]. We just didn't know what we couldn't do there, so we just kept going – and when you think about how we created these communities from the CNIB, etc., and that documentary [City of Ruins] – when you think about it, on a Tuesday night, that went down as one of the top drawing docs, it was over a million. And that, even today, would really get attention. And then the actual [two-part mini-series dramatic] show itself [Shattered City: the Halifax Explosion], the program itself, got record numbers. I don't even remember what it was but it was big numbers [1.5 million]. It wasn't just advertising that got that. That was that whole underground, groundswell that we built underneath that [through the Partnerships process of community connection]. (Personal interview, March 19, 2012).

The two-part dramatic mini-series *Shattered City*, independently produced for national broadcast and the national documentary *City of Ruins*, were augmented by an award-winning regional anthology program developed for television, titled *Legacy: The Halifax Explosion*, produced by Marie Thompson, and focused on local stories.<sup>58</sup> *ArtSpots* produced dramatic readings of explosion-related Canadian literature such as Hugh MacLennan's *Barometer Rising* and Sharon McKay's *Penelope: Terror in the Harbour*, a children's book in Penguin's "Our Canadian Girl"

---

<http://www.cbc.ca/archives/categories/lifestyle/pastimes/handmade-in-canada-the-art-of-craft/topic---handmade-in-canada-the-art-of-craft.html> (accessed July 7, 2014).

<sup>58</sup> From 2003, see: <http://www.cbc.ca/halifaxexplosion/> and [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shattered\\_City:\\_The\\_Halifax\\_Explosion](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shattered_City:_The_Halifax_Explosion) (accessed July 6, 2014)

series, as well as a feature on the work of Canadian Group of Seven painter Arthur Lismer from that time period, comparing it to work dealing with similar subject matter in the 2000s by contemporary artist Garry Neill Kennedy.<sup>59</sup> While the Explosion project engaged representatives from crucial history audiences in a consultative manner during production, similar to the practices of *ArtSpots* Advisory Groups, and while it expanded the genres represented at *ArtSpots*, it did little for artists themselves.<sup>60</sup> The CBC Partnerships Halifax Explosion initiative team won awards for the work, but as *ArtSpots* was discovering through its own evolution into a multi-modal production unit, the emphasis was increasingly placed on generating audience rather than on innovation, collaboration or pluralism in creativity. Brooks compares the Explosion project with *ArtSpots* and subsequent multi-platform projects that did not do as well:

You can't just take everything and throw it at the web. It's not like you get a crowd and just throw everything at them and hope it's going to stick. You need to think about what that audience is looking for. And then taking that content and realizing that it may be thirty seconds of video or it may be a documentary, or it may be a drama: in the case of the Halifax Explosion [project] with *Shattered City*. Realizing that there are ways to slice and dice it, and look at it from different sides. That was something that was really, really hard [for CBC to understand] in the early days of the internet: that it was different from television. It was really hard. (Personal interview, February 7, 2012).

The narrowing emphasis on understanding innovation as almost exclusively about audience building echoes even today, as shown when CBC lost the highly lucrative contract – and a sixty-year history - in 2013 for presenting Hockey Night in Canada to Rogers Television. Within five

---

<sup>59</sup> See:

[http://www.cbc.ca/halifaxexplosion/he5\\_connections/he5\\_connections\\_feature\\_lismer.html](http://www.cbc.ca/halifaxexplosion/he5_connections/he5_connections_feature_lismer.html) (accessed July 6, 2014)

<sup>60</sup> The core working group for the project included 24 participants (14 external and 10 internal) on subcommittees for the project. Additionally, the project involved several technicians (camera operators, sound engineers, editors, graphic designers) assigned for short period of time to the production and post-production phases. The list of credits can be found here:

[http://www.cbc.ca/halifaxexplosion/he8\\_library/he8\\_library\\_site\\_credits.html](http://www.cbc.ca/halifaxexplosion/he8_library/he8_library_site_credits.html) (accessed July 6, 2014)

days, a deal was struck with Rogers, about which President Hubert Lacroix noted in the *Globe and Mail*, a national newspaper:

The changing media landscape will force us, and rightly so, to partner with other players to continue not only to tell Canada's stories, but to showcase Canadian musicians, artists, talent and athletes... Let's be honest, CBC can't put a \$5.2-billion bid on the table because we don't have the specialty networks, pay-TV and mobility platforms to monetize those rights. So, we need to change our mindset. We look for how and where the public interest can be served by collaborating with those giants, in this case Rogers, to share national consciousness and preserve Canadian heritage... Creativity, fluidity, adaptability – these are the attributes that define a modern public broadcaster (Lacroix, 2013).

That “sweet spot” of leveraging resources inside and outside the CBC, and the development of inventive multi-platform programming for exhibition and broadcast on several platforms certainly speaks to the development of narrowcast audiences today, but not to the kind of programming input by community members and co-creation with artists that had been initiated by *ArtSpots*.

*Content development inspired by artists – but not co-creative*

There were three particular content development projects at *ArtSpots* that aspired (with limited success) to break out of the more restrictive parameters of traditional television production practices, with core creative elements inspired by artists' work. All three imbricated representatives of specific narrowcast audiences in shaping programming at *ArtSpots*, CBC and in partner sites. The first profiled artists emerging from an artist residency program at a national park and some of the community members with whom they were involved or connected, and the second involved a First Nations community's recuperation of historical storytelling. The third attempted to incorporate an externally juried artist selection process into *ArtSpots* that significantly overlapped with Advisory Group selections.

In 2001, *CBC ArtSpots* began working with UNESCO Heritage Site Gros Morne National Park and curators at the Art Gallery of Newfoundland and Labrador (who had

participated in *ArtSpots* Advisory Groups locally). An early prototype of the partnership with Oboro, this experiment began with an *ArtSpots* website feature profiling the work of artists involved in the artist residency program in the Park, a residency co-hosted by Gros Morne and the Art Gallery. The first iteration of the born-digital feature included content selected by the eleven artists initially featured (Internet Wayback Machine, 2013).<sup>61</sup> The format mirrored how *ArtSpots* built profiles on the website at the time, namely thumbnails of a few still images and some text that revealed an artist statement or reflection about their residency. As it happened, in 2000, two of the residency artists (Tara Bryn and Anne Meredith Barry) had been involved with author Kevin Major on a project to produce a limited edition artist book they titled *Gros Morne Time Lines*. This book featured poetry, painting and printmaking contributions from the three artists, detailing thousands of years of geological history in a compellingly visual format. In 2002, a program partnership was conceived to leverage funding and resources from CBC Partnerships (including Gillivan and then-Partnerships Manager for Newfoundland and Labrador Antje Springmann), the CBC New Media Pod (Brooks) as the web programming builders, *ArtSpots* as the production unit, and the regional office of National Parks of Canada as a co-presenter. The CBC's *Gros Morne Time Lines* project exemplified, in a modest manner, the kind of leveraged production experiences sought by CBC at the time, and even now in some of its largest program offerings, as the quote from Lacroix (2013) above makes evident. Community and artist interviews offer up a series of storylines about the history and geological significance of the Park, expressed through site-based cultural expressions, including music, artwork and storytelling, as well as rich body of scholarly and journalistic material. The half-hour

---

<sup>61</sup> It can only be found on the Internet Wayback Machine now, not on the original CBC website: [http://web.archive.org/web/20011121204541/http://radio.cbc.ca/programs/ArtSpots/html/features/gros\\_morne/index.html](http://web.archive.org/web/20011121204541/http://radio.cbc.ca/programs/ArtSpots/html/features/gros_morne/index.html) (accessed July 6, 2014).

documentary in French and English (produced by *ArtSpots*) and an extensive interactive website (produced by the New Media Pod) were designed to play at the Park as well as for broadcast on CBC TV and the internet. Perhaps the most striking element was an animation of the artist book itself, including the use of the colour palette and images from the artist book as the visual inspiration for the entire project. The multi-modal project depended on the original artworks produced by the three artists involved, who were involved in production decisions about the documentary and website materials in a more traditional (i.e. limited) television production manner than *ArtSpots* artists had been wont to experience, though the work of Tara Bryan was also shot and produced for *ArtSpots* in the usual manner. As *ArtSpots* production drew to a close in 2008, an agreement was signed by CBC to incorporate a DVD of the CBC's English and French documentaries into the trade paperback edition of the original artists' book, with benefits accruing to the community-based non-profit group associated with the Park that had been so helpful in organizing contacts within the community during production.<sup>62</sup> Traces of the materials produced are still accessible through the Internet Wayback Machine digital archives.<sup>63</sup>

*The Boy Who Visited Muin'iskw* ("bear woman") project, a ten-minute animation of a Mi'kmaw story for the winter holiday line-up, linked *ArtSpots* to a mainstream (main channel) national drama initiative (CBC's *Winter Tales*) that, like *ArtSpots*, had arisen out of pluralistic

---

<sup>62</sup> To view the trade paperback edition, including the presentation of the DVD, please see: <http://www.tarabryan.com/timelines.html> (accessed July 7, 2014).

<sup>63</sup> The Parks Canada official press release for the July 16 premiere of the documentary and official launch of the project on the site: [http://www.pc.gc.ca/APPS/CP-NR/release\\_e.asp?id=911&andor1=nr](http://www.pc.gc.ca/APPS/CP-NR/release_e.asp?id=911&andor1=nr) and [http://www.pc.gc.ca/APPS/CP-NR/release\\_e.asp?bgid=757&andor1=bg](http://www.pc.gc.ca/APPS/CP-NR/release_e.asp?bgid=757&andor1=bg) (accessed July 7, 2014). The bare bones of the original website (though none of the media materials), are on the Internet Wayback Machine: <http://web.archive.org/web/20060312103947/http://www.cbc.ca/grosmore/> (accessed July 7, 2014).

policy commitments to represent a range of stories and voices.<sup>64</sup> During production, *ArtSpots* resourced a “Making of” documentary (2004) to track the community consultations and co-creative strategies used to develop the project, including providing tapes, camera and editing resources, and a producer. Mi’kmaw artist Alan Syliboy – who had been profiled on *ArtSpots* – was commissioned to provide the characters and settings for the animation. These designs were adapted through a then-innovative computer-generated animation approach employed by artist Michaela McIntosh and *ArtSpots* video editors at CBC Halifax. Award-winning documentary writer and director from the Mi’kmaw community, Catherine Martin describes the experience this way:

I have always wanted to produce a Mi’kmaq legend using animation combined with artwork from a Mi’kmaq artist... I agreed to do this if I could take the story back to the community first and speak to some of my respected elders and storytellers, since I had some concerns about the wording and English translation of the story... I also needed to be sure that it was okay to take something that I considered sacred to our nation, our stories, and put it on television... Alan Syliboy’s artwork was chosen to be used in the story. We had one of the storytellers, Mary Rose Julian, transcribe the story back into Mi’kmaq and read it to Mi’kmaq speaking children for their input. We asked Mi’kmaq historians, elders, storytellers and educators about the story, what they know of it, of Rand and what they thought about using television as a medium to retell this story. I received my answers to my questions and a great amount of guidance from the elders along with permission to go ahead and proceed with the retelling of this story. I felt that I had deconstructed the story and reconstructed it using Mi’kmaq thinkers, storytellers and perspective. I was thrilled to finally see my vision of creating an animation, using a Mi’kmaq artist, come alive. (Martin 2008, pp. 53-54).

Both the animation and the documentary won awards, including at the Milwaukee Indian Summer Festival Film and Video Image Awards in 2005. Martin has presented the process and used the materials extensively in her subsequent educational and scholarly work within the

---

<sup>64</sup> See one example of the story here: <http://www.muiniskw.org/pgCulture3c.htm> (accessed July 7, 2014). The story that Martin began her adaptation from had been published by the Nova Scotia Museum in 1989 as part of Ruth Whitehead’s *Six MicMac Stories* and subsequently by Nimbus Publishing as *Six Mi’kmaq Stories* (1992). Whitehead was a well-known folklorist who collected stories from various communities, included the Mi’kmaw, in the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century.

Mi'kmaw community and elsewhere.<sup>65</sup> The short animation and the “Making of” documentary plus the existing *ArtSpots* materials produced across the country with twenty-five Aboriginal artists were showcased in the founding year (2004) of the Planet IndigenUs Festival in Toronto (*CBC ArtSpots* archives).<sup>66</sup>

Finally, in 2002, based on the Bronfman Award model, a preliminary exploration began for a potential relationship with the fledgling Sobey Art Award for visual artists under 40, involving *ArtSpots* with the Sobey Art Foundation as the funder of the Award and Art Gallery of Nova Scotia (AGNS) as the administrator of the Award. The national Sobey Award was originally conceived as a biennial event and only became an annual event in 2008. Like the Bronfman Award, the Sobey Award featured a nation-wide nomination and juried process. For the 2002 event, the local *ArtSpots* production team shot the local CBC news crew shot the exhibition and announcement event (respectively). Because there was no formal partnership, and therefore no official resources assigned to it, *ArtSpots* was not able to proceed with production for either the final nominees or the first recipient, Brian Jungen, at that time. Clearly, the event fit more comfortably into the news format than it did the *ArtSpots* one: a format that explicitly sought audiences rather than advancing the arts discourse. The next time the Sobey Award was

---

<sup>65</sup> Martin was then in the midst of her term as founding Chair of the Board of the Aboriginal Peoples Television Network. In 2004, APTN would publicly admit to a serious financial crisis generated out of an aggressive production and programming mandate, which would then be resolved in time for license hearings shortly after (Baltruschat 2004; Barnsley 2004). Martin is currently completing her affiliation with the Coady Institute at St Francis Xavier University in Antigonish, NS as well as working on films and public speaking across North America. [www.coady.stfx.ca/coady/staff/cathy-martin/](http://www.coady.stfx.ca/coady/staff/cathy-martin/) (accessed July 6, 2014)

<sup>66</sup> See also <http://www.harbourfrontcentre.com/planetindigenus/> (accessed July 6, 2014). Also included in the *ArtSpots* project file was a reference to a scholarly article that had been circulated by Martin and myself to the Indigenous Media E-Circle listserv on February 15, 2004. Valaskakis, Gail Guthrie. (2004). Telling Our Own Stories: The Role, Development and Future of Aboriginal Communications. In *Aboriginal Education: Fulfilling the Promise*. Eds. Castellano, Marlene Brant, Lynne Davis and Louise Lahache. Vancouver: UBC Press. This article provided a framework for the proposed Mi'kmaw storytelling project.

presented, in 2004, the recipient Jean-Pierre Gauthier had already been included in that year's *ArtSpots* "regular" shoot in Quebec; his Sobey Award work was shot at the AGNS and became available to local and national news as well as to *ArtSpots*. In subsequent years, several Sobey Award nominees – such as Michel de Broin and Raphaëlle de Groot – participated in *ArtSpots* through the regular Advisory Group selection process, making any special arrangement with the Sobey Award moot. However, the overlap between *ArtSpots*' long lists and the lengthy finalist lists curated for the Sobey Award subsequently became a contributing motivator for the emphasis placed on redeveloping *ArtSpots* as a website where content from a variety of sources could be uploaded to a database, predicated on *ArtSpots*' growing narrowcast audiences.

About the transportability of *ArtSpots*' creative citizenship practices to the present-day convergent digital environment, participants in the 2012 Advisory discussion group session note:

Fillmore: Maybe there's a place for the YouTubes of the world to save [*ArtSpots*].

Cronin: There is something about the public broadcaster though, as a platform. Because the thing about the internet is – how many links to interesting articles to any of us get in the course of a day? That we could go and look at, and it's so vast.

Alfoldy: Yes, you get overwhelmed.

Fillmore: But if you use it the way we, well, the way that I used *ArtSpots* – I never saw one on TV. Ever. ...But the idea that something exists as a resource is great: it depends on the intention. Obviously you intended it to be disseminated to the public on a public platform, in a subversive way – offering it to people who didn't know they wanted it until they saw it. Maybe the new world isn't to convince people who are watching hockey that they really want to look at art. Maybe there's a more cynical view [about art out there].

Dykhuis: Well, also, convergence is going to happen sooner than we know it. Television as we know it is going to cease to exist. Everything is going to be on demand. (Advisory discussion group, March 26, 2012).

These observations about the potential for developing present-day creative production practices based on *ArtSpots* principles to feature and curate art in a digital environment today are also

reflected in interviews with participants from the television side of the equation. As Mattocks observed in an earlier quote, years after *ArtSpots* finished production:

I think [*ArtSpots*'] place isn't on television, anymore, I think it's probably in the digital space now. We didn't know that then. Because we didn't have a digital space that was mature enough to deal with it. (Personal interview, February 7, 2012).

Analyses of digital media production in relation to narrowcast audiences emerging from the intersection of digital convergence with more traditional media studies are starting to be generated. But there is still little reference to the visual arts, other than parallel connections that the concept of creative citizenship can make among scholars such as Mayer around creativity, and Spiegel concerning the history of interventions by artists in media production at crucial moments of change. Nonetheless, these parallels insist on *ArtSpots* as a multi-platform digital project that not only explicitly courted narrowcast audiences – but staked out a commitment to co-creative work with artists (as shown in chapter five) – in order to express a distinct form of creative citizenship.

Motivations around narrowcast audience development (though likewise without the important reference to co-creative work that *ArtSpots* offers to the emerging concept of creative citizenship) are developed in the evidence gathered in *Television as Digital Media* (Bennett, James and Strange 2011), a collection of essays about the world-wide transition to cross-platform digital television starting in the mid-2000s. The explorations of narrowcast audiences in relation to interactive content are relevant, though the collection focuses on the United Kingdom, Australia and the United States. The essays are helpfully organized in four ways leading up to ways in which narrowcast audiences are produced (including at *ArtSpots*): technological developments, production practices, content aesthetics (creative forms), and the way in which the rhetoric around user-generated content was more about “producing digital audiences” (Bennett

and Strange 2011, 281) than generating programming to be shared. This is where *ArtSpots* diverges from the emphasis on technology in convergence studies. Since the pre-production and production processes themselves required creative input by key stakeholders – including the artists profiled and the advisors who identified potential artists – these groups became key narrowcast audiences to address first during production, even though it was always critical that cultural programming be produced and circulated to broader audiences.

Notably, in their discussions of the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), Strange (2011) and Turner (2011) delve into some of the important evolving relationships among narrowcast groups of television users and viewers in the transition to a digital environment and multiple platform content delivery in ways similar to those incorporated into the creative citizenship concept arising from earlier definitions offered by Bazalgette and Gauntlett concerning British television and the international communities of craft artists respectively. In particular, Strange emphasizes the transition to a diffused, dialogic production and consumption system by the BBC in the early- to mid-2000s, building on Caldwell's use of cyclical flows and reflexivity among others. Strange's analysis of users as citizens complements (but doesn't go as far as) the concept of creative citizenship. The scrutiny also enhances Turner's historical accounting of television as nation-building work evolving into shared creative practices. Strange's synthesis of convergence culture scholarship (such as that of Jenkins and P. David Marshall) similar to the way in which I have made those connections to almost the same group of theorists, is notable. As with Born's analysis of how creative production shifted at the BBC at the turn of the twenty-first century (2004), for Strange, an enquiry into this change must also include analyses of the use of "interactive" rhetoric at the BBC, multiple delivery sites and "cultural forms," to illustrate the parallel between aggregating content and delivery systems for-profit and

for public service (Strange 2011, 138). Innovative and experimental interactivity is encouraged to thrive on public service broadcasting through educational and “factual” programming concerned with the engagement of audiences with artwork, artists and art institutions for television in its newly diffused shapes (137-149). While *ArtSpots* was situated through the broadcast act to narratives of regional reflection and specific artistic communities (as my earlier discursive analysis demonstrated), Strange notes that BBC programming related to identity-based storytelling through mediatized books:

In tying in this content with a range of initiatives with schools, libraries, national literacy organizations, and charities, as well as with publishers and book retailers, the BBC sought to emphasize its successful role less as broadcaster than as orchestrator of a multipartnered, multiplatform campaign whose public service was in generating debates around, and reflections on, national identity and, also, personal transformation (2011, 138).

This complements my analysis of media industry creativity in relation to creative citizenship. Interestingly, Bennett and Strange’s (2011) analysis of convergent content as both educational and entertaining also coheres with van Zoonen’s (2005) analysis of the relationship between actual democratic practices and the portrayal of them in fictional television programs. What Bennett and Strange’s analyses most support about creative citizenship is how many of the partnership project experiences helped open up the digital narrowcast distribution space at CBC – but not the individual artist experiences, except for a time, and increasingly incidentally. The primarily content-sharing, genre-expanding and narrowcast audience projects with which *ArtSpots* became involved over time reflect its conflicted location as a co-creative undertaking inside a broadcasting environment. Though the Bronfman and Sobey Awards continue to thrive, they maintain an active presence on social media and a professional presentation of still images or videos only through their respective events and exhibitions, not through broadcast. News

coverage and social media mavens now document the artists involved – and many other artists – with little or no creative control offered to the artists themselves.

When *ArtSpots*' work as a production unit increased overall, the projects that were not as directly involved with artists gained profile inside and outside CBC. It sometimes seemed as if *ArtSpots* had abandoned its commitment to what has emerged as creative citizenship in this dissertation. The sharing and growing of social capital throughout the networked, fluid relationships among all the creative players were sustained but weren't augmented. Pluralistic goals and policies continued to be operationalized in innovative ways, some that relied on traditional television production practices, and some that pushed beyond those boundaries. Collaborative practices connected with the communities involved through knowledge-sharing activities and the sharing of content for exhibitions, artist portfolios, "how to" events and other similar initiatives. In the first eight years of the project – including at the height of the partnerships analysed in this chapter – the number of artists involved in regular *ArtSpots* production (thirty-second and two-to-five-minute items) through the Advisory Group process continued to grow in size, scope and reach, before declining in the last two. In those last two years of production, two key factors precipitated *ArtSpots*' final days. One was the increasing popularity of uploading sites such as YouTube coupled with the growing ability of artists and galleries to produce and present their own versions of *ArtSpots*-like material on their own websites, and the other the advent of reality programming at the public broadcaster. This can be seen in a comparison of *ArtSpots* to the rise and fall of *ZeD*.

#### *Curated uploading supersedes co-creation at CBC*

The late-night television/internet project *ZeD* ran from March 2002 to 2006, with a regular one-hour timeslot (later reduced to 30 minutes) between three and five days a week over its lifetime

that mobilized a coterie of emerging, freelance regional producer-directors. It was CBC's most substantial national foray to date into soliciting user-generated submissions of audio and video material for playback on the CBC website and on television.<sup>67</sup> In many ways, it was the logical next step to combine the lessons learned about multi-modal programming from *ArtSpots* – coupled with commitments of pluralism drawn from the broadcast mandate as at *ArtSpots* – with traditional variety programming formulas. Indeed, then-Regional Director of CBC Television in British Columbia (CBC BC), Rae Hull, was able to capitalize on cultural community networking regularly exercised at *ArtSpots*. Hull had been the lead contact and resource manager at CBC BC for *ArtSpots*' first years of production in BC (1999 onwards), including assigning *ArtSpots* in BC to award-winning culture news producer Dale Drewery. By 2002, industry journal *Exclaim* noted that *ZeD*'s exploratory efforts held great promise, focusing on performance and on the production of short series of comedies as well as a website to host content (Walsh, 2002).

Importantly, Walsh (2002) also notes that *ZeD* opted not to pay honoraria or licensing fees for content uploaded by users, although *ZeD* retained all rights to the material, unlike previous variety programs, which were generally bound by agreements with actors, musicians and technicians unions, and unlike the approach taken at *ArtSpots* as a pioneering digital program. This was a conscious decision by the *ZeD* production team after considering existing experimental models such as *ArtSpots*' licensing system with artists as well as more standard contracts issued under the CBC's Independent Producers Terms of Trade within the broadcast industry.<sup>68</sup> Visual arts were still not governed by any pre-existing union agreements with CBC. However, as part of the *ArtSpots*' commitment to develop broadcast production practices to

---

<sup>67</sup> <http://www.cbc.ca/programguide/program/zed> (accessed July 7, 2014).

<sup>68</sup> The relevant (2002) version of this document can be found here: <http://www.cbc.ca/independentproducers/termsoftrade.pdf> (accessed July 6, 2014).

support a professional visual arts community, an agreement with the CARFAC Copyright Collective (English Canada's voluntary association for artists for exhibition and other fee guidelines and professional assistance) had established a modest fee to license each artist's material. This included acknowledgement of the extensive use CBC would make of the material as well as the ways that the artist could make use of the edited material provided to them by CBC before it aired. The exceptions involved artists (such as musicians) who would be bound by union agreements to which CBC was already a signatory and for which pre-existing fee scales applied. The cultural community expressed appreciation for the professional approach and acknowledgement of the appropriate management of intellectual property in many *ArtSpots* Advisory Group meetings and community discussions. The lack of license fee payments for material uploaded to the *ZeD* website was frequently raised in *ArtSpots* Advisory Group meetings across the country, especially in reference to early days when material was curated onto *ZeD*'s television offering without payment. In part, this was an "optics" challenge for CBC in its work with the arts and media arts communities, but also a real financial consideration during the design of both projects.

The production practices and resources honed at *ArtSpots* found new efficiencies at *ZeD*. While *ZeD* was operational, a small amount of *ArtSpots* material was incorporated, particularly items that included performance art or media arts. Some members of the media and visual arts communities connected to *ArtSpots* actively uploaded material of their own to *ZeD*. Several of the freelance producers and technicians involved with *ArtSpots* across the country also worked on *ZeD* as staff, stringers or freelancers, including Mark Lawrence and Kevin Teichroeb at CBC British Columbia where *ZeD* was based. Lawrence had worked with the Bronfman Award artists in British Columbia, and shortly after became one of the lead producer-directors at *ZeD*.

Teichroeb subsequently took up the *ArtSpots* mantle in BC until the end of its tenure there, but also did quite a lot of work for *ZeD*. The synchronizing of workload enabled *ArtSpots* to become more active in CBC for a short time, during *ZeD*'s off-season, and to benefit from an intense growth of the in-house capacity in BC to shoot and edit arts-based materials. These arrangements weren't without their challenges. *ArtSpots* was increasingly a year-round program, and scheduling challenges at busy centres such as Vancouver's were tricky to work with. Additionally, union regulations meant that if a producer-director was hired on a freelance basis in a sequence of substantially similar positions (such as *ZeD* and *ArtSpots*), then they became eligible to request a more permanent contract, although budgets weren't available for permanent positions. Rather than decreasing the precarity of creative workers' positions, the convergence of two multi-modal programs at CBC simply made ongoing freelance work harder to schedule.

*ZeD*'s late-night television program resembled many historical variety programs. It took place in a particular timeslot, was hosted by a series of musicians, artists and cultural figures, and featured live music recorded in the CBC's Vancouver studio. Despite the relative lack of licensing fees for user-generated and uploaded material, *ZeD* was quite popular with the Canadian independent film and media arts community, which saw it as a national launching pad for their own work. By the time it was cancelled in 2006, it had captured enough of peoples' imagination at CBC that the Canadian Media Guild (the union representing producers and other production workers at the CBC) bemoaned the decision as one of a series of decisions to compromise public broadcasting by downsizing in-house production at CBC (CMG, 2006), a theme reiterated to this day. This was a trend made evident by shifting financing rules in Canada

favouring independent production.<sup>69</sup> *ZeD* also acted as a significant experiment in seeing whether an online community could be generated *by the broadcaster*, rather than by fan groups. As the work of Hermes (2005), Jenkins (2004) and others have since shown, the growth of early fan-based communities were primarily driven and managed by avid fans – the most active of cultural citizenship participants. But creating such a community from scratch proved to be more difficult than it looked.

At CBC, 2006 also marked the arrival of Kirstine Stewart (then Layfield) as Head of Network Programming for English Television, later Executive Vice-President of English Services, and subsequently head of Twitter Canada in 2013, where she “draws on her extensive content and production knowledge to form new content model partnerships with Twitter around the world” (Professional Development Institute, 2013), a positioning oddly reminiscent of the founding language at *ArtSpots*, the New Media Pod, the CBC Partnerships office, and later, of Lacroix’s positioning of CBC (2013).<sup>70</sup> Stewart’s initial programming strategies included the founding of CBC’s Factual Entertainment Department as well as contracting American game shows (*Wheel of Fortune* and *Jeopardy*), or American daytime television stars (e.g. for the *Steven and Chris* mid-afternoon program still on the air) to attract demographics that were important to draw advertisers to pre-primetime and daytime programming respectively (Posner 2011). Such strategies required significant changes in funding priorities. Some documentary department and program funding was reassigned to the new department, and several other in-

---

<sup>69</sup> From the mid-2000s on, a substantial portion of primetime and other programming at CBC as at other networks was funded through a series of funding envelopes favouring independent production. The formulas used meant that independent production companies could generate more money for a production than an in-house production could. The funding agency is now the Canada Media Fund, although at the time it was the Canadian Television Fund.

<sup>70</sup> This quote appears on several other websites around the same time as this one, reflecting its origins as the official Twitter biography for Stewart at the time.

house production program budgets were reexamined (as happened on an annual basis). The *ZeD* budgets were exponentially larger than that of *ArtSpots*, for example, in part because of *ZeD*'s substantial television footprint, and so it made an earlier, more lucrative target for downsizing when funding was required for other priorities at CBC.

Virtually nothing has been written about *ZeD* in the scholarly environment, although it did receive industry coverage during its tenure (CBC.ca 2002; Dixon 2006). *ZeD* was also said to have influenced the development of Al Gore's Current TV project in 2005 (McKay, 2005), an online broadcasting initiative from the same period, which has since been sold to Al-Jazeera (Bercovici, 2013). Although *ZeD*, like *ArtSpots*, benefited from critical recognition, including plenty of awards, it never drew large audiences. Notably, the late-night timeslot traditionally does not draw significant numbers, but has usually been seen as a place to test program formats and train hosts and personalities. This can be seen in subsequent programming hosted by George Stroumboulopoulos in this timeslot, who was brought to CBC during Stewart's tenure in an effort to capture a similarly young, hip demographic as that sought by *ZeD*, though in a more traditional talk show format familiar to TV audiences. Discussions at the time internally at CBC, and more recently in industry assessments of Stewart's contributions to CBC, suggest that her reliance on reality and lifestyle programming was at the expense of the arts in Canada, something that was regarded as an abandonment of mandate. TV pundit John Doyle, for example, notes:

Under Stewart, CBC TV fled from arts programming, a tactic initiated, it seems, by her predecessor Richard Stursberg. That has always seemed to me a terrible failing, a breach of CBC's contract with Canadians. Sorry, but reality show *Over The Rainbow*, about finding a new Dorothy for *The Wizard of Oz*, is not arts programming. There's a lot of mediocrity in the schedule that could be balanced by good arts programming (2013, n.p.)

An aggressive strategy of booking well-known celebrities was implemented for the George Stroumboulopoulos show, and had spillover into bookings for Q, the radio show launched and hosted by Jian Ghomeshi. This form of "content-sharing" between television and radio

programming signaled a return to traditional formats as well as future directions in efficiencies for CBC, particularly in the growth of cross-promotions on radio as well as on internet and television programming. The era of co-creation at CBC would have to wait for another day.

## **Conclusion: Moving on with creative citizenship**

As a strategic thinker, I like to plan ahead. Like most artists, journalists, and media makers, I am interested in the range of possible answers to questions about how culture and media in society works or comes to be. In the two decades or so that I have worked in and studied the culture sector, I have observed that it is filled with a combination of cynics and boundless optimists; I am among the latter. The culture sector is also kind of messy: negotiations require power sharing and collaboration in an environment where the individual voice is expected to assert itself. Like the internet as a whole in the 2000s, *CBC ArtSpots* was a significant theoretical undertaking as well as a messy site of optimism rising out of the late 1990s in the way that it developed. The devolution of creative control to artists and loosely networked curators and producers was fundamental to *ArtSpots*' longevity, for a modest segment of the public broadcast programming schedule on television and in a brand new digital medium. So was the development of several content-sharing and knowledge-sharing strategies and distribution practices, particularly in concert with the rise of widely available broadband platforms for broadcasting and the multi-site, multi-modal use of cultural media content. All this made for a heady, sometimes chaotic mixture. That the approach used at initiatives such as *ArtSpots* continues to adapt and to influence post-2008 dialogues and cultural programming support is not unexpected, but satisfying nonetheless. More importantly, it is indicative of the flexible strength of creative citizenship.

The implications of the practices and projects analysed throughout the dissertation suggest that if you build a time-based space through policy articulation and production practices and then involve artists and creative workers, you can develop an experimentally creative,

stewardship-based, knowledge-sharing mandate together, incorporating pluralistic content and process goals. To the degree that you can let those same creative people “run with it”, innovative and collaborative programs and relations may follow. The *ArtSpots* experience affirms that arts communities cohere by doing something together; by marking pathways to generate change and development. Over time, a collective identity is asserted by a group of people making interventions in the everyday world: a set of creative and artistic gestures but also of involvement with one another in shared processes. This manifested dialogically at *ArtSpots* in both time periods as openness around creative practice, for example, initially in Advisory Group meetings, then through artist and regional working relationships, and years later, in interviews and discussion groups involving erstwhile participants.

For *ArtSpots* – and the development of the concept of creative citizenship – it is not only that there must be innovative creative practices involving civic engagement of individual creators from narrowcast audiences through the production and sharing of content and then the sharing of knowledge. Real limits must also be addressed – and in some cases, can be superseded – but they are always present. The 2010-2014 interviews and discussion groups with cultural leaders and artists suggest that not only could the basic production practices of *ArtSpots* be understood as an expression of creative citizenship, but even more explicitly, it was that these were combined with advancing the arts discourse in the context of democratic curatorial processes.

Creative citizenship also means to develop multiple sites for interventions: at *ArtSpots*, that included networked exhibitions, production projects, digital and television material, and educational initiatives. Here, the civic nature of creative citizenship could be exercised through media production incorporating collegial relationships among individuals, groups and institutions linked by *ArtSpots*. However, the ability to leverage partnerships towards narrowcast audience

development is a doubtful advantage. The extension of collaborative creativity processes to networked professional and institutional levels through knowledge-sharing and creative content development processes contributes to the legitimation and profile of any given initiative within a host institution, and holds promise for audiences. Without an ongoing commitment to activate the discursive, knowledge-sharing and pluralism elements articulated in policy documents through the co-creative practices that originated at *ArtSpots*, the experimental creative processes rapidly become confined by the limits of resources available, and by programming priorities that do not prioritize such citizenship-based elements. In other words, for *ArtSpots*, it is not just the production of art and broadcast material featuring individual artists that was crucial, but also the production and distribution of these *together with the artists and with others*, including the consequent circulation of expertise as well as informed outreach to narrowcast audiences. Smart distribution in the form of shared content-development, content-sharing, and knowledge-sharing, then, takes on importance but *does not drive* the configuration of creative citizenship. A robust, integrated sharing of media production experiences, however, can drive the realization of creative citizenship aspirations.

The final two years of production for *ArtSpots* saw the program balanced on a knife-edge of change, as was CBC, and indeed the broadcast industry itself. The industry moved decisively towards a digital broadcast environment but with shrinking production dollars, while the diversification of media platforms, particularly the emergence of mobile media, moved on unabated. At *ArtSpots*, the cumulative volume of content became increasingly unmanageable internally without a firm television timeslot, and online without a database, even while resources were stripped away from the arts initiatives and infrastructure that could support it. The frequency of and comfort with user-generated uploads began to grow, including in artistic circles

where net art and media art blossomed. Broadband capacities as well as the potential for interactive opportunities grew in leaps and bounds. Through targeted budget management, *ArtSpots* prepared for conversion to a curated database in 2007-08, particularly one that had the capacity to host user-generated material. In 2007, the CBC Arts and Entertainment Department had finally agreed to dedicate staff to support the conversion of existing *ArtSpots* programming to database management. By early 2006, Brooks and I were making the argument that if *ArtSpots* instituted its own YouTube channel, a user-upload function could be introduced on a pilot project basis that would allow artists to showcase their own videos on the *ArtSpots* website, which could then be curated in a variety of ways, easing some of the resource management pressures on digital distribution at CBC. The YouTube channel idea was turned down, but work progressed on the design for a new *ArtSpots* website that would allow for user uploads, curatorial initiatives, and arts news headlines.

Prior to leaving CBC in 2008, Brooks would be reassigned to the national New Media Department to help prepare for and negotiate CBC's eventual first deal with YouTube but not in time for *ArtSpots* to secure its own channel, about which she would later note:

I did some work with iTunes, to get some of the first CBC content that was ever on iTunes. We were putting our YouTube channel together, I worked on that. Of course now, Facebook, Twitter, stuff like that is tightly integrated, for better or worse, in terms of the content, that's what's being worked on now. And being used on the air now. ... What happened was, what was seen to be almost as an adjunct, and a throwaway, at one time, turned the opposite way. If you listen to radio, you hear them talking about things that have been tweeted. Same thing with television, you get crawls across the bottom, and it's all to do with the technology and the audience coming in the other way... Now it's all totally turned around. Pushing the other way. And I remember we had conversations about how this would change what we would produce. Anything that wasn't about the technology, it was about the content. We've got to change what we were doing because people weren't interacting with it. We were just starting to do that when I left I left in 2008. (Personal interview, February 4, 2012).

As *ArtSpots* moved towards a new look and feel in late 2007, including a database management system, and a worker-generated content model with potential for participant and producer alike, it became obvious that the *ArtSpots* mandate, goals and values needed to be revisited to reflect the coming shift to increasingly curatorial and knowledge-sharing functions, along with the role of the Advisory Group and artists within the project. A series of consultations began in Vancouver and Montreal in December 2007, which were to be followed by other centres in early spring. As the *ArtSpots* archives concisely document, meetings were held in Vancouver, including with ArtSpeak, Western Edge, Vancouver Art Gallery and others. My personal archives more comprehensively document the six meetings held in Montreal on December 11 and 12, with presidents, directors and curators at Société des arts technologiques (SAT), Oboro Gallery, the Fondation Langlois, Musée des Beaux Arts de Montreal, the member-based umbrella distribution organization Vidéographe, and Musée d'Art Contemporain de Montreal. Each expressed interest in pursuing collaborative media generating or distribution projects with *ArtSpots* under the new model. Several pages of potential video, archival and other media content for the new *ArtSpots* concept (both immediately and longer-term) were researched and documented during the lead- and follow-up to these meetings. The parameters of a new project began to emerge.

Well before the end of the 2007-2008 fiscal year, the design, wireframes and a new wordmark for *ArtSpots* in its digital incarnation were completed. Much of the existing artist-based content had been redigitized and migrated to a database format used by CBC. At the last minute in the 2007-2008 fiscal year budgeting process, however, rather than pursue the combination of a targeted user-generated and in-house production strategy on the verge of

implementation, funding for *ArtSpots* was withdrawn just before final approval, and the project was cancelled.

*It's a wrap: preparing for giving it all away*

In the weeks that followed the cancellation of national funding, a proposal for an archiving and migration strategy quickly developed for what would become the formal *CBC ArtSpots* archive of thirty-one boxes, currently stored in Toronto. By late spring, a short list of potential recipients was drawn up and evaluated internally, work was completed on outstanding production projects, and negotiations began with the organization at the top of the potential recipient short list. All of the correspondence, creative materials, minutes and lists were included in the archives except the confidential business documents, which continue to exist in the CBC's Business Affairs and Human Resources departments. In April 2008, a presentation was enthusiastically received by an educational institution as a potential recipient of the *ArtSpots* Archive Collection. The PowerPoint developed for the presentation positions the *ArtSpots* material as an extensive curated collection of Canadian art throughout its decade of production. A number of meetings were held at CBC and with the recipient to brainstorm potential uses and next steps: a ten-page document of potential uses was developed in May 2008 in preparation for final negotiations. Comprehensive charts of *ArtSpots* materials were developed, including lists of tapes and files, types of copyright secured, and any limits on use of material. Tapes were organized, inventoried and packed.<sup>71</sup>

CBC committed to ensure that the *ArtSpots* website would be maintained until at least June 2009, at which time it was anticipated that the website would be hosted elsewhere. I left the CBC shortly after the archive was prepared and packed up. The negotiations to move the archive

---

<sup>71</sup> See Appendix One for the master lists of boxes, tape dubs and field tapes.

that had looked so promising upon my departure went on for several months but ultimately fizzled out. However, Fred Mattocks and Jennifer Gillivan were able to oversee the establishment of the *ArtSpots* collection as an internal CBC corporate archive. They were not able to secure a commitment from CBC to maintain the website itself, and by 2010, most of the video links ceased to work. However, the two extensive tape collections continue to exist: the tape library in Halifax includes a duplicate copy of the field footage as well as the original master tapes of edited programming, and the formal archive is stored in Toronto. CBC not only made the formal archival material readily available to me during the research phase of this dissertation, but seems amenable to the possibility of future forays into the tapes and files. Artists, curators, scholars and media producers await.

### *Original contributions*

What this thesis does is unpack the particularities of CBC *ArtSpots*' evolution to devise the concept of creative citizenship, to help understand the transition from traditional mass media broadcast models to a multi-modal digital broadcast system in Canada. This original contribution to the field of communication and media studies focuses on a complex set of interdisciplinary theoretical underpinnings for the development of the concept, as well as a deep investigation of *ArtSpots* as a case study to test and demonstrate it. In Canada, as shown in chapter one, little has been done to analyze multi-modal digital television and media from a media production studies perspective that includes consideration of creative labour, narrowcast audiences, policy and identity concerns. Although creative citizenship clearly emerges out of media production studies, it also incorporates relevant insights from cultural economy and creative labour literature, visual culture studies, social identity and political economy concerns and technology studies. Creative citizenship thus becomes a concept applicable to a wide array of cultural production

environments, especially those incorporating a range of media production and dissemination strategies and elements – a field of potential study that has expanded exponentially over the last two decades.

In the research, I make use of a case study framework to activate an interview-based methodology dependent on reflexivity and dialogue. My research is shaped by a feminist approach, placing equity concerns in a central position, including identity politics, social activism, civic engagement and public broadcasting services. Through discussion groups and interviews, effective creative processes and innovations for a digital broadcasting era developed or enhanced at *ArtSpots* become evident, including new business practices such as shared creative control and navigating complex intellectual property management issues together. Methods incorporated into the research period include document analysis in the archives, transcription and quoting of interviews conducted between 2010-2014, and the production of 100 new videos in 2012-13, combining video and auxiliary material from both eras (2010-2014, and 1997-2008). Video materials mash together observations from two eras, as well as visual cues about artwork and the visual and performing arts discourses of the time. Digital softwares are mobilized to help generate and confirm themes arising from the emergence of the concept of creative citizenship.

The research itself began in the archives: both my own, and the formal corporate CBC *ArtSpots* archive now resident in Toronto. An analysis of the pluralism narrative framed by policy language and priorities at the heart of *ArtSpots*, including extant industrial conditions, is a useful prelude to the findings of the interviews and discussion groups. This analysis makes it apparent that certain circumstances help shape a modern take on ameliorating discrimination and asserts a complex, fluid identity for potential audiences of public broadcasting in the early

twenty-first century. Not permitting the dominant economic and industrial frame to dictate the values embedded in the policy and processes of *ArtSpots* shows how creative citizenship can step outside economic limits to realize goals, while tolerating economically driven limits.

Investigating the particular form of precarity of creative work of the time is crucial for shaping discussions of skill sharing, interventions in broadcasting, and assuming stewardship responsibilities that take place with participants then (1997-2008) and now (2010-2014). The introduction of co-creative producers and of narrowcast audiences as an industrial priority, an innovative approach, and as a contributing element to the concept of creative citizenship follows.

### *Characteristics and themes of creative citizenship*

The particular characteristics of the overarching themes of creativity and citizenship clearly flow from the process-oriented nature of creative citizenship. Important elements contributing to the definition and application of citizenship in relation to creativity include pluralism and identity, reflexivity, and skill/knowledge/content-sharing through widespread archival distribution and narrowcast audience engagement. More broadly, the richly diverse nature of the genres, participants and culture discourses employed at *ArtSpots* (and surrounding it) is made evident. The networked and collaborative nature of the *ArtSpots* structure studied in chapter three includes the delineation of shared responsibilities. In chapter four, pluralism and identity concerns are shown to be activated in the public sphere through equity commitments. The genesis of *ArtSpots* from a policy framework is analysed, as are important contributing ideas such as stewardship, social capital and discursive and textual analyses. Program outcomes by genre and demographic are analysed. In chapter five, the set of robust day-to-day creative practices employed at *ArtSpots* are thoroughly unpacked, including narratives of innovation and collaboration, as well as the generation of creative business practices. *ArtSpots*' extensive agenda

of co-creative content-development is examined. Chapter six offers a sobering second look at *ArtSpots* within the evolving industrial context, including pressures to find external sources of funding and the increasing emphasis on narrowcast audience development strategies at CBC and therefore at *ArtSpots*, up to and including today. Several related collaborative projects are analysed, including *ZeD*, *The Boy Who Visited Muini'skw*, and the Saidye Bronfman Award suite of activities. The concept of the interview is explored and mobilized throughout the dissertation, particularly through reflections generated by interviews and discussion groups in both time periods.

*ArtSpots'* contributions to the cumulative effect of partnering within CBC itself added to the nodes of activity and trajectories of networks that could be mobilized by its sister initiatives in CBC Partnerships and the New Media Pod, particularly in relation to crucial stakeholders and narrowcast audiences. This proves to be a two-edged sword. The expansion of collaborative processes to institutional levels and projects stresses the *ArtSpots* process considerably – including its activation of creative citizenship. It is also met with significant challenges at *ZeD*, *Gros Morne Time Lines* and in other multi-modal initiatives. Even though such audience-focused work provides these initiatives with additional legitimacy inside CBC, including positioning *ArtSpots* as a more traditionally composed (and fundable) production unit, maintenance clearly becomes an issue under these conditions: without resources to respond to new conditions, the promise of experimental creative practices becomes confined by the limits of the mainstream broadcast system and the tendency to essentialize experimental processes into replicable and profitable business practices. This means eliminating mandate-based public service elements in favour of “chasing eyeballs” and “putting bums in seats”, as the professional vernacular would have it. Nonetheless, at *ArtSpots*, the production and distribution practices marshaled to work

with over 300 artists, over 200 Advisors, and dozens of internal and external partners from 1997-2008, help to shape a legacy of partnerships and networks in the culture sector that still echoes today.

What I did not do in this thesis is exhaustively study every last minute of the existing *ArtSpots* program material produced and background material collected then (1997-2008) and now (2010-2013). Many opportunities exist for future potential discrete projects, further leveraging the existing *ArtSpots* material, including multiple opportunities for reuse and augmentation of the program material.

I also did not assume or show that *ArtSpots* is the only way to organize and develop the relationship of artists to broadcasting. Quite the opposite. This dissertation takes pains to show that the precise conditions of the time engender this particular configuration. The contingent and fluid nature of what becomes more or less possible over the course of the decade, depends on the specifics of who is involved, and how and when they are involved. This is supported by the literature engaged, and through a close scrutiny of timing, location, policy, funding models and several other crucial factors, in circumscribing what it may be possible to do. Concomitantly, it is evident that the actions of a collaborative group – more-or-less united behind values and goals – can crack open and build an extraordinarily engaging cultural contribution, as well as a great deal of specific programming content. This is the optimistic hope embedded in the generative nature of the semantic Web 3.0 and beyond, today. By Web 3.0, I mean the potential for open collaboration and contributions that can build on one another, including those managed by computers themselves. Algorithms, tags, aggregations, immersive experiences, and crowdsourcing all play a part. So does the broad sharing of information and participation in common goals.

Reviewing particular creative practices at *ArtSpots* through the interview and discussion process is certainly an act of remembering and documenting how things worked, and analysing why. But that is not all it is: it is the generating of new knowledge about how and why the transformation to a digital production environment is still fluid enough for interventions and shaping today. *ArtSpots*' innovative and collaborative practices in the broader cultural firmament, through its participation in television, the internet, exhibitions and most importantly, in the ways that it networked cultural leaders, artists, and other creative workers to produce culture together, speaks to the power of creative interventions at moments of industrial and social change. This is consistent with, but goes beyond the research of other scholars in the field about creative practices and the importance of access to media at such moments of change. The transition period and approaches that *ArtSpots* occupies are marked in the scholarly world and in the North American media industry – on one hand – by the shift away from the closed doors of art and media professionalism towards a more pessimistic view of the precarious exploitation of professional artists and media workers. On the other hand, the experience speaks to the more optimistic – and perhaps more nuanced – view of a co-creative produsage world that many in both the academic and industrial worlds praise and desire.

For erstwhile *ArtSpots* participants, recognizing their own achievements operationalized in industrial and creative terms within the original ten-year *ArtSpots* project, is significant. So is a growing understanding of the tenacity and strategic capability required to intervene creatively and sustainably in social and cultural discourses over such an extended period, on a national stage. My own optimism and that of my colleagues involved in producing programming and engaging with audiences (then and now), particularly with narrowcast culture sector audiences, was evident in recollections shared, discourses invoked and documentation reviewed. It was –

and still is – tempered, however, with deep understandings of the challenges and disappointments that actual resource, technology and scheduling limits engendered. Each year that passes brings new ways to engage with digital technology more robustly, as well as keen observations about concerns such as privacy and surveillance management, the limits of democratic engagement through social media, and the like. If I were to start this dissertation process now, I might build in a methodology that explicitly analyses discourses on social media about creative practices at the intersection of the arts and broadcasting. Given the specific demographics involved in such conversations, this might provide an additional narrowcast audience to engage and measure. However, “old” technology is sometimes the best. In this case, it would be interesting to develop more discussion groups, and to commission the artists, curators and producers already involved to develop their own chronologies. Fortunately, the end of this dissertation is not the end of the conversation, but the continuation of one. Hopefully, it is also one that generates illuminating insights and inspiring ambitions anew.

## Bibliography

- Adorno, Theodor W. and Max Horkheimer. 1944. "The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception." In *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*, 2002 edition, translated by Edmund Jephcott. Stanford: Stanford University Press. 94-106.
- Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities*. 2006 ed. London & New York: Verso.
- Anderson, Chris. 2006. *The Long Tail: Why the Future of Business is Selling Less of More*. New York: Hyperion.
- Andrew, Caroline, Monica Gattinger, M. Sharon Jeannotte, and Will Straw, eds. 2005. *Accounting for Culture: Thinking Through Cultural Citizenship*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Appadurai, Arjun. 1996. *Modernity at Large*. Eighth printing, 2008 ed. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Art Gallery of Nova Scotia. 2009. "Sobey Art Award Partners with Bravo!". Media release. [http://www.artgalleryofnovascotia.ca/en/AGNS\\_Halifax/AboutUs/agnews/news/sobeyawardpartnerswithbravo.aspx](http://www.artgalleryofnovascotia.ca/en/AGNS_Halifax/AboutUs/agnews/news/sobeyawardpartnerswithbravo.aspx)
- Art Gallery of Nova Scotia. 2011. "2011 Short List Announcement". Media release. <http://www.artgalleryofnovascotia.ca/en/sobeyartaward/news/2011shortlistannouncement.aspx>
- Art in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (Art21). 2012. *Collection (Seasons 1-6)*. [1440 minutes of television episodes; can also be purchased in separate seasons with companion books]. New York: Art21, Inc., and PBS. <http://www.shoppbs.org/family/index.jsp?categoryId=3842586&sr=1&origkw=art%2021>

- . 2013. *Access 100 artists*. [screening package]. New York: Art21, Inc., and PBS.  
<http://www.art21.org/100artists>
- Artist-Run Centres and Collectives Conference [ARCA] and Independent Media Arts Alliance [IMAA]. 2010, October. *Employment Standards in Artist-Run Centres and Independent Media Arts Centres*. Montreal: ARCA/IMAA.
- Bairstow, Ted. 2004. "Culture Online: From Virtual Museums to New Media." [powerpoint presentation]. Berlin: Archives and Museum Informatics Europe.  
[http://www.archimuse.com/publishing/ichim04/6789\\_Bairstow.pdf](http://www.archimuse.com/publishing/ichim04/6789_Bairstow.pdf) Ottawa: Canadian Culture Online Branch, Department of Canadian Heritage.
- Baltruschat, Doris. 2004. "Television and Canada's Aboriginal Communities: Seeking Opportunities through Traditional Storytelling and Digital Technologies." *Canadian Journal of Communication*, Vol.29:1. <http://www.cjc-online.ca/index.php/journal/article/view/1403/1495>
- Barnsley, Paul. 2004. "APTN still reeling from near-death experience." *Windspeaker* Vol.22:4, 9. Publisher: Aboriginal Multi-Media Society. <http://www.ammsa.com/>
- Bateman, K., and Karim, Karim. 2009. "Canadian Legislation, Regulations, and Guidelines on the Representation of Diversity". *Canadian Journal of Communication*, North America, 34, Dec. 2009. Available at: <http://www.cjc-online.ca/index.php/journal/article/view/2294/2124>
- Bazalgette, Peter. 2009, February. "Public service narrowcasting." *Prospect Magazine Issue 155*: 38-40. February. <http://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/>
- Becker, Howard S. 1982. *Art Worlds*. 25<sup>th</sup> Anniversary ed., 2008. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

- Beers, David. 2011, March 23. Canadian women in news still hit glass ceiling: study. [TheTyee.ca/Blogs/TheHook](http://TheTyee.ca/Blogs/TheHook).
- Beaumont, Hilary. 2011, March 3. "Full arts, can't lose." *The Coast*. Halifax. <http://www.thecoast.ca/>
- Bennett, James, and Niki Strange, eds. 2011. *Television as Digital Media*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Bennett, Tony. 1995. "The Multiplication of Culture's Unity." *Critical Inquiry*, 21(4): 861-889.
- . 2000, February. *Transversal Study of the Theme of Cultural Policy and Cultural Diversity*. Prepared for the Council of Europe's Study on Cultural Policy and Cultural Diversity.
- Bennett, Tony, Michael Emmison, and John Frow. 1999. *Accounting for Tastes: Australian Everyday Cultures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bercovici, Jeff. 2013. "Current TV Sold to Al Jazeera; \$500Million Deal for Al Gore." *Forbes Magazine Online*. January 2. <http://www.forbes.com/>
- Berger, John. 1972. *Ways of Seeing*. 1982 ed. London and Middlesex, UK: British Broadcasting Corporation and Penguin Books.
- Bociurkiw, Marusya. 2011. *Feeling Canadian – Television, Nationalism and Affect*. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press.
- Bolter, Jay David and Richard Grusin. 1999. *Remediation*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Bordieu, Pierre. 1983. "The Field of Cultural Production, Or: the Economic World Reversed." *Poetics* 12:311-356.
- Born, Georgina. 2004. *Uncertain Vision: Birt, Dyke and the Reinvention of the BBC*. London: Secker & Warburg.

- . 2010. “The Social and the Aesthetic: For a Post-Bourdieuian Theory of Cultural Production.” *Cultural Sociology* 4: 171-208. <http://online.sagepub.com/>
- boyd, danah. 2007. “Why Youth (Heart) Social Network Sites: The Role of Networked Publics in Teenage Social Life.” *MacArthur Foundation Series on Digital Learning – Youth, Identity and Digital Media Volume*, edited by David Buckingham. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- . 2014. *It’s Complicated: The Social Lives of Networked Teens*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press.
- Bradley, Dale. 2004. “The Divergent Anarcho-Utopian Discourse of the Open Source Software Movement.” *Canadian Journal of Communication* 30.4: 585-611. <http://www.cjc-online.ca/index.php/journal/article/view/1642/1781>
- Bruns, Axel. 2007. “Prodsusage: Towards a Broader Framework for User-Led Content Creation.” [conference paper]. In *Proceedings of Creativity and Cognition 6*. Washington, DC. <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/6623/1/6623.pdf>
- . 2008. *Blogs, Wikipedia, Second Life, and Beyond (Digital Formations)*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc.
- Burdick, Anne, Johanna Drucker, Peter Lunenfeld, Todd Presner, and Jeffrey Schnapp. 2012. *Digital Humanities*. Open access ed. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology. [https://mitpress.mit.edu/sites/default/files/titles/content/9780262018470\\_Open\\_Access\\_Edition.pdf](https://mitpress.mit.edu/sites/default/files/titles/content/9780262018470_Open_Access_Edition.pdf)
- Burgess, Marilyn and Maria De Rosa. 2011, November 15. *Recommended Employment Standards and Human Resource Management Tools in Canadian Artist-Run Media Arts Organizations*. Montreal: IMAA.

- Burstyn, Varda and Dorothy E. Smith. 1985. *Women, Class, Family and the State*, Toronto: Garamond Press.
- Butler, Connie, Amelia Jones and Maura Reilly. 2010. "Feminist Curating and the 'Return' of Feminist Art." In *The Feminism and Visual Culture Reader*, 2nd ed., edited by Amelia Jones, 31-43. New York and Abingdon: Routledge.
- CBC.ca. 2002. *ZeD* debuts. [http://www.cbc.ca/10th/timelineContent/20020420\\_zed.html](http://www.cbc.ca/10th/timelineContent/20020420_zed.html)
- CBC.ca/Archives. <http://www.cbc.ca/archives>. Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. *CBC.ca*.
- CBC.ca/ArtsCanada. <http://www.cbc.ca/artscanada>. Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. *CBC.ca*.
- CBC.ca/ArtSpots. <http://www.cbc.ca/ArtSpots>. Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. *CBC.ca*.
- CBC.ca/HalifaxExplosion. <http://www.cbc.ca/halifaxexplosion/>. Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. *CBC.ca*.
- CBC ArtSpots* Corporate Archives. 2008. CBC Halifax and CBC Toronto: Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.
- CBC Business Affairs. 2007. "Artwork License for *CBC ArtSpots*." Toronto: Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.
- CBC Television. 1999. "*ArtSpots* projected timeline by quarter (July '98 – Dec '01): production, impact research and program development, website, education, distribution (at 28 July 1999)." Halifax: *CBC ArtSpots* Corporate Archives.
- CBC Television. 2000. "*CBC ArtSpots* Information Package (at 3 March 2000)." Halifax: *CBC ArtSpots* Corporate Archives.
- Caldwell, John Thornton. 2008. *Production Culture: Industrial Reflexivity and Critical Practice in Film and Television*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

- . 2010. “Breaking Ranks: Backdoor Workforces, Messy Workflows and Craft Disaggregation.” *Popular Communication*, 8.3, 221-226. doi: 10.1080/15405702.2010.493425.
- . 2011. “Worker Blowback: User-Generated, Worker-Generated and Producer-Generated Content with Collapsing Production Workflows.” In *Television as Digital Media*. edited by James Bennett and Nikki Strange, 283-310. Durham & London: Duke University Press.
- Canada. 1991. Dept. of Justice. *Broadcasting Act S.C. 1991, c. 11*. Ottawa: Government of Canada, 1991 (current to January 12, 2010).
- Canada. 2012. *An Act to amend the Copyright Act. S.C. 2012 [Bill C-11]*. Ottawa: Government of Canada, 2012.
- Canada. 1984. *Equality Now!, Report of the Special Committee on Participation of Visible Minorities in Canadian Society*. Ottawa: House of Commons.
- Canada Council for the Arts. 1995, March. *A Design for the Future*. Ottawa: Canada Council for the Arts. <http://www.canadacouncil.ca/>
- Canada Council for the Arts. 2012, October 16. *Public Engagement in the Arts: Bringing the Arts to Life*. Ottawa: Canada Council for the Arts. <http://www.canadacouncil.ca/>
- Canada Council for the Arts. 2010. *Strengthening Connections: Strategic Plan 2011-2016*. Ottawa: Canada Council for the Arts. <http://www.canadacouncil.ca/>
- Canadian Association of Broadcasters. 2008, April 30. *2007-08 Report on Diversity in Broadcasting*. Ottawa: CAB.
- . 2010. *Diversity in Broadcasting*. Ottawa: CAB. <http://www.cab-acr.ca/english/social/diversity/default.shtm>.

- Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. 2008. "CBC/Radio-Canada 2008 Annual Employment Equity Report to Human Resources Skills Development Canada (Labour): Executive Summary." <http://www.cbc.radio-canada.ca/docs/equity/pdf/ee-exec2008e.pdf>. 2011.
- Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. 2010. "Canada's Aboriginal Population Tops Million Mark: StatsCan." *CBC News*, April 11. <http://www.cbc.ca/news/>
- Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. 2002. "Terms of Trade for Independent Producers." Toronto: Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. <http://www.cbc.ca/independentproducers/termsoftrade.pdf>
- Canadian Media Guild. 2006, 05 May. "In-house TV production suffers another blow at CBC." Toronto: CWA. <http://www.cwa-scacanada.ca/>
- Canadian Museum of History website. <http://www.historymuseum.ca/>
- Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission. 1999a. "Transcript of proceedings for the CRTC June 1, 1999: Public Renewal, CBC License Hearings." Ottawa: Government of Canada.
- Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission. 1999b, 16 July. *Ethnic Broadcasting Policy*. Broadcasting Public Notice CRTC 1999-117. Ottawa: Government of Canada.
- . 2013. 28 May. *Broadcasting Decision CRTC 2013-263 and Broadcasting Orders CRTC 2013-264 and 2013-265*. (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation – license renewals). Ottawa: Government of Canada. <http://www.crtc.gc.ca/eng/archive/2013/2013-263.htm>
- Canadian Unions for Equality on Screens. 2013. *Focus on Women 2013: A Report on gender (in)equality in the Canadian independent screen-based production industry*. Prepared by Dr. Amanda Coles. <http://www.actra.ca/actra/focus/>

- Chapman, Owen, and Kimberley Sawchuk. 2012. "Research-Creation: Intervention, Analysis and "Family Resemblances"." *Canadian Journal Of Communication*, 37(1). <http://www.cjc-online.ca/index.php/journal/article/view/2489>
- Chun, Wendy Hui Kyong. 2008. "The Enduring Ephemeral, or the Future Is a Memory." *Critical Inquiry* 35 (Autumn): 148–171. The University of Chicago. <http://www.jstor.org/>
- Chun, Wendy Hui Kyong, and Thomas W. Keenan, eds. 2006. *New Media, Old Media: A History and Theory Reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Conference Board of Canada. 2008, July. *Valuing Culture: Measuring and Understanding Canada's Creative Economy*. Ottawa, ON.
- Conference Board of Canada. 2010. *Cultural HR Study 2010: Labour Market Information Report for Canada's Culture Sector*. Ottawa: Conference Board of Canada.
- Cook, Terry. 2007. "Archives as Media of Communication." In *Essays: Archives as Medium. Old Messengers, New Media: The Legacy of Innis and McLuhan*. <http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/innis-mcluhan/030003-4040-e.html>
- Couldry, Nick. 2006. "Culture and Citizenship: the Missing Link?" *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 9.3 (2006): 321-339. *SAGE Online*.
- Creative Nova Scotia Leadership Council in partnership with the Nova Scotia Department of Communities, Culture and Heritage. 2012, 14 February. *Creative Economy Literature Review*. Halifax, NS: Government of Nova Scotia.
- Creative Nova Scotia Leadership Council. 2013. *Culture: Nova Scotia's Future: a CNSLC Report for the Minister of Communities, Culture and Heritage*. Co-authors: R Bourgeois, T Bulger, G Klass, ME Luka, J MacLellan, M McKeough, P Tibbo-Cameron. Halifax: CNSLC.

- Cunningham, Stuart. 2013. *Hidden Innovation: Policy, Industry and the Creative Sector*.  
Brisbane: The Queensland University Press.
- Curran, James, Natalie Fenton and Des Freedman. 2012. *Misunderstanding the Internet*. New  
York & Abingdon: Routledge.
- Cvetkovich, Ann. 2002. "In the Archives of Lesbian Feeling: Documentary and Popular  
Culture," *Camera Obscura* 49 Vol. 17.1: 107- 147.
- de Souza e Silva, Adriana and Jordan Frith. 2010. "Locative Mobile Social Networks: Mapping  
Communication and Location in Urban Spaces." *Mobilities*, 5(4), 485-505.  
<http://www.itu.dk/people/miko/ADRIANADESOUZAESILVAFINAL.pdf>
- Denzin Norman K. and Yvonna S. Lincoln, eds. 1994. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*.  
Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Dixon, Guy. 2006. "CBC to cut cutting-edge, late-night *ZeD* TV." *Globe & Mail*. May 6.  
<http://www.theglobeandmail.com>
- Dornfeld, Barry. 1998. *Producing Public Television, Producing Public Culture*. Princeton, NJ:  
Princeton University Press.
- Doyle, John. 2013. "Sexism spite and Kirstine Stewart's CBC legacy." *Globe & Mail*. May 1.  
<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/>
- Douglas, Pamela. 2007. *Writing the TV Drama Series*. Second Edition. Studio City, CA: Michael  
Wiese Productions, 2007.
- Druick, Zoë and Aspa Kotsopoulos, eds. 2008. *Programming Reality: Perspectives on English-  
Canadian Television*. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press.
- du Gay, Paul and Michael Pryke. 2002, reprinted 2006. *Cultural Economy*. London: SAGE  
Publications Inc.

- Eckerson, Wayne. 2011. "Big Data Analytics: Profiling the Use of Analytical Platforms in User Organizations." TechTarget/Beye Network and SAS. September.
- Elwes, Catherine. 2005. *Video Art, A Guided Tour*. London: I.B. Taurin.
- Fischer, Gerhard and Elisa Giaccardi. 2007. "Sustaining Social Creativity." *Communications of the ACM* Vol. 50.12: 28-29. EBSCO.
- Florida, Richard 2002a. *The Rise of the Creative Class and How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Florida, Richard. 2002b. "The Rise of the Creative Class: Why cities without gays and rock bands are losing the economic development race." *The Washington Monthly*. May.  
<http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/features/2001/0205.florida.html>
- Fraser, Nancy. 1990. "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy." *Social Text*, No. 25/26: 56-80. Duke University Press.  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/466240>.
- Frank, Anne, Ed. 1996. *Telling It: Writing for Film and Television in Canada*. Toronto, Doubleday Canada Limited.
- Friesen, Joe. 2010. "The changing face of Canada: booming minority populations by 2031." *Globe & Mail*. March 9. CTV Globemedia Inc. <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/>
- Gagnon, Monika Kin. 2000. *Other Conundrums: Race, Culture and Canadian Art*. Vancouver & Kamloops, B.C.: Arsenal Pulp Press, Artspeak Gallery and Kamloops Art Gallery.
- Gajjala, Radhika. 2009. "How Can Researchers Make Sense of the Issues Involved in Collecting and Interpreting Online and Offline Data: Response to Shani Orgad." In *Internet Inquiry: Conversations About Method*, edited by Annette M. Markham and Nancy K. Baym, 61-67. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Inc.

- . 2013. NMP #29. “Use/Use less: Affect, Labor and Non/materiality.” *No More Potlucks*, 29. <http://nomorepotlucks.org/site/useuse-less-affect-labor-and-nonmateriality-radhika-gajjala/>
- Galloway, Anne and Matthew Ward. 2006. “Locative Media as Socialising and Spatializing Practice: Learning from Archeology.” *Leonardo E-Journal Archive*, 14(3). [http://leoalmanac.org/journal/vol\\_14/lea\\_v14\\_n03-04/gallowayward.html](http://leoalmanac.org/journal/vol_14/lea_v14_n03-04/gallowayward.html)
- Gauntlett, David. 2011. *Making is Connecting: the Social Meaning of Creating, from DIY and Knitting to YouTube and Web 2.0*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1993. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. First published 1973. New York: Fontana Press.
- Geist, Michael, Ed. 2010. *From “Radical Extremism” to “Balanced Copyright”*: Canadian Copyright and the Digital Agenda. Toronto: Irwin Law.
- . 2013, Ed. *The Copyright Pentalogy: How the Supreme Court of Canada Shook the Foundations of Canadian Copyright Law*. Ottawa, ON: University of Ottawa Press.
- . 2014, April 4. “Digital Canada 150: The digital strategy without a strategy.” *The Toronto Star*. <http://www.thestar.com/>
- Gélinas, Michel-F. 2003, March. “ArtSpots: Une idée CBC, un projet. Une analyse. Un projet SRC.” Montreal: Société Radio-Canada.
- Gitelman, Lisa. 2008. *Always Already New: Media, History, and the Data of Culture*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Goggin, Gerard. 2008. “Regulating Mobile Content: Convergences and Citizenship.” *International Journal of Communications Law and Policy* 12: 140-160. [http://ijclp.net/files/ijclp\\_web-doc\\_7-12-2008.pdf](http://ijclp.net/files/ijclp_web-doc_7-12-2008.pdf)

- Gollmitzer, Mirjam and Catherine Murray. 2008. *From Economy to Ecology: A Policy Framework for Creative Labour*. Ottawa and Vancouver: Canadian Conference of the Arts and Simon Fraser University—Centre for Policy Studies in Culture and Communities.  
<http://ccarts.ca/wp-content/uploads/2009/01/CREATIVEECONOMYentiredocument.pdf>  
Google.com. <http://www.google.com>
- Grace, Sherrill E. 2001. *Canada and the Idea of North*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Graham, Beryl and Sarah Cook. 2010. *Rethinking Curating: Art after New Media*. Cambridge, MA & London, England: The MIT Press.
- Gray, Ann. 2003. *Research Practice for Cultural Studies*. 2009 reprint. Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore, Washington DC: Sage.
- Griffen Cohen, Marjorie. 1987. *Free Trade and the Future of Women's Work*. Ottawa: Garamond Press and the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.
- Habermas, Jurgen. 1989. *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society*. Translated by Thomas Burger with Frederick Lawrence. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Halifax Film Company and Salter Street Films International (production companies). 1992 – 2014. *This Hour Has 22 Minutes* [comedy television series]. Halifax. Aired on Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.
- Hall, Stuart. 1980. "Encoding/Decoding." In *Culture, Media, Language*, edited by Stuart Hall, Dorothy Hobson, Andrew Lowe and Paul Willis, 128-138. London: Hutchinson.
- Halleck, Dee Dee. 2002. *Hand-held Visions: The Impossible Possibilities of Community Media*. New York: Fordham University Press.

- Hartley, John, ed. 2009a. *Creative Industries*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Hartley, John. 2009b. "Uses of YouTube: Digital Literacy and the Growth of Knowledge." In *YouTube*, edited by Jean Burgess and Joshua Green, 126-143. Cambridge UK & Malden MA, USA: Polity Press.
- Havens, Timothy, Amanda D. Lotz and Serra Tinic. 2009. "Critical Media Industry Studies: A Research Approach." *Communication, Culture & Critique* 2: 234-253. DOI: 10.1111/j.1753-9137.2009.01037.x.
- Hay, James and Nick Couldry. 2011. "Rethinking Convergence/Culture." *Cultural Studies* 25 (4-5): 473-486. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09502386.2011.600527>
- Hermes, Joke. 2005. *Re-reading Popular Culture*. Malden, Oxford & Victoria: Blackwell Publishing.
- Hermus Greg, Joseph Haimowitz, David Redekop, and Tony Fisher with assistance from Alison Howard (Campbell), P. Derek Hughes and Douglas Watt, for the Cultural Human Resources Council. 2010. *Cultural HR Study 2010: Labour Market Information Report for Canada's Cultural Sector*. Ottawa: Conference Board of Canada.
- Hesmondhalgh, David. 2007. *The Cultural Industries*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. London, UK: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Hesmondhalgh, David and Sarah Baker. 2008. "Creative Work and Emotional Labour in the Television Industry." *Theory, Culture & Society* 25.7-8: 97-118. <http://tcs.sagepub.com/>
- Hill Strategies Research Inc. 2004. "A Statistical Profile of Artists in Canada." *Statistical Insights on the Arts*. Vol. 3:1. November. [www.hillstrategies.com](http://www.hillstrategies.com).
- . 2010. "Mapping Artists and Cultural Workers in Canada's Largest Cities." February 9. [www.hillstrategies.com](http://www.hillstrategies.com).

- . 2012. “Arts and Culture in Nova Scotia: Stats and Gaps for Arts Nova Scotia, Creative Nova Scotia Leadership Council and NS Department of Communities, Culture & Heritage.” [PowerPoint presentation]. October 26. Ottawa: Hill Strategies.
- Hine, Christine, ed. 2005. *Virtual Methods: Issues in Social Research on the Internet*. 2010 reprint. New York: Berg.
- Hirsch, B.D., ed. 2012. *Digital Humanities Pedagogy: Practices, Principles and Politics*. United Kingdom and United States: Open Book Publishers.
- HistoricaCanada.ca. <https://www.historicacanada.ca/>
- Hogan, Mélanie. 2012. “Crashing the Archive: A Research-Creation Intervention into the SAW Video Mediatheque.” PhD Thesis, Concordia University.
- Hogan, Mél and Luka, Mary Elizabeth. 2013. “Archiving *ArtSpots* with Mary Elizabeth Luka.” *No More Potlucks*, 25. <http://nomorepotlucks.org/site/archiving-ArtSpots-with-mary-elizabeth-luka-mel-hogan/>
- International Women’s Media Foundation. 2011. *Global Report on the Status of Women in the News Media*. Written by Carolyn M. Byerly, PhD, Principal Investigator. Washington: IWMF. <http://www.iwmf.org/our-research/global-report/>
- Internet Archive Wayback Machine. <http://web.archive.org>
- Jeannotte, Sharon and Alain Pineau, eds. 2013, February. *Flat-lined but still alive: Analyses of the Provincial and Territorial Budgets from the Perspective of Arts, Culture and Heritage*. Ottawa: Canadian Conference of the Arts and Centre on Governance, University of Ottawa. <http://socialsciences.uottawa.ca/>
- Jenkins, Henry. 2004. “The Cultural Logic of Media Convergence.” *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 7.1: 33-43. <http://ics.sagepub.com/>

- . 2006. *Fans, Bloggers and Gamers: Exploring Participatory Culture*. New York: New York University Press.
- Jenkins, Henry, Sam Ford, and Joshua Green. 2013. *Spreadable Media: Creating Value and Meaning in a Networked Culture (Postmillennial Pop)*. New York: New York University Press.
- Jennings, Sarah. 2009. *Art and Politics: The History of the National Arts Centre*. Toronto: Dundurn Press.
- Jones, Amelia. ed. 2008. *The Feminism and Visual Culture Reader*, 2nd edition. New York and Abingdon: Routledge.
- Jones, Amelia. 2005. "Seeing Differently: From Antonioni's Blow Up (1966) to Shezad Dawood's Make It Big." *Journal of Visual Culture*, Vol. 7 (2008). 181-203. *SAGE Publications*. DOI:10.1177/1470412908091937
- Kuhn, Virginia and Vicki Callahan. 2012. "Nomadic Archives: Remix and the Drift to Praxis." In *Digital Humanities Pedagogy: Practices, Principles and Politics*, edited by B.D. Hirsch, 291-308. United Kingdom and United States: Open Book Publishers.
- Lacroix, Hubert. 2013. "Creative partnerships are CBC's new norm." *The Globe and Mail*. November 28.
- Langlois, Ganaele, Greg Elmer, Fenwick McKelvey and Zachary Devereaux. 2009. "Networked Publics: The Double Articulation of Code and Politics on Facebook." *Canadian Journal of Communications* Vol. 34: 415-434. <http://www.cjc-online.ca/index.php/journal/article/view/2114>
- Lee, Benjamin, and Edward LiPuma. 2002. "Cultures of Circulation: The Imaginations of Modernity." *Public Culture* 14(1), 191-213.

- Lefebvre, Henri. 2004. *Rhythmanalysis: space, time and everyday life*. First published 1992. London: Continuum.
- Lemos, Andre. 2010. "Post–Mass Media Functions, Locative Media, and Informational Territories: New Ways of Thinking About Territory, Place, and Mobility in Contemporary Society." *Space and Culture* 13(4) 403–420. doi: 10.1177/1206331210374144.
- Levin, Gail. 2007. "Art Meets Politics: How Judy Chicago's Dinner Party Came to Brooklyn." *Dissent Magazine*, Spring. Accessed September 3, 2012. <http://www.dissentmagazine.org/>
- Lind, Rebecca Ann, ed. 2012. *Producing Theory in a Digital World*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.
- Lovink, Geert. N.d. "Interview with Wolfgang Ernst: Archive Rumbblings." <http://laudanum.net/geert/files/1060043851/>.
- Luka, Mary Elizabeth (producer/director). 2002. *Footprints on the Pier* (3 x 30-minute documentary episodes). Halifax: CBC Television, DVD.
- (producer/director). 2002. *Making the Ordinary Extraordinary* [documentary]. Halifax: CBC Television.
- . 2004. "CBC ArtSpots: Arts, Television, New Media. *ArtsNetlantic Conference Proceedings*. Charlottetown: University of Prince Edward Island, University of Moncton, University of New Brunswick, Confederation Centre for the Arts & Canadian Culture Online.
- . 2012a. "Media production in flux: Crowdfunding to the rescue." *WI Journal of Mobile Media*, Vol. 6, No. 3. <http://wi.mobilities.ca/media-production-in-flux-crowdfunding-to-the-rescue/>
- . 2012b. *Canadian Dance Assembly National Training Subsidy Program Research Report*:

- Towards an Action Plan*. Toronto: Canadian Dance Assembly.
- . 2013. Mapping *CBC ArtSpots* (2013). In *Diverse Spaces: Examining Identity, Heritage and Community within Canadian Public Culture*, edited by Susan Ashley, 124-147. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Lunenfeld, Peter, Todd Presner, Jeffrey Schnapp, and commentators on the Commentpress blog. 2009. "Digital Humanities Manifesto 2.0." May 29. Los Angeles: University of California. <http://manifesto.humanities.ucla.edu/2009/05/29/the-digital-humanities-manifesto-20/>
- Mackey, Eva. 1999. *The House of Difference: Cultural Politics and National Identity in Canada*. 2002 edition. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- MacLeod, Roderick and Eric John Abrahamson. 2010. *Spirited Commitment: The Samuel and Saidye Bronfman Family Foundation, 1952-2007*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Marcus, George E. 1998. *Ethnography Through Thick and Thin*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Markham, Annette M. and Nancy K. Baym, eds. 2009. *Internet Inquiry: Conversations About Method*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Inc.
- Martin, Catherine. 2008. "The Little Boy Who Lived with Muini'skw (Bear Woman)." In *Aboriginal Oral Traditions: Theory, Practice, Ethics*, edited by Renée Hulan and Renate Eigenbrod, 53-59. Halifax: Fernwood Publications.
- Mas, Susana. 2013. "Calgary floods push Conservative convention to the fall." *CBC News*. June 22. <http://www.cbc.ca/news/>
- Mayer, Vicki 2011. *Below the Line: Producers and Production Studies in the New Television Economy*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

- McChesney, Robert W. and Schiller, D. 2003. "The Political Economy of International Communications: Foundations for the Emerging Global Debate about Media Ownership and Regulation." New York: United Nations Research Institute for Social Development.  
<http://www.robertmcchesney.com/articles.html>
- McKay, Niall. 2005. "Gore's TV Seeks Northern Insights." *Wired News*. April 14.  
<http://mediafactory.tv/niall.org/wp-content/uploads/2006/04/WiredGores.pdf>
- McRobbie, Angela. 1998. *British fashion design: rag trade or image industry?* London: Routledge.
- . 1999. *In the Culture Society: Art, Fashion and Popular Music*. London and New York: Routledge.
- . 2002. Clubs to companies: notes on the decline of political culture in speeded-up creative worlds. *Cultural Studies*, 16(4), 516-531.
- . 2012. "A Good Job Well Done: Richard Sennett and the Politics of Creative Labour." In *Futures of Modernity Challenges for Cosmopolitical Thought and Practice*, edited by Michael Heinlein, Cordula Kropp, Judith Neumer, Angelika Pofert and Regina Römhild, 155-177. Germany: Transcript Verlag Bielefeld.
- Mendelsohn, Alan (director). 2003. *City of Ruins: The Halifax Explosion*. Written by Alan Mendelsohn and Sally Reardon. Toronto: CBC Television.
- Middleton, Catherine A. 2009. "Can Broadband Support Environmental Sustainability? An Exploration of Claims at the Household Level." *Telecommunications Journal of Australia*, 59:1. 10.01-10.14. <https://www.academia.edu>
- . 2011. "From Canada 2.0 to a Digital Nation: The Challenge of Creating a Digital Society in Canada." In *The Internet Tree: The State of Telecom Policy in Canada 3.0.*, edited by

- Marita Moll and Leslie Regan Shade, 3-13. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.
- Miller, Toby. 1998. *Technologies of Truth: Cultural Citizenship and the Popular Media*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- . 2007. *Cultural Citizenship: Cosmopolitanism, Consumerism, and Television in a Neoliberal Age*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Moffat, Ellen and Kim Morgan. 2012. *Place Markers: Mapping Locations and Probing Boundaries* [art installation]. Curated by Peter Dykhuis. Halifax, NS: Dalhousie University.
- Moll, Marita. 2011. “Fibre Not Satellite for Local Economic Development.” In *The Internet Tree: The State of Telecom Policy in Canada 3.0.*, edited by Marita Moll and Leslie Regan Shade, 137-141. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.
- Moll, Marita and Leslie Shade. 2011. *The Internet Tree: The State of Telecom Policy in Canada 3.0*. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.
- Muir, Paddy. 1999. *Love from Katie*. Illustrations by Kathy R. Kaulbach. Halifax: Nimbus Publishing.
- Murray, Catherine. 2002. “Silent on the Set: Cultural Diversity and Race in English Canadian TV Drama: A Study Directed by Dr. Catherine Murray.” August. Hull: Strategic Research and Analysis, Strategic Policy and Research, Department of Canadian Heritage.  
[http://www.sfu.ca/media-lab/research/culturaldiversity/sra-587.pdf\\_1.pdf](http://www.sfu.ca/media-lab/research/culturaldiversity/sra-587.pdf_1.pdf).
- . 2005. Cultural Participation: A Fuzzy Cultural Policy Paradigm. In *Accounting for Culture: Thinking Through Cultural Citizenship*, edited by Caroline Andrew, Monica Gattinger, M. Sharon Jeannotte and Will Straw, 32-54. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.

- . 2009. “Designing Monitoring to Promote Cultural Diversity in TV.” *Canadian Journal of Communications*. 34: 675-699. <http://www.cjc-online.ca/index.php/journal/article/viewFile/2125/2149>
- National Film Board of Canada. 2013a. *2013-2018 Strategic Plan*. Montreal. <http://onf-nfb.gc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/2013-2018NFBStrategicPlanMay30.pdf>
- . 2013b. “Tom Perlmutter announces that he is stepping down as NFB Chair.” December 10. Montreal. <http://onf-nfb.gc.ca/en/press-room/press-releases-media-kits/?idpres=21109>
- National Governors’ Association. 2012. *New Engines of Growth: Five Roles for Arts, Culture and Design*. Ed. Nancy Geltman. NGA Center for Best Practices: Washington, DC.
- Neff, Gina. 2005. “The Changing Place of Cultural Production: The Location of Social Networks in a Digital Media Industry.” *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 597:134-152. doi: 10.1177/0002716204270505.
- Negus, Keith. 2002. “The Work of Cultural Intermediaries and the Enduring Distance Between Production and Consumption.” *Cultural Studies* 16.4: 501-515. Routledge. doi: 10.1080/09502380210139089.
- . 2006. “Rethinking Creative Production away from the Cultural Industries.” In *Media and Cultural Theory*, edited by James Curran and David Morley, 197-208. London & New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Neilson, Brett and Ned Rossiter. 2008. “Precarity as a Political Concept, or, Fordism as Exception.” *Theory, Culture & Society*, 25(7-8), 51-72.
- Onyx, Jenny and Jennie Small. 2001. “Memory-Work: The Method.” *Qualitative Inquiry* Vol. 7.6: 773-786. doi: 10.1177/107780040100700608.

- Phillips, Sarah. 2007, July 25. "A brief history of Facebook." *The Guardian*.  
<http://www.theguardian.com/>
- Pink, Sarah. 2001. *Doing Visual Ethnography*. Second Edition, 2007. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Pittman, Bruce (director). 2003. *Shattered City: The Halifax Explosion* [TV movie]. 2003.  
Written by Keith Ross Leckie. Toronto: Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.
- Pochmursky, Christina (director). N.d. *NFB Pioneers: Challenge for Change*. National Film Board of Canada, Doc Channel and Corus.
- Posner, Michael. 2011. "Will Kirstine Stewart Save the CBC." *Globe & Mail*. July 29.  
<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/will-kirstine-stewart-save-the-cbc/article588900/>
- Powell, Alison. 2008. "Co-productions of technology, culture and policy in North America's community wireless networking movement." PhD dissertation. Concordia University.
- Professional Development Institute. 2013. Women in Business 2013: Real Women. Real Leaders. (Speakers). [http://pdi-cma.com/cmp/wib\\_speakers.html](http://pdi-cma.com/cmp/wib_speakers.html)
- Punch, Maurice. 1994. "Politics and Ethics in Qualitative Research." In *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, 83-97. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Raboy, Marc, and Jeremy Shtern, eds, with William J. McIver, Laura J. Murray, Seán Ó Siochrú, and Leslie Regan Shade. 2010. *Media Divides: Communication Rights and the Right to Communicate in Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Radway, Janice. 1984. *Reading the Romance: Women, Patriarchy and Popular Literature*. North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press.

- Robertson, Clive. 2006. *Policy Matters: Administrations of Art and Culture*. Toronto: YYZ Books.
- Rockwell, Geoffrey, Garry Wong, Stan Ruecker, Megan Meredith-Lobay, and Stéfan Sinclair. 2010. "The Big See: Large Scale Visualization." *Journal of the Chicago Colloquium on Digital Humanities and Computer Science (JDHCS)*, Vol. 1.2.
- Roth, Lorna. 2005. *Something New in the Air*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- . 2008. "Snapshots and Dialogues: Canadian Ethnic Television Broadcasting and Social Cohesion." In *New Citizens. New Policies? Developments in Diversity Policy in Canada and Flanders*, edited by Leen d'Haenens, Marc Hooghe, Dirk Vanheule, and Hasibe Gezduci, 171-199. Gent: Academia Press.
- Rowland, Wade. 2013. "Wade Rowland: A better model for the CBC." *National Post*. June 17. <http://fullcomment.nationalpost.com>
- Rushkoff, Douglas. 2003. *Open Source Democracy: How online communication is changing offline politics*. London: Demos.
- . 2013. *Present Shock: When Everything Happens Now*. New York: Penguin Group.
- Sassen, Saskia. 2006. "Public Interventions: The Shifting Meaning of the Urban Condition." *Open 11: Hybrid Space - How Wireless Media Mobilize Public Space*, 18-26. Skor Foundation. [http://www.skor.nl/\\_files/Files/OPEN11\\_P18-26.pdf](http://www.skor.nl/_files/Files/OPEN11_P18-26.pdf)
- Sawchuk, Kim. 2007. "Materiality, Memory Machines and the Archive as Media." In *Essays: Archives as Medium. Old Messengers, New Media: The Legacy of Innis and McLuhan*. <http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/innis-mcluhan/030003-4050-e.html>
- Scassa, Teresa. 2005. "Interests in the Balance." In *In the Public Interest: The Future of*

- Canadian Copyright Law*, edited by Michael Geist, 41-65. Toronto: Irwin Law, 2005.
- Sennet, Richard. 2008. *The Craftsman*. London, UK: Allen Publishers.
- Sensemaker™. <http://www.sensemaker-suite.com/>
- Shade, Leslie Regan. 2010. "Access." In *Media Divides: Communication Rights and the Right to Communicate in Canada*. Eds. Marc Raboy, and Jeremy Shtern, with William J. McIver, Laura J. Murray, Seán Ó Siochrú, and Leslie Regan Shade, pp. 120-144. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Sherbert, Garry, Annie Gérin and Sheila Petty, eds. 2006. *Canadian Cultural Poesis: Essays on Canadian Culture*. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press.
- Shohat, Ella, and Robert Stam. 1994. *Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the Media*. 2006 printing. London and New York: Routledge.
- Slack, Jennifer Daryl and J. McGregor Wise. 2005. *Culture + Technology – A Primer*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Smith, Charles, ed. 2012. *Pluralism in the Arts in Canada: A Change is Gonna Come*. Ottawa: Our Schools/Our Selves and RR Donnelley.
- Spigel, Lynn. 2008. *TV by Design: Modern Art and the Rise of Network Television*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Statistics Canada. 2001. *Visible Minorities in Canada*. Ottawa: Minister of Industry.  
<http://www.statcan.gc.ca/> and [http://www.ocol-clo.gc.ca/html/visible\\_e.php](http://www.ocol-clo.gc.ca/html/visible_e.php)
- . 2005. *Women in Canada, Fifth Edition: A Gender-based Statistical Report*. Ottawa: Minister of Industry. <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-503-x/89-503-x2005001-eng.pdf>
- . 2010. *Women in Canada, Sixth Edition: A Gender-based Statistical Report*. Ottawa: Minister of Industry. <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-503-x/89-503-x2010001-eng.htm>

- Stevens, Garry. 1998. *The Favored Circle: The Social Foundations of Architectural Distinction*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Strange, Niki. 2011. "Multiplatforming Public Service: The BBC's "Bundled Project"." In *Television as Digital Media*, edited by James Bennett and Niki Strange, 132-157. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Street Cents* [youth television series]. 1989-2006. Halifax: CBC Television (production company and broadcaster).
- Sundara Rajan, Mira T. 2010. "Culture Matters: Why Canada's Proposed Amendments to its Copyright Law Should Revisit Moral Rights." In *From "Radical Extremism" to "Balanced Copyright": Canadian Copyright and the Digital Agenda*, edited by Michael Geist, 476-499. Toronto: Irwin Law.
- Tapscott, Don. 2006. *Grown up Digital: How the Net Generation is Changing your World*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Tapscott, Don, and Anthony D. Williams. 2008. *Wikinomics: How Mass Collaboration Changes Everything*. New York: Portfolio.
- Taylor, Charles. 2004. *Modern Social Imaginaries*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Taylor, Kate. 2013. "How Tom Perlmutter turned the NFB into global new-media player." *The Globe and Mail*. May 18. <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/arts/film/how-tom-perlmutter-turned-the-nfb-into-a-global-new-media-player/article11992885/?page=all>
- Theodore Tugboat* [children's television series]. 1993-2000. Halifax and Sydney, NS: Cochran Entertainment Inc. Aired on Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.
- Thompson, Marie (producer/director). 2003. *Legacy: The Halifax Explosion*. Drama and artwork segments produced and directed by Mary Elizabeth Luka. Halifax: CBC Television.

- Throsby, David. 2008. "Globalization and the Cultural Economy: A Crisis of Value?" In *The Cultural Economy*, edited by Helmut K. Anheier, Yudhishtir Raj Isar, Annie Paul (Associate Editor), Stuart Cunningham (Guest Editor), 29-41. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi and Singapore: SAGE Publications Ltd/Inc.
- . 2012. "Why should economists be interested in cultural policy?" *Economic Record*, 88 (Special Issue, June): 106-109. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-4932.2012.00808.x.
- Todd, Bridget. 2013. "Women won't be Equal to Men in the Media until 2085, Study Finds." *Polycymic.com*. March 7. <http://www.polycymic.com/articles/28873/women-won-t-be-equal-to-men-in-the-media-until-2085-study-finds>
- Turner, Graeme. 2011. "Convergence and Divergence: The International Experience of Digital Television." In *Television as Digital Media*, edited by James Bennett and Niki Strange, 31-51. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Uricchio, William. 2004. "Beyond the Great Divide: Collaborative Networks and the Challenge to the Dominant Conceptions of Creative Industries." *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 7.1: 79-90. <http://ics.sagepub.com/>
- Valaskakis, Gail Guthrie. 2004. "Telling Our Own Stories: The Role, Development and Future of Aboriginal Communications." In *Aboriginal Education: Fulfilling the Promise*. Eds. Castellano, Marlene Brant, Lynne Davis and Louise Lahache, 76-96. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- van Dijck, José. 2013. *The Culture of Connectivity: A Critical History of Social Media*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- van Zoonen, Liesbet. 2004, August. "Popular Qualities in Broadcasting." *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 7.3: 275-282. *SAGE online*.

- . 2005. *Entertaining the Citizen: When Politics and Popular Culture Converge*. Lanham, MD: Rowan & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- . 2006. “The Personal, the Political and the Popular: a Woman's Guide to Celebrity Politics.” *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 9.3: 287-301. *SAGE online*.
- Varga, Darrell, ed. 2009. *Rain, Drizzle, Fog: Film and Television in Atlantic Canada*. Calgary: University of Calgary Press.
- Walsh, Tony. 2002, April. “Do I Want my ZeD TV? CBC Attempts “Open Source” Television.” *Exclaim*. [http://exclaim.ca/Features/Net/do\\_i\\_want\\_my\\_zed\\_tv-cbc\\_attempts\\_open\\_source](http://exclaim.ca/Features/Net/do_i_want_my_zed_tv-cbc_attempts_open_source)
- Wang, Tricia. 2013. “Big Data Needs Thick Data.” *Ethnography Matters* [blog]. May 13. <http://ethnographymatters.net/2013/05/13/big-data-needs-thick-data/>
- Waugh, Thomas, Michael Brendan Baker, and Ezra Winton, eds. 2010. *Challenge for Change: Activist Documentary at the National Film Board of Canada*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Weick, Karl E. 1995. *Sensemaking in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, California, USA and London, UK: SAGE Publications Inc.
- Whitehead, Ruth. 1992. *Six Mi'kmaq Stories*. Halifax: Nimbus Publishing.
- Whitelaw, Anne. 2006. “Placing Aboriginal Art at the National Gallery of Canada.” *Canadian Journal of Communication*, Vol. 31, 197-214. <http://www.cjc-online.ca/index.php/journal/article/viewFile/1775/1898>
- Wiley, Stephen B. Crofts, Daniel M. Sutko and Tabita Moreno Becerra. 2010. “Assembling Social Space.” *The Communication Review*, 13(4), 340-372. doi: 10.1080/10714421.2010.525482.
- Wilken, 2010. “A Community of Strangers? Mobile Media, Art, Tactility and Urban Encounters

with the Other.” *Mobilities* 5.4: 449-468. *SAGE online*.

Williams, Joan, Shelagh Luka, Mary Elizabeth Luka, Greg Inwood and Nancy Bell. 1991. *Go For It! Barriers to Women’s Promotion in Education*. Toronto: Federation of Women Teachers’ Associations of Ontario.

Williams, Raymond. 1977. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilson, Pamela. 2009. “Stalking the Wild Evidence: Capturing Media History Through Elusive and Ephemeral Archives.” In *Convergence Media History*, edited by Janet Staiger and Sabine Hake, 183-191. New York: Routledge.

Women in View. *Women in View on TV 2013*. [annual report]. [http://www.womeninview.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/Women-in-View-on-screen\\_web-1.pdf](http://www.womeninview.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/Women-in-View-on-screen_web-1.pdf)

Woolf, Janet. 1990. *Feminine Sentences: Essays on Women and Culture*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.

World Bank. 2009. *2009 World Development Indicators*. [annual report]. Washington: The World Bank.

World Bank. 2010. *2010 World Development Indicators*. [annual report]. Washington: The World Bank.

Yin, Robert K. 2009. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. 4<sup>th</sup> Revised Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

YouTube.com. N.d. <http://www.youtube.com/>.

*ZeD*. 2002-2006. [Television series and website]. Vancouver: CBC Television - Vancouver.

### *Interviews and discussion groups*

Discussion group 1: *ArtSpots* artist participants, (Gerard Choy, Frances Dorsey, Ursula Johnson, Mary Elizabeth Luka, Gary Markle) February 28, 2012.

Discussion group 2: *ArtSpots* Advisory Group participants (Sandra Alfoldy, Ray Cronin, Peter Dykhuis, Sarah Fillmore, Johanne Gallant, Mary Elizabeth Luka), March 26, 2012

Discussion group 3: NSCAD University Media Arts class (David Albert, Andrew Classen, Ajay Datt, Stuart Johnston, Léola Leblanc (instructor/locative media artist), Jeremy MacDonald, Fillisha Morris). April 3, 2012.

Personal interview with Jere Brooks, Fashion Designer and former CBC Web Developer and New Media “Pod” Manager, February 4, 2012.

Personal interview with Karina Garcia Casanova, former Producer, *CBC ArtSpots*, February 12, 2012.

Personal interview with Alan Elder, Curator, Canadian Crafts and Design, Ethnology and Cultural Studies Division, Canadian Museum of Civilization (now Canadian Museum of History), April 19, 2012.

Personal interview with Johanne Gallant, former Associate Producer, Web Content Manager and *ArtSpots* Producer, *CBC ArtSpots*, March 21, 2010.

Personal interview with Jennifer Gillivan, President, IWK Foundation, and former Director, Partnerships, Communications, Brand & Promotion, CBC English Services, March 19, 2012.

Personal interview with John Goldsmith, retired Director of Stakeholder Relations, The Canada Council for the Arts, September 7, 2012.

Personal interview with John Hobday, former President, Samuel and Saidye Bronfman Family Foundation and former Director, The Canada Council for the Arts, June 19, 2012.

Personal interview with Russell Kelly, retired Head of Music, The Canada Council for the Arts, April 18, 2012.

Personal interview with M.E. Luka, founder and former executive producer, *CBC ArtSpots*,  
(conducted by Jacqueline Wallace), February 13, 2012.

Personal interviews with M.E. Luka, Founder and former Executive Producer, *CBC ArtSpots*,  
(conducted by Emma Frank), June 23 (not recorded), August 29 (not recorded) and  
December 14 (audio recorded), 2011.

Personal interview with Fred Mattocks, General Manager, Media Operations and Technology,  
CBC English Media Services, February 7, 2012.

Personal interview with Kim Morgan, Artist and Professor, NSCAD University and former  
*ArtSpots* artist, March 22, 2012.

Personal interview with Nancy Rosenfeld, President, Claudine and Stephen Bronfman Family  
Foundation, May 29, 2012.

Personal interview with Cheryl Sim, Curator, DHC Foundation and former *ArtSpots* Advisory  
Group member, March 11, 2010.

Personal interview with Cynthia White-Thornley, Director-General, Arts Policy Branch,  
Department of Canadian Heritage, April 18, 2012.

## Appendices

### *Appendix One: Tape Lists*

This appendix contains three separate lists generated by CBC Halifax at the conclusion of *ArtSpots*' production in 2008. The first is the contents list as posted on the thirty-one boxes in the formal *CBC ArtSpots* archive now residing in Toronto ("ArtSpots Packed Boxes for Transfer at May 27, 2008.") The second list is a copy of the Excel spreadsheet "Master List of ArtSpots Tape Dubs 10 March 2008.xls," which enumerates chronologically the contents of the sixty-five masters of edited material produced during *ArtSpots*' production phases (1998-2008), one copy of which is in the formal archive and another which is in the CBC Halifax tape library. I have a copy of this collection on DVD. The third list, "*Master List of ArtSpots Field Tapes 22 May 2008.xls*," specifies the contents of the consolidated field tapes in the formal *CBC ArtSpots* archive that were duplicated during the archiving process and which now also exist as a copy in the CBC Halifax tape library. The tapes are in alphabetical order by artist (approximately). I do not have a copy of this collection.

#### *ArtSpots Packed Boxes for Transfer at May 27, 2008*

##### Box #1; FIELD TAPES

GERALD BEAULIEU, JENNIFER BELANGER, LOIS BETTERIDGE-ETHERINGTON, PAUL BOURGUE, SHIRLEY BROWN, STEPHEN BRONFMAN, MAUD BUSSIERES, DOROTHY CALDWELL, ERIC CAMERON, LEVI CANNON, DAVID CANTINE, KARIN CANTINE, BARB FLEMINGTON

##### BOX #2: FIELD TAPES

MICHEL DE BROIN, KARIN BUBAS, ISLA BURNS, KAI CHAN, JANICE WRIGHT-CHENEY, MONIQUE CLICHE-SPENARD, WALTER DEXTER, NANCY EDELL, CAL LANE

BOX #3: FIELD TAPES

BGL, RICK BURNS, MIMI CABRI, BONNIE CHAPMAN/ HEATHER CLINE, CHRYSTAL CLEMENTS, GERARD COLLINS, ALAN ELDER, PETER FLEMING, DEE FONTANS, MICHAEL FORTUNE, LEOPOLD FOULEM, GARDINER MUSEUM

BOX #4: FIELD TAPES

LYNDAL OSBORNE, STEPHEN BRONFMAN, 1960'S CMC VIDEOS, URSULA JOHNSON, MICHELINE BEAUCHEMIN, GREAT NORTHERN ARTS FESTIVAL 2004

BOX #5: FIELD TAPES

LUCIE CHAN, JANET DAVIS, DEL ZOPPO, PETER DRYSDALE, WILLIAM EAKIN, ERIK EDSON, JERRY EVANS, DEANNE FITZPATRICK, AUDREY FELTHAM, PAUL FENNIK, MICHAEL HOSALUK

BOX #6: FIELD TAPES

ROBIN SMITH PECK, MANON DE PAUW, WALTER OSTROM, MARLA HLADY, JURG HOFER, PETER DYKHUIS, DOUCET SAITO, NAOKO FURUE, COLLEEN CURSCHALL, TONIA DI RISIO, CHALRES DOUCETTE, SARAH CRAWLEY

BOX #7: FIELD TAPES

DEMPSEY & MILAN, SANDRA DENNIS, DAN CRICHTON, HARLAN HOUSE, PAUL FREEMAN, ERIQUE FERREOL, ALEXANDRA FLOOD, MARK GIBEAU, ROBIN HOPPER, MARCEL MAROIS, ONE-OF-A-KIND 2005, PERCY PIEROWAY

BOX #8: FIELD TAPES

CAROLINE GOULD/MARGARET PELLETIER, DIANE LANDRY. GRIT LASKIN, GARY MARKLE, SUSAN LOW BEER, MIKE MASSIE, AGANETHA DYCK, MICHAELLE JEAN, SUSAN WARNER KEENE, WILL GILL, SHAWN CUNNINGHAM, ELIZA GRIFFITHS, ANDREAS GUIBERT

BOX #9: FIELD TAPES

JOHN LITTLE #1, JOHN LITTLE #2 (INCL. GRANELLI), CLAUDE LATOUR, TOM MCFALL, TERESA MARSHALL, DAWN MCNUTT, SARAH MACMILLAN, DIVYA MEHRA, ALEX JANVIER, SHIE KASAI, MARLENE CREATES, ALAN LACOVETSKY, WANDA KOOP

BOX # 10: FIELD TAPES

SOBEY 2004, JOANNE STANISZKIS, DEAN SMALE, JENNIFER STILLWELL, MARK SOO, ANN SMITH/JURG HOFER, NELSON SURRETTE, REVA STONE, CAROLE SABISTAN, JON SAWYER, TANYA SEHN, JUDITH SCHERER, RANDY SIMON, KEVIN SCHMIDT, ZEQRJA REXHEPI, GARMEL RICH

BOX #11: FIELD TAPES

YVON GALLANT, HELENE GALLANT, CANDY GALLANT, FRIEDER HERMANN, FRANCOIS GAUDET, LOUISE GENEST, JEAN-PIERRE GAUTHIER, ELIZABETH

GOLUCH, DAVID HOFFOS, JOANNE HUI, MONETTA JAMES, HAL JONES, GARRY NEILL KENNEDY, GORDON KENNEDY

BOX #12: *FIELD TAPES*

MAGGIE MILLER, KIM MORGAN, WAYNE NGAN, RON NOGANOSH, SHAWN O'HAGAN, KATIE OHE, PETER POWNING, MICHELE PROVOST, STEVE RELTON, LESLIE REID, SYLVIA RIDGWAY, PAUL ROBLES, FRED ROSS, ERICA RUTHERFORD

BOX # 13: *FIELD TAPES*

CARL ZIMMERMAN, COLLEEN WOLSTENHOLME, JEFFERY THOMAS, REECE TERRIS, ANNIE THIBEAULT, MITCHEL WEIBE, MICHAEL WILCOX, WWKA, JOHN TERRIAK, TWO-SIX COLLECTIVE, WAYNE BOUCHER, GRANT BOLAND, DINAH ANDERSON, JUSTIN AUGUSTINE, MICHELLE BAIKIE, WILLIAM ANHANG

BOX # 14: *FIELD TAPES*

GMTL: PAT GRATTON , KEVIN MAJOR, BOOK, BARRY, TARA BRYAN, ANN MARCEAU, DANIELL, AGNL, MONTAGUE, HMHH QUILT CONFERENCE, MASTER LOGO 2001, DESIGN ELEMENTS, ARTSPLOTCH, DVD PROMO ROUGH CUT, PROPOSED FRONT PLATE, *ARTSPOTS* 2002 PACKAGING ELEMENTS, NS ADVISORY GROUP MEETING FEB 2/08, *ARTSPOTS* ON-LINE EDITOR TAPE, NSDCC DOC MAR 4/08, NEOCRAFT CONFERENCE

BOX # 15: *FIELD TAPES*

SUZANNE HILL, GAYLE HERMICK, JIM THOMPSON, STEVEN HEINEMANN, MASSIMO GUERRERO, NADIA MYRE, RICHARD MUELLER, RAPHAELLA DE GROOT, TIM CUSAK, BRIGITTE CLAVETTE, CHRIS CRAN, GERARD CHOY, DENISE COMEAU, TANYA DAVIS, ROSALYNN IULIUCCI, NELSON HENRICKS

Box # 16: field tapes

SOBEY AWARD 2002, PAT BATES, LINDA BARTLETT, KC ADAMS, LOUISE BERUBE, NORTHERN ARTS FESTIVAL 2006; PITSEOLAK, PAPATSIE, MALLICKI, MI'KMAQ STORYTELLING DOC; STORYTELLING, PETER CHRISTMAS, MARSHALL, CATHY MARTIN, SYLIBOY, DENNY, AUG 21/03, MISEL JOE, KEN MARTIN

Box # 17: field tapes

OTIS TOMAS, JORDAN VAN SEWELL, SUZANNE SWANNIE, MAURICE SAVOIE, JOHN REICHERT, JESSE ROBICHAUD, LIBBY WEIR, ALAN SYLIBOY, LEONARD PAUL, CHRIS & CARL PHILLIS

**BOX 18**

Adams, KC  
Akpata, John  
Anderson, Dinah  
Anhang, Bill (William)  
Augustine, Justin  
Barry, Anne Meredith  
Bartlett, Linda  
Bates, Pat Leclair  
Bear, Ned  
Beauchemin, Michiline  
Beaulieu, Gerald  
Belanger, Jennifer  
Berube, Louise Lemieux  
Berntson, Steph  
Betteridge, Lois  
Etherington  
Beuys, Joseph  
BGL  
Boland, Grant  
Bolt, Ron  
Boucher, Wayne  
Bourque, Paul  
Boyle, Gwen  
Michel de Broin  
Brown, Shirley

Burden, John  
Burns, Isla  
Burns, Rick  
Bussieres, Maud  
Cabri, Mimi  
Caldwell, Dorothy  
Cameron, Eric  
Cannon, Levi  
Cantine, David  
Cantine, Karen  
Carpenter, Brad  
Chan, Kai  
Chan, Lucie  
Chapman, Bonnie  
Cheney, Janice Wright  
Choy, Gerard  
Clark, David  
Clark, Lee  
Clarette, Brigitte  
Clements, Crystal  
Cliché-Spenard, Monique  
Comeau, Denise  
Cline, Heather  
Cole, Nancy & Perry, John

Collins, Gerard  
Corkery, Bridgit  
Cox, John & Christine  
Trainor  
Cran, Chris  
Crawley, Sarah  
Creates, Marlene

**BOX 19**

Crichton, Daniel  
Cunningham, Shawn  
Cusack, Tim  
Cutschall, Colleen  
Dabinett, Diana  
D'Agostino, Elizabeth  
Davis, Janet  
Davis, Tanya  
Dawda, Derek  
Day, Cecil  
DeGroot, Raphaelle  
Del Zoppo, Edna  
Dempsey, Shawna  
Dennis, Sandra  
DeSantis, Solange  
Deveau, June  
Dexter, Walter  
Dhaliwal, Sarindar  
DiRisio, Tonia  
Diviney, David  
Doucet-Saito (Louise  
Doucet & Satoshi Saito)  
Doucette, Charles  
Drysdale, Peter

Dunphy, Gordon  
Dyke, Aganetha  
Dykhuis, Peter  
Eakin, William  
Edell, Nancy  
Edson, Erik  
Elliot, Charles W.  
Evans, Jerry  
Feldham, Audrey  
Fenniak, Paul  
Ferguson, Gerald  
Ferreol, Enrique  
Fitzpatrick, Deanne  
Fleming, Peter  
Fleminton, Barb  
Flood, Alexandra  
Fontans, Dee  
Fortune, Michael  
Foulem, Leopold  
Freeman, Paul  
Furue, Naoko  
Gallant, Candy  
Gallant, Helene  
Gallant, Yvon

Gaudet, Francois  
Gauthier, Jean-Pierre  
Gayton, Alison  
Genest, Louise  
Gibeau, Mark  
Gill, Will  
Gilot, Stéphane  
Goluch, Elizabeth  
Gould, Caroline  
Gough, Peter  
Grace, Michael  
Granelli, Gerry  
Grant, Shauntay  
Gregory, Helen  
Greyeyes, Audrey  
Griffiths, Eliza  
Guerrera, Massimo  
Guibert, Andreas  
Harnett, Tanya  
Haufschild, Lutz  
Hazzard, Dorothy  
Heinemann, Steven  
Helfand, Fern  
Henricks, Nelson

**BOX 20**

Hermann, Frieder  
Hermick, Gayle  
Hill, Suzanne  
Hlady, Marla  
Hofer, Jurg  
Hoffos, David  
Hopper, Robin  
Hosaluk, Michael  
Houle, Terrance J.  
House, Harlan  
Hui, Joanne  
Hunt, Barbara  
Luluicci, Rosalynn  
James, Monetta  
Janvier, Alex  
Johnson, Ursula  
Juliussen, Svana  
Jungen, Brian  
Kasai, Shie  
Kaspales, Farouk  
Keene, Susan Warner  
Kelley, Brian  
Kelly, John  
Kennedy, Garry Neill  
Kennedy, Gordon  
Komst, Sandi  
Koop, Wanda  
Lacovestsky, Alan  
Landry, Diane

Lane, Cal  
Laskin, Grit (William)  
Latour, Claude  
Lawrence, Donald  
Little, John  
Low Beer, Susan  
Lynch, Colleen  
MacDonald, Rita  
Lamontagne  
MacKenzie, John  
MacMillan, Sarah  
MacNutt, Dawn  
Markle, Gary  
Marois, Marcel  
Marshall, Teresa  
Massie, Michael D.  
Mathieu, Paul  
McCoy, Virginia  
Mehra, Divya  
Meigs, Sandra  
Merkosak, Billy  
Metcalf, Robin  
Michener, Sally  
Millan, Lori  
Miller, Maggie  
Mona, Chris  
Morgan, Kim  
Morrish, David  
Mueller, Richard  
Musiol, Marie-Jeanne

Myre, Nadia  
Nasogaluak, Bill  
Nasogaluak, Eli  
Nasogaluak, Joe  
Ngan, Wayne  
Noganosh, Ron  
Oberholtzer, Beth  
Ohe, Katie  
Okano, Haruko  
Okheena, Mary  
Osborne, Lyndal  
Ostrom, Walter  
Parolin, Maria Anna  
Paul, Leonard  
de Pauw, Manon  
Peck, Robin Smith  
Pelletier, Margaret  
Pethick, Jerry  
Phillis, Christopher & Carl

**BOX 21**

Pieroway, Percy  
Pouliot, Yannick  
Powning, Peter  
Pratt, Barbara  
Provost, Michele  
Qayutinnuaq, Paul  
Ragus, Amy  
Reichert, John  
Reid, Bill  
Reid, Leslie  
Relton, Steve  
Rexhepi, Zeqrja  
Rewakowicz, Ana  
Rickert, Wesley  
Ridgway, Sylvia  
Ritchie, William Brent  
Robichaud, Jesse  
Robles, Paul  
Roe, Nigel G.  
Rorick, Isabel  
Rutherford, Erica  
Sabiston, Carole  
Sabourin, John

Savoie, Maurice  
Sawyer, Jon  
Scherer, Judith & Brian  
Burke  
Simon, Randy  
Simpson, Scott  
St. John, Isabella  
Smale, Dean  
Smith, Ann  
Smith, Joe  
Smith, Ted  
Staniszkis, Joanna  
Stillwell, Jennifer  
Stone, Reva  
Surrette, Nelson  
Swannie, Suzanne  
Squires, Gerry  
Swartz Bromberg,  
Selma  
Syliboy, Alan  
Takashima, Yoko  
Takenouchi, Naoko  
Terriak, John  
Terris, Reece  
Thibault, Annie

Thomas, Jeff  
Thomson, Jim  
Tomas, Otis  
Trainor, Christine  
Two-Six  
Van Delft, Femke  
Van Sewell, Jordon  
Wallace, Denise Cedar  
Waterman, Megan

BOX #22: LEGAL DOCUMENTS (***NEEDS LABEL***)  
ARTIST WAIVERS & LICENSES (A-Z BY ARTIST)  
*ARTSPOTS* COPYRIGHT DOCUMENTS  
*ARTSPOTS* ONLINE “HOW TO” WAIVERS  
HAND MADE HAND HELD DOC/WAIVERS/LICENSES  
MAKING OF THE BOY WHO VISITED MUINISKW-WAIVERS  
“USE OF” WAIVERS/NFP & EDUCATIONAL USE

BOX #23: DIGIBETA MASTER TAPES #1 TO #16

BOX #24: DIGIBETA MASTER TAPES #17 TO #32

BOX #25: DIGIBETA MASTER TAPES #33 TO #48

BOX #26: DIGIBETA MASTER TAPES #49 TO #64

BOX #27: DIGIBETA MASTER TAPES #65 TO #71  
DVD MASTERS #67a TO #71  
CUE SHEETS for all MASTER TAPES

BOX #28: DVD MASTERS #1-66

*BOX #29: PROJECT FILES (NEEDS LIST OF CONTENTS)*

*BOX #30: PRODUCTION FILES INCLUDING ADVISORY GROUPS & ARTIST LISTS  
(ALBERTA, BC, ....)*

- Alberta Production
- *ArtSpots* Production—BC
- Nova Scotia—Artist Suggestions
- Nova Scotia—Production Advisory Group & Artist Lists
- Ontario
- Prince Edward Island
- Quebec Advisory Group & Correspondence
- Quebec Artists Lists & Suggestions
- Saskatchewan Production
- North
- Manitoba
- New Brunswick
- Newfoundland and Labrador

*BOX #31: PRODUCTION FILES CONT'D ... PLUS WEBSITE PRINTOUT*

WEBSITE PRINTOUT AND EXTERNAL HARD DRIVE

- 1000+ COLOUR PAGES FROM THE EXISTING WEBSITE APRIL 2008
- EXTERNAL HARD DRIVE WITH EXISTING WEBSITE, ADDITIONAL FLV VERSIONS & DATABASE, PLUS WORD FILES OF WRAP DOCUMENTS AND OTHER B/G INFORMATION

Master List of ArtSpots Tape Dubs 10 March 2008.xls

----- MASTER LIST OF ARTSPOTS TAPE DUBS 10March2008 .xls

ARTSPOTS

MASTER SET

MASTER SET DUB

<b>1 NS 1998 - 16 x 30 Cycle I</b>		<b>NS 1998 - 16 x 30 Cycle I</b>
Unpackaged		Unpackaged
Packaged	30717-S	Packaged
Upack/Mixed	37107-S	Mixed
<b>2 NS 1999 - 18 x 30 Cycle II</b>		<b>NS 1999 - 18 x 30 Cycle II</b>
Unpackaged	5243D, YelDot 65, 5316-D	Unpackaged
Packaged	30719-S	Packaged
Upack/Mixed	37108-S	Mixed
<b>3 NB 1999 Artspots - Cycle III</b>	23 x :30	<b>NB 1999 Artspots - Cycle III</b>
Unpk'd	30194M / 30195M	Unpackaged
Pack'd	30726-S	Packaged
Upack/Mixed	37109-S	Mixed
<b>4 1999 PEI Artspots</b>		<b>1999 PEI Artspots</b>
Unpack'd	30072-S	Unpack'd
Pack'd	30723-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	37110-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>5 2000 NB &amp; PEI Artspots</b>	19 x 30	<b>2000 NB &amp; PEI Artspots</b>
Unpk'd	30568-S	Unpackaged
Pack'd	30730-S	Packaged
Upack/Mixed	37111-S	Mixed
<b>6 NS 2000-01 30 x :30</b>		<b>NS 2000-01 30 x :30</b>
Unpack'd	7096-D	Unpack'd
Pack'd	30547-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	37112-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>7 BC 2000-01 ARTSPOTS 49 X 00:30</b>		<b>BC 2000-01 ARTSPOTS 49 X 00</b>
Unpack'd	6870-S	Unpack'd
Pack'd	66026-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	66447-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>8 NS 2000-01 30 x :30</b>		<b>NS 2000-01 30 x :30</b>
Unpack'd	7096-D	Unpack'd
Pack'd	30547-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	37112-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>9 2001 Bronfman Artspots - 25 Artists</b>		<b>2001 Bronfman Artspots - 25 Ar</b>
Unpack'd	30695-S	Unpack'd
Pack'd	30698-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	66479-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>10 2001-02 NF Artspots</b>		<b>2001-02 NF Artspots</b>
Unpack'd	36041-S	Unpack'd
Pack'd	30742-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	37137-S	Upack/Mixed

----- MASTER LIST OF ARTSPOTS TAPE DUBS 10March2008 .xls

<b>11 June 2006 Artist Profiles</b>		<b>June 2006 Artist Profiles</b>
Unpack'd	66444-S	Unpackaged
Pack'd	66445-S	Packaged
Upack/Mixed	37117-S	Mixed
<b>12 2006 June ARTSPOTS 15 x :30</b>		<b>2006 June ARTSPOTS 15 x :30</b>
Unpack'd	66443-S	Unpack'd
Pack'd	66442-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	37118-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>13 March 2006 NF Artist Profiles</b>		<b>March 2006 NF Artist Profiles</b>
Unpack'd	37006-S	Unpack'd
Pack'd	37005-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	37119-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>14 May 2006 Artspots MB, Calg, Montreal 30x:30</b>		<b>May 2006 Artspots MB, Calg, Montreal 30x:30</b>
Unpack'd	36994-S	Unpack'd
Pack'd	36993-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	37120-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>15 May 2006 Artist Profiles</b>		<b>May 2006 Artist Profiles</b>
Unpack'd	36996-S	Unpack'd
Pack'd	36995-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	37121-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>16 2005 Alberta Artspots 18 x :30</b>		<b>2005 Alberta Artspots 18 x :30</b>
Unpack'd	36902-S	Unpack'd
Pack'd	36901-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	37124-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>17 Summer 2005 NS 5 x 0:30</b>		<b>Summer 2005 NS 5 x 0:30</b>
Unpack'd	36874-S	Unpack'd
Pack'd	36873-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	37113-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>18 2005 North Artspots 6 x :30</b>		<b>2005 North Artspots 6 x :30</b>
Unpack'd	36870-S	Unpack'd
Pack'd	36869-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	37122-S	Upack/Mixed
* DO NOT USE Hofer or SMITH from tape # 36870-S		
<b>19 2005 Spring ARTSPOTS 17 x 0:30</b>		<b>2005 Spring ARTSPOTS 17 x 0:30</b>
Unpack'd	36781-S	Unpack'd
Pack'd	36876-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	37125-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>20 March 2006 NS ARTSPOTS 10 x 0:30</b>		<b>March 2006 NS ARTSPOTS 10 x 0:30</b>
Unpack'd	36990-S	Unpack'd
Pack'd	36989-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	37126-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>21 2006 Sept Artspots</b>		<b>2006 Sept Artspots</b>
Unpack'd	36782-S	Unpack'd
Pack'd	36746-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	37123-S	Upack/Mixed

----- MASTER LIST OF ARTSPOTS TAPE DUBS 10March2008 .xls

<b>22 2006 Feb NL Artspots</b>		<b>2006 Feb NL Artspots</b>
Unpack'd	37003-S	Unpack'd
Pack'd	37004-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	37114-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>23 2006 Feb NS &amp; MB Artspots</b>		<b>2006 Feb NS &amp; MB Artspots</b>
Unpack'd	37008-S	Unpack'd
Pack'd	37007-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed		Upack/Mixed
<b>24 2004 Autumn Artspots</b>		<b>2004 Autumn Artspots</b>
Unpack'd	66339-S (DO NOT Use Savoie)	Unpack'd
Pack'd	66338-S (DO NOT Use Savoie)	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	37128-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>25 2004 April AB Artspots</b>		<b>2004 April AB Artspots</b>
Unpack'd	36549-S	Unpack'd
Pack'd	36547-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	37129-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>26 2006 Dec MB Artspots &amp; Profiles</b>		<b>2006 Dec MB Artspots &amp; Profile:</b>
Unpack'd	37101-S	Unpack'd
Pack'd	37100-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	37127-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>27 2006 Sept MB &amp; AB Artspots</b>		<b>2006 Sept MB &amp; AB Artspots</b>
Unpack'd	37105-S	Unpack'd
Pack'd	37104-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	37116-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>28 2004 April Artspots</b>		<b>2004 April Artspots</b>
Unpack'd	36478-S	Unpack'd
Pack'd	36479-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	37130-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>29 2003 April ARTSPOTS</b>		<b>2003 April ARTSPOTS</b>
Unpack'd	36232-S	Unpack'd
Pack'd	36234-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	37131-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>30 Jan-Mar 2003 Artspots - Chan, Genest</b>		<b>Jan-Mar 2003 Artspots - Chan, C</b>
Unpack'd	36199-S	Unpack'd
Pack'd	36183-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	37132-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>31 2003 May PEI Artspots</b>		<b>2003 May PEI Artspots</b>
Unpack'd	36202-S	Unpack'd
Pack'd	36236-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	37133-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>32 2003 Oct-Nov Artspots</b>		<b>2003 Oct-Nov Artspots</b>
Unpack'd	36481-S	Unpack'd
Pack'd	36483-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	37134-S	Upack/Mixed

----- MASTER LIST OF ARTSPOTS TAPE DUBS 10March2008 .xls

<b>33</b>	<b>2003 August Artspots</b>		<b>2003 August Artspots</b>
	Unpack'd	36456-S	Unpack'd
	Pack'd	37102-S	Pack'd
	Upack/Mixed	37135-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>34</b>	<b>Oct 2002 North, NB, BC</b>		<b>Oct 2002 North, NB, BC</b>
	Unpack'd	36157-S	Unpack'd
	Pack'd	36155-S	Pack'd
	Upack/Mixed	37136-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>35</b>	<b>December 2003 ARTSPOTS</b>		<b>December 2003 ARTSPOTS</b>
	Unpack'd	66247-S	Unpack'd
	Pack'd	66248-S	Pack'd
	Upack/Mixed	66474-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>36</b>	<b>Summer 2002 PEI ARTSPOTS</b>		<b>Summer 2002 PEI ARTSPOTS</b>
	Unpack'd	36018-S	Unpack'd
	Pack'd	36016-S	Pack'd
	Upack/Mixed	37138-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>37</b>	<b>2002 July Bronfman</b>		<b>2002 July Bronfman</b>
	Unpack'd	66096-S	Unpack'd
	Pack'd	66099-S	Pack'd
	Upack/Mixed	66475-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>38</b>	<b>May 2004 Artist Profiles</b>		<b>May 2004 Artist Profiles</b>
	Unpack'd	66260-S	Unpack'd
	Pack'd	66258-S	Pack'd
	Upack/Mixed	66476-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>39</b>	<b>2002 Ottawa Artspots</b>	Griffiths & Noganosh	<b>2002 Ottawa Artspots - Griffiths</b>
	Unpack'd	36186-D	Unpack'd
	Pack'd	30734-S	Pack'd
	Upack/Mixed	37146-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>40</b>	<b>2002 BC &amp; Ottawa Artspots</b>		<b>2002 BC &amp; Ottawa Artspots</b>
	Unpack'd	37189-S	Unpack'd
	Pack'd	36030-s	Pack'd
	Upack/Mixed	37144-S	Upack/Mixed
	(only Ottawa artists – no unpackaged video avail for BC artists )		
<b>41</b>	<b>Dec 2003 Artist Profiles</b>		<b>Dec 2003 Artist Profiles</b>
	Unpack'd	36495-S	Unpack'd
	Pack'd	36496-S	Pack'd
	Upack/Mixed	37141-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>42</b>	<b>Jan 2004 Artist Profiles</b>		<b>Jan 2004 Artist Profiles</b>
	Unpack'd	36468-S	Unpack'd
	Pack'd	36470-S	Pack'd
	Upack/Mixed	37139-S	Upack/Mixed

----- MASTER LIST OF ARTSPOTS TAPE DUBS 10March2008 .xls

<b>43</b>	<b>May 2004 Artist Profiles</b>		<b>May 2004 Artist Profiles</b>
	Unpack'd	66307-S	Unpack'd
	Pack'd	66309-S	Pack'd
	Upack/Mixed	37142-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>44</b>	<b>June 2004 Artist Profiles</b>		<b>June 2004 Artist Profiles</b>
	Unpack'd	66310-S	Unpack'd
	Pack'd	66311-S	Pack'd
	Upack/Mixed	37143-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>45</b>	<b>April 2004 Artist Profiles</b>		<b>April 2004 Artist Profiles</b>
	Unpack'd	66257-S	Unpack'd
	Pack'd	66255-S	Pack'd
	Upack/Mixed	66478-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>46</b>	<b>April 23, 2004 Artist Profiles</b>		<b>April 23, 2004 Artist Profiles</b>
	Unpack'd	66254-S	Unpack'd
	Pack'd	66252-S	Pack'd
	Upack/Mixed	37140-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>47</b>	<b>June 2004 French Profiles</b>		<b>April 23, 2004 Artist Profiles</b>
	Unpack'd	36738-S	Unpack'd
	Pack'd	36739-S	Pack'd
	Upack/Mixed	37145-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>48</b>	<b>Spring 2005 Artist Profiles</b>		<b>Spring 2005 Artist Profiles</b>
	Unpack'd	36780-S	Unpack'd
	Pack'd	36875-S	Pack'd
	Upack/Mixed	37125-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>49</b>	<b>2006 Feb NS &amp; MB Profiles</b>		<b>2006 Feb NS &amp; MB Profiles</b>
	Unpack'd	37010-S	Unpack'd
	Pack'd	37009-S	Pack'd
	Upack/Mixed	37194-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>50</b>	<b>2005 July North Artist Profiles</b>		<b>2006 Feb NS &amp; MB Profiles</b>
	Unpack'd	36868-S	Unpack'd
	Pack'd	36867-S	Pack'd
	Upack/Mixed	37200-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>51</b>	<b>2005 April AB Artist Profiles</b>		<b>2005 April AB Artist Profiles</b>
	Unpack'd	36904-S	Unpack'd
	Pack'd	36903-S	Pack'd
	Upack/Mixed	37199-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>52</b>	<b>2006 MB &amp; AB Artist Profiles</b>		<b>2006 MB &amp; AB Artist Profiles</b>
	Unpack'd	37074-S	Unpack'd
	Pack'd	37103-S	Pack'd
	Upack/Mixed	37116-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>53</b>	<b>2004 April NS Artist</b>		<b>2004 April NS Artist</b>
	Unpack'd	36992-S	Unpack'd
	Pack'd	36991-s	Pack'd
	Upack/Mixed	37198-S	Upack/Mixed

----- MASTER LIST OF ARTSPOTS TAPE DUBS 10March2008 .xls

<b>54 Artist Profiles Tape 3</b>		<b>Artist Profiles Tape 3</b>
Unpack'd	N/A	Unpack'd
Pack'd	66198-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	66532-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>55 Artist Profiles Tape 4</b>		<b>Artist Profiles Tape 4</b>
Unpack'd	N/A	Unpack'd
Pack'd	66199-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	66533-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>56 Artist Profiles Tape 5</b>		<b>Artist Profiles Tape 5</b>
Unpack'd	N/A	Unpack'd
Pack'd	66200-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	66534-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>57 Artist Profiles Tape 2</b>		<b>Artist Profiles Tape 2</b>
Unpack'd	N/A	Unpack'd
Pack'd	66197-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	37201-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>58 2005 Artist Profiles</b>		<b>2005 Artist Profiles</b>
Unpack'd	36776-S	Unpack'd
Pack'd	36775-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	NOT COMPLETE	Upack/Mixed
<b>59 2007 NL Artspots</b>		<b>2007 NL Artspots</b>
Unpack'd	66527-S	Unpack'd
Pack'd	66528-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	66529-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>60 2007 Montreal</b>		<b>2007 Montreal</b>
Unpack'd	37186-S	Unpack'd
Pack'd	37106-S	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	37196-S	Upack/Mixed
<b>61 2007 Manitoba</b>		
Unpack'd	TBD	Unpack'd
Pack'd	TBD	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	TBD	Upack/Mixed
<b>62 2008 Final Reel - MB(3), ON(2), QC(4), BC(4), NS(1)</b>		
Unpack'd	TBD	Unpack'd
Pack'd	TBD	Pack'd
Upack/Mixed	TBD	Upack/Mixed
<b>63 Hand Made, Hand Held</b>	66461-S	<b>Hand Made, Hand Held</b>
<b>64 Gros Morne Time Lines</b>	36732-S	<b>Gros Morne Time Lines</b>
<b>65 Making Ordinary Extraordinary</b>	66121-S	<b>Making Ordinary Extraordinary</b>
<b>66 Boy Who Visited Muini'skw - The Making of</b>	36723-S	<b>Boy Who Visited Muini'skw - The Making of</b>

----- MASTER LIST OF ARTSPOTS TAPE DUBS 10March2008 .xls

<b>67</b>	<b>Artspots Compilation Reel</b>	Tape 1 66523-S	<b>Artspots Compilation Reel</b>
	<b>Artspots Compilation Reel</b>	Tape 2 66524-S	<b>Artspots Compilation Reel</b>
<b>68</b>	<b>Artspots Aboriginal Reel</b>	ME's office	<b>Artspots Aboriginal Reel</b>
<b>69</b>	<b>Artspots Craft Reel</b>	ME's office	<b>Artspots Craft Reel</b>
<b>70</b>	<b>Pier - Visual</b>	Tape # ?	<b>Pier - Visual</b>

Master List of ArtSpots Field Tapes 22 May 2008.xls

----- MASTER LIST OF ARTSPOTS FIELD TAPES 22 May 2008.xls

ARTSPOTS

MASTER SET - ORIGINAL FIELD TAPES

# of field tapes/lengths

FIELD TAPE BOX NUMBER

	1960s archive video for CMC 2005	2x32 sx	4
<b>A</b>	Adams, KC	dupe of consolidated tapes done	16
	Andersen, Dinah	dupe of consolidated tapes done	13
	Anhang, William	dupe of consolidated tapes done	13
	Artspots Advisory Group Feb 2008	3x62 (no dupe required)	14
	Artspots demos & packaging	2x32, 1x60, 1x22, 1x5, 1xDVD	14
	Augustine, Justin	dupe of consolidated tapes done	13
<b>B</b>	Baikie, Michelle	dupe of consolidated tapes done	13
	Barry, Ann (also see GMTL)	5x32 sx	14
	Bartlett, Linda	dupe of consolidated tapes done	16
	Bates, Pat	dupe of consolidated tapes done	16
	Beauchemin, Micheline	3x62sx,2x32sx (fits 3 hrs)	4
	Beaulieu, Gerald	4x20 sp	1
	Belanger, Jennifer	3x32 sx	1
	Berube, Louise	dupe of consolidated tapes done	16
	Betteridge-Etherington, Lois	2x32 sx	1
	BGL	2x62 sx	3
	Boland, Grant	dupe of consolidated tapes done	13
	Boucher, Wayne	dupe of consolidated tapes done	13
	Bourque, Paul Edouard	3x20 sp	1
	de Broin, Michel	2x62,2x32,DVD images (fit 3hrs)	2
	Brown, Shirley (see Flemington)	2x62sx,1x32sx partials	1
	Bronfman, Stephen (INVU)	2x 32 sx	1
	Bronfman Award-25th anniv ceremony	3x32 SX, partials	4
	Bryan, Tara (see also GMTL)	5x32 sx	14
	Bubas, Karin	3x32 SX, partials	2
	Burns, Isla	4x62, likely fits 3 hrs	2
	Burns, Rick	2x30 sp	3
	Bussieres, Maude	2x62sx,1x32sx	1
<b>C</b>	Cabri, Mimi	2 x 32 SX	3
	Caldwell, Dorothy	4x32 sx	1
	Cameron, Eric	1x62,2x32 sx partials	1
	Cannon, Levi	4x20 sp	1
	Cantine, David	2x62 sx	1
	Cantine, Karen	3x62 sx	1
	Chan, Kai (Artspots+HMHH)	7x32sx,1x62sx (likely fits 3 hrs)	2
	Chan, Lucie (w DelZoppo)	3x32 sx	5
	Chapman, Heather (see Cline)	3x32 sx	3
	Cheney, Janice Wright	2x32 sx,4x22 sx	2
	Choy, Gerard	5x32 sx, partials	15
	Clavette, Brigitte	3x20 sp	15
	Clements, Chrystal	2x20 sp	3
	Cliche-Spenard, Monique	3x32 sx,1x22 sx, partials. Note there is	2
	Cline, Heather (see Chapman)	2x32 sx	3



----- MASTER LIST OF ARTSPOTS FIELD TAPES 22 May 2008.xls

	Great Northern Arts Festival 2004	see various artists-GNAF 2004	4
	Goluch, Elizabeth	3x32 sx	11
	Gould, Caroline (see Pelletier)	see Pelletier tapes	8
	Griffiths, Eliza	3x32 sx	8
	de Groot, Raphaelle	2x62 sx	15
	Gros Morne Time Lines invus/art	check number of tapes	14
	Guerrera, Massimo	2x62 sx	15
	Guibert, Andreas	4x20 sp	8
<b>H</b>	Heinemann, Steven	3x32 SX, but #3 shared w who?	15
	Henricks, Nelson	1x62 sx	15
	Hermann, Frieder	5x32 sx	11
	Hermick, Gayle (see Thomson)	2x32 SX partials, 1x10 sp, 1x20 sp	15
	Hill, Suzanne	3x32 sx	15
	Hlady, Marla	3x32 sx	6
	Hofer, Jurg	3x 32 sx	6 \ 10
	Hoffos, David	3x32 sx	11
	Hopper, Robin	3x62 sx	7
	Hosaluk, Michael	5x32 sx	5
	House, Harlan (see Crichton)	3x32 SX, one is partial w Crichton	7
	Hoy, Dale-Tickleberry Foods	see One-of-a-Kind Nov 2005	7
	Hui, Joanne	3x62 sx	11
<b>I</b>	Ialiucci, Rosalyn (poet 2005)	1x32 sx	15
<b>J</b>	James, Monetta	1x32 sx	11
	Janvier, Alex	5x60 sx	9
	Jean, Michaele (DOC INTRO ONLY)	3x30 sx, partials (fits 1 hr)	8
	Johnson, Ursula	7x32 sx, partials-fits 3 hrs	4
	Jones, Hal (INVU-HMHH)w McFall	2x32 sx	11
<b>K</b>	Kasai, Shie (wKeene,Laskin)	1x62 sx	9
	Keene, Susan Warner (w Kasai,Laskin)	2x32 sx	8
	Kennedy, Gary Neill (Pier 21 or Legacy?)	3x32 sx plus dvd (partials?)	11
	Kennedy, Gordon	3x32 sx	11
	Kitai, Momo Tomoko-Momo clothes	see One-of-a-Kind Nov 2005-2	7
	Kluger, Jennifer-Foxy Originals jewelry	see One-of-a-Kind Nov 2005-3	7
	Koop, Wanda	3x62 sx	9
<b>L</b>	Lacovetsky, Alan	3x 62 sx	9
	Lamothe, Daniel Pierre(body tiles)	See One-of-a-Kind Nov 2005	7
	Landry, Diane	2x62 sx	8
	Lane, Cal	6x32 SX, partials (fits2.5 hrs)	2
	Laskin, Grit (w Kasai,Keene)	2x32 sx	8
	Latour, Claude	2 x 32 SX	9
	Little, John (incl Granelli)	8x32 sx, partials, fits 3 hrs	9
	Low Beer, Susan	3x32 sx	8
<b>M</b>	MacMillan, Sarah (see Swannie, Markle,MacNutt)	2x20 sp, one partial w Swannie	9
	MacNutt, Dawn (see MacMillan, Markle)	3 x 20 sp	9
	Major, Kevin (see GMTL) & book	3 x 32 sx	14
	Making Of The Boy Who Visited Muini'skw-inv	16x32, 2x62	16
	Malliki, Paul	5 x 62 partials	16
	Maniapik, Noah	1 x 62 partial	16
	Marceau, Anne (INVU-see GMTL)	2 x 32 sx	14
	Markle, Gary	2x20 sp	8
	Marois, Marcel	6x32 sx, partials, 1x32 digibeta, fits3 hrs	7
	Marshall, Theresa	2x32 sx	9

----- MASTER LIST OF ARTSPOTS FIELD TAPES 22 May 2008.xls

	Martin, Stacey-Kania Clothing	See One-of-a-Kind Nov 2005	7
	Massie, Mike	1x62 sx	8
	McFall, Tom (INVU-HMHH)	3x32 sx	9
	McLaughlin, Theresa-Coco candles	See One-of-a-Kind Nov 2005-2	7
	Mehra, Divya	1x62 sx	9
	Merkosak, Billy	See the North, GNAF 2004	4
	Miller, Marjorie	3x32 sx	12
	Montague, Shirley (INVU-see GMTL)	1 x 32 sx	14
	Morgan, Kim	1x32 SX	12
	Mueller, Richard	2x62 SX partials	15
	Myre, Nadia	1x62,2x32,1x22 (max 2 hrs)	15
<b>N</b>	NSCC camera/lighting workshop	3x62 sx partials-	14
	Nahrgung, Chris-stone sculpture	see One-of-a-Kind Nov 2005-3	7
	Neo-Craft 2007 gallery tours	2x32 sx	14
	Newkingak, Mathew	See the North, GNAF 2004	4
	Ngan, Wayne	3x62	12
	Noganosh, Ron	2x32	12
	North (the), GNAF 2004-various artists	9x62	4
	Northern Arts Festival 2006	5x62 sx	16
	Nowe, Kendall (INVU-editing)	1x32 sx - migrate field tape	14
<b>O</b>	O'Hagan, Shawn	1x62	12
	Ohe, Katie	2x32	12
	One of a Kind- Nov 2005	3x32 SX	7
	Osborne, Lyndal	1x62(10mins),6x32partials,fits 3hrtape	4
	Ostrom, Walter	5x32 SX	6
<b>P</b>	Papatsie, Jamasee	5x62 partials	16
	Paul, Leonard	3x20 SP	17
	de Pauw, Manon	2x62(partials),fits 1.5hrs	6
	Peck, Robin Smith	2x32 sx	6
	Pelletier, Margaret (see Gould/H.Jones)	5x32sx, shared w Gould, H.Jones	8
	Phillis, Carl and Chris	5x20 sp	17
	Pieroway, Percy	1x62 sx	7
	Pitseolak, Jamasee	5x62 partials	16
	Pitseolak, Josie	5x62 partials	16
	Pitsiulak, Okpik	see the North, GNAF 2004	4
	Piqtokun, David Ruben	see the North, GNAF 2004	4
	Pootoogook, Qiatsuk (?)	see the North, GNAF 2004	4
	Posa, Richard-woodworker	See One-of-a Kind Nov 2005	7
	Pouliot, Yannick	1x94 sx for library.db for migration	17
	Powning, Peter	2x20sp,2x30 sp	12
	Provost, Michele	2x32 sx	12
<b>Q</b>	Quilt Conference -HMHH footage	2x62,1x32 sx	14
<b>R</b>	Reichert, John	6x32 sx, partials	17
	Reid, Leslie	2x32 sx	12
	Relton, Steve	4x20 SP	12
	Rexhepi, Zeqirja	6x32 sx, partials	10
	Rich, Garmel	1 x32 SX	10
	Ridgway, Sylvia (?)	6x32 SX, partials	12
	Robichaud, Jessie (poet 2005)	1x32 SX	17
	Robles, Paul	1x62 SX	12
	Ross, Fred	2x20 sp,3x30 sp	12
	Rutherford, Erica	4x20 SP	12

----- MASTER LIST OF ARTSPOTS FIELD TAPES 22 May 2008.xls

<b>S</b>	Sabiston, Carol	2 x 62 SX	10
	Savoie, Marcel	1x32,3x60, partial, fits 3-hrs	17
	Sawyer, Jon	2 x 30 SP	10
	Scherer, Judith	2 x 20 SP	10
	Schmidt, Kevin	1x62 sx	10
	Sehn, Tanya	3x62,1x32(4mins), fits3-hrs	10
	Simon, Randy	2x20 SP	10
	Smale, Dean	3 x 62 SX	10
	Smith, Ann	3x32 sx	10
	Soo, Mark	1x62 sx	10
	Sobey Award 2002: Jungen, Woolstenholme,...	6x32, some partial	16
	Sobey Award 2004: Dzama, Forrest,...	2 x32	10
	Staniskis, Joanne	2 x 62 SX	10
	Stilwell, Jennifer	1x62 sx	10
	Stone, Caroline INVU (see GMTL)	partial	14
	Stone, Reva	2x62 sx, partials	10
	Surette, Nelson	3 x 32 SX	10
	Swannie, Suzanne (see MacNutt &MacMillan)	4 x 20 SP, 2 partials w MacNutt/MacMillan	17
	Syliboy, Alan	3 x 20 SP	17
	<b>T</b>	Terriak, John	1x32 sx
Terris, Reece		3 x 62 SX, partials?	13
Thibeault, Annie		1x20sp,1x30sp,1x32sx partials	13
Thomas, Jeffrey		3x32 SX	13
Thomas, Otis		1x20,1x30 sp	17
Thomson, Jim (see Hermick)		4x32 SX, 2partials +1x10,1x20 Hermick	15
Two-Six Collective		dupe of consolidated tapes done	13
<b>U</b>			
<b>V</b>	Van Sewell,	1x60, partial	17
<b>W</b>	Waterman, Megan	see the North, GNAF 2004	4
	Weir, Libby	1x60, partial	17
	Wiebe, Mitchell	3x20SP	13
	Wilcox, Michael	2x32 plus slides on 1x32 partial	13
	Wolforth, Kate INVU (see GMTL)	1 x 32	14
	Wolstenholme, Colleen	4x32 plus Sobey Award 2002	13
	WWKA	2x62 SX	13
<b>X</b>			
<b>Y</b>			
<b>Z</b>	Zimmerman, Carl	2x20 sp	13

## *Appendix Two: List of 85 videos edited during 2010-2014 research*

This appendix specifies the working titles of the 85 short videos edited from a combination of interviews during the research phase of the dissertation (2010-2014), and programming and interview materials from the ArtSpots archive (1997-2008). These 85 videos were used in a working version of a Korsakow database documentary during the research phase. A low-resolution version of this work-in-progress can be found at <http://moreartculturemediaplease.com/kmovies/process.apr21/> (accessed July 6, 2014).

### *Key:*

FD = Frances Dorsey (former ArtSpots artist)

GC = Gerard Choy (former ArtSpots artist)

GM = Gary Markle (former ArtSpots artist)

HOW = “How To” videos (including those produced during ArtSpots’ production, and those produced during the research phase)

JB = Jere Brooks (former ArtSpots web developer)

JG = Johanne Gallant (former ArtSpots web and then media producer)

KGC = Karina Garcia Casanova (former ArtSpots producer)

ME = Mary Elizabeth Luka (former ArtSpots executive producer)

UJ = Ursula Johnson (former ArtSpots artist)

### *Videos:*

1. FD-Seq02-DG1-Frances-experience-B-41mb-C-38mb.mov
2. FD-Seq03-DG1-Frances-walkaround Saigon 2007-B-70mb-C-66mb.mov

3. GC-Seq08-Gerard-live chat-B-21mb.mov
4. GC-Seq09-Gerard-B-24mb.mov
5. GC-Seq10-Gerard artspot 1-12mb.mov
6. GC-Seq11-Gerard profile-B-41mb.mov
7. GM-Seq01-DG1-Gary-experience-11MB.mov
8. GM-Seq12-Gary-artspot1-24mb.mov
9. GM-Seq13-Gary-artspot sound and field stills-8mb.mov
10. HOW-Seq14-HowToIntro-B-39mb.mov
11. HOW-Seq15-HowTo-AdvisoryGroups-B-48mb.mov
12. HOW-Seq16-HowTo-Criteria-B-103mb.mov
13. HOW-Seq17-HowTo-finding art-26mb.mov
14. HOW-Seq18-HowTo-Prep-for-invu-B-39mb.mov
15. HOW-Seq19-HowTo-camera-lighting-B-39mb.mov
16. HOW-Seq20-HowTo-editing\_1-72mb-B-23mb.mov
17. JB-Seq1-JB-since1999-B-18mb.mov
18. JB-Seq2-JB-wild west-24mb.mov
19. JB-Seq3-JB-how-to-work-w-audiences-19mb.mov
20. JB-Seq4-JB-audiences-B-16mb.mov
21. JB-Seq5-JB-experimenting-20mb.mov
22. JB-Seq6-JB-experience-and-content-B-33mb.mov
23. JB-Seq7-JB-user experiences-26mb.mov
24. JB-Seq8-JB-crazy enthusiasm-18mb.mov
25. JB-Seq9-JB-no db-B-16mb.mov

26. JG-Seq01-JG-tell-story-19mb.mov
27. JG-Seq02-JG-winterof2000-14mb.mov
28. JG-Seq03-JG-legacy-archive-on-internet-13mb.mov
29. JG-Seq04-JG-advisory-groups-23mb.mov
30. JG-Seq06-JG-adv-grp-doing-homework-22mb.mov
31. JG-Seq07-JG-copyright-20mb.mov
32. JG-Seq08-JG-cal-lane-13mb.mov
33. JG-Seq09-JG-tech-crews-artist-voice-2ndpass-35percent-34mb.mov
34. JG-Seq10-JG-monumental-3mb.mov
35. JG-Seq11-JG-risk-failure-13mb.mov
36. JG-Seq12-JG-tried-radio-spots-24mb.mov
37. JG-Seq13-JG-what-*ArtSpots*-did-29mb.mov
38. JG-Seq14-JG-legacy-50percent-31mb.mov
39. JG-Seq15-JG-web-page-format-17mb.mov
40. KGC-Seq01-Karina-limits-25mb.mov
41. KGC-Seq02-Karina-studio-limits-24.5mb.mov
42. KGC-Seq03-karina-edit-limits-26mb.mov
43. KGC-Seq04-Karina-collaboration-10mb.mov
44. KGC-Seq05-Karina-*ArtSpots*-ahead-25.4mb.mov
45. KGC-Seq06-karina-arts-tv-23.7mb.mov
46. KGC-Seq07-karina-oboro-*ArtSpots*-partnership-B-40mb.mov
47. KGC-Sequence 08-karina-sense of discovery-B-19mb.mov
48. KGC-Sequence 09-karina-30seconds-fiveminutes-B-18mb.mov

49. KGC-Sequence 10-karina-working w WWKA-B-10mb.mov
50. KGC-Sequence 11-karina-limits-on-*ArtSpots*-for-WWKA-15.6mb.mov
51. KGC-Sequence 12-BGL-Karina-B-16mb.mov
52. KGC-Sequence 13-karina-debroin-8mb.mov
53. KGC-Sequence 14-anhang-karina-B-19mb.mov
54. KM-DG1-Seq21-Kim-Morgan\_1-B-61mb-C-56mb.mov
55. ME-Sequence02\_digiarts\_Luka27mb.mov
56. ME-Sequence03-Luka-by-the-numbers-B-47mb.mov
57. ME-Sequence04-how\_*ArtSpots*\_started-B-18mb.mov
58. ME-Sequence05-just-do-it-B-18mb.mov
59. ME-Sequence06-partnerships\_model34mb.mov
60. ME-Sequence07-*ArtSpots*-impacts-B-26mb.mov
61. ME-Sequence08-local-crew-B-24mb.mov
62. ME-Sequence09-toronto-regional-environments-B-31mb.mov
63. ME-Sequence10-producers-advisors-B-32mb.mov
64. ME-Sequence11-ten-year-trajectory-B-25mb.mov
65. ME-Sequence12-under-the-radar.mov
66. ME-Sequence13-no-timeslot-B-16mb.mov
67. ME-Sequence14-scheduling\_1-B-45mb.mov
68. ME-Sequence15-aggregation-curation-B-20mb.mov
69. ME-Sequence16-negotiating-resources-B-28mb.mov
70. ME-Sequence17-bible-B-18mb.mov
71. ME-Sequence18-advisory-process58mb-B-45mb.mov

72. ME-Sequence19-pre-production32mb-B-29mb.mov
73. ME-Sequence20-production-B-43mb.mov
74. ME-Sequence21-Canadian-identity-a-ton41mb-B-38mb.mov
75. ME-Sequence22-Cdn-artwork34mb.mov
76. ME-Sequence23-*ArtSpots*-as-creative-citizenship-20mb.mov
77. ME-Sequence24-focus-on-art-35mb-B-15mb.mov
78. ME-Sequence25-ubiquitous-digimedia-44mb-B-19mb.mov
79. ME-Sequence26-annual-resources-33mb-B-24mb.mov
80. ME-Sequence27-calculating-airplay-25mb-B-15mb.mov
81. ME-Sequence28-numbers-aired44mb-B-21mb.mov
82. UJ-CG-Seq07-Caroline profile-B-35mb.mov
83. UJ-Seq04-DG1-Ursula-experience-B-37mb.mov
84. UJ-Seq05-Ursula profile-B-43mb.mov
85. UJ-Seq06-Ursula-grad-exhibit profile-B-51mb.mov

### *Appendix Three: Sample transcript (artists' discussion group)*

This appendix is comprised of a sample transcript, from the discussion group that included several ArtSpots artists. It provides a sense of the tone and duration of the discussion groups and interviews conducted during the 2010-2014 research phase, as well as the details captured in the transcripts themselves.

Participants: Gerard Choy (GC), Frances Dorsey (F), Ursula Johnson (U), Mary Elizabeth Luka (ME), Gary Markle (GM)

Camera operation: Brian Downey, Mary Elizabeth Luka

Date: February 28, 2012

Location: Nova Scotia Cultural Federations' Boardroom, Halifax, NS

Camera/Angle 1 shows: ME profile, Ursula across the table.

Camera/Angle 2 shows: Gerard screen left, Gary middle, Frances screen right, chance profile shot of ME

#### *Tape 1.1*

1.1 12:24 mins

0:00 People settling in. discussion of a red-orange, getting lost, installing exhibitions, ME profile, Ursula across the table

Miscellaneous conversation during set-up.

6:40

ME; Thank you all for doing this. This is the test discussion group. I'm only going to do about two or three of these disc groups for my dissertation research. Cos I'm doing a combination of discussion groups, interviews, and an experimental documentary. So that's plenty. And a little bit of stuff on a blog. But the blog stuff is really meant to be thinking-in-process so other people as I'm talking to them have something to go to and comment on. I do have questions I'll start with and see where it goes. But I'm curious to see what gets generated. The diss is focused on a

concept- creative citizenship. It's something I came up with intuitively, then worked backwards into some theoretical models and work that had been done in media and cmmcns but also cultural production. So what my diss will be about is testing whether this is a concept that has legs or not. Is there such a thing as creative citizens and the act of what they do when they work, is that creative citizenship. .. because I had a particular expertise in this thing called *ArtSpots* [Ursula grins], I'll use it as my primary case study, probably my only case study but I'll address other things. And one of the things that was important to me – what other people who were involved thought about it, and thought happened in the course of that project. Hence interviews and disc groups. I'll also look back at the interviews we did with some of the artists. Gary –Gary was in the first round, first six – we weren't officially doing interviews then. I don't think we even recorded an interview. I think I just had notes..sitting and talking to you about your work  
GM: I remember we decided that since it was performance, it should be the piece. I thought that was smart. Because why would you talk about being the performance, well, I could see it if it was about acting...

ME: it would be totally TV though, and that's what we were fighting against, particularly in the first couple of years. To carve out some other kind of a space. That either had never been seen before or had fallen out of people's memories. Short term TV memories. ... anyways. So if you don't mind, could each of you mention your own knowledge and involvement with *ArtSpots*. Could you start, Frances.

10:12

F: ok. Well, the first encounter that I had with *ArtSpots*, was actually sitting slackjawed watching TV, and having Gary pop up. [laughs] I was amazed and surprise and amused and delighted, and I thought "oh how enlightened of the CBC" that they would put up a five-minute [sic – it was 30 secs] spot of an artist. So that was my first encounter and then I didn't really think of them much at all until you contacted me and asked if we could do a gallery tour of my show during the craft conference. I was – I'd been quite charmed. One of the potters, Sarah [Macmillan].. I'd seen that too. I'd been really excited at the idea that something that was unscripted – an art form – could pop and be in your living room. In these little chunks. So I was happy to participate. And our little artspot was a walking tour of the exhibition. I was interested in the idea that you could present a body of work just sort of moving and talking. You know, a little 5-minute survey. Seemed like an interesting idea to me.. [to 12:24]

### *Tape 1.2*

12:11 – 23:14 mins

ME: and that was a real departure for us. And the project you [GC] did with us was a departure too. We kind of had this standard process that got generated very quickly, you know, that seemed to work for people. But by the time we did that one, because it was part of the conference, we were trying to focus more on projects as well as have a regular influx of new artists. So it was a bit more – in a funny kind of way – it was more TV-ish. More like something you'd see on Bravo. Though part of what we were trying to do was keep to the spirit. And this is one of the things I'm curious about. How do you keep to the spirit. Give the artist as much creative input as possible in that kind of environment. [Camera operator Brian leaves]

F: it's a hard question about the artist's creative input because what you really want to do is do it once, then do it again after you understand what's happening. Because you don't really have a sense of what the creative possibilities are . you're just sort of stumbling through it. But if you

were to come back a week later, you would have more input. Because you would have had time to ponder how to make use of this opportunity. To present whatever your idea is, in this amount of time.

ME: what was your involvement in *ArtSpots*, Gary Markle [smiles]

GM: ha, because it didn't exist yet, and I hadn't seen any examples. I just remember meeting with you and brainstorming. I'd been working with the character of the dunce, and it was kind of the dunce became a kind of super-dunce. It was being retired. I'd loved those car commercials as a kid where they broke through the paper screen, using the proscenium arch. A conflation of the sport. Art could be connected to the heros leaping through the air and smashing through the paper. It was also the year I was going to the gay games, and I was in great shape. Feeding off all of that . and you were like, yeah, let's do that. let's not just do an interview. Tape it and talk about it. But make the whole piece in and of itself. And I liked that, because it was really ambiguous. It didn't fit completely comfortably into any structure of normal TV. People referred to it, students, for a few years. Great advertising. They'd go: "I remember you were the guy in that commercial." [lots of laughter] And I'd say, "yes, my commercial". But they couldn't remember any specifics. That was it. That one little bit. It was a real thrill to be something that wasn't the status quo.... I didn't watch TV at the time. So I really didn't ever see it on TV, I only saw it on the tape you gave me. And I never really saw other *ArtSpots* except for the ones on the master tape of everyone from the first season. I didn't watch TV until five or six years later.

ME: did any of you..

U: missed some good stuff!

ME: did any of you go to the website and look at the stuff on the website...

GC: I couldn't find the website...

ME: yours was different... stills and didn't we put ... streaming project

GC: the work was shot..

ME: but wasn't that the one I shot for you .. when we just did the blue bowls and everything

GC: johanne Gallant

ME: johanne? Johanne did one. Omigod, I totally forgot. Well, there were only 300 artists..

[woah].. but how could I forget yours?...

GC: [laugh] should I answer that?

ME: no....

F: don't dignify it..

ME: just let me wallow in my .. [spills coffee]

[Misc conversation]

7:30 mins of this section

F: I don't have mine either

ME: I don't know if I have yours...

F: Found it years ago

ME: yeah, but hardly any of the links work

U: I looked at the website. That's how I came across everything. Tonia [di Risio] had talked to me about what *ArtSpots* was. I think she might have been a part of that whole process. Told me I should go to the website. Went on and browsed through the list, to try to figure out what an ArtSpot was.

ME: did you figure it out?

U: a little bit. I kinda did. They were all v different. At the time, my great-grandmother and myself were going to do an ArtSpot. It wasn't sure if it was going to be together or separate. I think Johanne neither knew how it was going to go, until after the interviews and photo sessions were done, and then it was decided that it was going to be two separate *ArtSpots* but because we mention each other. They're kind of tied in– [cross-referenced]. So for a while if you googled Caroline's ArtSpot, a link would come up to mine, and if you googled my ArtSpot, Caroline's would come up ..

ME; ah perfect, yeah I remember we talked...

U: which was kind of neat, how the internet put them together.

ME: yeah, I like that. I think it was one of the things that was sort of a potential that was never fully realized about *ArtSpots*

U: mm hmm

ME: by the end of the project, we'd been working on and had proposed a much more comprehensive project that would be around aggregating and curating [others: mm hmm] that in the end didn't fly. We were migrating to a database, which would have made it much easier. I swear to god, for ten years we argued for a database, they finally said yes, and then cancelled us... good luck with that... anyway.... [to Gerard] do you want to talk about your experience?

10:05

GC: which one?

ME: anyone.

GM; the real one

ME: I think there were three or four, I just can only remember one

GC: well there was that one we did with Svava. I thought it was interesting because I couldn't type. You were typing as quickly as I could talk. And also because I couldn't see the screen, I could not verify what you said and what was being said to what I said. [laughter] but I liked that very much. It was the first time that we could actually be talking to someone who was talking about issues that I was interested in. you were in so many different places that it gave a different perspective to what I had been looking at the time.

ME: who else was on that call?

GC: Gabrielle, from eastern edge.

ME: that's right.

GC: three of us were talking while you were furiously typing.

ME: live chat.

GC: live chat.

ME: and it was very early, [GC: oh yeah] one of the first times..

[end of segment]

### *Tape 1.3*

22:47-34:44 mins

ME: it was an experiment to see if it was something we wanted to do long term. And I don't think we ever did anything quite like that again. It was very hard to talk CBC into doing something live.

GC: uh huh

U: yeah

ME: not so much now. It's a bit easier now. Same thing with commenting. Even with putting something up on YouTube. Now there's a CBC YouTube channel. But we couldn't. It was really hard for us to talk CBC into considering...

[brian comes in with more cookies... discussion about schoolhouse cookies]

ME: um. Ok. So what did you think. Were there any specific things that worked about *ArtSpots*. Or didn't work about *ArtSpots*. That you would have liked to see.

U: I think there was a really good promotional tool. Especially for myself. I had just come out of school. And it was a very generous venue. I had 5 *ArtSpots* and a profile that were made.

Working in a multi-disciplinary fashion, this is your sculpture, this is your performance, these are your drawings. it gave a good sense of what my practice was at the time, and then for it to be on TV and available online, then it kind of , really helped my info to get out there.

ME: yeah, it was your graduation exhibition.

U: oh right. There were two profiles, and five *ArtSpots*.

ME: the graduation show – was one we gave content to news. That was one of the things we tried to do from time to time was talk news into playing stuff.

U: right, because the news lady came, and Sobaz recorded that one. Because he was going to use it for a documentary, I think it was called blurring the lines or something.

ME: yeah, that ended up being called, hand made, hand held. Sobaz and Johanne were both producers on that. And that is actually, that is the one you can still play online. So you might find a section on there. I'll send you the link. Just remind me if I don't do it in a timely fashion.

U: I'll find it and connect it to my blog. That's the great thing about the internet. You can map people

ME: what do you guys think? What worked? What didn't?

GM: I liked the fact that you were willing to collaborate. That you weren't stuck with a matrix that had to be fit with this and this and this. that was good. Because that meant you were working with the individual character almost of the individual artist. And I think that variety is really smart too. I think the only drawback for me was that it was done in such a tight [timeline]..we had to

ME: yeah...

GM: that it was a bit stressful from that point of view. Probably my own style of working. I hadn't prepped it as much as it could be. Maybe similar to what you were saying, Frances, that if I'd had a dry run, then come back to it and pared down a little bit. It looked maybe a little over the top in terms of production quality. For who I am, truly. But in retrospect, I kind of liked its CBC qualities [see Ursula & ME holding back grins], cos I would never have that normally, the little twinkling sound, all the lighting, stuff like that. Usually it's bare bones.

F: I like the subversive aspects of it. You're sitting there watching TV, soap ad comes on, and another kind of ad comes on, and an artist with an idea, just a nugget, comes on, and you sort of ponder that, and then, .. it's subversive but it also then makes one pay attention. I would have liked to see *ArtSpots* happening more frequently, and more erratically. So it just became part of CBC's programming, that you knew if you had that station on for a few hours that you were going to get sold stuff, but you were also going to have some chunks to think about. So I would have liked to see it go much farther.

ME: yup. I like that because one of the things we pushed really hard on a lot. .. as you say that, that was a TV thing. We were always looking for a regular timeslot so we could tell people, oh

you'll see it for sure. But the random nature of it was so appealing from the beginning, I mean that drove the concept - that I think you're right. The way to do it effectively would have been to kind of saturate the airwaves, rather than... even if it was off-prime, which it was, you could saturate the airwaves at the other times of day. So more airtime would have been. And we certainly had, after the first few years, we had tons of material. It's not like we ever played everything, we didn't. Hmmm.

U: it was very funny too from a cultural perspective. Like, in my community, once the artspot came on, everybody on the whole rez - they were like - did you see Ursula on TV, and then people would want to watch CBC to see if they could see it again. And I noticed that more people in my community were tuning into CBC in the hopes of trying to see it. Cos then they saw another aboriginal artist. It was like, there's this thing, and all these native people are showing up there. They wanted to tune in more.

ME: it was one of the things that - the conversations that took place at the advisory groups were very much around under-represented communities and voices because it was a mandate program. So we didn't have objectives that related to how many people we were attracting to television. We had other objectives about what measures of success would be. About 10% of the material that we produced was work by aboriginal artists, which gave it a real character. It shaped it in a particular way. The conversations in the advisory group meetings were always very much around, who in the community is under-represented. Or what is the most exciting work that's going on. What kind of issues are they dealing with. How do you frame those questions, community to community. Without pinning people into any corners. Which was the other thing we wanted to be really careful with.

GC: there are several things I want to pick up on. Part of my problem is that I don't watch TV, I think I've only caught one artspot, and that was Naoko. But it came on so quickly and unexpectedly that I only wondered if I had seen Naoko at all. So that I liked that nice guerilla idea. But I'm just wondering. For instance, the under-represented issues that came out with all the different *ArtSpots*. ..Like what we did for the streaming, that talk we had, where we could connect people that actually have this discussion, somehow. Would that have developed the whole idea?

ME: absolutely. And that was one of the things we wanted to work on - whatever the new *ArtSpots* would be. I still think there's enormous potential - I mean with all the *ArtSpots* material, sure, but there's so much work that is out there. That kind of conversation - who is it who should be making that conversation happen in a virtual environment. And how can that be done in a way that is inclusive rather than falling into the same old patterns of how material and interpretation is controlled.

GC: to talk about other than just talk. Keep it open enough..

FD: I wonder if there isn't so much less of a void now. When you started doing *ArtSpots*, we didn't all watch YouTube. Those other avenues weren't really there, and that was one thing that made them feel really radical and refreshing. There are now so many other places that you can engage in that kind of conversation and experience...

[end of segment - pickup in next segment..]

#### *Tape 1.4*

34:03-45:20

FD: ... that kind of conversation and experience you know, whether you're coming thru to see what my cat has done today..

GM: speaking from experience [laughter]

ME: don't watch TV but [laughter] those cats on YouTube...

FD: yeah, there are a lot of other vehicles. So I wonder if *ArtSpots* would work in the same way now, in this climate. The internet's such a large part of our lives..

U: maybe not on television. Probably wouldn't work on television. No one really sits down to watch television

GC: not in the way that we used to watch television [yeah]. We tend to stream or

U: find something to watch. Looking for your new episode of the walking dead.

ME: yeah, you find it recorded somewhere. Yeah, I agree with all those things. You couldn't do *ArtSpots* now, not in the way that we did it. You could take the spirit of it, this is what I think is kind of interesting about it, how do you take the spirit of something like that, which is around a form of radical intervention in a public sphere, right, in a media production sphere in particular. What does that look like? What would that look like now? Is someone doing that now? Its that kind of..

GM: it makes me think of the idea of subversion. Late 60s, when I was a kid, late 60s, watching TV. I think there was more of that kind of action that would happen. Public service announcements that weren't touted to be that, but would sort of alter your flow. And then, like you said, it kind of went away. It was almost like a kind of Marshall McLuhan kind of use of media. It's almost like there was more. I remember more radical theatre being presented on TV, as a kid, even through the 70s. I remember a show, front row centre, it was a great show. You never knew what you were going to run into when you checked into that show. It was all these new Canadian playwrights. Very edgy kind of material. That idea for TV still needing to have that moment where you need to stop and think. You're given something to chew on, rather than just being sold.

GC: mmm

ME: internet and mobile technology is kind of at that threshold now, it's been a bit of the crazy space for the last ten years, twenty years. And now it's getting regulated, carved up, and smoothed out [mmm] so there's a lot. Which I think is what happened to TV in the late 70s, and moving into the 80s for sure. My sense is that there's still opportunity, on the internet and in mobile. But that any use of television – in fact, there's more radical potential on radio, again, than TV.

Various: yup

U: course, television's becoming the new VHS

Various: yup

ME: so it's kind of interesting. What do you do.

GM: well in what ways did *ArtSpots* anticipate a shift. It really being a lot more akin to YouTube. That on demand. Instead of having to wait around. I could check it out. You could check in once in a while - what are those crazy artists up to now [laughter].

ME: I want to see the "Walking Dead *ArtSpots*"

U: [imitates a zombie artist...]

GM: maybe by next fall we'll be there. [laughter]

ME: one of the reasons to do this pilot project (discussion group in particular) ... because of my involvement... generally, one of the things that happened. NSCAD had a really strong influence on how *ArtSpots* got shaped developed and shaped.

U; [makes an incredulous face]

ME: imagine

ME: I know.

U: everyone becomes aware of the camera of the cameras all of a sudden [laughter]

ME: NSCAD, which is facing its 125<sup>th</sup> anniversary and other matters...[laughter] Is it significant? Or just gee whiz, that's nice.

GM: hmm.

U: what was the question..

ME: I just had this feeling that it was really informed by what NSCAD was, and the kind of conceptual questions, I guess, that really got discussed at NSCAD. Like I think it's fantastic that Jan got a GG [governor-general's award in visual arts] now, because one of the reasons that I ended up proposing *ArtSpots* to CBC in the first place, was because I took a course with her, and we looked at a whole bunch of intervention video. And to me, it is that echo of the 60s [right] and 70s, in that time period. And hopefully it carries forward. Is that just a NSCAD thing, or was it reflective of a broader spectrum of work in Canada?

FD: well. I think that. .. an art school in an out-of-the-way place becomes a kind of cooker for ideas in a way that an art school in a really big city, like OCAD in the middle of Toronto or Emily Carr in Vancouver. So rather than making it specific to NSCAD, I'd say an art school in an out-of-the-way small town, gives you a kind of an arena or bed to kick around ideas that then might go that next step. It would be a lot harder to get it on the CBC in Toronto, like if it were an OCAD thing in Toronto. I think that what NSCAD did, and does, is provide the arena where the conversation can happen. And that we'd like to think it's specific to NSCAD, but it's probably more specific to having a whole bunch of people involved in a set of creative practices in a little city on the edge of the continent far away from Montreal and New York or Toronto or any other place. Like making your own playground.

GM: it's like geography...

U: ...Canada's *ocean* playground! [laughter]

GM: but proximity too. You yourself are a graduate. We tend to start with who we know in many ways...

F: ...the conversations happen according to the context of the kinds of conversations in a place where people are involved in – in our case – a visual creative practice – but perhaps a similar kind of thing in a music school in a fairly isolated environment might give rise to an equivalent – or a theatre school in another – those things are less likely to happen in isolated places because they require audiences more specifically...

GM: mm hmm. Local...

U: like looking at the Banff centre. On the mountain in the middle of nowhere. But there's an incredible amount that happens there because it's one little concentrated pocket where creative people come together.

ME: and they know it as a destination..

U: and it's also a safe space to just talk about whatever is in your head. A safe space to go through your process with your peers before you can decide upon something. That's what – not just NSCAD has provided but Halifax in general – there's a very small artist community in NS and the majority of the people know about each other or know each other. It creates that safe space here, in Canada's ocean playground [chuckles.]

GC: and also because it's such a small space, communities tend to be closer together. And less distracted by other stuff that being in Toronto, Montreal or Vancouver would tend to pull your attention.

ME: there was always really strong work that came out of places like Winnipeg and Saskatoon.

F: yeah, I was thinking of other really interesting places; Winnipeg and Saskatoon. Peterborough in Ontario is way more interesting.

*Tape 1.5*

45:00-57:18 mins (12:11 mins)

ME: so funny. One of the kinds of groups of people we worked with were the recipients of the Saidye Bronfman award which for us, was, for CBC, a specific kind of attempt to boost how much work from Ontario and Quebec. And for us was kind of a short cut. Because we couldn't exercise the advisory group process in Toronto that we could in Halifax, or Winnipeg or Saskatoon or even in Vancouver. Even in Vancouver, we could kind of get there in a more formal way. But Toronto was a pretty big nut to crack. To try and do it in a way that would sympathetic to the principles. Plus there was a lot of production that happened out of Toronto so if there was any attention being paid to the arts, it was happening in Toronto

Various: yes.

ME: so we just avoided it. But the interesting thing about the Bronfman recipients was that most of them were living in outlying areas. So even if they had representation in larger centres, they tended to live in Peterborough or Quebec City or Rimouski, or someplace that was a little farther afield. We had a ton of great stuff that came out of the north.

GM: did you have to consciously decide that you were going to begin it with a pool of artists in mind and expand from there. Did you think, I have to step away from this.

ME: you know, that's tough to recall. What I do – the advisory group process happened before we picked our first artists. So I didn't start by saying, I think we should work with these six artists. It was always – the only way this project came to be after several conversations with people like Jan, Monica Tap, Peter Dykhuis, and like – there was a big Halifax gang and a couple of other people who were involved in the conversation. We came up with the value statements and objectives. There were a bunch of people there from television including Fred Mattocks, who was regional director at the time, and that was a big deal. Cos it meant that whatever resources we were going to need, he was the one who could say – yes, you could have them. [right] but it was also, for him. And he talks about this, and has for many years, it was an incredible experience because he was having a conversation with a community that he really admired but didn't really understand so for him to have that kind of in-depth exposure to the kind of ideas and how ideas circulated in that environment was really helpful. Particularly as he thought about what is the role of television. And then he went on to do other things – he's now in charge of all the resources for English media. But part of the reason that CBC's digital media strategy developed so early was because he was responsible for it, and he really pushed to have as interesting a combination of experiences as was possible within the confines of – you know, there was still a lot of breaking out that CBC had to do – around how – what is this new media form, how does it relate to television and radio, what are the rules we apply, how do we measure success. All those questions. With *ArtSpots* for example, we had video online way before any other broadcaster in Canada. and if *ArtSpots* wasn't the first program to have video online at CBC, it was probably the second. And we very quickly became a program that had more video online than on television. And that was five years before YouTube..

Various: [discussion about who has to leave.. parking...]

ME: what do you think about this idea – the idea of creative citizenship – does it have any meaning for you?

GC: can you expand on it?

ME: a little bit. I guess. I can talk endlessly and in circles about it.

U: do you have a definition for it?

ME: I do. It has to do with the dynamics that occur when you put artists or artistic thinking, creative thinking but not in that corporate way, together with cultural production, so in my case what I'm really interested in is broadcast and digital media, so. It is around what is it that people like you or I do, because this is what we do in the world, it's an exercise of who we are in the world, of citizenship, of engaging with the community, however we define the community, or engaging with ideas in a way that we want to advance over a short period of time, or our lifetime. But it's really about the dynamics, what is the role of the artist and producer or artist/producer, or creative producer in the world.

U: I would just look at the term itself. I would imagine that everyone sitting at the table – different things come into their mind when they hear creative citizenship. Like personally for me, I get hung up on the term citizenship. Because then I relate citizenship to belonging to some kind of country or monarch or something. For someone who is Status First Nations and not recognized as a Canadian citizen but yet I live in Canada, then I keep getting bumped up with that term citizenship and can't look past that to the broader topic or theme that's being suggested.

ME: that's interesting. I think that's really interesting. Because I have some of the same issues, because it's so conjoined with 'nation' and I don't want it to be that, necessarily. It could be – it could be Canadian creative citizens – whatever that is - but that's not necessary - ...

U: but putting the term Canadian has that same roadblock

ME: absolutely. Absolutely. That's what I'm trying to get away from. That's one of the things that was interesting about *ArtSpots* and using it as an area to look at this. some people will say - you could always tell this is an ArtSpot – but you couldn't say, this is what makes it an ArtSpot. It was Canadian work, but you couldn't go, tick tick tick, that's what makes it Canadian. Or not. But yes, thank you for your ...

F: this isn't totally connected. But I'm going in a couple of minutes. But to me what was really important was that it gave a place where something more visual could be explored. Because when we talk about the arts: theatre, dance, and music have a really big stage. Whether you're looking at the newspaper or looking at the Coast, the reviews, there's really a small amount of space and thought devoted to the visual arts. So what I thought was really thrilling about *ArtSpots* was that it wasn't about theatre or dance or even poetry. It was about the visual arts discourse, regardless of how performative or conceptual or grounded or made – that was the sort of bucket that the stuff was in. And when I thought about the term creative citizenship, I thought more of stewardship than citizenship. And if that, what people were doing was not so much being citizens as being stewards of a kind of conversation or questioning or inventive exploration that didn't really have another location where that could happen. So I was sort of translating citizenship into stewardship as a way you take care of or you nurture, or you try to bring it along, or you shepherd.

GC: mmm.

GM: yeah, definitely. It sidesteps that whole idea of nationhood. Brings it more into the idea of you're responsible for caring for something that isn't necessarily even yours, per se. That's a beautiful way to look at it.

F: yeah, if you're... the story of something, you're just...

U: I think that helps – make me be able to look at that broader context of the way it is. Then I'm not hung up on the term citizenship, which is kind of like national obligation...

F: yeah, citizenship is a terrible word – patriotism is a terrible word

GC: yeah..

F: if you think fundamentally of it as a love for the land that you spring out of, then it's a good thing. Because it doesn't mean my land is good and your land is bad. It just means that I love this ground that I came out of. But it's really distorted. So that to say that someone is a patriot becomes a pejorative term, when in fact what you mean is that person loved.. you know, I describe my father as a patriot... well, he wasn't a jingoistic...

[end of tape!..]

## *Tape 2*

(20:12 mins)

F: .. goodness and receptiveness and possibility. And yet the term, patriot, or citizen leaves a bad taste in the mouth because it's got all of this other stuff glopped onto it.

ME: mm hmm... [brief conversation about administration of forms]

1:22

GC: I have the same problem with the word citizenship. I agree very much with the idea of stewardship, and bringing something forward

[Frances heads out - ... Brian moves camera around]

ME: sorry, citizenship yes, stewardship..

GC: so I like the idea about what Frances has said about bringing forward the sort of – always presenting our issues, our practice, into that arena. But I think there is another part. This is just thinking it, not that I stand for it or whatever. There's another idea of citizenship. It goes back to the root. Exactly the way that patriot has been used, in a pejorative way. There might be a way of taking back, the idea of citizenship, the idea of responsibility, the idea of yes. We have all of these boundaries, we can't escape those boundaries. But how to transcend those boundaries? I think that – I hate to speak from a transnational default, I don't know how I've come to speak from a transnational default. But the idea of: this is where we are, we accept our stereotyping, our prejudices, whatever it is we have, this is my citizenship of my own stuff, and then we take it from there, out. And that is where the creative process comes into its being. So it's not looking at that. Even looking at the idea of multiculturalism. We take it from there. We look at it from the point of citizenship. That might be a strategy.

ME: yeah. Mm. I think that's very useful. When I work backwards from the term, because I wanted to address some of the stuff that you've [all] raised. And kind of come to terms with some of the ambiguity of it. Which is one of the things that I think is important about what you're saying. And that kind of multiplicity of it. How do you work with something that is day to day, but is also something bigger than that, in a way that validates instead of isolates. Or excludes. There's a bunch of theoretical discussion that has gone on. Part of the reason I think it's interesting to ground the conversation in *ArtSpots* is because that is to some extent, that is what the advisory groups tried to do. When we had those discussions around what are the priorities, what is the work, who are the people doing the work, where that conversation is the most evocative.

BD: change tape... ..

GC: I did think, when we were doing the ArtSpot, not the one we did because I liked because there was a live conversation, but the one that I did with Johanne. I thought that it became a little formulaic, because it was very much an interview. If I remember correctly, and then showing of work. But very little about - partly my own fault. Maybe I didn't think hard enough. And also I wasn't familiar with what the program was about. And also because I couldn't articulate my own issues at the time as clearly as I can now. But still. That was the main difference between the streaming thing and the other – about my stuff. Seemed like it was so much more about me rather than getting at ideas.

ME: ... interesting...

GM: again I'm interested in that term cultural citizen?

ME: creative citizen..

GM: is this a term you've coined..

ME: well, the creative citizenship part of it is. There are people who use the term creative citizen, and people who use the term cultural citizenship. And they have very different meanings. And what I mean by creative citizenship is not exactly a combination of those things. So for example, creative citizen is usually used in contexts where somebody is actively engaged in production in the arts, and makes most of their living that way. So a creative worker...

U: so instead of calling themselves a cabaret artist...

ME: yup, they could be, or a writer or actor or whatever, they're a creative citizen, small c citizen. And it's kind of incidental, the citizen part of it is kind of incidental, I'm just, I'm a working stiff, kind of interpretation I guess. But it's also kind of loaded with I have this special responsibility that's called creativity [laughter]

U: yes, same with the cabaret artist

GM: yes, I'd like to be a super-hero. So yes, I'm a creative citizen

U: Capital c.

ME: exactly.

GM: yes, but then I demure.. I think, truthfully. I remember once this exchange student from Spain was talking about the difference in creating cultural product versus art. She said only time will tell whether it's art or not. Because most of what we do won't be remembered. And I asked her if that was from being from a culture, a western culture that was that intact. She said yes, it was kind of preposterous that a western culture that was only a couple hundred years old in this nation to be going around presenting itself as this sort of ... as the big, capital A culture...

ME: yeah...

GM: except it begins with a c..

ME: yeah, I liked the capital a

U: aaa, culture...

GM: I did feel really responsible – in terms of that piece that we did. I wanted to respect your mission as I interpreted it. And also that it was something that was going to be for the public, a wide audience. So I wanted to include them without them feeling pushed away. Without being dumb. I didn't want to pander, or talk down to people at all. But also that it wouldn't be something that would upset people or that they'd have to go away and think about it too much. I like being involved in that kind of work.

ME: and interestingly, so that's partly where cultural citizenship comes from. Because it comes from – what is the audience's reaction, and how do they interpret what's going on, culturally. The audience being a vague and ambiguous term, until it's specific to a television audience that deals with the walking dead, or that uses the internet or whatever. Cultural citizenship is around

– you put stuff out there – you may intend as a producer or somebody whose work is involved – you may intend for there to be meanings or not. Then what people do when they get it, is their prerogative. What they’re doing is the act of cultural citizenship. That they’re specifically deciding this is what this means.

GM: so they become..

ME: they’re exercising cultural citizenship. So , for example, one of the really obvious examples would be fan sites. Because that’s where it’s very clear what the exercise of cultural citizenship is. You can see what people think they’re seeing. Or how they’re understanding characters. Like I think fan sites for architecture or home design or something like that, would equally do that, right. [mmhmmm]. It’s kind of like, why I watch this kind of television program, or why I have this magazine in my house.

U: or facebook stalkers.

ME: yeah.

GM: that’s an interesting. Do you want to find out who they are? No.

U: no.. I’m afraid {laughter}

ME: do you think there are other projects. Or other kind of work that is touching on some of this.

U: about the creative citizen.

ME : yeah, or how you engage with discourse in the arts in innovative ..

U: through media

GM: what about art21? Close, different..

GC: PBS?

GM: yeah, same sort of enchanting snippet. it’s longer format, but you spend a certain amount of time. There’s a formula, but it’s not oppressive to the point that it eclipses the subject. I love the idea that the artist becomes contained in the way it’s mediated. This kind of open framework.

GC: Bravo had a program – a very short – interview with someone specific, sitting on a chair. I liked that one. What I got was totally an insight into what was behind the work. It’s one thing for me to think about what the artist might be doing and quite another to get what the artist is doing – access to that information, that thought, and have that dialogue. I think it’s Bravo.

15:10

ME: it’s like “inside the artist” but something like that... its..

GM: classic.. inside the artist [laughter]

ME: we sent a camera inside the artist...

GM: let’s go deep inside ...see if he’s really a citizen..[laughter] we’re looking for clues

GC: do you have a passport...

ME: anything else that you’re burning to say...

[No one has anything further to say; they sign forms]

GM: I think you should think about another phase of this but more under your own control...

ME: oh I see what you’re saying...

U: do you have control over this stuff?

ME: no, but the artists do...

[multiple conversations]

U; it’s funny, I looked at that a while ago.. I looked like such a baby..

ME: it’s one of those things that we thought about it... let’s assume, ha ha ha, that it will last for ten years... it’s kind of out there forever...

GC: it’s on the internet?

ME: only some are readily available

U: I think it's ACTRA related

ME: performance piece.. because one of the things that got prompted by your work and other peoples – more around performance. If an artist is doing a performance piece, are they an actor under the definition of ACTRA, so we tried to avoid making that the definition. But if the artist..

U: there was also a little tiff between CBC and ACTRA

ME: and then another cut came to the CBC... thank you. Thank you...

[closing/departures]...

## ***Appendix Four: Ethics Protocol***

This appendix presents the University Research Ethics Protocol filed and approved for the research undertaken.



### **Summary Protocol Form (SPF) University Human Research Ethics Committee**

Office of Research – Ethics and Compliance Unit: GM 1000 – 514.848.2424 ex. 2425

#### **Important**

Approval of a *Summary Protocol Form* (SPF) must be issued by the applicable Human Research Ethics Committee prior to beginning any research involving human participants.

The University Human Research Ethics Committee (UHREC) reviews all Faculty and Staff research, as well as some student research (in cases where the research involves more than minimal risk - please see below).

Research funds cannot be released until appropriate certification has been obtained.

#### **For faculty and staff research**

Please submit one signed copy of this form to the UHREC c/o the Research Ethics and Compliance Unit, GM-1000. Please allow one month for the UHREC to complete the review.

Electronic signatures will be accepted via e-mail at [ethics@alcor.concordia.ca](mailto:ethics@alcor.concordia.ca)

#### **For graduate or undergraduate student research**

- If your project is included in your supervising faculty member's SPF, no new SPF is required.
- Departmental Research Ethics Committees are responsible for reviewing all student research, including graduate thesis research, where the risk is less than minimal. In Departments where an ethics committee has not been established, please contact the Research Ethics and Compliance Unit.
- In cases where the student research is more than minimal risk (i.e. the research involves participants under the age of 18yrs, participants with diminished capacity, participants from vulnerable populations or participants from First Nations), an SPF must be submitted to the UHREC, c/o the Research Ethics and Compliance Unit, GM-1000, by the Course Instructor/Supervisor on the student's behalf.

## Instructions

This document is a form-fillable word document. Please open in Microsoft Word, and tab through the sections, clicking on checkboxes and typing your responses. The form will expand to fit your text. Handwritten forms will not be accepted. If you have technical difficulties with this document, you may type your responses and submit them on another sheet. Incomplete or omitted responses may cause delays in the processing of your protocol.

Does your research involve

- Participants under the age of 18 years?
- Participant with diminished mental or physical capacity?
- Aboriginal peoples?
- Vulnerable groups (refugees, prisoners, victims of violence, etc.)?

## 1. Submission Information

Please provide the requested contact information in the table below:

Please check ONE of the boxes below :

- This application is for a new protocol.
- This application is a modification or an update of an existing protocol:  
Previous protocol number (s): \_\_\_\_\_

## 2. Contact Information

Please provide the requested contact information in the table below:

Principal Investigator/ Instructor (must be Concordia faculty or staff member)	Department	Internal Address	Phone Number	E-mail
Monika Kin Gagnon	Communication Studies	CJ 4.415	514-848-2424 x2563	mkgagnon@alcor.concordia.ca
Co-Investigators / Collaborators		University / Department		E-mail
Mary Elizabeth Luka (doctoral research)		Communication Studies		meluka@gmail.com
Research Assistants		Department / Program		E-mail

## 3. Project and Funding Sources

**Project Title:** *Towards creative citizenship: collaborative cultural production at CBC ArtSpots*

In the table below, please list all existing internal and external sources of research funding, and associated information, which will be used to support this project. Please include anticipated start and finish dates for the project(s). Note that for awarded grants, the grant number is REQUIRED. If a grant is an

application only, list APPLIED instead.

Funding Source	Project Title	Grant Number	Award Period	
			Start	End
Concordia University	Faculty of Arts and Science Fellowship	N/A	09-2009	08-2012
SSHRC	Vanier Canada Graduate Scholarship	770-2011-0084	05-2011	04-2014

#### 4. Brief Description of Research or Activity

Please provide a brief overall description of the project or research activity. Include a description of the benefits which are likely to be derived from the project. Do not submit your thesis proposal or grant application.

This research will be undertaken for Mary Elizabeth Luka's doctoral dissertation. The research will inform the development of her key concept of "creative citizenship" by examining the role of the artist and producer in the production of culturally-based media in Canada, for distribution on television, the internet, and in the gallery and fine arts systems. More precisely, the primary research site is a case study focused on the internet and television program called CBC ArtSpots, which existed between 1997-2008. It involved over 300 artists and 1,200 volunteers and technical crew. Luka was the founder and executive producer; this will allow unique reflexive access and understanding during the research to be undertaken. Key research methods will take advantage of Luka's extensive experience as a producer for more than twelve years, including interviewing 8 to 10 individuals and facilitating two discussion groups, primarily drawing from the large groups of ArtSpots participants, for a detailed case study analysis. The research will triangulate interview and discussion group findings with an annotated inventory of the content produced and a chronology of ArtSpots based on Luka's personal archival documents and access to the archives currently held at CBC Halifax, as well as an analysis of a selection of key broadcast and arts policy documents. It is anticipated that Luka will also create an exploratory artistic documentary for presentation on the internet and in professional and scholarly environments as a third key method.

Please note that a significant proportion (up to 10%) of the creative professionals involved in ArtSpots self-identified as Aboriginal, and as a result, it is desirable and likely that some interviewees or discussion group participants will be Aboriginal.

Benefits include historicizing the largest collection of visual arts production for television and the internet by the Canadian public broadcaster within the context of the Communication and Media Studies domain; making visible and examining the relationship between technology and social relations in professional media production and fine arts at a particularly transformative period in Canada, including an assessment of explicit goals to include traditionally under-represented groups in mainstream media; and creating an opportunity for participants to comment on and help assess the impact of such projects on creative and cultural industries and scholarly theory related to these fields.

## 5. Scholarly Review / Merit

Has this research been funded by a peer-reviewed granting agency (e.g. CIHR, FQRSC, Hexagram)?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes	Agency:	SSHRC (Vanier Canada Graduate Scholarship)
<input type="checkbox"/>	No	If your research is beyond minimal risk, please complete and attach the Scholarly Review Form	

## 6. Research Participants

a) Please describe the group of people who will participate in this project.

There are two groups of people who will participate in this project. The first group includes 20 to 30 interview or discussion group participants, primarily drawn from among those who were originally involved in the ArtSpots programming initiative (1997-2008). A preliminary list of interviewees and discussion group participants is available. A sub-group of three or four individuals to be interviewed or involved in discussion groups includes professionals currently involved in internet or media production or artists and their representatives involved in cultural production who were not involved in ArtSpots. This sub-group will primarily emerge from discussions with the ArtSpots interviewees or from professional networks, and may include representatives (for example) from Kickstarter.com, IDEO.com, the Nova Scotia film and television industry (ArtSpots started in Nova Scotia), the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the National Film Board of Canada.

The second group of people who will potentially participate in the research includes individuals who comment on or contribute content to the proposed exploratory documentary, on Luka's blog or through other public forums, including discussion at scholarly or other presentations. It is anticipated that several of the participants from the first group will be involved in this stage, as well as a few additional participants generated from the blog or presentations.

b) Please describe in detail how participants will be recruited to participate. Please attach to this protocol draft versions of any recruitment advertising, letters, etcetera which will be used.

First point of contact for both groups will primarily be established through email. A sample is provided below. Many of the individuals to be invited to participate are part of Luka's existing professional and personal networks, particularly through their relationship to ArtSpots, and/or may be referred through such networks. In addition, in the relatively public forum of the blog, information will be posted by Luka which clearly indicates the nature of the research underway. The wording will be based on item #4 above as well as #6 a) and 6 c).

### Draft contact letter/email

Dear xx,

I hope this finds you well. [If known, reference to most recent contact. If not known, reference to how I secured their contact information – likely a public source.] I am conducting research for a doctoral dissertation about collaborative production in cultural media, and particularly CBC ArtSpots. Your involvement [or connection] with this project [or similar project] is intriguing to

me, and I would appreciate the opportunity to speak with you about it [or, invite you to a discussion group about it]. I am hoping that you [and/or your director, another producer, founder, etc] might be interested in being interviewed by email or skype for this project. The primary research will take place between now and summer 2012, so there is plenty of time to book an interview [and possibly a follow-up] at a mutually convenient time. If you decide to participate, I would like to record the interview to better concentrate on our conversation during the interview, and potentially to use specific excerpts of the interview (with your permission) to inform or use in a documentary. Afterwards, I would appreciate it if you would also be willing to review a transcript or research notes for fact-checking purposes, though this is not required. Please find attached the consent form for the research project. Thanks for your consideration. Sincerely,  
Mary Elizabeth Luka.

-----

c) Please describe in detail how participants will be treated throughout the course of the research project. Include a summary of research procedures, and information regarding the training of researchers and assistants. Include sample interview questions, draft questionnaires, etcetera, as appropriate.

All participants will be treated with courtesy and respect at all times.

Interviews and discussion groups will be arranged at mutually convenient times in comfortable locations, with adequate time for changes as needed. Permission will be sought to record proceedings, and options for confidentiality will be clearly outlined. Consent forms will be sent in advance wherever possible, as well as a sample set of open-ended questions. The draft questions are provided below, and the draft consent form is attached. Participants will be offered the opportunity to review research reports or transcripts for fact-checking and accuracy, if they wish to do so.

#### Draft interview questions

1. Please tell me about your involvement in CBC ArtSpots [or similar project/film/website/etc]. When, how and why did you decide to get involved?
2. Who are/were the key participants involved?
3. How (and why) were the resources put together for the project?
4. What were the identification and selection processes? How did they work?
5. What do you know about the production processes?
6. Can you describe the standard distribution processes (broadcasting, internet, exhibitions, etc) and/or partnerships or other ways in which you were involved?
7. How and why did ArtSpots [or another project] work/not work for you? Strengths? Weaknesses?
8. Do you know others (other projects or individuals) who have used collaborative production (etc) processes? If so, would you be willing to refer me to them?
9. Would you be interested in remaining involved in the research through the documentary production? If so – as an interview participant, or through use of ArtSpots produced about your work [if applicable], or in another way?
10. Do you have any other comments?

-----

Participation in discussions on the blog will be moderated by Luka, and informed by a research statement that this is a public forum, asserting the need for courtesy and respect, outlining the research underway, and noting that the level of personal identification and confidentiality is the prerogative and responsibility

of participants, and will be respected to the degree possible in a public forum. For example, participants on the blog may decide to participate under a pseudonym of their own choice, or under their own name.

M.E. Luka will conduct all aspects of the primary research, with the results incorporated into her doctoral dissertation.

## **7. Informed Consent**

a) Please describe how you will obtain informed consent from your participants. A copy of your written consent form or your oral consent script must be attached to this protocol. *Please note: written consent forms must follow the format of the sample consent form template provided for you at the Ethics and Compliance webpage*

A written consent form will be sent in advance for interviews and discussion groups: a draft is attached. A downloadable pdf of the consent form will be available on the blog or by email for participants involved in the documentary. A downloadable pdf of the research statement will also be available on the blog or by email.

b) In some cultural traditions, individualized consent as implied above may not be appropriate, or additional consent (e.g. group consent; consent from community leaders) may be required. If this is the case with your sample population, please describe the appropriate format of consent and how you will obtain it.

It is not anticipated that additional consents will be required. Some of the participants in the main case study, CBC ArtSpots, may have come from cultural traditions with possible additional consent requirements for other purposes; however, during their association with ArtSpots, they were not required to secure additional consents. If any individuals request additional time, documentation or consents in order to participate in the research study, this will be accommodated or alternate subjects will be identified. There is a reasonable amount of time in the research timetable to accommodate this, as well as a large potential pool of subjects.

## **8. Deception and Freedom to Discontinue**

a) Please describe the nature of any deception, and provide a rationale regarding why it must be used in your protocol. Is deception absolutely necessary for your research design? Please note that deception includes, but is not limited to, the following: deliberate presentation of false information; suppression of material information; selection of information designed to mislead; selective disclosure of information.

N/A

b) How will participants be informed that they are free to discontinue at any time? Will the nature of the project place any limitations on this freedom (e.g. documentary film)?

The consent form includes the information they are free to discontinue at any time or to place limits on their visible identity including the documentary project. The documentary project will be produced in discrete segments, any one of which can be withdrawn prior to circulation on the internet or other venues. Participants will be offered the opportunity to review the segments for accuracy prior to circulation.

## 9. Risks and Benefits

a) Please identify any foreseeable risks or potential harms to participants. This includes low-level risk or any form of discomfort resulting from the research procedure. When appropriate, indicate arrangements that have been made to ascertain that subjects are in “healthy” enough condition to undergo the intended research procedures. Include any “withdrawal” criteria.

There are no foreseeable risks or potential harms anticipated. Participants are able to withdraw at their own discretion. These are professionals involved in artistic practice and/or the creative, funding, administrative and promotional aspects of their own projects and work. As professionals, they regard participation in interviews, creative production and commentary and research as a potential benefit to the project and possibly to their own work. Almost all will be familiar with the critical perspective brought to bear in research of this nature. This critical perspective will also be discussed during the interview, discussion group or other interaction.

b) Please indicate how the risks identified above will be minimized. Also, if a potential risk or harm should be realized, what action will be taken? Please attach any available list of referral resources, if applicable.

N/A

c) Is there a likelihood of a particular sort of “heinous discovery” with your project (e.g. disclosure of child abuse; discovery of an unknown illness or condition; etcetera)? If so, how will such a discovery be handled?

N/A

## 10. Data Access and Storage

a) Please describe what access research participants will have to study results, and any debriefing information that will be provided to participants post-participation.

Participants will be offered the opportunity to fact-check research reports and transcripts relevant to their participation. They will be provided with a copy of research paper(s) or summaries if interested. Permission forms and followup discussions will indicate that further uses of the results may be developed into non-scholarly articles, presentations or initiatives. Participation in discussions on the blog will also enrich participants’ opportunities to provide feedback and to debrief.

b) Please describe the path of your data from collection to storage to its eventual archiving or disposal. Include specific details on short and long-term storage (format and location), who will have access, and final destination (including archiving, or any other disposal or destruction methods).

Recordings of interviews and correspondence will be stored in a secure location in my private office for a period of at least five years, in hard copy form and on a separate hard drive. Interviewees will have access to a copy of the original research materials (e.g. copy of a tape or transcript). Long-term archiving is dependent on the participants, and will include wiping drives and destroying paper records if needed for confidentiality. The work that is conducted on the blog will become a matter of public record as soon as it is placed on the blog, even if I later remove it from the website, given the nature of automatic saving that occurs in this

environment. This information will be incorporated in the wording on the blog.

## 11. Confidentiality of Results

Please identify what access you, as a researcher, will have to your participant(s) identity(ies):

<input type="checkbox"/>	Fully Anonymous	Researcher will not be able to identify who participated at all. Demographic information collected will be insufficient to identify individuals.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Anonymous results, but identify who participated	The participation of individuals will be tracked (e.g. to provide course credit, chance for prize, etc) but it would be impossible for collected data to be linked to individuals.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Pseudonym	Data collected will be linked to an individual who will only be identified by a fictitious name / code. The researcher will not know the “real” identity of the participant.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Confidential	Researcher will know “real” identity of participant, but this identity will not be disclosed.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Disclosed	Researcher will know and will reveal “real” identity of participants in results / published material.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Participant Choice	Participant will have the option of choosing which level of disclosure they wish for their “real” identity.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (please describe)	

a) If your sample group is a particularly vulnerable population, in which the revelation of their identity could be particularly sensitive, please describe any special measures that you will take to respect the wishes of your participants regarding the disclosure of their identity.

N/A

b) In some research traditions (e.g. action research, research of a socio-political nature) there can be concerns about giving participant groups a “voice”. This is especially the case with groups that have been oppressed or whose views have been suppressed in their cultural location. If these concerns are relevant for your participant group, please describe how you will address them in your project.

The ArtSpots initiative—the main case study—explicitly articulated goals and implemented working processes to involve under-represented socio-cultural groups in arts-based media production. Careful attention will be paid during research to ensure an appropriate sampling from these groups. The structure of the research project reflects a commitment to maximizing the study participants’ control over their level of involvement and degree of confidentiality.

## 12. Additional Comments

a) Bearing in mind the ethical guidelines of your academic and/or professional association, please comment on any other ethical concerns which may arise in the conduct of this protocol (e.g. responsibility to subjects beyond the purposes of this study).

On-going relationships with several study participants will likely continue after the study. Luka will maintain these relationships in a professional manner. The professional and creative community in Canada is relatively small, and highly connected one to another, as are individuals from many of the specific under-represented groups involved in the ArtSpots initiative. In addition, the field of professional

media production, particularly public broadcasting, is subject to rigorous protocols about ethical professional behaviour and interaction, and this is reflected in the approach to be taken in the proposed doctoral research. This general area of study forms the foundation upon which Luka intends to continue her research after her doctoral studies have been completed. In addition, the openness which has already been expressed by several potential participants to Luka directly is based on her existing reputation, and her previous professional relationships and standing. As a result, she is highly motivated and positioned to ensure that the research processes are deeply respectful while being balanced with generating knowledge in the field.

b) If you have feedback about this form, please provide it here.

N/A

### **13. Signature and Declaration**

Following approval from the UHREC, a protocol number will be assigned. This number must be used when giving any follow-up information or when requesting modifications to this protocol.

The UHREC will request annual status reports for all protocols, one year after the last approval date. Modification requests can be submitted as required, by submitting to the UHREC a memo describing any changes, and an updated copy of this document.

**I hereby declare that this Summary Protocol Form accurately describes the research project or scholarly activity that I plan to conduct. Should I wish to add elements to my research program or make changes, I will edit this document accordingly and submit it to the University Human Research Ethics Committee for Approval.**

**ALL activity conducted in relation to this project will be in compliance with:**

• ***The Tri Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Human Subjects***  
**[http://www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/pdf/eng/tcps2/TCPS\\_2\\_FINAL\\_Web.pdf](http://www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/pdf/eng/tcps2/TCPS_2_FINAL_Web.pdf)**

• **The Concordia University Code of Ethics: Guidelines for Ethical Actions**

**Signature of Principal Investigator: \_\_\_\_\_ Monika Kin Gagnon**

**Date: November 7, 2011**

Note that SPF's with electronic signatures will be accepted via e-mail

-----



**Consent to Participate:**

***Towards creative citizenship: collaborative cultural production at CBC ArtSpots***

This is to state that I understand I have been asked to participate in the research project conducted by Mary Elizabeth Luka, (meluka@gmail.com; 902.292.9957), under the supervision of Dr Kin Gagnon, (mkgagnon@alcor.concordia.ca; 514.848.2424x2563) of Concordia University.

**A. PURPOSE**

I have been informed about the purpose of the research. I understand that the researcher intends to develop the key concept of "creative citizenship" by examining the role of the artist and producer in the production of culturally-based media in Canada for distribution on television, the internet, and in the gallery and fine arts systems. I understand that the primary research site is a case study focused on an internet and television program called CBC ArtSpots, which existed between 1997-2008.

**B. PROCEDURES**

The research includes my participation in an interview or discussion group. I understand that an interview may take place in person, via skype or telephone at a mutually agreeable real or virtual location. I understand that a discussion group will take place in person. I have been informed that the interview will last approximately 45 to 60 minutes, while a discussion group may run for approximately two hours. I have been informed that the interview or discussion group will be recorded on camera or with an audio recording device. I understand that it is intended that excerpts from the interview or discussion group may (though will not necessarily) be used in an exploratory documentary, or in presentations or publications, with attribution at the level of confidentiality I specify below. I understand that the primary research phase will conclude on or around September 2012, with some findings reported as early as April 2012. I understand that research notes and the recordings will be kept in a secure location for logging or transcribing.

**C. RISKS AND BENEFITS**

I understand that some questions may elicit confidential information, which I am at liberty to decline answering. I take responsibility to indicate if any information that is shared is confidential. I understand I will receive no remuneration for my participation.

**D. CONDITIONS OF PARTICIPATION**

**i. Please check BOTH boxes below**

- I understand that I am free to withdraw my consent and discontinue my participation at anytime without negative consequences, prior to the relevant research results being reported in academic or other public environments. More specifically, I understand that it is difficult, if not impossible, to withdraw results once they have been published or otherwise reported (*please check*)
- I understand that the data from this study may be published (*please check*)

**ii. Please check only ONE of the following:**

- I understand the data collected from me during this research project may be kept indefinitely for archival or other purposes in Luka’s home office or another secure, long-term location.  
**OR**
- I prefer that the data collected from me during this research project be destroyed within five years, including deleting electronic files. I understand that the data will be kept in Luka’s home office or another secure location for the five years following data collection.

**iii. Please check only ONE of the three following choices:**

- I understand that my participation in this study is NON-CONFIDENTIAL (i.e., my identity will be revealed in study results), **OR**
- I understand that my participation in this study is CONFIDENTIAL (i.e., my identity will NOT be revealed in study results), **OR**
- I understand that my participation in this study is at the following level of disclosure (*please specify*):

---



---

I HAVE CAREFULLY STUDIED THE ABOVE AND UNDERSTAND THIS AGREEMENT. I FREELY CONSENT AND VOLUNTARILY AGREE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY.

NAME (please print) \_\_\_\_\_

SIGNATURE \_\_\_\_\_

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

If at any time you have questions about the proposed research, please contact the researcher, M.E. Luka, by email: meluka@gmail.com or telephone: 902.292.9957; or her supervisor, Dr Monika Kin Gagnon, Department of Communication Studies, Concordia University, by email: mkgagnon@alcor.concordia.ca or telephone: 514.848.2424 x2563.

If at any time you have questions about your rights as a research participant, please contact the Research Ethics and Compliance Advisor, Concordia University, at (514) 848-2424 x7481 or by email at ethics@alcor.concordia.ca. Thank you.

## Appendix Five: Comparison of Policy Documents

This appendix is primarily discussed in chapter three, and represents a comparison of the language used in legislation and strategic plans that were contemporaneous with *ArtSpots*, and influenced those who helped to develop the *ArtSpots* value statements and objectives.

Table 1: Comparison of Canadian Broadcasting System mandate, CBC mandate, Canada Council for the Arts, Ethnic Broadcast Policy, and *ArtSpots* Value Statements and Objectives

Subject	1991 Broadcast Act: Canadian broadcasting system	1991 Broadcast Act: CBC Mandate	1999 Ethnic Broadcasting Policy – CRTC (Summary & additional clauses)	1995 Canada Council for the Arts Strategic Plan: A Design for the Future	1997-2008 <i>ArtSpots</i> : Value Statements and Objectives
Who/what	3. (i) The programming provided by the Canadian broadcasting system should	3. (l) The CBC, as the national public broadcaster, should	Section 3. (d) (iii) of the Broadcasting Act states, in part, that the Canadian Broadcasting system should reflect the circumstances and aspirations of Canadians, including the multicultural and multiracial nature of Canadian society.	The Council operates as an independent agency at arm’s length from the government while being accountable to Parliament through the Minister of Canadian Heritage.	CBC is a public broadcaster on three platforms, including television, new media, and radio, both regionally and nationally. <i>CBC ArtSpots</i> is a[n in-house CBC] project highlighting visual and literary arts, particularly in television and new media.
General mandate, and dissemination	3. (i) (i) Be varied and comprehensive, providing a balance of information, enlightenment and entertainment	3. (l) ... provide radio and television services incorporating a wide range of programming that informs, entertains and enlightens...	...the Commission has licensed ethnic television and radio broadcasters that specialize in providing ethnic programming ...directed to any culturally or racially distinct group other than one that is Aboriginal	The Canada Council was created by an Act of Parliament in 1957 ... “to foster and promote the study and enjoyment of, and the production of works, in the arts.” [In the 1995 Strategic Plan] the Council has identified five priority areas: ... investment in the arts; leadership, advocacy and appreciation of the arts; partnerships and other forms of support;	It is possible and desirable for our public broadcaster to provide opportunities for artists to explore their artistic concerns and intents across platforms. ... Sample Objective: Act as a catalyst for CBC’s role as a cultural partner in the community, regionally and

	for men, women and children of all ages, interests and tastes.		Canadian or from France or the British Isles. ... Ethnic radio and television stations will continue to be required to devote at least 60% of their schedule to ethnic programming.	equity, access, and new practices; and, improving program delivery. (8-9)	nationally.
Definition of groups served: local, regional, national, diasporic, international	3. (i) (ii) Be drawn from local, regional, national and international sources.	3. (i) [programming provided should] (i) be predominantly and distinctly Canadian. (ii) Reflect Canada and its regions to national and regional audiences, while servicing the special needs of those regions.	The Commission will ... require ethnic ... stations to devote at least half of their schedules to programming in third languages, that is in languages other than French, English or an Aboriginal language. This will ensure that the Canadian broadcasting system reflects Canada's linguistic diversity. ... Ethnic stations play an important role in serving local communities. They will, therefore, be expected to provide, at time of licensing and renewal, plans on how they will reflect local issues and concerns.	[G]ranting programs... designed to serve many and differing needs of the developing and established arts communities. ... (9) [O]pportunities for the Canadian public in all regions of Canada to experience the arts, and which distribute and promote the arts to new audiences across our country... [and] abroad. ... (10) [T]erminate the Art Bank Program... [in order to] increase its support to Canadian visual and media artists. (11-12)... The Council has a national mandate. All Canadians are entitled to have access ... The Council will address the importance of regional representation by monitoring the composition of Council juries and advisory committees [and] while maintaining its commitment to the criterion of artistic merit, will be sensitive to development needs in different parts of the country. (15).	Artists live in particular communities and regions and their work can be of great interest to that community as well as broader communities. Finding ways to reflect and to facilitate engagement between individuals, communities and regions is important to CBC. An emphasis on youth, education, arts and culture, partnerships and outreach, grounded in provinces and regions with both national and regional application, can help to focus CBC's development of <i>CBC ArtSpots</i> .
Cultural and community responsibility	3. (i) (iii) Include educational and community programs.	3. (i) (iii) Actively contribute to the flow and exchange of cultural expression.	...[E]thnic stations will continue to be required to serve a broad range of ethnic groups within their service area (broad service requirement). [More specifically, later in	Those [arts] service organizations which directly contribute to the creation, production and distribution of the arts will... receive support (12) ... The Council will actively advocate on behalf of artists and arts organizations [and] provide logistical and information	It is possible to represent works of art on television and new media in a way that complements the artist's concerns and intents and/or describes or reflects an artist's personality, approach and/or set

			the policy:] 10. Ethnic programming may be in English, French, a third-language or a combination of languages. It also includes cross-cultural programming provided, once again, that it is specifically directed to any culturally or racially distinct group other than one that is in languages other than French, English or an Aboriginal language.	support to community-based arts awareness initiatives (13).	of issues in the work. In some cases, it is possible for CBC to present works of art in a way that becomes a conduit for artists, and/or facilitates discussions and engagements about works of art. ... Sample Objective: Play a role in bringing visual and aural arts to a broader public in a manner that engages and encourages viewers to “see” and to seek out arts and culture experiences, on television, new media and elsewhere.
Identity and difference	3. (i) (iv) Provide a reasonable opportunity for the public to be exposed to the expression of differing views on matters of public concern, and	3. (l) (iv) Be in English and in French, reflecting the different needs and circumstances of each official language community, including the particular needs and circumstances of English and French linguistic minorities. 3. (l) (v) strive to be of equivalent quality in English and French 3. (l) (vi) Contribute to shared national consciousness and identity 3. (l) (viii) Reflect	Service to a variety of ethnic groups... 18. The Commission will continue to set, by condition of license, the minimum number of ethnic groups that each ... station must serve and the minimum number of languages in which it must provide programming. 19. Ethnic stations are required to serve a range of ethnic groups in a variety of languages [because of] scarcity of broadcast frequencies [and to ensure] provision of services to groups that would otherwise not be able to afford their own single-language service. Canadian content - Television: 29. The	The Canada Council has recognized the importance of the work of First Peoples artists .. [and] established the First Peoples Secretariat, and a First Peoples Committee on the Arts to advise the Council (15). ... The Canada Council ... is committed to assisting artists of culturally diverse backgrounds achieve recognition and excellence. The position of Equity Coordinator and the Advisory Committee for Racial Equality in the Arts were established (16). ... The Canada Council will ensure that increasing accommodation is made for the needs of artists and arts organizations working in new artistic forms, grouping, or media whose practice crosses over the generally accepted boundaries of any single discipline[;] explore the ways and means by which to better accommodate multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary forms of expression[; and] increase its resources for creation in the media arts, and for initiatives linking the arts to new	Television and new media audiences are intelligent, receptive to images and sound that encourage thinking/ response/learning, and are sometimes interested in engaging with artists and others about culture, identity and other issues. ... Representing the work of Canadian artists can reflect cultural, identity, local and global concerns of interest to a broader Canadian public. Sample Objectives: Facilitate the CBC Television role as distinctive from private television, in part by the continued development of CBC’s unique identity. ... Act as a catalyst for CBC’s role as a cultural partner in the community, regionally and nationally. ... Promote <i>CBC ArtSpots</i> within the context of

		the multicultural and multiracial nature of Canada.	Commission will continue to require that ethnic television stations broadcast the same minimum Canadian content levels as non-ethnic private television stations.	media[,] contemporary electronic and interdisciplinary media (17). ...	the CBC TV Arts programming strategy, and CBCs overall objectives, particularly in relation to outreach, education, youth, arts and culture.
Other partners and resources	3. (i) (v) Include a significant contribution from the Canadian independent producers	3. (l) (vii) be made available throughout Canada by the most appropriate and efficient means and as resources become available for the purpose...	31. ... [I]ndependently-administered production funds may be established to respond to some of the funding demands which do not currently fit within the framework of the Canadian Television Fund (CTF). 32. It would, therefore, be possible to establish a fund to support ethnic television production. Broadcasting distribution undertakings (BDUs) would then have the option of directing up to 20% of their total required contribution to Canadian programming to this fund.	The Council will create and/or restore programs which bring artists and their work to communities in partnership with community institutions[;] explore greater collaborative possibilities with other potential partners at the federal, provincial and municipal levels, and in the private sector; ... work with the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade and such other departments and agencies ... in order to assist Canadian artists disseminate their work (10). ... The Council will work more closely with other federal, provincial and municipal funders in such general areas as strengthening public support for the arts and artists [and] develop better working links with the corporate and philanthropic sectors in order to strengthen support for the arts and for artists (14-15). ... The Canada Council will, within the context of available resources, work to improve outreach communications initiatives within all regions of Canada, particularly for those artists and locations which have been under-served (21).	Artists make a significant contribution to our society. ... Sample objectives: Act as a vehicle and departure point for partnerships with the cultural, youth and education communities. ... Facilitate the integration of <i>ArtSpots</i> web and internet activities with the goals and plans for CBC new media and develop the web site as a key component of the CBC arts and culture gateway.