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Abstract

This practice-led research project attempts to seek out and reveal the structures that frame the production of art practice, through and with art practice itself. With this premise in mind, the first phase of the study aims to use practice-led research by adopting quasi-ethnographic strategies firstly to explore the field of artistic production, and secondly in an attempt to activate, capture and contain tangible evidence that the artistic field is powered by persuasive informal discourse and practices that contribute to stringent and hierarchical rules of engagement. Entering the second phase of the project the contribution of this study is based on the proposition that as a research project it utilises the performative lecture to position art practice as a formal presentation model demonstrating that art practice in and of itself can act as an appropriate tool to articulate the findings from the practice-led research cited above. The study aims to demonstrate that art practice can be an adept conceptual, contextual mode of communicating its own particular character, to iterate and embody its own hierarchical structures and articulate, critically, by rendering visible its structures and evasive, invisible properties.

Through a decisive performative approach adopted in the second phase of the project, the artworks produced seek to tease out and form a type of rebuttal towards the problem of subjectivity inherent in my position as a researcher in relation to my research enquiry, that is, the problem of how an artist can make critical artworks about the system of which he/she is a part. This teasing out process is done by attempting to attain an insightful ‘inter-subjective’ reflexivity around my research enquiry through performative practice and by adopting self-conscious strategies. These self-conscious attributes aim to acknowledge, harness and present nuances of subjectivity, coupled with and couched in a formal academic context where the performative works play out, acting as an objective frame for the work.

Through a body of practice contained on the accompanying website (naomi-sex.com) and text including various theoretical references where at conceptually relevant points art practice theory and textual content intersect and interface, this project as a whole aims to present and contextualise the subject of my enquiry, its influencing factors and the outcomes of the research period.
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Introduction

I will introduce my enquiry by reiterating the shorter title of the project – “Practice Makes Practice… Visible”? This title is intended to imply that the act of art practice within the project is used as a research activity with an aim to examine other dominant forms of practice that frame and mediate the production of art making – for example, the professional practices of artists and, in general, the more informal “custom and practice” conventions of the unregulated field of artistic production. The above project title asks, “can art practice be harnessed to produce research activity and construct art works that in some way interrogate the structures and forms of practice that frame art making”? The title also implies that these framing forms of practice are hard to locate and are in a sense made invisible by the inhabitants, agents and producers in the field of art. By positing the question “Practice Makes Practice …Visible?” the title presents my enquiry and the overarching practice-led premise of this research project: that is, can I as a researcher produce art works that reveal and make visible aspects of the unique character of the field of artistic production?

Through this thesis and the accompanying submission of artwork produced throughout a four-year research period I aim to establish that the above premise and research investment in the enquiry have yielded fruitful outcomes with regard to the above cited research aims. The practice-based submission can be found at the website www.naomisex.com; within the body of this text the reader is directed to the website at certain junctures by way of the specific project titles.¹

¹ Please note that the accompanying DVD of documentation contains all of the projects within titled folders in the case of there being no access to an internet connection.
This project is a *practice-based* endeavour and it relies predominantly on *art practice* to yield data and articulate material collated from the research period. In this regard, theoretical and philosophical discussion were used to aid in the design of the research path and to aid the framing and the problem solving/teasing out process of pragmatic issues encountered throughout the research period. In this body of text, various references to key classical theorists coupled with a cross-section of relevant contemporary commentators are utilised in order to contextualise my practice-based activity and the conceptual underpinning of that activity.

The following is an overview of how the various key theoretical references play out throughout the text and cite what the commonality is between those various references. Chapter One sets out the parameters and context for the research activity and describes and contextualises the contemporary field of artistic play, elaborating on the current definition of the contemporary art field as a field that operates as a reputation-based economy. Following this, Chapter One lays out the professional practices of artists, forms of practice that contain evidence of the reputation of the artist; this is done by citing the deriving contexts from which artistic professional practice has evolved, including the art education post-graduate arena and the 1990s residual effect of artistic professionalism left from the Young British Artist phenomena. In the context of establishing these parameters and exemplifying typical forms of artistic professional practice as a dominant framing and mediating mechanism existing in the contemporary art world, extensive reference is made to the theoretical discussions of Michel Foucault (1977) and the contemporary philosopher Giorgio Agamben’s (2008) updated ideas on Foucault’s work in order to help define and provide a conceptual entry point for my initial research activity. In this regard, the classical work done by Foucault in the 1970s
with his specific theories on state systems and the mechanisms for the distribution of state control via what he terms an “apparatus” are utilised in order to aid in constructing a definition for artistic professionalism and a structural anchor for a research design or – as in accordance with this research project – a research schema. Chapter Two then details the initial stages of practice-based activity conducted within the research project with a description of a flurry of artistic projects produced at the beginning of the research period, based on a trial and error approach. Working through this process with Foucault’s and Agamben’s theories reinforcing and anchoring the research, a refinement of practice is then recorded where the development of a two-phase research schema is conveyed. The first phase of practice-based activity is then outlined in Chapter Two, which evidences a theoretical alignment to a form of field-based art practice relating to the field of social sciences, specifically to the pivotal research done by Pierre Bourdieu in the 1970s on the subject of aesthetic taste distinguishing the (then) French tiered class system (1979).

Initially, Bourdieu’s research techniques were studied in order to conduct the first field-based project, which yielded concrete material toward the research enquiry with the project I entitled The Gatekeeper Project. In Chapter Two, this project is then described and contextualised by citing relevant contemporary artistic practices. In brief, The Gatekeeper project saw me take on a curatorial role that was coupled with that of an ethnographer in order to infiltrate an amateur artistic event by creating an exhibiting opportunity for four academically trained/professional artists at the event. An extensive and nuanced negotiation process was required in order for this project to be permitted to go ahead by the committee of the amateur event. The act of creating a mini presentation of art works made by the artists I invited to the event was based on the
negotiation process cited above. The event played out producing unexpected learning outcomes for the research enquiry. It clearly offered tangible evidence of the often-veiled physical and psychological separations existing in the field of artistic play by the situating of differing artistic ideologies of individual artists within that field.

Forming a link with The Gatekeeper Project (which operated as an observation and study of a professional/amateur interface and the practices of the individual artists operating in the field) with a key structure inhabited by artists in the field, Chapter Three aims to offer a rounded perspective on the research project as a whole. It records the second project – again a type of field-based project entitled *A Structuring Structure*. Sitting within the first phase of the research schema, this project again saw me take on the “artist as an ethnographer” role and engage heavily and persistently in a subtle and delicate negotiation process with one of Ireland’s key artistic institutions, in order to gain permission to observe and record, through photography and sound, the large selection of artworks that is held annually at the institution. To aid in describing this project and its outcomes, Foucault’s history of hierarchy is used to contextualise it and act as a type of theoretical mapping for *A Structuring Structure*. Through the use of metaphor, I then linked Foucault’s history of hierarchy to the introduction of the salon hanging system in the gallery situation (a system still used in the selection of artworks cited above), described in Brian O’Doherty’s seminal essays found in *Inside the White Cube* (1976). This linking helps bring the focus of theoretical contextualising exercise more specifically in line with the research enquiry. To aid in the analysis of the sound-recorded material taken during the observation process (included in the appendix of this text) conducted throughout *A Structuring Structure*, Bourdieu’s theories are once again
referred to, specifically his theories relating to the forms of capital accrued by artists during their careers (1986).

In this regard, *A Structuring Structure* as a project acts as a type of container, which documents evidence of social capital via the transcribed material taken from the sound recordings I took as I observed the selection process. According to Bourdieu social capital is the form of value that relies on the social connections of the artist. Through the observation I made, the potency and powerfully persuasive forms of social capital (again normally veiled) are made a visible structure, which through this project can clearly be seen to determine artists’ exhibiting opportunities.

Importantly, the commentary of the activist and artist Gregory Sholette (2005) is referenced in order to gain a contemporary perspective and a conceptual bridge between the material gathered from both *The Gatekeeper Project* and *A Structuring Structure*. Sholette’s theories on the artistic field and his close observation and ideas surrounding what he calls *informal* practices of the art world, i.e., amateur artistic activity or hobbyist forms of practice, become pivotal with regard to contextualising a conceptual linkage in the two field projects cited above. Framed by his theories, the research outcomes from the two field-based research projects argue that there are hidden co-dependencies existing between the more *formal* professional practices of artists and those of the informal forms of art practice cited above and featuring as part of *The Gatekeeper Project*. These co-dependencies rely on a defined structural hierarchy within the field, exemplified by institutions such as the one sampled in the field-based project *A Structuring Structure*, and the power perceived by the artistic community in relation to those organisations. The hidden dependency which is revealed through this
research project demonstrates that these powerhouse-type institutions rely heavily on the perceptive power or the accrued reputation of the institution in order to continue to attract large submissions of interest via the annual event from both the community of informal and formal art practitioners – maintaining this attraction and allure is not only financially important to the institution but also psychologically significant in terms of continually bolstering the position of the organisation within the field of artistic play.

As cited above key classical and contemporary theorists aided in the eclectic practices conducted throughout the first phase of the research, including the work of Foucault, Agamben, Bourdieu, O’Doherty and Sholette. These key influences are as eclectic as the various methods I employed to conduct the research; this eclecticism is conveyed with regard to the various fields, contexts and time frames the theorists cited above are positioned within. However, there is a commonality to be found within their work, which prompted the choice to look to them as aids in the difficult task of navigating my research activity throughout the four-year period. In all cases these theorists propose theories that in some way tease out issues of parity and value within the field of study in which they operate. This is evident in Foucault’s work done on the more marginalised groups within society evidenced in, for example, his work *Discipline and Punish, The Birth of the Prison* (1977). Observing issues surrounding equality and parity within the class systems via the aesthetic value assigners and signifiers of society can be found also in the work of Bourdieu. Although articulating his ideas in a very different tone to Foucault or Bourdieu, O’Doherty takes on the architecture of the gallery space by insightfully observing and attributing various forms of value to the artists’ works that hang within those specifically designed spaces. Shollette positions his theories in a contentious space with a desire to subvert the entrenched value systems of the
contemporary art world by teasing out how reputation-based value is channelled and distributed via informal art practice and discourse.

With the outcomes of the field-based projects outlined in the latter part of Chapter Three, in Chapter Four the task of the practice within the overall project is recorded as taking a shift in focus and agenda. Instead of gathering and collating data from the field as in Phase One of the research schema, the second phase of the research activity sought a way to articulate the data via art practice. An evolving performative practice, which takes as its context the academic lecture, is then explained and contextualised as the main artistic activity contained in the second phase of research. This form of practice is evident in two pieces entitled *Rehearsed Practice* and *Next-Previously-Meanwhile* – in both works I perform alongside two trained actors; together we enact scripted dialogue and at certain and specific points in the piece we sync movements and gestures. The actors embody composites of the shifting field of artistic activity and in this regard the body is used as a formal construct in the works to allude to a hierarchy of practice and to convey the complex social dynamic of a reputation-based economy.

To take into account this shift in the practice, the movement of Institutional Critique is referred to with specific reference to the pioneers of the movement such as Hans Haacke and Michael Asher to more recent contributors to the movement exemplified by the performative works of Andrea Fraser and then chronologically moving to contemporary artists such as Hayley Newman and Anton Vidokle. Although framed and influenced by these examples of artistic practices, i.e., how artists from this genre of making were and are keenly aware of the systems of production that dictate the conditions of the field of cultural production and gear their practices toward critically
commenting on the field, my practice within the Irish context of my research offers a
difference in regard to how the works are produced and play out. Describing a marked
and perhaps dramatic contrast I will take an example of a typical kind of performative
work produced in the genre of Institutional Critique, for instance, Fraser with her video
piece *Untitled* (2003). In this piece Fraser literally prostituted herself to an art collector
who paid $20,000 for her services. The video piece contains 60 minutes of explicit
content documenting the sexual acts. This politicised form of practice operates as a
critical gesture directly aimed at the systems that govern art making; the approach is
overt, direct, sensationalist and highly controversial; on those terms the work
successfully drew mass media attention.

In the case of my work and the research activity I pursued in order to yield material
toward my research and then articulate that material via the performative lecture, I see
the practice as still occupying a political position and offering a valuable and reflective
critique of the system of art albeit a much more subtle manner. In this regard, I see the
delicate negotiation process involved in both field-based projects *The Gatekeeper
Project* and *A Structuring Structure* as being a significant and challenging process to
work through as a researcher and an artist; it was done in order to covertly infiltrate the
systems of art making to gain insight into unprecedented terrain. This subtle yet
persistent push and pull process required an extremely delicate handling and was
subject to collapse at any point, contributing to the testing and experimental character of
this research project as a whole.

As contextualised in Chapter Four, taking the outcomes of the above field work and
embedding it within the content of the performative lecture, the works *Rehearsed*
Practice and Next – Previously – Meanwhile take influence from a broad field of theory and culture; for example, they look to Simon Critchley’s theories on humour and the critical properties that humour embodies (2002). The works themselves aim to operate with a degree of humour. In this regard the combination of prop, material, action, dialogue and language itself are harnessed to construct and conduct a critique based on the outcomes gathered from the research. The pieces are complex and relied on an extensive rehearsal process for an exact staging – this process pays homage to classical Irish theatrical influences, from the work of Samuel Beckett to more recent works by Brian Friel.

In order to problematise issues that may arise around my inherent subjectivity in relation to the content of my research – i.e., how an artist can successfully conduct a critical reflection on the very systems that the artist is a part of and engages in – with the performative works I overtly position myself and my subjective position within the works in order to present the value of that subjective reflection and my inherent insider knowledge of the field within the works. The couching of the pieces with the more formal academic context intends to balance out that subjectivity with an objective context for the work offering an intersubjective interpretation and reading of them.

To summarise the overall agenda of the research project, it is intended that through this submission of art practice and text this project aims at the following:

To acknowledge the art world system as a form of economy, one that works on an informal basis and through informal discursive activity defined as a reputation-based economy.
To use art making as a form of field research directed toward infiltrating the systems and structures of artistic production in an original and unprecedented manner.

To employ, and engage in, subtle yet strongly persistent negotiation processes to form a political position within the practice in order to critique and make visible aspects of the veiled character of the art world.

To use the container of the performative lecture as a multi-faceted form of practice to disseminate, articulate, critique and make visible the outcomes of the research.
Chapter One: Describing and defining an economy inhabited by ‘professional’ artists

I will now begin the narration and contextualisation of my research. This will be done in this chapter describing the site of my research, the context for my practice and the space of my own positioning as an artist in the artistic field of play. It should be noted at this juncture that the system of theoretical referencing used in this text follows a conceptually associative line of categorisation and is not necessarily a chronological one.

With that in mind, I will now argue that the artistic field is a type of economy – one that works unconventionally and on its own non-monetary terms. I will do this with the use of the phrase ‘Reputation Economy’ that has more recently been assigned to the artistic field.

With this term I will specifically describe, with the aid of commentary from the artistic field and the research findings of (artist and economist) Hans Abbing in his study entitled *Why Are Artists Poor? – The Exceptional Economy of the Arts* (2002), the unique and ‘informal’ nature of the reputation economy of the art world.

*Where art is made?*

Welcome to the Reputation Economy – a world in which perceptions are reality, in which reputation dynamics drive value creation and value destruction. To succeed in this environment, organisations must learn to navigate the complex web of relationships they inhabit and recognise the growing importance that stakeholder perceptions have on a company's prospects for long-term growth. (The Reputation Institute, n.d.)
The above quote is taken from the website of The Reputation Institute, a privately-run specialist organisation offering guidance in corporate and reputation management skills. The organisation is run by a number of leading specialists in the field. Other services include regular and themed international conferences, seminars and symposiums, which are facilitated by their organisers who are all academically awarded experts in their field. Although its message may seem at odds with art practice, this rhetoric does reflect the contemporary space of artistic production.

Spokespeople from the field of art may not appear crass or overt as to state that ‘to succeed in this environment’ one must be hyper-aware of the trading power dynamics embodied in one’s reputation. The message is given in a more subtle manner by Aidan Dunne, one of Ireland’s prominent art critics. When asked about his views on artistic careers, he states: ‘I think there is a huge amount of manoeuvring that goes on . . . artists who are quiet and modest in nature can be at a disadvantage’ (Dunne, 2011, cited in Humphries, 2011 [approx. 1 screen]).

In art practice the term ‘Reputation Economy’ has been relatively newly assigned as a descriptor for how the space of artistic production operates. Within the Irish field the term has been circulating in the domain of artistic research and education since the late 2000s. For example, within pedagogical circles Mick Wilson (a leading figure in Irish artistic research and practice) prefaced a text on artistic postgraduate study with the following assertion and allusion to artistic ‘manoeuvring’: ‘We all participate in the reputation-based economy in the form of e-flux, the advertising pages in Art Forum, constructing one’s curriculum vitae, and so on’ (Wilson, 2008, [approx 2 screens]).
**How a reputation works – informally . . .**

Hans Abbing, an artist and economist from the Netherlands, used his dual and opposing professions of artist and economist to conduct a PhD study on what he calls ‘The Exceptional Economy of the Arts.’ In his study he marks out the parameters for economic understanding of the art world. Abbing bases his research on a number of cultural assumptions. He maintains that to understand how an economy works, it is important to define what its subject is – what art is – a difficult and contentious hurdle to overcome from the outset. He unpacks the question pragmatically and leans more towards a sociological framing of it. He uses ‘art world’ in a broad sense, and asserts that within the art world there are multiple worlds, and that these smaller groupings or worlds represent various artistic ideologies, but not all of these worlds have an equal vote in the defining question of what art is (Abbing, 2002, pp. 19-20). He states that:

> Because the arts evolve and new genres arise, an art world is continuously repositioning this demarcation line. . . When relatively small art worlds are analysed, there can be as many orderings and lines and subsequent definitions of art as there are art worlds. Within society, however, such different opinions ‘add up’ and a dominant definition emerges. The definition ends up governing the economy of the arts. (Abbing, 2002, p. 20)

Abbing argues that these groupings or smaller worlds within the art world are generally in agreement with each other with regard to what art is – but when one group views another group’s choice, ‘asymmetry’ occurs. He says: ‘judgments\(^2\) concerning each other’s art choices do not run similar’ (Abbing, 2002, p. 21). With regard to this ‘asymmetry’, Abbing observes the following:

\(^2\) A closer examination will follow this chapter that is aligned to sociological and theoretical reasoning for judgement diversity within the field of artistic production. This is particular to the practice-based research intervention written up in Chapter Two and will reference the work of the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu and his publication *Distinction, A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* (1979).
People have notions regarding the art of other social groups and they assess these notions. Group A puts down the art of group B, while group B looks up to the art choices made by group A. I call this the phenomenon of asymmetric judgement or cultural asymmetry. (Abbing, 2002, p. 21)

In his publication *High Art Lite* (2006), answering the question of what art is, Julian Stallabrass (the British art historian, photographer and curator) gives a direct opinion as to who are the dominant group with power to define the subject of contemporary art. They, he says, are the groups of people who belong to and who have been to art school; he states: ‘You will find very, very few artists endorsed by the gallery system, private or public, who have not been through an accredited course’ (Stallabrass, 2006, p. 188). Within the Irish field of art practice, Stallabrass’s opinion does correlate with the recent report and survey of artists in the field entitled *The Social, Economic & Fiscal Status of Visual Artists in Ireland* (2008/2009) conducted by the professional representative body for artists (Visual Artists Ireland), which found that: ‘Visual artists represent a highly educated part of the community. Self-taught artists are the exception, with most art graduates progressing to MA and post-doctorate studies’ (Visual Artists of Ireland, 2008/9).

Stallabrass’s opinion cast in Abbing’s research findings would indicate that art education and its representatives form one dominant group of agents that govern the economy of the arts. Again, I will return to this observation more closely in Chapter Two. Abbing’s research brings the psychology of the field of art into focus by naming the social detriments that activate ‘asymmetry’ – he refers to them as forms of ‘cultural inferiority and superiority’, highlighted in groupings A) and B) mentioned above (Abbing, 2002, p. 21).

---

3 The Visual Artists of Ireland are the main state-funded body representing visual artists in Ireland. This study was from a surveyed group of artists and members of the Visual Artists of Ireland, not a survey conducted of a general group of art graduates.
According to Abbing, another unique character of the economy of the art world is how it ‘denies’, hides and veils money and cash exchanges, and works in a kind of reverse manner to a conventional transparent economic set of circumstances (Abbing, 2008 [approx. screen 2]). In art galleries he says: ‘One does not find price tags on a gallery's walls.’ In terms of his own art practice, Abbing states: ‘Buyers who come to my studio avoid the subject of money.’ When he does sell work through his art dealer, Abbing reports: ‘I only get paid when I pretend to be asking for a favour rather than rightfully demanding I be paid’ (Abbing, 2008 [approx.screen 2]).

Abbing observes that the general prevailing perception of the arts remains a romantic one, that artists are perceived as being gifted, and art is a gift. He relates this to art having religious and god-like associations, and uses the silence that is observed in galleries and museums as an example of the relationship art has to religion (Abbing, 2008). He expounds on the general perception by saying: ‘In our rational modern society art fills a void or compensates for what is missing in our everyday lives’ (Abbing, 2002, p. 27). He maintains that the evaluating processes in the arts can be ‘idiosyncratic’, and that there is often a duality that exists in terms of how art is valued within the wider market for the arts and that the dominant voices governing the economy or the experts ‘determine aesthetic value’, he states: ‘It is a social value. Their power of words is comparable with the consumer's power of money’ (Abbing, 2008 [approx. screen 3]). This indicates how there is a measure in terms of what is said about an artist or artwork that is comparable to money in economic terms.

In his study, which was published in 2002, pre-dating the emergence of the term ‘Reputation Economy’ in the artistic field that we have today, Abbing doesn’t define the
Reputations in the arts signal quality. Like the certificate on the door of the used car dealership, a reputation promises certain qualities for consumers, which artists without this reputation cannot offer. Nevertheless, a reputation is not a certificate; it is not a piece of paper conferring certain rights on the owner, rights that are guaranteed by some official authority. Instead, a reputation in the arts is part of a discourse in which many reputations are formed, assessed, changed, brought down, or protected. (Abbing, 2002, p. 271).

Abbing divides reputation into two categories and formulates how value with regard to the construction of a reputation is based on an artist’s distinctiveness in the field: what he/she makes or presents by their practice that is different, unique and distinct from anyone else’s. Abbing asserts:

The individual component is the personal trademark of an artist. Artists are usually known for certain authentic characteristics in their work, which they do not share with other artists. This personal ‘trademark’ is an essential part of their reputation. (Abbing, 2002, p. 271)

According to Abbing the above is the ‘individual’ component comprising reputation. He posits there is also a ‘collective’ aspect to reputation, and this comes from the group that the individual artist is a member of – the perceptive attributes that are accumulated and collectively felt about an individual artist by that group. This is subtly yet powerfully distributed via ‘discourse’ by that group – one could call them the ‘peer’ group of the artist. Abbing states that the collective aspect of reputation is: ‘an imaginary signal or mark of quality, which is connected to the informal barrier that surrounds the group of related artists’ (Abbing, 2002, p. 271). Importantly, Abbing recognises the power of this discursive space created by an artistic ‘peer’ group, by acknowledging that:
Gatekeepers decide on who to let in (to attain a certain reputation) and those who are to be kept out. In fact, participants in the discourse occasionally let artists in by granting them a favourable reputation, while others are rejected or are stripped of their favourable reputations. This way the favourable reputation of the insider artists can be protected. Letting artists in is often a matter of cooptation, but cooptation within the limitations set by the discourse. (Abbing, 2002, p. 272)

**The professional contemporary artist**

This chapter is intended to set the scene in terms of this enquiry – so I will now perform a metaphorical ‘zoom in’ using an imaginary lens of focus. Building a reputation is an activity engaged in by the contemporary artist and although in many ways a reputation is intangible, it is effectively made tangible through the professional profile of the artist. I will now outline a summary of the historical factors shaping contemporary artistic professionalism, including the Young British Artist (yBa) movement in the 1990s, with reference to the movement’s main critical commentator, the curator and writer Julian Stallabrass with his publication *High Art Lite* (2006). I will also review with the aid of the digital media entrepreneur Andrew Keen’s polemic *The Cult of the Amateur* (2008), the cultural consequences of technological advances in the internet, which have facilitated current constructions and models of professionalism in contemporary art practice.

The ‘professionalisation’ of art practice emerged with the development of formal undertakings of artistic research, particularly at doctoral level in the United Kingdom. According to Timothy Emlyn Jones in his text *Research Degrees in Art* (2009), the term ‘practice’ began being used by visual artists in the 1980s and coincided with the widespread activity and introduction of fine art-based research (Jones, 2009, cited in

---

4 This study implies an emergence of artistic professionalism within the contemporary sense indicated by the formal introduction of professional practices as a part of UK and Irish fine art education within the past 20 years.
Elkins, 2009, p. 35). Stephen Kimmis (who dedicated a study to professional practice in education) states: ‘Practice is a rich and complex notion whose nuances remain elusive for many practitioners, researchers, policymakers and administrators’ (Kemmis, 2004, p. 1). However, ‘practice’ does imply professionalistic associations that can relate to, for example, architecture. Jones made the observation that: ‘When a fine artist talks about “professional practice” the standards of the professions such as medicine and law do not apply in a direct sense.’ He also stated: ‘This professionalistic creativity seeks to adopt the respectability but not the operational reality of professional conduct’ (Elkins, 2009, p. 35).

The macro political and economic circumstances made for ripe cultural conditions in the late 1980s and saw the birth of the Young British Artist (yBa)\(^5\) phenomenon in the early 1990s. Even with the well-recorded fall of the artistic movement described by Julian Stallabrass in his publication *High Art Lite* (2006) (in the artistic field of production) there still remains a residual ‘hangover’ from this movement of artists who fully embraced the status of celebrity, the 1990s capitalist sentiment and mass media marketing strategies that have come to embody successful formats and models of artistic mediation.

According to Stallabrass the political climate preceding the yBa movement rose from the tail end of a recession in the UK\(^6\) in the late 1980s. This caused a slowing of the art

---

\(^5\) yBa is the abbreviation for Young British Artists movement, a group of Goldsmith graduates who dominated the art world internationally during the 1990s.

\(^6\) In the 1980s in Britain, the conservative government led by Margaret Thatcher brought in severe austerity measurements by following a ‘Monetarist’ approach, attempting to decrease inflation and stabilise the economic conditions they inherited from the 1970s. To do this, they raised interest rates and tightened fiscal policies and the effects of these measurements caused a reduction in consumer spending, and an increase in their trading exchange rate, which aggravated fuel and oil costs. Thatcher’s government made an overt aim to break up and disperse trade union power, which greatly affected the
market, which up until that point enjoyed an increased interest from wealthy eastern Asian investors that primarily traded in established US and European artists producing works within the postmodernist genre. The combination of a local recession in the UK and the bursting of an economic bubble in Japan in the late 1980s\textsuperscript{7} had a knock-on effect for the global art market, which as a consequence lost many of its main traders. Stallabrass states: ‘Galleries closed or sharply scaled down their activities, while a few began to turn away from the work of highly expensive international stars to young home-grown and much cheaper talent’ (Stallabrass, 2006, p. 5). Empty spaces across the UK became freely or cheaply available because of the downturn and were taken up by opportunistic artists beginning to mount their own exhibitions.\textsuperscript{8} The yBa artists were products of a pedagogical ideal of ‘interdisciplinarity’ within contemporary art education. Stallabrass states:

\texttt{\ldots the artists who were to find success in this tendency came from the fine art course at Goldsmiths College, part of the University of London. There the divisions between different media (painting, sculpture, printmaking and so on) had been abolished and students were encouraged to make specific interventions in an art scene of which they were to acquire extensive and detailed knowledge. (Stallabrass, 2006, p. 7) }

The pattern emerging in the art market above allowed the dominant UK-based investor and advertising mogul Charles Saatchi to alleviate his financial troubles by selling his extensive art collection and turning his attention firmly to the emerging UK art graduate scene. Stallabrass maintains that Saatchi, as the high profile collector of the time, chose what to collect based on his own ‘penchant’ for artwork that emulated typical working classes and further aggregated the recession, increasing unemployment with a greater number of strikes and social unrest. (Economics Help, 2012, [approx. screen 2]).

\textsuperscript{7} At this time in Japan an economic bubble caused primarily by property inflation burst, with global consequences.

\textsuperscript{8} The most famous example of this was ‘Freeze’, an exhibition which was held in a post-industrial warehouse space in London’s dockland area, organised and curated by yBa Damien Hirst.
advertising strategies and high-impact selling messages. According to Stallabrass, Saatchi’s dominant buying position and experience in advertising and promotion meant that he knew how to drive and cultivate a market for this new work. Saatchi’s taste and skills in creating a market helped shape the work that the yBa artists made (Stallabrass, 2006).

The political economic factors, coupled with the emergence of the right group of artistic personalities at the right time, coming on the scene with sophisticated educational backgrounds, produced a group of young British artists, the most prominent being Damien Hirst. As the yBas began dominating the global art scene in the 1990s the UK came out of recession. Other macro factors such as the dissolving of the Iron Curtain meant that the capitalist ideology was embraced globally and advocated in particular by the rhetoric of the United States Republican president Ronald Reagan in the 1980s, followed by George W. Bush in the 1990s.

Hirst represents a case in point, where capitalist ideals combined with business and marketing strategies aided in the framing and mediating of an artistic persona as a form of content and consumable within the art world and its market (Stallabrass, 2006). Stallabrass remarks that Hirst’s artwork operates as a form of subsidiary and that ‘the artist is better known as a social animal’ and that his art ‘itself is a spin-off of the reputation for socialising’ (Stallabrass, 2006, p. 28). In relation to the usual press release information accompanying his work throughout that time, Hirst himself conceded that it is ‘almost like a logo as an idea of myself as an artist’ (Hirst, n.d., cited in Stallabrass, 2006, p. 28).
Stallabrass’s critique centres around the perception that the movement was avant-garde, autonomous and anti-establishment. He demystifies this by making claims that yBa artists and their artworks were in co-option with the political agendas of the new Labour government in power throughout the 1990s. He reports on a study done at the time revealing a ‘determination within government arts policy to make public art institutions reliant on business sponsorship.’ He maintained that the aim of this was to ‘change the character of these institutions and that this, in turn, would change the nature of the art produced for them’ (Stallabrass, 2006, p. 180). He uses an exhibition by Jake and Dinos Chapman held at the ICA (Institute of Contemporary Arts) as an example of this aim, where the catalogue essay had the following promotional message from its sponsors:

Toshiba is proud to support the ICA in its mission to promote a better understanding of contemporary arts to an ever-increasing audience. As a company committed to people and the future through innovation and creativity, it is both exciting and appropriate that Toshiba should join forces with an organisation that shares our determination to promote a better appreciation of the arts, science and technology. (Stallabrass, 2006, p. 182)

More recently, from within the artistic activist movements there has been a critical backlash to these kind of sponsorships and unions made within the art world, an example being the 2012 Whitney Biennial web hoax. The hoax was orchestrated in conjunction with the Occupy Wall Street movement. The home website page for Whitney was hacked into and the home page content rewritten announcing that the main sponsorship for the Biennial (Deutsche Bank and Sotheby’s) had been sacked – ‘the former for reckless and even fraudulent financial speculation; the latter for a lockout of unionised art handlers’ (Seaton, 2012 [approx. 1 screen]). This anti-capitalist and activist statement meant Whitney had to make a formal apology to its sponsors in order to gain continued support from them for the event.
In the 1990s, with the example of Toshiba sponsorship above, art and science are presented in a compatible businesslike union. Stallabrass states that ‘businesses that buy into high culture want something in return that they cannot get from buying other luxuries’ and that a collaboration as cited above gives businesses ‘a chance to display their name before a distinguished group of consumers, notably wealthier and better educated than the average public’ (Stallabrass, 2006, p. 182).

A culture of DIY

The resonance of this movement can now be found in a more understated manner in the professional promotional material generated by artists today. Liam Gillick, commenting on the influence of popular culture on the yBAs said: ‘What artists have learnt from more sophisticated forms of popular culture is that the creation of an aura of activity can be everything’ (Gillick, 1995, cited in Stallabrass, 2006, p. 3). At a local level, an example of this can relate to the current trend found in email correspondence by artists, which often includes a list of forthcoming exhibiting activity appearing under the artist’s name. Every person that the particular artist has any type of correspondence with is relayed a shortened predicative form of CV (Appendix A). The message is subtle in one sense, yet in another it is an effective attention-seeking device to drive home the fact that the artist has a busy forthcoming calendar of events and is in demand. The power of accessible and free distributing methods enabled by technological advances, namely the Internet, has been a driving force, allowing artists to promote their activities without having to pay or rely on expensive professional assistance. In this regard, they are now able to do things for themselves.
Andrew Keen, the American-based digital media entrepreneur, recently wrote a polemic titled *The Cult of the Amateur* (2008) in which he argues that the Internet, more precisely the 2.0 version (which has allowed for broadband and continuous connection to the Internet) is destroying the production and consumption of culture and the economy. The general thrust of his argument is that there is no longer a need or a general appetite for the traditional expert or professional whose role it has been to mediate, write, review, design or produce original material, including music, literature and art. Through his research and observations he predicts this will mean an overall ‘flattening’ of quality of material and a cultural landscape of ‘mediocrity’. He calls himself an ‘insider’ with his experience in Silicon Valley in the heyday of internet development in the early 90s, and he maintains that he bore witness to what was conceived and coined as ‘media democratisation’ (Keen, 2008, pp. 11-14). He states:

This blurring of lines between the audience and the author, between fact and fiction, between invention and reality further obscures objectivity. The cult of the amateur has made it increasingly difficult to determine the difference between reader and writer, between artist and spin doctor, between art and advertisement, between amateur and expert. (Keen, 2008, p. 27)

Keen is insightful with regard to the explosive production of blog sites, which he maintains generate questionable content with little cultural or intellectual worth. Blogging, he posits, is a haven for self-expressive, narcissistic gratification. He reveals blogging (the contemporary form of online diary-making) is a truly massive generative condition with ‘fifty-three million blogs on the internet, and this number is doubling every six months’ (Keen, 2008, p. 3). His opposition to the Internet includes the giant global sites such as Wikipedia and YouTube. Alarmingly, he points out that Wikipedia

---

9 Silicon Valley, situated in the outskirts of San Francisco, was the hub for technological developments in the internet throughout the 1990s.

10 NB At the time of writing.
(the content of which can be constructed by literally anybody with an internet connection) is the ‘third most visited site for information and current events; a more trusted source of news than CNN or BBC web sites . . .’ (Keen, 2008, p. 4). According to Keen the standard Google search is shifting the manner in which intelligence is gathered and distributed. He summarises this critically, maintaining that the logic that underpins Google’s search engine is known scientifically as an ‘algorithm’ and this is ‘a process or set of rules used in calculations or other problem-solving operations’ (Oxford Dictionary, 2006, p. 27). It relies on locating the most common denominator, or as Keen states it, ‘reflects the wisdom of the crowd.’ He says that by cumulative Google searching, users are creating ‘collective intelligence.’ Keen explains how Google works, i.e., ‘the more people click on a link that results in a search, the more likely that link will come up in subsequent searches.’ His theory is that ‘The search engine is an aggregation of the ninety million questions we collectively ask Google; in other words, it just tells us what we already know’ (Keen, 2008, p. 6).

The music and literature industries have suffered catastrophically because of file sharing sites and with the production of online forums, blogs and material written or produced freely by the vast internet public – ‘amateurs’ as Keen regards them (Keen, 2008). The word ‘amateur’ more often than not is regarded as a form of insult, but within the new era and with the democratisation of media and cultural consumption it has a celebrated status and is collectively a powerful agent. Keen gives a traditional definition of the term ‘amateur’: ‘An amateur is a hobbyist, knowledgeable or otherwise, someone who does not make a living from his or her field of interest, a lay person, lacking credentials, a dabbler’ (Keen, 2008, p. 36). He reports that YouTube is a ‘portal of amateur videos that, at the time of writing, was the world’s fastest-growing site, attracting 65,000 new
videos daily and boasting 60 million clips watched each day’ (Keen, 2008, p. 5). Keen’s quantative statistics alone reveal that the traditional and professional status of cultural producers is in real jeopardy. Within popular culture, this new amateur status features in a contemporary saturation and coupling with reality television; every creative profession has been tested with the premise of ‘amateur turned professional’, for example, chef, dancer, composer, hairdresser etc.\(^{11}\) The dominance of the television producer Simon Cowell over mainstream television has created the model of the amateur performing in front of the expert and more often than not superseding them, a television format that has filtered across all aspects of mainstream cultural and global entertainment.\(^{12}\)

For contemporary artists much of the above is a resounding positive and the Internet has been revolutionary with regard to a levelling of conventional professional hierarchies, thus supporting and empowering the ‘self-organised’ and more autonomous character of art practice. Thanks to what is now known as ‘all-inclusive design’\(^{13}\) artists can avail of free software and online tutorials teaching them how to use the software and construct their own websites (which often takes the form of a free online blog template). They can format and process imagery for massive distribution, commonly through sites such as YouTube, with a contemporary feel and slick aesthetic, with relative ease.\(^{14}\) Artists can

\(^{11}\) An example of this popular culture taking on the artistic field is currently being aired on BBC channels. The programme titled ‘Show me the Monet’, has a format and premise involving a panel of judges who critique and select artists who wish to hang their works for sale at the Royal Academy annual summer exhibition.

\(^{12}\) Cowell’s format for talent and singing competitions, for example, XFactor and Britain’s Got Talent, can be found globally in countries such as China, India and Serbia.

\(^{13}\) The term ‘all-inclusive design’ relates to the ease of online user activity and how design is now an open domain in which to participate.

\(^{14}\) It should be noted that the website submitted as part of this study and containing the practice-based works conducted throughout this study applied the above design software. The decision to use such software was contextually and conceptually specific and informed by the secondary research that frames this enquiry. I will discuss these conceptual and contextual factors with more detail throughout the three Chapters following Chapter One.
now write their own appraisals and artistic statements to accompany their imagery and flexibly work as a critic via informal online means, replacing the traditional figure of the art critic from a recognised newspaper. Artists can easily find out information about artistic opportunities and make online applications themselves, without the traditional figure of the agent present. Supportive online resources (within Ireland, the Visual Artists of Ireland are an example) have grown robustly around this informative professional online premise.

**Making visible an artistic reputation**

As referenced above, the internet facilitates (overtly and subtly) ways for contemporary artists to make visible what Abbing refers to as ‘the individual component’ of an artistic reputation, that is, the distinctiveness of what an artist brings to the field – his or her work. This is most commonly done through the production of documentation of previously shown or made artworks by media such as still photography, video and in some cases sound. It is often accompanying notification of forthcoming exhibiting participation. Now, through online means, an artist can include, attach or insert an image of their work to any email they write and send. Another common practice is for artists to send around e-invites to upcoming shows or events that their work will feature in to a wide group of contacts. The e-invite may be for a group or solo show, or it may be for a national or international event. In many cases the invite cannot logistically function as an actual genuine invitation – for example, the events that are international or in remote parts of the country will more than likely not be attended by the recipient of the invite. These kind of emails come from the artist’s named email account. The artist’s name will also feature commonly in the subject bar of the email, grammatically

---

15 A local example of this is the blog site containing critical reviews of artistic activities which is organised by the Irish visual artist (Merrigan, James 2012, [approx. screen 1]).
referring to themselves in the third person. The written content of the email (written by the artist) is also often written in the third person (Appendix B).

Simple email correspondence and an ease of technological use has meant that artists can produce subtle yet highly effective ways of making their names, reputations and artworks circulate in a powerfully persuasive manner. In many ways, by distributing aspects of ‘individual’ reputation with such ease, the discursive space of the ‘collective’ aspect of reputation is cultivated. Dual influences can be observed in this regard, one being the academic, i.e., the use of the third person written approach, which correlates with Stallabrass’s claim that art school and education is a dominant voice in the artistic field. The other influence is the artist as a persona and subject, featuring in the subject bar of the email, almost detached from the person sending the email. This can be related to the residual element of the Damien Hirst/yBa artistic mentality of creating a brand or logo of oneself. In the examples above, the receiver of the information may not be expecting or may not have asked for information regarding an artist’s profile.

In other instances artists are asked to make visible their reputation. This occurs in the established order of how contemporary artistic opportunity-seeking works. This process requires a visible disclosure of details in order for an artist to be considered for exhibitions, participation in events and funding or commissioning opportunities. An artist’s CV, an artist’s statement or proposal and documentation of artworks are usually required for these processes. Within an Irish context, the VAI (Visual Artists of Ireland) online information bulletin, which is sent free to any artist who requests it, has become a main point of contact for artists who are looking for an opportunity to promote their work as described above. This online resource displays and distributes notices of
upcoming opportunities. As seen above, out of the 32 opportunities posted and surveyed, 19 of them requested a CV, documentation of artwork and a written proposal. The single most requested requirement was documentation of artwork, which was requested in 26 out of the 32 notices surveyed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis timeframe</th>
<th>Requirements for submission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/03/2010 - 24/03/2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of information bulletins circulated in time frame</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total no. of notices featured</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no. of opportunities for visual artists</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of opportunities where CV requested</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of opportunities where documentation requested</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of notices where proposals requested</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee required</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notices with no details given</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notices with which CV, proposal and documentation are required</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table no. 1: Survey of opportunities listed in one month’s listing of VAI e-bulletin

Other instances where additional information was requested of the artist occurred when an opportunity had been given to an artist. For example, along with installing a body of work in either a public or privately run gallery, a press release is written by the artist to accompany the show. Increasingly throughout a show’s run a talk, seminar, lecture or more informally a ‘conversation’ is scheduled, featuring the artist whose work was on show. Again, a cross between marketing/PR tools in the production of press releases as a container for information and that of conventional academic models such as ‘the lecture’ were made use of in the public and professional presentation of the artist. As evidenced by surveyed material, if an artist was attempting to be a regular participant in the contemporary field of artistic production, these professional supplements and
practices, even though non-monetary, were a highly valuable means for artists to trade visibly with their reputations in a reputation economy. To summarise, examples of professional practice included the production and construction of the following: CVs, artists’ statements, press releases, extensive application forms for competitions, documentation of artwork, artist websites, PowerPoint presentations, etc. Now there is hegemony of this type of production and a proliferation of this material existing in the field of art.

**Concluding with a theoretical definition of artistic professional practices**

In this chapter I have described (with the aid of Abbing) the informal economy of the art world. I have contextually outlined the professional status of the contemporary artist within the reputation-based economy. I have done this with reference to key influencing factors, including the yBa phenomenon and the cultural consequences of technological advances such as the Internet that have aided in the current condition of professionalism in contemporary art practice manifest via professional and supplementary practices. I will now conclude this chapter through a theoretical lens, referencing the political philosopher Giorgio Agamben’s genealogy of economies and his elaboration of Michel Foucault’s technical term ‘apparatus’ in his text *What is an Apparatus?* (2009). Through this theoretical lens, I aim to form a concrete link between artistic professional practices, and classify and define them as an ‘apparatus’ underpinning the artistic reputation-based economy.

Agamben conducted a genealogical study around the formation and meanings of the term ‘economy’, and traced its origins to the Greek term *oikonomia* through the history of Christianity between the second and sixth centuries, and to a particular problem that
arose in the theological debates around this time. According to Agamben, conflicting discussions occurred in order to reach an understanding of how God alone could govern mankind, and how he could both represent a divine being, yet could also enforce action in a physical sense on the earth. In order to facilitate a solution to this problem, the ‘Fathers of the Church’ throughout this period introduced the concept of ‘The Holy Trinity’ (the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit) (Agamben, 2009). The purists opposed this premise and argued that God’s power could not be divided in this manner and maintained that the concept signalled a form of paganism by suggesting it should be (Agamben, 2009). Agamben cites a number of prominent theologians through this time who because of the contentious divide in opinion devised the word *oikonomia* to help form an argument qualifying the proposition of ‘a holy trinity,’ as follows:

God, insofar as his being and substance is concerned, is certainly one; but as to his *oikonomia* – that is to say the way in which he administers his home, his life, and the world that he created – he is rather triple. Just as a good father can entrust to his son his execution of certain functions and duties without in doing so losing his power and his unity, so God entrusts to Christ the ‘economy’, the administration and government of human history. (Agamben, 2009, p. 10)

This argument suggested that there was no intention of lessening God’s position as mankind’s one divine governing voice, but that the function of ‘The Holy Trinity’ was to aid an understanding that, through metaphysical means, God’s power and governance could be delegated through several channels, including mankind, and comprise an economy. According to Agamben, it is from this religious discursive space that the concept of an economy, mediating God’s governance of the world and mankind, originated (Agamben, 2009).

---

16 Agamben cites the theologians Terrulian, Iranaeus and Hippolytus (Agamben, 2009, p. 9).
By way of the above specific genealogy traced through the history of early Christianity, Agamben sets up a discussion to aid in philosophically defining the meaning of apparatus. Above, he describes how an economy acts as a form of mediatory space where God’s power is distributed through various channels – producing a complex and multifaceted entity. Then, through the work of Michel Foucault, Agamben connects the function of an economy with the theoretical properties of apparatus proposed by Foucault’s theories. To do this, Agamben illustrates how within Foucault’s work the term ‘apparatus’ really evolved throughout his scholarly career. For example, within Foucault’s seminal publication *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (1969), Foucault introduces the chapter entitled ‘Discursive Formations’ with the following intent: ‘I have undertaken, then, to describe the relations between statements’ (Foucault, 1969, p.34). A connection here to an economy can be observed – what Foucault conjures is indicative of a type of invisible space that is operable in a sense between visible, textual or aural entities. Agamben points out that it is in this early publication that ‘positivite’ and ‘positivity’ are prominent terms found in Foucault’s work, which Agamben posits as an early attempt by Foucault to locate a definition for this powerful, unpredictable, and difficult to pin down character between what he calls ‘established discipline’ and that of ‘discursive formations’ evidenced as follows: ‘One cannot establish a bi-univocal relation between established disciplines and discursive formations’ (Foucault, 1969, p. 197).

Through his philosophical investigation, Agamben’s findings show the term ‘positivities’ was also used by Jean Hyppolite, a highly influential figure in Foucault’s

---

17 Agamben cites one of Hyppolite’s works entitled *Introduction a la philosophie de l’histoire de Hegel*, pointing out that in it Hyppolite conducted an analysis of two of Hegel’s texts dated from Hegel’s years in Bern and Frankfurt from 1875 and 1896. These two texts by Hegel are titled *The Spirit of Christianity*
scholarly life while studying at École Normale Supérieure (the prominent French higher education institution). The chronological map Agamben constructs around the term ‘positivités’ in Hyppolite’s work reveals how these influences have formed a basis for Foucault’s methodological framework; for example, in another section of The Archaeology of Knowledge (1969), Foucault uses the term ‘positivities’ to help explain a vital discovery he made at the beginning of the nineteenth century regarding the ‘psychiatric discipline’. He states:

. . .What made it possible at the time it appeared, what brought about this great change in the economy of concepts, analyses, and demonstrations, was a whole set of relations between hospitalisation, internment, the conditions and procedures of social exclusion, the rules of jurisprudence, the norms of industrial labour and bourgeois morality. . . (Foucault, 1969, p. 197)

Above, Foucault speaks of the potent space of enquiry for his work found in the enigmatic ‘set of relations between’ and around the discipline of psychiatry – what he describes is almost subsidiary to the discipline, and in some cases intangible social constructs, for example; ‘social exclusion’ and ‘bourgeois morality’.

and The Positivity of the Christian Religion. In his analysis of these two works by Hegel, Hyppolite reveals that ‘destiny’ and ‘positivity’ are both key concepts used by Hegel. Hyppolite marks a distinction describing how Hegel uses ‘positive’ to note the differences in religious belief systems, one Hegel defines as ‘natural religion’ and the other ‘positive religion’ (Agamben, 2009, p. 4). The following definition of ‘positive religion’ by Hegel is found in The Positivity of the Christian Religion:

It is clear from this very contrast that a positive religion is a contranatural or a supernatural one, containing concepts and information transcending understanding and reason and requiring feelings and actions which would not come naturally to men: the feelings are forcibly and mechanically stimulated, the actions are done to order or from obedience . . . (Hegel, 1795, [approx. 4 screen])

The term ‘Positive’ above describes a relationship that man develops with a spiritual belief system (essentially a man-made construct), that over time is then subsumed by mankind and even though it is a man-made construct, man assumes a position of subordinate to it in a seemingly unconscious manner, producing a condition that is somewhat irrational, inexplicable or ‘supernatural’. Again a connection to Agamben’s early genealogy of economy and how it’s related to the history of Christianity can be observed here.
Foucault calls the above discovery ‘The linch pin’ in how he unpacked the history of mental illness in society in the publication *Madness and Civilization* (Foucault, 1969, p. 197). Agamben traces Foucault’s use of the term ‘positivities’, including the Hegelian influences cited in the footnotes, until the period in the 1970s when Foucault evolved and clarified the term to define a difficult yet powerful entity – *dispositif* (the French word for apparatus), derived from the Latin word *dispositio*. With *dispositio*, Agamben forms a connection in the ‘semantic sphere’ of his own genealogical study and the word *oikonomia* or economy. Via this logic, Agamben interlocks and underpins the term ‘apparatus’ with regard to its religious and historical context, and the contentious misunderstandings that provided the conceptual conditions for ‘economy’ in the founding period of Christianity (Agamben, 2009). Observing the pattern emerging through his genealogical analysis, Agamben states:

What is common to all of these terms is that they refer back to this *oikonomia*, that is, to a set of practices, bodies of knowledge, measures, and institutions that aim to manage, govern, control, and orient – in a way that purports to be useful – the behaviours, gestures and thoughts of human beings. (Agamben, 2009, p. 12)

In Foucault’s work one can see an evolved clarity comprising the above influential tracings. When asked to define ‘apparatus’ in *Power/Knowledge* interviews in the 1970s, he stated:

What I’m trying to pick out with this term is firstly, a thoroughly heterogeneous ensemble consisting of discourses, institutions, architectural forms, regulatory decisions, laws, administrative measures, scientific statements, philosophical, moral and philanthropic propositions – in short, the said as much as the unsaid. (Foucault, 1980, p. 195)
‘Apparatus’ to define artistic professionalism and enter the field of art

With the aid of Foucault’s theories, coupled with Agamben’s philosophical tracings and contemporary redefining of the term ‘apparatus’, I relate and apply the term ‘apparatus’ to the forms of professional practices that I outlined in this chapter, i.e., press releases, CVs, documentation, etc. I apply apparatus as a way to bracket the powerful and deceptive governing agency found in artistic discourse that cultivates ‘collective reputation’ as described by Abbing and relating to what Foucault describes above as the ‘said as much as the unsaid.’ Foucault asserts that discursive spaces have ‘a sort of interplay of shifts of positions and modifications of function…’ (Foucault, 1980, p. 195). In this regard, artistic discourse is hard to locate, it can occur in a gallery, a lecture theatre or in a pub after an opening; it shape-shifts in this regard and can appear in different ‘institutional’ or ‘architectural’ guises relating to Foucault’s use of the term ‘apparatus’.

With Agamben’s connection of economy to the meanings and properties of apparatus I see a connection with the psychology of ‘opportunity seeking’ found in the contemporary artistic field where artists compete and inhabit a reputation-based economy. Due to these competitive conditions, the economy subtly enforces the requirement for a continuous production of materials, documents and aural or textual presentations cultivating and trading in artistic reputations – powerful yet intangible entities. As the editors of e-flux, the contemporary art journal19 have noted, ‘to be contemporary is to be savvy, reactive, dynamic, aware, timely, in constant motion, aware of fashion’ (Amir et al., 2011). This drive and aspiration within the competitive field of contemporary art encompassing the above characteristics could be seen as

---

19 e-flux also acts as an expanded artistic hub and forum which organises key events and various kinds of projects internationally.
having a sense of urgency, and because of this sense practitioners pay heed to the requirements of the field to produce more and more ways to make visible the objects that represent the subject. In the case of professional practices the subject is the artist. This state of play within the contemporary art field comes to mind when Foucault summarises the meaning of the term ‘apparatus’ as a ‘formation which has as its major function at a given historical moment, that of responding to an urgent need. The apparatus thus has a dominant strategic function’ (Foucault, 1980, p. 195).

Professionalism, and constructing representations of an artistic persona, as Hirst did so overtly in his yBa reign, can be found also in Agamben’s elaboration of Foucault’s term when he explains:

. . . ‘apparatus’ designates that in which, and through which, one realizes a pure activity of governance devoid of any foundation in being. This is the reason why apparatuses must always imply a process of subjectification, that is to say, they must produce their subject. (Agamben, 2009, p. 11)

By referencing and analysing Foucault’s work, Agamben updates and re-contextualises Foucault’s use and meaning of ‘apparatus’ within the contemporary world. He expands and posits a new broad interpretation of the term, by separating out in a generalised manner what he calls a ‘massive partitioning of beings in two large groups or classes.’ (Agamben, 2009, p. 13). One of these groups he classifies as ‘living beings (or substances)’ and the other group he calls the ‘apparatus that seeks to govern and guide them toward good’ (Agamben, 2009, p. 13). Adding to the extensive description of Foucault’s definition of apparatus, Agamben defines an apparatus widely in the following way: ‘. . . also the pen, writing, literature, philosophy, agriculture, cigarettes, navigation, computers, cellular phones, and why not language itself...’ (Agamben,
Resonating with the technological advances aiding in the contemporary climate of artistic professionalism, Agamben observes: ‘The boundless growth of apparatuses in our time corresponds to the equally extreme proliferation in processes of subjectification’ (Agamben, 2009, p. 15).

It can be observed through the above discussion and the complex, genealogical semantic path that Agamben followed in the work of Foucault that the ultimate development of the term ‘apparatus’ offered Foucault and subsequently contemporary theoretical thinkers such as Agamben a fruitful thinking tool and way to access intangible and more abstract subject matter. With the above alignments to Foucault’s and Agamben’s theories, and for the purpose of guiding this research enquiry, I define the activity pertaining to artistic professionalism manifest through professional practices as an ‘apparatus’.

The age of artistic professionalism of course marks a significant milestone in the contemporary history of artists and their practices. My research position in relation to this newly professionalised status is not a cynical one. I acknowledge that the supplementary practices that are so prevalent in the contemporary field act as an important interface between artists and their various publics. These various publics could be, for example, evaluators such as awarding panels, curatorial selection panels, gallery attendees, or the avid student receiving notification of an upcoming artistic event on the social networking website Facebook via the professional apparatus. Although sprawling and unwieldy to imagine, the professional apparatus is a highly efficient structure that serves a valuable purpose in the artistic field. By defining these more intangible subsidiaries of art practice as an apparatus, I aim to argue that the
professional artistic apparatus can operate as somewhat of a paradox to its proposed function. I will do this with the aid of revisiting Agamben’s more contemporary observations of the apparatuses in our time.

In his re-contextualising of the apparatus in the contemporary moment, Agamben looks at what Foucault calls the ‘replissement of the apparatus’ (Foucault, 1980, p. 196). By this Foucault implies that the apparatus has a ‘dual process’ (Foucault, 1980, p. 196). This duality often causes a more paradoxical, unpredictable side effect. In this regard, Agamben uses the example of the mobile phone to describe a personal annoyance with an apparatus that dominates contemporary culture. He asserts that in his home country of Italy, where Italians are famous for their hand gestures, these cultural marks of distinction have become ‘reshaped from top to toe by the cellular telephone’ (Agamben, 2009, p. 16). The invention of the mobile phone signals a liberal and mobile form of communicating, and with ever-expanding developments in technology the device is advertised consistently with updates that allow for a personalised and individual tailoring of the device. What Agamben observes with his home country’s gestural idiosyncrasies above is the erosion of a cultural distinction and to some extent the individual characteristics of the user.

These kind of paradoxes can be observed with the artistic apparatuses as well – in general, these forms of production employ methods of promotion and quasi-advertisement in an aim to promote artwork to a public, to generate knowledge around one’s practice and most of all to appear visible in the field. J.J. Charlesworth, in his text *Not About Institutions, But Why We Are So Unsure of Them* (2008), claims that the contemporary artistic field has become ‘homogenised’ because it is now ‘a culture of
presentation’ (Charlesworth, 2008 [approx. 2 screens]). Charlesworth’s comments can be observed in the dominant proliferation of the artistic apparatus in the form of professional material that is sent by email alone; for example, artists/cultural producers commonly include a predicative apology for ‘cross-posting’ pre-empting that they are most likely sending the same person/persons multiple invitations or notices to the same event (Appendix C). Dan Fox, the associate editor of Frieze magazine, in his article featuring in Frieze entitled A Serious Business, What does it mean to be a professional artist? (2009), reveals the following:

Working for a contemporary art magazine, I get sent a vast amount of press material each day, almost all of which employs a strikingly similar tone of voice. Most common is the one of academic solemnity infused with a barely veiled aggression, as though art were engaged in some cultural ‘war on terror’. Words such as ‘forcing’, ‘interrogating’ or ‘subverting’ occur with incredible frequency. Boundaries are ‘broken down’ and ‘preconceptions challenged’ so often as to make subversion and radicality seem like a mandatory daily chore rather than a blow to the status quo. They perpetuate old-fashioned notions, such as that of the artist visionary liberating the masses from mental enslavement by bourgeois values. Overuse has made these words sound strangely toothless… (Fox, 2009 [approx. 3 screens])

Within the Irish context, Aidan Dunne, the Irish critic, writes: ‘The art world is like any other relatively self-contained system, it is self-reinforcing and conformist. The only odd thing about this is that it is largely made up of people who pride themselves on being non-conformists’ (Dunne, 2007 [approx. 1 screen]). This observation correlates with Agamben’s theories of how the apparatus aims ‘to manage, govern, control, and orient – in a way that purports to be useful – the behaviours, gestures and thoughts of human beings’ (Agamben, 2009, p. 12).

As artists we do conform, but have we become complacent and passive observers of the structures that we ourselves have constructed? These constructs are now the
contemporary established modes of presentation and fundamentally the frame and mediator of artwork. In so doing, we contribute to what Charlesworth deems a ‘homogenised’ field where Fox posits that ‘overuse’ and repetition of presentation formats and language makes the content of such professionalised information lack meaning or, as Fox posits, ‘toothless’.

Thus, what I want to propose is that one of the paradoxes of the professionalistic apparatus is that the very thing that it purports to create, i.e., visibility around art practice, is in a sense rendered invisible by way of a process of desensitisation. This is caused by a pure saturation of such material produced for and circulated by the inhabitants of the artistic field.

To conclude this chapter, I will describe the more practical rationale I had for turning to the theoretical definition of ‘apparatus’ created by Foucault and revisited by Agamben. The premise of this study had a difficult task to start out with, that was to in some manner capture and reveal aspects of informal discursivity – the ‘stuff’ that fuels the mechanics of a reputation, or basically ‘a word of mouth’-based economy. As cited above, the development of the thinking term ‘apparatus’ in the work of Foucault and later more contemporary thinkers such as Agamben gave access to difficult research terrain. How to nail down social behaviours and evolving cultures that create a set of conditions? In the case of Foucault the ‘apparatus’ aided in his study of the history of mental illness. Through its evolved theoretical clarity, applying the thinking term ‘apparatus’ to artistic professionalism offers me an entry point to the artistic field, a type of anchor and a way to structure a systematic approach towards a first phase of practice-led research.
In Chapter Two, I will begin by revisiting the term ‘reputation economy’ and its more formal use within the research arena through the work of Richard Whitley, the management scientist. This will give a contextual map of the influence of the arena of practice-based research on the artistic field. I will narrow the focus of this discussion to reference the issue and application of the term ‘methodology’ within the practices of artistic research. This will serve as a frame to overview my own structure for practice-led research within this project.
Chapter Two: Towards a method

Along with the historic factors described in Chapter One that contributed to the professionalism of art practice, as cited in Chapter One and acknowledged by Jones, the professionalisation of art practice was enabled greatly by the growth of the artistic research landscape in the past 20 years. As observed by Fox, cited in Chapter One, these academic influences are prevalent in the artistic field, i.e., academic references and language being commonly used to articulate much of the press-released information regarding artists’ work. The following contextualising overview aims to look at the influence of academia on the professional practices of artists and set up the description of how my own approach to research was formed, typically referred to as a methodology’ section.

When one is researching the notion of a ‘Reputation Economy,’ the formalising of the term ‘reputation’ can be attributed to the business and management expert Richard Whitley, within the field of knowledge production. As a term, it has been adopted by the field of art practice (more predominantly within academic artistic research contexts perhaps) in an attempt to make formal, to classify, and to help understand a field that is unregulated in terms of its workers, and nebulous and precarious with regard to its economic conditions. Academic clarity is perhaps sought and applied to the artistic field in this respect.

Whitley’s work, *The Intellectual and Social Organization of the Sciences* (2000), does not refer in any direct way to art practice. His publication does convey a type of contextual sketch that is helpful in considering the wider and more global frame of reference for my research enquiry and in understanding academia’s role as an influence
shaping artistic professionalism and the recent history of art practice’s uneasy position as a bona fide formal research topic (i.e., art practice as a subject studied at PhD level within the university system, and the bureaucratic structures that come with that position).

Whitley speaks in broad, global terms – his intentions within the above publication are to describe a major shift in how sciences and ‘formal undertakings’ in research have been organised in the past 20 to 30 years; he describes a scientific and research landscape in the US throughout the 1950s up until the early 1970s. He maintains that at that time, state polices for funding scientific research responded primarily to the needs of the Department of Defence and military technological advances in weapons and artillery. Whitley defines this focus as more ‘fundamental research’ with a ‘linear’ view of, and combination of science and technologies, where the outcomes and functions of the research are clear and accountable. By citing a number of key global political and economic factors such as the end of the Cold War between the United States and Russia, and the collapse of socialism within the Soviet Union leading to a wide liberal market, Whitley reports a radical shift, represented by how the West lessened its focus on military means and looked more towards innovation, with an emphasis on societal welfare such as healthcare (Whitley, 2000, pp. x - xiii).

Whitley describes developments and changes in how research occurring at that time was carried out academically with an updated, organised and ‘systematic’ approach being ‘heralded in universities’ contributing to an expansion of graduate and postgraduate courses being offered in many and diverse areas of the sciences. This broadened the general view and understanding of scientific research from the ‘linear’ models described
above towards one of pluralism (Whitley, 2000, p. xvi).

In the late 1980s, according to Whitley, ‘mass production’ based on the dominant Fordist\(^{20}\) model was beginning to diminish because of the oil crisis and a burgeoning and highly competitive cost-effective Asian\(^{21}\) influence on industry. He notes that along with these factors, the consumer, or ‘user’, was becoming wealthier and more educated, desiring and demanding more from the products in which they invested. These pressures on industries to become more innovative and creative in terms of predicting consumer needs brought about collaboration between industry and scientific researchers, encouraged by state funding policies.\(^{22}\) Whitley notes this was particularly the case with regard to ‘electronics, software and biotechnology in the USA’ (Whitley, 2000, pp. xiv-xv).

Whitley asserts that these collaborative relationships now mean that scientific research within academic contexts and universities is cultivated and aligned more and more for industry, state firms, and ‘problem solving’. The footnoted material evidences a recent

\(^{20}\) ‘Fordist’ implies the influence of Henry Ford’s car manufacturing and assemblage system, which heralded a radical and innovative turn in industry at the beginning of the twentieth century.

\(^{21}\) Eastern Asian countries have been able to challenge western industries via highly cost-effective strategies, for example, with low wage costs.

\(^{22}\) More recently an example of this kind of collaboration can be found in how the design interface of Apple computer products are conceived, reported as follows in an online *Market International* paper: . . . players such as MediaOne, Xerox, Apple, Intel, Microsoft, AT&T and the ‘Big Three’ automotive companies are among the many companies that have employed and continue to employ anthropologists to identify early trends and behaviour patterns relative to their markets (Market strategies, n.d., [approx. screen 1]). Apple prides itself on going beyond typical market survey techniques and focus group strategies in a pursuit of real user compatibility and what Apples calls ‘cultural innovation.’ They have worked with groups of social scientists — anthropologists using ethnographic research techniques to aid and formulate designs that prompt a bonding relationship between user and computer in an empathetic, emotive manner. The small light to the bottom right hand side of the typical iBook which glows on and off while in sleep mode is a result of this research and is a semiotic addition that emulates breathing and a living entity — thus people ‘love’ their Apple products such as iPhones, etc., and don’t just simply use them as this quote from a Mac blog site confirms; “I like it . . . it makes it look like your Power Book is breathing!” (Macrumors, 2005, [apropx. screen 1]).
Irish example of these types of collaborations. According to Whitley this has meant a binary relationship between political funding support and scientific research has grown, with an emphasis on formal research being seen to contribute to a widening breadth of political agendas, shifting what was a more autonomous scientific research field to what is now a more governed, bureaucratic framing of such research and the funding access that stimulates the various scientific fields (Whitley, 2000).

This more generalised appreciation of the merits of research and knowledge production in academia has led to the political landscape we have today where phrases such as the ‘smart or knowledge economy’ are circulated as part of Ireland’s mainstream political rhetoric in an attempt to bolster an economic recovery as referenced in the Fine Gael's five point plan (Fine Gael, 2012, [approx. 1 screen]). This implies political and societal ownership of academic knowledge production and a kind of commoditising of it as a resource to be extracted from and managed. Whitley states:

> Rather than being just a public good, or the source of technological marvels at some distant time in the future, academic research is becoming viewed, at least in some countries, as an input to innovation processes that can be managed in much of the same way as other, more material, ones. (Whitley, 2000, p. xv)

*How a reputation works formally . . .*

Whitley describes how all of these macro-contextual factors have brought about systematic changes in the traditional boundaries of the sciences and have meant lines

---

23 The following press material advertises an example of a key event held at Dublin Institute of Technology (DIT): ‘Innovation @ DIT holds the best record amongst Irish higher education institutions for commercialising its research and the Showcase will highlight industry-focused research in the following thematic areas: New Materials and Technologies (including nanotechnology, photonics, inorganic pharma and nanomaterials), Information and Media Technologies (including antennas, digital media and electrical power), Environment & Health (including food, pharma, sustainability and radiation science). There will also be presentations on funding opportunities for industry’ (Appendix D).

24 Fine Gael at the time of writing is the name of the main Irish political party in government.
blurring in discipline specificity within universities. Various attempts at classifying the evolving and shifting scientific paradigms were led in the 1990s by theorists such as Michael Gibbons applying classifications to the changes in the field that attempted to go beyond ‘hard and soft’ scientific method divisions. Gibbons and his co-authors developed Mode 1 and Mode 2 – Mode 1 being academically contained, isolated research within a specific scientific discipline, and Mode 2 meaning context-driven, real-life situated projects where scientific researchers are required to work amongst teams developing a greater need for interdisciplinarity (Gibbons et al., 1994, cited in Whitley, 2000, p. xvi). Whitley opposes these divisions, seemingly because of the arrangements of the sciences in countries like Japan where they don’t fall neatly into proposed models of operating and where there are frequent overlaps in the contexts and methods used to conduct research. In this regard Whitley states: ‘. . . intellectual production should be taken more as a varying phenomenon to be explained than as an assumed feature of a coherent, reified research system’ (Whitley, 2000, p. xvii).

Instead of classifying and making rigid, Whitley acknowledges the complexity of the field, the international variants and the field’s swiftness of change with the wider contextual factors shaping the production of knowledge. With these contextual factors above, Whitley overviews discipline breakdown and pluralist developments in the course structures in universities, which in turn dispersed the typical kind of ‘block’ funding that was normally directed towards discipline-specific departments within

25 Hard science traditionally relies on quantifiable or empirical data based on scientific method. It focuses on accuracy and objectivity. Examples are ‘pure science, natural science, physical science.’ Soft science is based on ‘qualitative analysis or scientific investigations for which strictly measurable criteria may be difficult to establish,’ for example ‘psychology, sociology, anthropology, and political science.’ (Biology Online Dictionary, 2007 [approx. 1 screen])

26 Co-authors include Camille Limoges, Helga Nowotny, Simon Schwartzman, Peter Scott and Martin Trow. Their publication is entitled The new production of knowledge: the dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies.
universities. This, he maintains, created an autonomy amongst individual and small collaborative group researchers whose projects could now respond to a wider breadth of research subjects, use diverse ‘interdisciplinary’ methods and not use ones typically prescribed by ‘discipline-specific goals’ within universities. As a consequence disparate groupings from both inside and outside academic determinants have meant that different kinds of rewarding hierarchies have grown (Whitley, 2000, p. xix).

In terms of the now commonplace state funding strands and the allocation of those funds, the decisions are crucially relayed to groups of peer review panellists and not state-nominated non-specialists. Whitley points out this important distinction: ‘researchers are collectively able to control the standards governing research priorities and performance evaluation’ (Whitley, 2003 [approx. 3 screens]). These panels are made up of experts and representatives from academic and scientific fields. The peer review process is based on a formal evaluation system. The process works most commonly on a system of blind peer review where a researcher or team submits written material to a journal editor. He/she removes the name of the author of the material and then the material is put through a formal reviewing process by the panel of reviewers who separately go through the material and give their review and recommendation of the work. These panels award prestigious accolades such as the publication of material in journals and make recommendations for the acquisition of funding to selected researchers.

According to Whitley, these panels also form clusters or ‘communities’ or ‘smaller elites’ in the field of the sciences because of their capacity to prioritise research agendas. Whitley observes: ‘Concentration of control within national peer group
communities also varies considerably.’ He notes how these differences in research communities and peer review panels across the UK and internationally, can explain ‘the intensity of intellectual competition between researchers for scientific reputations, and in the extent of intellectual novelty of their published contributions’ (Whitley, 2003 [approx 4 screens]).

Reputations strengthened by novelty and variety of research topic, content and methodology is interesting, relative to the field of artistic production – and that of the informal reputation Abbing describes in the art world. Whitley points out that ‘novelty’ in terms of scientific research drives competition and builds reputations and career-shaping with the peer review process named as a system that governs. According to Abbing (2002), in the art world ‘novelty’ or ‘distinctiveness’ of practice is an individual component of artistic reputation.

There is a resonance of peer review process within the context of academic research that is reflected in the informal character of the ‘collective’ component of artistic reputation that Abbing refers to as: ‘an imaginary signal or mark of quality’ and is ‘connected to the informal barrier’ of artistic practice (Abbing, 2002, p. 271). Whitley not only formalises ‘reputation’ but he also explains how the peer review merit system for the sciences based on reputation is in effect an institutionalised system as follows:

By relying on peer review to assess the merits of research projects, on scientific journals to decide the worth of research results, and on practising researchers to evaluate the qualities of job applicants and promotion candidates, states effectively institutionalise intellectual reputation as the key to rewards. They thus substitute reputational control for bureaucratic direction and evaluation. (Whitley, 2000, pp. xxii – xxiii)
A struggle for art as an equal within universities

Within the shifts and changes in the field of science and the university system that Whitley describes, art practice has its own recent history. Within Whitley’s world of knowledge production, formal undertakings of research and the sciences, art practice is an uneasy inhabitant. Whitley’s work doesn’t refer to art practice as a science. Theorists such as Sarat Maharaj have written polemics positing art-making as a type of science, but it is still a controversial position to have within the general and wider field of scientific research. From the academic and non-artistic-specialist perspective, this is perhaps due to what Abbing (2002) describes as the general romantic view held of the arts and how this prevalent perception causes difficulty in understanding just what concrete visible contribution art can make academically, socially or economically besides one of whimsy.

For the artist undertaking the research Maharaj pinpoints the problems in his text Know-how and No-How: stopgap notes on “method” in visual art as knowledge production (2009). Maharaj seems to echo Whitley’s position with regard to attempts at classifying scientific differences, leading to a form of massification. He states: ‘. . . what we lump together as “science” is often a congeries of quite divergent activities, disciplines and domains, each with its own kit of objectives and logical procedures’ (Maharaj, 2009 [approx 2 screens]). Maharaj’s text pivots on issues of methodology, the how to, in the answering of a research enquiry. Constructing a methodological approach in a research project marks a critical milestone in an enquiry and one that needs reiterating at every stage of the course of the research development. Maharaj marks out the distinctiveness of art practice research, stating it amounts to ‘a proliferation of self-shaping probes, stand-alone inquiries, motley see-think-know modes’ that ‘tends to stump and stonewall
generalisable principles. They resist being wholly taken under the wing of systematic methodological explication’ (Maharaj, 2009 [approx 2 screens]).

The academic conventions of deciding on a method approach in other knowledge producing fields, for example mainstream sociology, is to adopt an already tried and tested set of methodologies. An example of this is the social study conducted by Michael Grenfell and Cheryl Hardy (2007), two academics who used the sociologist Pierre Bourdieu’s three-tiered analysis theories as an established methodological approach to study the yBa phenomenon in the 1990s. Bourdieu’s three-tiered approach saw him conducting extensive sociological research projects via three distinct categories, i.e., the subjects that operated in the field (‘the habitus’ to use Bourdieu’s term), the forms of capital that fuelled the field of operation and the structures of the field itself. I will detail these categories and his approach in a more in-depth manner in the latter part of this chapter. With regard to adopting an established method in artistic research Maharaj states:

It lends a stamp of reliability, consistency and coherence as would be expected of a considered socio-economic statement. This is at odds with how we might understand repetition in art practice and research where such a degree of “exact repeatability” would be looked upon not only as unlikely but undesirable . . . (Maharaj, 2009 [approx 2 screens])

Maharaj’s observation above unravels an issue around the academic conventions of adopting established methods in artistic academic research. Maharaj’s point in relation to applying an established formula or set of methods to one’s art-making practice as an ‘undesirable’ approach correlates with Abbing’s theories as a regressive step reputationally speaking – Abbing (2002) notes a ‘distinctiveness’ of practice is a
valuable individual component comprising one’s reputation in the art world outside of the academy.

Within the Irish artistic research landscape, Siun Hanrahan (the Head of Research at the National College of Art and Design) brackets the two ‘overarching’ models of research as ‘quantitative’ and ‘qualitative.’ Hanrahan argues that qualitative methods are akin to fine art practice and can be applied to fine art research. She does suggest that ‘it is not that research models in other academic disciplines have not yet been particularly applicable to fine art but that the parallels between such research models and fine art practices have not yet been particularly recognised’ (Hanrahan, 2002 [approx. 2 screens]). This lack of recognition as described above and what Maharaj points out in terms of method, helps understand the root of the discomfort artistic practice and its position has in the formal research arena – resonating with student, supervisor, the macro-managerial and political factors shaping university structures.

A schema for research

In terms of my own research narrative, this would seem an apt juncture to insert a ‘methodology’ section. However, Maharaj’s insightful observations ring true in my case. With several attempts throughout the research period to perhaps ‘shoehorn’ my approach to research into a plausible ‘methodology’ in accordance with its footnoted definition, in my case this seemed wholly unsuited.

---

27 In quantitative research (usually associated with the physical and biological sciences) a hypothesis is tested, results are based on observable, measurable data, and the researcher adheres to a strict research design developed before the research begins. In qualitative research (well-established within the social sciences) the emphasis is on discovery and exploration rather than on hypothesis testing and the research strategy and structure is relatively open.

28 Definition of ‘methodology’
1. A set or system of methods, principles, and rules for regulating a given discipline, as in the arts or sciences.
2. Philosophy.
Reflecting on my mode of knowledge production through art practice as a process that somehow kept rigidly to one stable path and used a defined set of ‘principles’ or ‘regulating rules’ couldn’t account for my art-making processes. Firstly it didn’t allow for the unwieldy nature of my enquiry and secondly it didn’t account for the significance and context of how an artistic enquiry conceptually leads, shapes and informs, how an artist approaches their practice, and how this can mean that the ‘goalposts’ require continual shifting. In my case, my practice is aligned to Maharaj’s remarks in relation to the character of artistic research and how it produces ‘a proliferation of self-shaping probes, stand-alone inquiries’ and ‘motley see-think-know modes’ (Maharaj, 2009 [approx 2 screens]). My art-making approach within the research project morphed at various points in line with my enquiry, in order firstly to yield knowledge and material through forms of artistic practice and then produce another body of practice informed by the material and knowledge my art practice gathered. The way I worked required changes and sometimes complete u-turns. Throughout the research time, the overarching guideline for me became enquiry-led – that is, the enquiry led as a contextual frame and as a conceptual/cultural type of probe. With the above discussion in mind, I searched for a more appropriate term that could be applied to my research approach – this came from the term and meanings of a ‘schema’.  

---

29 Definition of schema  
Noun, plural sche-ma-ta [skee-muh-tuh or, sometimes, skee-mah-tuh, ski-] sche-mas.  
1. A diagram, plan, or scheme. Synonyms: outline, framework, model.  
2. An underlying organisational pattern or structure; conceptual framework: A schema provides the basis by which someone relates to the events he or she experiences (Online Oxford Dictionary, [approx. 1 screen]).

---

a. The underlying principles and rules of organisation of a philosophical system or inquiry procedure.  
b. The study of the principles underlying the organisation of the various sciences and the conduct of scientific inquiry  
(Online Oxford Dictionary, n.d. [approx. 1 screen])
From its footnoted definition, the attributes of ‘schema’ seem more nuanced, and generally more akin to the processes of producing contemporary art. The reference to a framework and a diagrammatic way of thinking are pertinent to art-making. It is a term that encompasses organisational pattern-making and pays heed to the notion of conceptual ideas underpinning a structural rationale. Unlike the more dated application of the scientific ‘methodology’ and perhaps its quite crude application to the processes of practice-led research, schema acknowledges the subjectivity of the subject – in my case, my research position, which essentially constructs the structure to how I conducted research. Its definition seems to allow for associative and contextual thinking and organic shifts in character, depending on outcome and previous experience.

For the sake of what will hopefully be deemed clarity, I want to divide my schema into two phases. The first phase recalls my early practice-led research – that is, the way I used modes of practice to research and yield material towards my enquiry. In the second phase of my schema this order was reversed somewhat. In the second phase the research agenda shifts away from an aim at yielding material from the artistic field and is directed more toward constructing an appropriate mechanism in order to articulate and disseminate my research findings from Phase One of the research schema as cited below via art practice to the artistic field. I will describe and detail this second phase in Chapter Four – a more relevant juncture to do so. Returning to the first phase of the schema, this could be observed as a phase of field research, which orientated the enquiry.
**A working schema – Phase One**

I will now return to the term ‘apparatus’. As cited in Chapter One, this term provided a kind of navigational thinking tool to enter and anchor my research within the field of artistic practice. Prior to referring to the definition, the task of locating, containing and articulating how the mechanics of the field of art operate seemed impossibly daunting. Conceptually, the apparatus provided a way in. At first my application of it to my research proved hit and miss. For one of these early projects, I produced a body of work that metaphorically represented the apparatus. For example, the project entitled *Made by Graham Cahill* (see image below and naomi-sex.com project entitled *Made by Graham Cahill*) was anchored to the idea of the artist’s proposal – one of the components on the professionalism apparatus.

![Fig. no. 1: Naomi Sex, 2010, Made By Graham Cahill](image)

It was a work that used the proposal-making process as an integral aspect of the work. I submitted a proposal to a curatorial panel for a show entitled *INVISIBLE* to be sited in
the window of one of Dublin’s city centre galleries. The proposal was written detailing how I was not going to make the artwork myself but was going to employ a gallery technician, ‘Graham Cahill’, to build a free-standing false wall out of plasterboard over the course of the exhibition’s run (Appendix E). The result was a formally positioned sculptural work that emulated the shape of a dressing room screen, typical of the Victorian era. Its positioning blocked any view a passer-by would have through the gallery’s window. Contemporary works that contextualise these conceptual actions can be observed, for example, in Mark Leckey’s *Proposal for a Show* (2011), which uses the proposal as a central device to contain an artwork in and of itself.

Fig. no. 2: Mark Leckey, 2011, *Proposal for a Show*

Leckey’s piece is an eclectic assemblage of imagery compiled as a type of online slideshow (Leckey, 2011). The conceptual basis for how the images relate to each other follows Leckey’s artistic sensibility/logic and the show’s conceptual thematic, which looks at the contemporary societal relationship to technology. A sense of dry wit can be
found in how Leckey’s voice narrates throughout the course of the piece. By uploading Proposal for a Show to YouTube, its function as a proposal (usually only produced for a select few viewers or readers) transforms the proposal’s behind-the-scene character so it becomes exposed to a mass online viewership. Attempting to highlight the often invisible character of the gallery context conceptually informed how I wrote the proposal for Made by Graham Cahill. The proposal-making process can often be a space where an artist can promote his or her own virtues or experience as an artist. In the proposal for Made by Graham Cahill, I attempted to instead profile and highlight Cahill’s career as a skilled and experienced gallery technician. The acceptance of the proposal meant that Cahill would be present throughout the run of the exhibition so that in a sense his presence became highly visible and acknowledged.

Helping to contextualise the conceptual basis within the piece in a much more humorous manner relates to the artist Tino Sehgal’s piece shown in the 2005 Venice Biennale entitled This is so Contemporary. As a viewer, the encounter with Sehgal’s work is a highly playful one – the museum attendants who usually remain discreetly positioned within the gallery space are the untrained performers in Sehgal’s piece. Bringing their presence into the foreground, within the performance they sporadically dance around the gallery space singing sarcastically ‘This is so contemporary’ while they danced.
Contextualising the formal attributes of the piece Made By Graham Cahill could be aesthetically aligned with the Projections – Unfinished Sculptures (2007) series by Matt Calderwood. Calderwood’s sculptural pieces are made using plasterboard – an intrinsic aspect of the fabric of the contemporary gallery – symbolically and associatively it connects to an institutional vernacular. Giving a material like plasterboard a focus takes it out of the shadows and away from its typical function in the exhibition space. It no longer serves as a backdrop or a prop to present or enable an artwork; it is the main attraction. In a muted sense, it highlights the veneer of production value so often couching contemporary presentations of work.
Made by Graham Cahill may have attempted to provoke thoughtful responses and reactions as an artwork. However, as a piece of research it didn’t serve my research remit – in one sense, it simply presented, metaphorically, my research enquiry in a suppositional manner. This is true with other works in the early phase of orientation, including the projects entitled – Led and A Sale of Work. – Led comprised an installation produced for a warehouse space, the works aimed to metaphorically reference the subject of my enquiry and comment on the dominance and value of the artistic document as commodity within the art world (see image below and naomisex.com project entitled – Led).
A Sale of Work explored consumerist value systems attached to the purchasing of artworks by purchasing unwanted artworks by various artists and then attempting to resell them without the artist’s name attached to the work (see image below and naomisex.com project entitled A Sale of Work).

Changing lanes

Finding a way of anchoring my research to the apparatus required a re-think and a shift in direction. Turning to timely theoretical debate, I encountered aspects of ‘trickster
theory’ as a possible influence for direction. According to the writer Helen Lock, ‘the trickster’ is a prevailing mythical and fictional figure within children’s literature and is easily recognisable by way of his methods for solving problems and his actions in doing so. Among others, she cites the famous character B’rer Rabbit as an example. In her text *Transformations of the Trickster* (2002) Lock acknowledges and intellectualises the figure of the ‘trickster’ within society as follows:

... the trickster performs such fundamental cultural work: in understanding the trickster better, we better understand ourselves, and the perhaps subconscious aspects of ourselves that respond to the trickster’s unsettling and transformative behaviour. (Lock, 2002 [approx 1 screen])

Within the context of artistic and cultural production, perhaps the archetypal example of ‘the trickster’ is Marcel Duchamp. Within the postmodern and contemporary era and space of artistic production, his influence on artistic endeavour remains palpable. Lewis Hyde, in his publication *Trickster Makes this World, How Disruptive Imagination Creates Cultures* (1998), references the cultural importance of artists and tricksters such as Duchamp and notes their unique attributes as an ‘embodiment of ambiguity and ambivalence, doubleness and duplicity, contradiction and paradox’ (Hyde, 1998, cited in Lock, 2002 [approx 2 screens]). At a recent lecture delivered at IMMA (Irish Museum of Modern Art) on the subject of Duchamp’s legacy on contemporary practice, Francis Halstall reflected on Duchamp’s activity as an artist where the above paradoxes are evident. In his unpacking of Duchamp’s artistic activity, Halstall observed that

---

30 In the children’s tale B’rer Rabbit is short for Brother Rabbit, and he is the central character from the Uncle Remus series of children’s stories originating from African/American folklore – later adapted by Disney animators. Within the stories, B’rer Rabbit displays a keen wit and uses it to get himself out of trouble with his arch nemeses B’rer Fox and B’rer Bear. In one instance, B’rer Fox has caught the rabbit and is readying him for his evening meal, and musing on which way is the best method to exterminate him before eating him. B’rer Rabbit successfully tricks B’rer Fox with quite sophisticated methods of reverse psychology. He manages to convince the fox that the worst thing he could possibly do with him is to throw him into the nearby prickly briar patch. Falling for the trick, B’rer Fox subsequently throws the rabbit into the patch, and to what he thinks will be his certain death, only to find he has been fooled by B’rer Rabbit who reveals he was born and reared in a briar patch and so is able to scuttle away unharmed.
Duchamp actually made very little art, yet, in a survey, his iconic work entitled *Urinal* was named the most influential piece of art of the 20th century (Halstall, 2012).

Fig. no. 7: Marcel Duchamp, 1936-41 *M, Boîte-en-Valise*

Halstall noted how Duchamp was ahead of his time by a century or so, and consistently demonstrated his astute awareness of the systems governing art-making. With this awareness he pioneered a challenge to those systems by knowingly subverting his growing reputation and artistic authorship, for example, by curating a body of his own work with a set of replica miniatures that neatly fitted into a consumer-friendly suitcase in the piece *M Boîte-en-Valise* (1936-41) (Halstall, 2012). With this set of conceptual actions, he must surely have been one of the first artists to inhabit the common position in place today of ‘the artist as curator’. In terms of trickster theories defined and described by Hyde, later in Duchamp’s life, he commits the ultimate contradictory trickster action by turning his back on artistic practice in favour of becoming a chess player.31

---

31 Duchamp’s trickster actions were followed closely by other prevalent tricksters of the early to mid 20th century coming on the artistic scene under the guise of artistic movements such as Dadaism and Surrealism. These movements were influenced by the writings of Mikhail Bakhtin and what he termed the *Carnivalesque*. With the term *Carnivalesque*, Bakhtin called for a more democratic set of social
In this regard, Hyde says the trickster’s ability to invert and subvert gives them a facility to ‘boundary cross’, and, as exemplified by Duchamp, a facility to transform and ‘create’ new boundaries (Hyde, 1998, cited in Lock, 2002). According to Hyde, the successful trickster ‘participates in the same world as the hearers of their tales’ and in a world where those hearers’ ‘lives are ruled’. He maintains that in some sense, these hearers or inhabitants look to the trickster to see ‘those rules being broken, or circumvented’ (Hyde, 1998, cited in Lock, 2002).

In terms of my research, I saw how the notion of ‘the trickster’ could be applied to my own position as artist/researcher and could possibly act as a fruitful and appropriate fit. My research position is to ‘participate in the same world’ that I too operate in and the same world I want to examine. In terms of Phase One of my research schema, I wanted to engage in a form of practice that, as Lock might posit in relation to ‘the trickster’, could help ‘better understand ourselves and the perhaps subconscious aspects of ourselves’. A shift in how I used the apparatus in my research to align more with the notion of trickster theory was the next step in my schema, and this was done to observe the ‘rules’ artists engage in, in order to operate in and structure their field.

Developing my thinking tool, I thought about how the apparatus itself is symbolic of the rules of engagement, and is fundamentally the way artists trade in a reputation-based economy. Reflexively and rhetorically I asked what and where is the alternative? Is the apparatus of artistic professionalism required for every exhibiting space and every form of art practice? If not, what occurs in those types of spaces or contexts?

conditions advocating a deliberate subversion of the dominant cultural forms of conditioning and production (Hirschkop and Shepherd, 1989).
The shift in direction required that I seek out spaces and practices where the apparatus of professionalism appeared to be absent from the process of showing artwork. This led me to produce two field-based projects. The first one is entitled The Gatekeeper Project (see naomi-sex.com project entitled The Gatekeeper Project). I will conclude this chapter with a detailed account of the project, its approach and a theoretical contextualisation.

The Gatekeeper Project – an introduction to informal art practices

Before I detail and contextualise The Gatekeeper Project, I will introduce this section of the chapter with a brief overview of what the project entailed. In line with Phase One of my research schema – seeking out artistic events requiring no professional apparatus – The Gatekeeper Project was an event that I curated where I invited four professional, academically trained artists to make art works in response to an annual informal amateur art outdoor event held on the railings of a park in Dublin’s South inner city. Prior to the event, I took on a quasi-ethnographic approach and engaged in close field work in order to understand and observe the amateur event more fully.

As I describe The Gatekeeper Project below, I aim to interweave and contextualise how I expanded my form of research-led practice to encompass aspects of the social sciences and in particular employ a quasi-ethnographic set of strategies, which contribute to my research schema. Prior to describing the premise and outcomes of The Gatekeeper Project, I want to summarise in bullet points my approaches to research in Phase One of my research schema.
**Research schema – Phase One**

- Process of orientation through research-led practice
- Refining focus of enquiry through a theoretical shift in direction
- A coupling of ‘apparatus’ with aspects of ‘trickster theory’
- Displacing the apparatus in an attempt to reveal the rules of artistic engagement
- Ethnography to enable an immersive close reading of the field.

*The Gatekeeper Project* was conceived by seeking out a space that enacted a type of ‘boundary cross’ as Hyde might put it. With reference to my research as contextualised in Chapter One, I considered the field of cultural production in a broad sense, being mindful of the contemporary ‘topsy turvy’ jeopardised state of the professional cultural status within a capitalist social order. Informed by aspects of subversion and ‘trickster theory’, I sought to encompass and encounter the field of culture beyond my own artistic position – to resist and defy my own entrenched and embedded experience and conditioning of a formal, professionalised and academic training. In his insightful essay entitled *Dark Matter* (2005), the artist, activist and writer Gregory Sholette refers to a ‘taboo’ that ‘extends especially to the sort of irregular systems informal culture has evolved for circulating work outside the dominant art market’ (Sholette, 2005, p. 93). The taboo relates to remarks made by Abbing, quoted in the preface to this chapter. These taboos are discretely promoted by the dominant playing field of the reputation economy, which advocates a defined hierarchy of practice and practitioners for inclusion in its field.

Outside of and not included in this space of production above is an ‘informal’ cultural
event (as Sholette refers to it), that occurs tri-annually during the summer at the railings in a city centre location in Dublin. The general perception of artistic railing events such as the above (and the taboo Sholette refers to above) can be observed sardonically in a recent article in *The Irish Times* by Michael Parsons, entitled *Anglo’s sketchy art collection is of little cash value to the State*. In the article, Parsons claims that Anglo Irish Bank (the main bank at the centre of Ireland’s economic crisis, due to its unregulated and illegitimate borrowing culture) has an art collection which is also worthless. Drawing a type of value comparison he states: ‘About one-third of the paintings have been valued as worthless – in financial, not necessarily artistic, terms – consisting of the type of art that could be bought from the railings on Merrion Square’ (Parsons, 2012 [approx.1 screen]). The event at Merrion Square takes place on the periphery of one of the city’s main municipal parks (which is Dublin’s principal eighteenth-century residential square) in the city centre, where a weekly art exhibition is hung on the metal railings.

The annual event that I sought out as a part of *The Gatekeeper Project* purports to have an all-inclusive ethos, with no request for the professionalised apparatus. Prior to the conception of the premise for *The Gatekeeper Project*, I engaged in a process of field observation to learn more about the proceedings of what is most commonly referred to as an ‘amateur event’. This process was more akin to the field of social theory, and could appear to have strong anthropological and, more specifically, ethnographic leanings.

According to the writer, curator and critic, Hal Foster, contemporary artists have begun

---

32 Art events organised at city centre railings occur across the world such as in the UK, Denmark and the United States; for example, during the summer months in Washington Square in San Francisco weekly art exhibitions are held at the railings of the park.
to seek out and use the observational benefits and contextual properties encompassed by ethnographic techniques to introduce ‘alternate’ layers of social meaning and understanding to their practices (Foster, 1996). With regard to this recent pattern and the adoption of ethnographic strategies in art making, Foster elaborates on the benefits of utilising such approaches for the contemporary artist as follows:

... it is the discipline that takes culture as its object, and it is this expanded field of reference that postmodernist art and criticism have long sought to make their own ... ethnography is considered contextual, the rote demand for which contemporary artists share with many other practitioners today, some of whom aspire to fieldwork in the everyday ... anthropology is thought to arbitrate with interdisciplinary, another rote value in contemporary art and theory ... it is the self-critique of anthropology that renders it so attractive, for this critical ethnography invites reflexivity at the centre ... (Foster, 1996, p. 305)

Foster refers to this pattern as a ‘quasi-anthropological paradigm in art’ (Foster, 1996, p. 305). In some respects, his observation could be a further reference to an adoption of established formal research approaches in art practice, which could conceivably relate to the general expansion and influence of research within the field of art practice as noted at the beginning of Chapter Two. In the international context, this turn to ethnography can be evidenced in the contemporary art event entitled Ethnographic Terminalia, which showcases forms of art practice that encompass ethnographic modes of making. The event occurs in a different international context every year, for example, Philadelphia, New Orleans, Montreal, and will be hosted in San Francisco in 2012 in various site-specific locations across the city. As well as an exhibition of contemporary art, there are also various discursive events scheduled which aim to bring together leading figures from the field of art practice and anthropology. Their curatorial mission statement states the following: ‘Ethnographic Terminalia is an exploration of what it might mean to exhibit anthropology – particularly in some of its less traditional forms –
in proximity to and in conversation with contemporary art practices’ (Ethnographic Terminalia, 2010 [approx 1 screen]).

This fascination with observing and interacting with the other, or as Foster refers to as ‘the alternate’, can be evidenced also at a local level, for example, in the work of the Northern Irish artist Susan MacWilliam who represented Northern Ireland at the 2010 Venice Biennale. MacWilliam has for the last 15 years or so embedded herself and her practice within a community of prominent representatives from the field of the paranormal. As a result, her video-based works take the form of documentary style portraits, which portray the lives, belief systems and idiosyncrasies of key individuals from the field of parapsychology.

![Fig. no. 8: Susan MacWilliam, 2007, 13 Roland Gardens](image)

For example, in 2007, she took part in a residency at The Parapsychology Foundation, resulting in a body of video works. The still image above is from MacWilliam’s piece entitled *13 Roland Gardens* (2007), a recorded interview with Eileen Coly, who is a prominent figure from the field of parapsychology (MacWilliam, 2007, [approx. 1 screen]). Another example of an Irish contemporary artist utilising ethnographic modes
of making art is Rhona Byrne. Byrne recently worked with a group of roller coaster enthusiasts from the United States to produce a collective sound and video piece entitled *Coaster Choir* (2010). The term ‘enthusiast’ is often used to indicate a hobbyist or amateur level of interest in a subject. The piece comprises a video of the group taking the form of a choir and producing a musical rendition of the sound of a roller coaster. As a viewer one becomes exposed to and learns about the cultural rituals and hobbyist forms of production of another social group.

In terms of an approach to a project that involved my closely observing and working alongside an alternative group of individuals, in this case ‘amateur’ artists, I referred to aspects of social theory. In this regard, I looked to the seminal theories of the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu and his work in the field of culture and aesthetics in order to manage my enquiry. In his publication *Distinction, a Social Critique of The Judgement of Taste* (1979), Bourdieu’s ethnographic work investigated the mechanics of how aesthetic judgement operates. This work marked a breakthrough, heralding an inventive and innovative approach towards the notoriously subjective ‘subject’ that up to that
point (mid-1970s) remained a contested space of enquiry. In the above study Bourdieu conducted an all-encompassing, extensive survey, analysing for the first time the social, economic and cultural conditions that influence and dictate an individual’s taste. To capture his research holistically, Bourdieu developed a tiered analysis to construct his study. As cited at the beginning of Chapter Two, exemplified by the work of Michael Grenfell and Cheryl Hardy, many sociologists and researchers since have adopted Bourdieu’s thinking tools and analysis frameworks. According to Bourdieu, the subjects and individuals who occupied the space of his study are referred to as ‘the habitus’. The ‘habitus’ encompasses the sum of the parts of an individual’s make-up, their upbringing, their value systems, moral codes; the inherent perceptive faculties of the individual. Bourdieu used the term ‘habitus’ as an analytical definition to help objectify the subjects of his study. In the case of his criticism of taste, the object of his study was the subject of what prompted and influenced people to aesthetically like or dislike.

Bourdieu refers to the space that the ‘habitus’ occupies as ‘the field’. ‘The field’ comprises a space held in place by tangible and non-tangible structures. Within ‘the field’, ‘the habitus’ occupies and manages the structures, producing forms of ‘practice’ that are influenced by the embodied forms of ‘capital’ that ‘the habitus’ accrues over the course of their lifetime.33 According to the Bourdieusian philosophy and literature, ‘capital’ comes in ‘social,’ ‘cultural’ and ‘economic’ forms. The forms capital takes depend on the particular ‘habitus’; for example, the individual who has accrued a large network of influential social connections throughout his or her life could be said to possess ‘social capital’. The person who has gained and aggregated educational-related status possesses ‘cultural capital’, and the sum of these two forms of capital could

---

33 Influenced by the seminal work and theories of Karl Marx in relation to his criticism of early capitalism, Bourdieu developed, evolved and categorised ‘capital’ in three main ways as cited above (within the contemporary climate ‘capital’ as a term is commonplace within intellectualised discourse).
contribute to aspects of ‘economic capital’, where the two come together to produce some kind of financial or symbolic reward (Bourdieu, 1979).

Via these categories and theories, Bourdieu divided up his fieldwork and used it as a structure to conduct surveys that questioned different groups of people from various class structures on their thoughts in relation to classical music and examples of high and low cultural references, using examples of paintings and photographs. Through these methods his research found that individuals’ aesthetic tendencies related conclusively to their class profile, their upbringing, and what kind of value system they had been exposed to throughout their lives, including educational (Bourdieu, 1979).

Aided and informed by Bourdieu’s holistic sociological approach and his linked forms of taxonomy, I divided the management of my enquiry by referencing his thinking tools. Initially, I considered how I could observe the individuals that occupied the space of artistic production; in the case of my research ‘the habitus’ are artists. I utilised Bourdieu’s theories as a type of entry point to systematically produce artistic projects. To capture forms of ‘habitus’ I conceived of an intervention that acted as a type of interface between two groups of artists or players in the field of art, the aim of which was to help observe how various kinds of artists think, behave and interact with each other within the field of power, activating and fuelling the reputation economy. To resonate with these power dynamics, I entitled the project The Gatekeeper Project.34

34 In preparation for field research, I referred to a study conducted by the sociologists Michael Grenfell and Cheryl Hardy, entitled When Two Fields Collide (2006). This sociological analysis of artists in the art world gave me a more specific ‘Bourdieusian’ analysis to refer to when planning The Gatekeeper Project. Grenfell and Hardy used Bourdieu’s empirical systematic methods of research to map the interface between two groups of artists in St. Ives in Britain during World War II. This analysis referenced Bourdieu’s observation of art practice and the constant shifting of artists from avant-garde to rear garde positions. They used his tiered analysis framework, i.e., the habitus, the field, and the wider socio-economic field to study St. Ives in the 1950s. At this time it was home to an established set of traditional painters until an urban migration of modern artists fled there from London. Grenfell and Hardy’s research
In preparation for *The Gatekeeper Project*, I engaged in a close field study of this organised amateur or ‘informal’ event. Throughout this time, I met and spent time talking to the exhibiting artists at the railings. The most overt observation that made itself apparent from these conversations and my field notes was that very few of the artists at the railings that I encountered had a formal academic training. In his essay of the same name, Sholette (2005) refers to the work produced by such artists as ‘Dark Matter’. He notes the expansion of the formal field of artistic production by quoting the ever-increasing numbers of masters graduates entering the field, stating that around 24,000 individuals graduate from art schools with an MFA annually in the United States alone (Sholette, 2005, p. 92). Sholette calculates that ‘the size of this pool of cultural producers grows larger still if we include artists who only hold undergraduate degrees’, and by considering the field of informal practice and the producers of informal art work, he remarks that ‘the figure virtually explodes beyond enumeration if amateur and self-trained practitioners are included in the statistics’ (Sholette, 2005, p. 92). In this regard, and after roughly estimating the massive size of the broader field of cultural production, Sholette asks:

> Is it the case, therefore, that the majority of creative activity in our post-industrial society remains invisible to the institutions and discourse – the critics, art historians, collectors, dealers, museums, curators and arts administrators – that manage and interpret contemporary culture? (Sholette, 2005, p. 93)

The other very obvious deduction that emerged from my field notes was the level of visibility of the event at the railings, and although relaxed in approach, the highly organised system that the artists had developed for showing and presenting artworks

---

35 ‘The Gatekeeper’ is a term that features within the literature of Franz Kafka, in particular in the parable entitled *Before the Law*, the Gatekeeper refers to a character with the power to let individuals in or keep them out of a defined group.
outdoors. As a city centre location, the event unofficially exposed itself to a massive passing cross-section of the city – the kind of visibility and exposure which is often sought after by formal private or state-run gallery spaces. Sholette remarks that examples of this work are far from invisible and that we encounter them far more often than we do ‘serious art’ (Sholette, 2005, p. 93). If cast in Bourdieu’s categories, due to their lack of formal training, the artistic habitus at the railings event could be said to evidence a deficit of cultural capital. This lack of formal training means, of course, that their artworks appear in content and formality different from the artists possessing cultural capital. Sholette refers to the seminal theories of the art critic Arthur C. Danto: in his essay entitled *The Artworld*, he remarks that ‘to see something as art requires something the eye cannot descry – an atmosphere of artistic theory, a knowledge of the history of art: an artworld’ (Danto, 1968, cited in Sholette, 2005, p. 93). In Chapter One of this thesis, according to Abbing’s (2002) economic and analytical deductions, the dominant voice in a field determines what art is, the field of education being one of these dominant voices. However, Sholette makes a contemporary observation when he remarks that within the formal art world there is evidence of individual practitioners attempting to turn their backs on this premise and ignore the voices of the dominant model. He cites various examples such as Mike Kelley, Julie Parsons, Jason Rhodes, Sarah Lucas or Thomas Hirschhorn, stating that they are ‘some of the better exemplars of slack art’36, who are exploring a kind of ‘amateurisation of high art practices’ in how they are making and presenting their work (Sholette, 2005, p. 99).

Sholette also compares the field of art to other fields, stating that there are superficial similarities and that in general ‘specialised filters regulate upward mobility. Those who

36 With the term ‘slack art’, Sholette refers to a deliberate amateur aesthetic being sought and applied to artworks within the contemporary art world evidenced in the aforementioned artists.
reach the summit are well rewarded and find themselves made extremely visible to those beneath’ (Sholette, 2005, p. 94). He elaborates on how, if observed closely, it is possible to see that the highly competitive artistic economy does not work in that straightforward a manner, and there is an extreme scarcity of individuals who in fact enjoy any success at the top. In this regard he claims:

Unlike these other highly educated professionals, artists typically work two or three jobs, often in other areas than art, just to make a living wage. In 1990, as many as half of all artists earned less than $3,000 from making art. A quarter earned only $500 from art sales. Not surprisingly unemployment is chronic among artists with a “dropout” rate far higher than in other specialised professions. (Sholette, 2005, p.93)

Although Sholette’s statistics are based on conditions in the United States in the early 1990s, they do correlate to the Irish context evidenced in the recent Visual Artists of Ireland survey entitled *The Social, Economic & Fiscal Status of Visual Artists in Ireland* (2008/2009 [approx. 1 screen]), which found in 2009 that on average visual artists make approximately €10,000 annually. Given inflation and Ireland’s economic shifts in the past 10 years there is parity with this figure in Ireland and Sholette’s statistics in the United States. Sholette summarises these statistics by indicating that the vast majority of artists are ‘over-educated, overworked, and structurally unemployable’ (Sholette, 2005, p. 93). Sholette ‘unpacks’ how the successful few artists rise to the top in the art world by referring to the anthropologist Stuart Plattner’s analysis model. Sholette uses this model to relate the art world success stories to the sporting performances of athletes, remarking that ‘just one athlete’s performance will be recognised even if it is a mere fraction of a second faster or better than that of other competitors’ and that this athlete “wins the prize” and many others lose, despite achieving outstanding athletic performances.’ This is similar to the art world and ‘describes a situation of workers
receiving payments that don’t seem related to their input of effort’ (Sholette, 2005, p. 94). He then observes that within the sporting field there are clear goals but in the art world these goals are more nebulous and change all the time, depending on the contemporary art market. Akin to Abbing’s theories on the exceptional economy of the arts as referenced in Chapter One, i.e., the components of an artist’s reputation increasing in worth depending on the relay, power and breadth of informal discourse circulating an artist’s practice, Sholette observes the same and refers to a circle of ‘insider knowledge’ that bolsters the rise of an artist to the top of his/her field (Sholette, 2005, pp. 95-96).

Although utilising Bourdieu’s thinking tools, when reflecting on the research I gathered I became less interested in capturing aspects of Bourdieu’s own specialised subject area (that of aesthetic judgement and distinction), and more inclined to focus on the ‘opposing’ virtues of informal practice advocated by Sholette, in line with the aspects of ‘trickster theory’ which I utilised in my artistic approach. Apart from the subject of aesthetic judgement being a well-trodden path of enquiry, focusing on the actual content, formal attributes, style, medium application, etc., of the informal artworks I encountered became irrelevant and even problematic in terms of my research enquiry, which looks to reveal aspects of the invisible character of the artistic field and to capture, contain and articulate the conditions and conditioning of the reputation economy. Relative to this premise, Sholette explains the aim of his subsequent 2011 publication based on his 2005 essay entitled Dark Matter: Art and Politics in the Age of Enterprise Culture, as follows:

My aim in other words is not to separate art from non-art, the rubbish from the dross, but to examine how these self-defined cultural practices operate within a changing economy involving material and symbolic rewards and penalties,
visibilities and shadows. I leave it to the reader to decide if this idiosyncratic approach permits the airing of ideas and histories that would otherwise remain in the dark. (Sholette, 2011, p. 6)

Instead I observed how informal practice conducts itself rather than what it produces. I made contact with the organisers of the event through engagement with the representatives on site. Through this engagement, I established the ‘all-inclusive’ ethos of the group and of the events, and learned of the criteria for applying which appeared not to ask for the conventional professionalistic apparatus that I was familiar with as an exhibiting artist. The requirements for inclusion in the organised events were as follows:

1. Filling in an application form.
2. Paying a fee of €25 to rent an allotted and assigned 6ft-wide section of the railings.
3. Agreeing to the terms, which stipulated that all works must be framed, for sale and that there could be no less than eight pieces shown on the railings at one time.

At the railings, the space was divided into exactly equal sections of railings. As the application guidelines indicate, each artist showing is allocated one of these equal 6ft x 12ft sections. For the duration of the event, the artists are highly visible and invigilate their work for the entire time, engaging interested members of the general public in their work. It is possible to see these sections of railing given to the artists from the video footage I took in my field observation period in preparation for the event (see naomisex.com project entitled The Gatekeeper Project).
I applied for a space and paid a fee for a 6ft x 12ft section of the railing. To create the desired interface of artistic ‘habitus’, I sought out four academically trained artists with contemporary practices and invited them to respond and work towards one of the events held at the railings. Having all been academically trained, the four artists all possessed considerable cultural capital in contrast to the other exhibitors at the railings. The four artists who agreed to show as a part of *The Gatekeeper Project* were Cormac Browne, John Graham, Margaret O’Brien and Sinead McCann. They all wished to make artworks outside of the stipulations of the committee rules in their application procedure above. They wished to make work in a site-specific manner aiming to respond to the site and context conceptually and via various modes of contemporary artistic production including relational methods, object-based installation and various facets of performance (see Appendix F and naomi-sex.com project entitled *The Gatekeeper Project* for further details on the project and documentation of each of the featured artists’ artworks).

Based on the fieldwork connections, I made contact with the committee of the group to inform them of my planned project. As my request was unprecedented, considerable negotiations needed to be engaged in before the committee would alter their rules to allow the artists who were involved to show at the railings at the same time as the regular exhibitors (Appendix G). The reasons outlined for this included an anxiety about the actual work that the four invited artists intended to show and the proximity of their work to the other exhibitors’ work, and a sense that the work of the invited artists might affect the sales and general exhibiting of the regular artists. After various attempts, the committee of the railings event eventually granted my project acceptance to go ahead, based on a condition that for the event, my project with its invited artists would show on
the west side of the railings. From my fieldwork engagement, I was aware that it was perceived as a less desirable side of the railings and in general a negative location because of a lack of exposure and sales. *The Gatekeeper Project* went ahead on the scheduled date and all four artists presented their works at or around our designated section of the railing. In the below documentation shot it is evident that our section of the railings was an isolated section with no other exhibitors around (see image below – an installation shot depicting Margaret O’ Brien’s piece and naomi-sex.com project entitled *The Gatekeeper Project*).

![Installation shot depicting Margaret O’ Brien’s piece and naomi-sex.com project entitled *The Gatekeeper Project*](image)

*Fig. no. 10: Margaret O’Brien, 2008, *Halting Site* from *The Gatekeeper Project*

The outcome of the event meant there were slippages in terms of the event’s all-inclusive ethos and an overall sense of paradox. When surveyed via questionnaire,37

---

37 This questionnaire was produced and conducted by featured artist John Graham as part of his work on *The Gatekeeper Project* (see Appendix H and naomi-sex.com project entitled *The Gatekeeper Project* for further details).
(Appendix H) responding to the question ‘What do you think the perception of gallery artists is of the artists who exhibit on the railings?’, a common set of responses from the regular exhibitors at the railings conveyed a sense of inferiority and a feeling of being looked down upon by artists who show at galleries. For example, ‘They think we are plebs’, ‘Snobbish attitude’, ‘Not serious, or good enough’, ‘Frowned upon by many’ and ‘Not as far up the food chain as they are’. As a physical and visual exercise, the project evidenced what Bourdieu observes in his work, that in the larger field of cultural production there are many smaller fields that don’t necessarily come in contact with each other (Bourdieu, 1979). These outcomes of The Gatekeeper Project illustrated how when two fields do come together, the embedded ideological separations and differences of the groups, manifest by the forms of capital each group possesses, can translate in a physical and visual manner.

With the above outcomes captured, I referred back to the theories of Bourdieu and to his tiered analysis framework in particular. Cast in his theories, I could begin to consider The Gatekeeper Project as a type of analysis of the habitus within the field. I then followed Bourdieu’s theories to move the focus of research toward an examination of the structures that the habitus encounter and inhabit within that field. This was done to aid in yielding a more fully rounded and holistic perspective on the enquiry as a whole.

I then located a structure in the field and I hinged it to the second project featuring in the first phase of research. In the next chapter, I will describe this second field-based project entitled A Structuring Structure and its relationship to The Gatekeeper Project. A Structuring Structure became my encounter with one of Ireland’s key artistic structures and a space where informal and formal art practices meet and collide.
Chapter Three: A structural hierarchy in a space where formal meets informal practice

I will begin by way of reminder that the content of this chapter pivots around the second field-based project entitled A Structuring Structure, which will feature extensively in this chapter and can be bracketed by Phase One of my research schema and continues to employ aspects of an ethnographic approach. Prior to a more detailed description and contextualisation of A Structuring Structure which this chapter will provide, I will now give a brief overview of what the project entailed. In line with Phase One of my research schema, I took on a quasi ethnographic research position and sought out an artistic event which did not require the professionalistic apparatus. If cast in Bourdieu’s theories, The Gatekeeper Project sought to provide an observation and study of the habitus, i.e., the subjects inhabiting the artistic field; with regard to this project, the subjects are artists. A Structuring Structure attempted to build and develop my research premise to produce a study and close observation of one of the structures of the artistic field. To do this, I sought out one of the largest and oldest annual art events held in Ireland, occurring in one of Ireland’s key artistic exhibiting institutions. The art event comprises an extensive submission of artworks made by a diverse cross-section of artists; a selection process then takes place which the members of the artistic institution conduct. On selecting the artwork, a small portion of work which is selected is hung in the gallery space in accordance with a ‘salon’ style hanging system. A Structuring Structure saw me negotiating closely with the event’s organisers to gain unprecedented access to observe and document this process (see naomi-sex.com project entitled A Structuring Structure).
To offer an appropriate conceptual, contextual and theoretical entry point for a description of this project, I will refer again to the theories of Foucault, specifically to Foucault’s description of the history of societal hierarchies, including social orders and systems within the military, which according to Foucault spread to all state institutions, including systems of education.

To bring the focus of this history to the more relevant site of my research project, I will map and relate these theories to the more contemporary work of the critic and theorist James Elkins in his book *Why Art Cannot be Taught* (2001), in which he summarises the history of artistic social order and establishment using the history of art education, with particular reference to the early academies and salon exhibitions formed around the period of the Renaissance. To explain this more fully, I will link Elkins’s theories around the formation and establishment of art practice across Europe to examine how these early formations and defined hierarchies can be linked to the quintessential architecture of the contemporary gallery space. This will be done with the aid of the postmodern commentator Brian O’Doherty and his seminal work on the ideology and psychology of the white cube space (O’Doherty, 1976). By conducting an overview of how hierarchical power is distributed subtly through the architectural arrangement and the presentation and staging of artworks in the gallery space, I will use O’Doherty’s notes on the white cube gallery space to reconnect with my research project entitled *A Structuring Structure*.

This project saw me gaining full and unprecedented access to observe the largest and oldest selection of artworks in Ireland. I found this selection process to be in line with my research schema for Phase One of the research period – seeking out alternative
contexts where the professional apparatus appears to be absent from the process. In this case the selection of artworks did not require the professionalistic apparatus (i.e., a C.V., an artist statement or a written proposal). As cited at the end of Chapter Two, I considered this observation through the key analysis theories of Pierre Bourdieu. In this chapter, I will use his theories to define this observation as a study and an example of one key structure in the field of artistic practice. This annual selection process is over 200 years old and famously re-enacts the salon selection process. I will summarise the selection process I witnessed, making reference to the extensive still documentation and transcribed material I produced, which is included on the website that accompanies this study and the appendix of this text. By way of conclusion to the first section of the chapter, I will form a link and relationship in terms of research outcomes, noting a co-dependant relationship between the informal art practices described in Chapter Two and the more formal art practices featured in the observation of the selection process contained in *A Structuring Structure*. This will be done through the work of Bourdieu and will conclude with reference to the contemporary artist and activist Gregory Sholette.

**Summarising histories of social hierarchy**

As identified in Chapter One of this study, the professional practices of artists are manifest as a form of discipline, and this discipline has slowly embedded itself into the culture surrounding artistic production. In this regard, Foucault elaborates on the mechanics of discipline in his seminal work *Discipline and Punish* (1977), revealing that it works by ‘gradually’ and slowly invading ‘the major forms, altering their mechanisms and imposing their procedures’ (Foucault, 1977, p. 170). Summarising the history of disciplinary power, Foucault states: ‘The success of disciplinary power
derives no doubt from the use of simple instruments, hierarchical observation, normalising judgement and their combination in a procedure that is specific to it, the examination’ (Foucault, 1977, p. 170).

As part of his analysis, Foucault reveals in further detail what he defines as the derivatives of discipline; he titles the first of these detailed accounts *Hierarchical Observation*. As a preface to tracing a type of genealogy of hierarchy, he argues that discipline ‘presupposes a mechanism that coerces by means of observation’ (Foucault, 1977, p. 170). Foucault focuses on the classical age and the innovative advances for the organisation of individuals into armies by referring specifically to the ‘military camp’ or ‘artificial cities’ as he calls them. He deconstructs formally and mathematically how the typical and effective military camp was laid out. These new patterns of spatial arrangement used geometrical specifications to categorise the soldiers in accordance with their ranking. Foucault provides a detailed and illuminating description as follows:

The arms depots are ten feet from the tents of the junior officers, immediately opposite the first tent pole. A company street is fifty-one feet wide . . . All tents are two feet from one another. The tents of the subalterns are opposite the alleys of their companies. The rear tent pole is eight feet from the soldiers’ tent and is erected opposite the captain’s tent . . . The captains’ tents are erected opposite the streets of their companies. The entrance is opposite the companies themselves. The camp is the diagram of a power that acts by means of general visibility. (Foucault, 1977, p. 171)

According to Foucault this highly organised and partitioned space for living began being mirrored in the first working-class urban housing developments and across many state-funded institutions. Foucault maintains that this ‘spatial nesting of hierarchized surveillance’ was aimed at embedding forms of cultural and socialised discipline (Foucault, 1977, p. 172).
Foucault observes how prisons began to adapt and augment their architectural designs from those of a more ‘simple schema of confinement’ to more sophisticated and calculated spaces with both ‘filled and empty spaces, passages and transparencies’ (Foucault, 1977, p. 171). He notes in particular that with these developments in institutional architecture, hospitals began finely tuning the layout of space, beginning to compartmentalise the patients that occupied them in order to operate with greater efficiency. For example, according to Foucault, hospitals began the ‘careful separation of the patients.’ This was ‘to prevent contagions.’ The wards also began to ventilate air so that it could be ‘circulated around each bed,’ and this was to ‘prevent the detritus vapours from stagnating around the patient, breaking down his humours and spreading the disease by their immediate effects’ (Foucault, 1977, p. 172).

Looking at the pedagogical arena through Foucault’s genealogy, in order to introduce effective and efficient controlling and training for large numbers of children, the state schools adopted the above mechanisms. He cites École Militaire as an example, making reference to its military-style layout. According to Foucault, what occurred in the military schools spread to elementary schools, where teachers built a team of assistants to aid in this overall efficiency by selecting ‘from among the best pupils a whole series of “officers” – intendants, observers, monitors, tutors, reciters of prayers, writings officers, receivers of ink, almoners and visitors’ (Foucault, 1977, p. 176). This expansion in assisting teaching responsibilities marks a development in state disciplinary pedagogical systems. To this end, Foucault asserts:

We have here a sketch of an institution of the mutual type in which three procedures are integrated into a single mechanism: teaching proper, the acquisition of knowledge by the very practice of the pedagogical activity and a reciprocal, hierarchised observation. (Foucault, 1977, p.176)
Foucault’s remarks that underlining ‘the practice of teaching’ a dynamic ‘relation of surveillance’, which can be ‘defined and regulated’, comes into play and is intrinsic to any successful system of pedagogy (Foucault, 1977 p. 176).

Continuing his dissection of disciplinary power in the sub-section entitled Normalising Judgement Foucault uses the earliest state orphanages in France to demonstrate that in these houses there was a morning ‘tribunal’ of sorts, which was carried out with a staged ceremony. This occurred every morning in order to deal with any unruly individuals. Foucault observes that the students began mimicking military camps and standing ‘in perfect alignment, immobility and silence’ awaiting the scheduled form of tribunal. According to Foucault, children accused of a wrongful act and who were up for trial were given permission to defend their actions, while ‘witnesses were heard’ in front of a panel or deciding council. Foucault states this early institutional example illustrates that ‘at the heart of all disciplinary system functions is a small penal mechanism’ (Foucault, 1977, p. 177).

Foucault argues that by adopting microforms of judicial systems within state institutions, this meant that organisations could enjoy ‘a kind of judicial privilege’ and could apply their own rules to accompany their tailored judicial processes (Foucault, 1977, p. 178). Becoming a part of the fabric of institutional life within schools meant in particular that nearly every individual in society passed through these systems, and was exposed to and became aligned with variant disciplinary measurements as a means of control. Foucault reveals that within:

the workshops, the school, the army were subject to a whole micro-penalty of time (lateness, absences, interruptions of tasks), of activity (inattention,
negligence, lack of zeal), behaviour (impoliteness, disobedience), of speech (idle chatter, insolence), of body (incorrect attitudes, irregular gestures, lack of cleanliness), of sexuality (impurity, indecency). (Foucault, 1977, p. 178)

Foucault defines the use of the term ‘punishment’ within the context of this time and within the first elementary schools:

By the word punishment, one must understand everything that is capable of making children feel the offence they have committed, everything that is capable of humiliating them, of confusing them ... a certain coldness, a certain indifference, a question, a humiliation, a removal of office. (Foucault, 1977, p. 178)

According to Foucault’s theories, the way in which disciplinary punishments are enforced is what he calls ‘mixed nature’. On the one hand he maintains they are ‘artificial’, in that they are entirely a constructed and invented ‘set of regulations’. On the other, he defines them as operating in a natural way. He explains the natural character by way of using the ‘duration of an apprenticeship’ as a way of bringing a student’s learning capability to a natural conclusion. If they have not sufficiently learned or retained the lessons taught to them over the duration of the specific time, a penalty of some sort will be applied. In this regard, he states: ‘a pupil who at the end of their examinations has been unable to pass into the higher order must be placed, well in evidence, on the bench of the ignorant. In disciplinary regime punishment involves a double juridico-natural reference’ (Foucault, 1977, p. 179).

Referring to how discipline makes up for the overlooked areas or gaps of wider governance, Foucault asserts that discipline always works to be ‘corrective’. As he described above, this is done by borrowing ‘directly from the judicial models’ (Foucault, 1977, p. 178). He revisits how the military ‘favour punishments that are
exercise’, for example, repetitive training routines. And in the case of ‘lance corporals who show some negligence or lack of willingness they will be reduced to the rank of private’ (Foucault, 1977, p. 178). In a similar way to how the elementary school maintained the hierarchy of ascendance by keeping students back a year if they did not successfully pass their examinations, the military too within its systematic forms of discipline reinforces its hierarchy by effectively punishing by demotion. Typifying the nineteenth century’s reforms in structural organisation, Foucault makes an example of this system at play, specifically referencing the Christian Brothers’ teaching methods, stating they ‘organised a whole micro-economy of privileges and impositions’ (Foucault, 1977, p. 180). According to Foucault, elaborate and symbolic costumes began being instated in the early military schools of Paris, to make visible the distinct system of ‘honorary classification’, which Foucault exemplifies as follows:

The first class, known as “the very good”, were distinguished by a silver epaulette; they enjoyed the honour of being treated as “purely military troops”; they therefore had a right to military punishment (arrests and, in serious cases, imprisonment). The second class, “the good”, wore an epaulette of red silk and silver . . . the class of “mediocres” had the right to an epaulette of red wool; to the preceding penalties was added, if necessary, the wearing of a sackcloth. The class of the “bad” was marked by an epaulette of brown wool . . . (Foucault, 1977, pp. 181-182)

Running parallel to the period of time when Foucault describes the above formal emergence of hierarchy within the state institutions and how it became manifest and visible, the subject of art was also a part of a universal reform and time of heightened organisation. This can be observed within the evolving art education system at the time and the newly organised rigour of the artistic academy during the nineteenth century –

38 The Christian Brothers are a religious order within the Catholic Church. In the history of the Irish education system this sector of Catholicism dominated the manner in which male students in particular were educated.
essentially how the academies began formalising the teaching of art and how academies constructed various awarding rituals and accolades to then students of art.

**The emergence of artistic establishment**

In the contemporary climate, art education within the university system is believed by many to be in a state of crisis,\(^39\) offering a rationale for the growing numbers of student-led free universities with an emphasis on cultural studies springing up around Europe.\(^40\)

Contesting the notion that art can be taught at all, James Elkins in his publication entitled *Why Art Cannot Be Taught* (2001) produces a comprehensive study around contemporary art education and constructs a convincing argument dispelling conventions of teaching art via a prescribed formula. To construct his argument, he conducts an historical overview of art education at university level, tracing where and how art began being taught formally. His findings mirror (in many ways) some of the examples used by Foucault to explain the mechanics in which power in various forms fuels institutional discipline and training. In the quotation below, Elkins asserts the following with regard to the first medieval universities that taught aspects of classical studies:

\[\ldots\text{teachers drilled the students by going around the class, and the students were expected to memorise portions of the book as well as the professor’s discussions of it. It is easy to imagine what this regimen must have been like, especially since it involved “dry” texts on logic and little original thought …} (Elkins, 2001, p. 6)\]

\(^39\) This topic was addressed and titled *Education and the Commons* at a recent sub-section of a symposium entitled *Collaborative Change*, organised by GradCAM (The Graduate School of Creative Arts and Media Research) July, 2011.

\(^40\) An example of this within the Irish context is ‘Provisional University’, which at the time of writing is seeking a space from NAMA (Ireland’s National Asset Management Agency) to facilitate a free university. The organisation’s manifesto aims at providing a space where an autonomous third level education can be facilitated, one that is not reliant on student fees or dominant government policies (The Provisional University, 2011, [approx. 1 screen]). Another example, based in Spain, is known as *Universida Nómada*. 
Universities didn’t offer art as a subject to study in the medieval period and if seeking to train as an artist, an apprenticeship under a master craftsperson was the only available path to take. According to Elkins, it’s believed that the artists of the Renaissance period rebelled against the teaching techniques of the universities, and that they ‘attempted to have their craft (which did not require a university degree) raised to the level of a profession (which did require a university degree)’, these motives and actions resulting in ‘instituting art academies’ (Elkins, 2001, p. 7).

Elkins reveals that the first academies came about through informal means and were student-led initiatives aimed at enabling the study of subjects that were often left out of, or banned from, the formal university curricula (Elkins, 2001). The etymology of the word ‘academy’ was used in naming the art schools of the day; it derives from the teachings of Plato who conducted his lectures informally in a park on the outskirts of Athens. Within the history of Irish education, hedge schools came about through a similar, informal set of principles. As the name suggests, lessons often occurred outdoors and informally. These informal beginnings began to alter and shift towards the sixteenth century, when, according to Elkins, ‘mannerist taste tended to make academies more rigid, less informal and loose, and the idea of the academy began to merge with that of the late medieval university’ (Elkins, 2001, p. 8).

Using an example of the typical emerging academies in Florence throughout the Renaissance period, Elkins gives some insight as to the kind of curricula these new artistic establishments implemented and taught. He says that the ‘students learned mathematics, including perspective, proportion, harmony, and plane and solid Euclidean geometry’ (Elkins, 2001, p. 16). A pragmatic and practical structure of study was
devised for the students of the academy. The general belief was that artists needed ‘a good eye and a good hand, but even before they develop those they need mental principles to guide them: measured judgment and a conceptual foundation must come before manual dexterity’ (Elkins, 2001, p. 16).

When students entered the French academies, they did so to achieve a strict set of academic objectives which Elkins summarises as follows: ‘1. The drawings were required to have perfect proportions. 2. The students were required to observe decorum. 3. The students were not asked to be original.’ (Elkins, 2001, p. 18). With their informal and rebellious beginnings, it was during the Baroque period that the academies developed more substantially into establishments that spread globally; for example, The Royal Academy in London was founded in 1764. Interestingly, and resonating with my research project and in particular the notion of the contemporary status of the amateur within a reputation economy, Elkins notes that even though art and in particular painting and drawing had successfully been established as a respectable pursuit of study, it was during the Baroque period that the studying of art was ‘demoted’ to what Elkins calls an ‘amateur activity’. In this regard, Elkins states, ‘one text lists painting along with other pastimes appropriate to a gentleman, including fencing, riding, classical learning and coin collecting’ (Elkins, 2001, p. 16).

Reminiscent of Foucault’s observations of the systematic development of institutional hierarchies, in the academies, monthly examinations took place where aspiring students’ drawings and paintings were valued and judged. This contributed to an ever-present underlying competition and a constant evaluating barometer by which students could visibly distinguish themselves and their work. Elkins elaborates as follows:
There were monthly examinations, designated to weed out inferior students, but the major goal, from 1666 onward, was to win two all-important prizes: the *Grand Prix* (Grand Prize) and the *Prix-de Rome* (Rome Prize) scholarship. The Grand Prize was not easy to attain. First, students had to pass an examination by executing a satisfactory drawing in the presence of an instructor. If they passed the test they could submit another sketch, and if that sketch was accepted, they were invited to make a picture or relief from the sketch while locked in a room (to make sure they weren’t cheating or copying other drawings). All the pictures that had been made that way were put into a public exhibition, and eventually a panel chose a single Grand Prize winner. (Elkins, 2001, p. 24)

Being accepted to participate in the *Grand Prix* meant that the students who had successfully achieved this accolade could then advance on to another rung of the ladder of studentship and be referred to as an ‘agree’. Elkins states: ‘Agrees then had to pay a fee and complete a third work, this time specifically for the academy’s permanent collection; and if it was accepted, they became academicians, the highest normal position …’ (Elkins, 2001, p. 25).

Becoming an academician meant the period of studentship was completed and one was deemed to be a fully-fledged artist. Being an academician meant membership in a circle of like-minded artists who enjoyed, as Foucault remarked, in relation to any such micro-economy ‘a kind of judicial privilege’ (Foucault, 1977, p. 178). This ‘privilege’ came into play in particular with the academy salon exhibitions, which occurred annually. The most famous example from the nineteenth century was the Parisian salon, which attracted a wide cross-section of international recognition. For these exhibitions, an extensive showing of art was held, always inclusive of the work of the academicians, their choice of invited artists and most famously a juried process conducted by the academicians from a wide cross-section of artists and students who submitted their works for consideration for the exhibition.
In her text titled *With Practicality comes a Practice: the Artist as Curator* (2010), Sarah Pierce (an artist/curator) traces the history of artistic establishment from a different angle to that of Elkins. In her text, she links the academies and the salon-style exhibitions with the contemporary artistic/curatorial activity now defined as ‘self-organisation’. Relating to the content of my research and state of artistic professionalism, Pierce maintains that the academy salon shows, which were organised, selected and hung by artists (academicians) on an annual basis, marked the beginnings of artistic professionalism (Pierce, 2010). She states: ‘When critics and members of the public in 1800s France were invited to view the new society exhibitions, they were entering a world dominated by artists – where artists selected the work on the walls and arranged every aspect of its presentation’ (Pierce, 2010 [approx 2 screens]). Re-enforcing the basis of her discussion, Pierce cites examples of the counter artistic movements of the day, further evidencing the potency of artistic self-organising. In this case she refers to the avant-garde of the nineteenth century (the Impressionists) who were rejected in vast numbers by the academicians in 1863. As Pierce says, this group of artists became ‘outraged by the unprecedented number of works (over 3,000) the jury rejected that year’ (Pierce, 2010 [approx. 2 screens]). Turning their outrage towards productive means, they decided to not only organise their own exhibition – the *Salon Des Refusés* (1863) – but also to formally write and gain support from the then Emperor, Napoleon III, in order to formalise their rejection of the establishment. In this regard Pierce states: ‘The Impressionists continued to exhibit their works in successive *Salons des Refusés*, consistently dismantling the critical sway of the Paris Salon …’ (Pierce, 2010 [approx. 2 screens]).
Showing for seeing

The Salon Des Refusés contested the selection of artworks made by the academicians of the established academies but the choice of exhibiting space and the style of presenting artwork (i.e., the salon style) remained a common denominator and was utilised by both the establishment and the counter establishment. The particular relationship artists have with where they show their work – most conventionally within a gallery space – began with the formal presenting of paintings in these salon exhibitions. In his pivotal work Inside the White Cube (1976), which examines the psychology of this relationship closely – the one between art, artist and space, Irish artist and writer O’Doherty formally deconstructs the salon-style presenting model. O’Doherty’s observations of architecture and the spatial distribution of artworks within the Salon hang relay and relate to the manifestation of Foucault’s theories and history of hierarchy and social ordering. In the section O’Doherty entitles Notes on a gallery space, he insightfully points out that ‘the salon itself implicitly defines what a gallery is’ (O’Doherty, 1976, p. 16). N.B: To reiterate, I am referencing and extrapolating from O’Doherty’s particular critique of the gallery space, in the aim to contextualise and describe the project entitled A Structuring Structure which will conclude this chapter. This was the project that saw me gaining access to an annual selection process, which re-enacts the exact selecting processes used by the academicians of the nineteenth century and the presenting model of the salon-style exhibitions. It is on this basis that, although Inside the White Cube was written during the 1970s, I am including O’Doherty as a secondary reference whose observations still have contemporary relevance, not only in relation to my own research but in general: the white cube space remains the dominant exhibiting model of artistic choice.
In a humorous way O’Doherty depicts the challenges that the typical salon-style exhibition threw up for the nineteenth-century gallery attendee, by asking: ‘Are you to hire stilts to rise to the ceiling or get on hands and knees to sniff anything below the dado?’ (O’Doherty, 1976, p. 16). O’Doherty is of course alluding to the method of hanging the artwork employed in a salon-style hang, meaning that the walls are usually packed from ceiling to floor with paintings. O’Doherty reveals the hierarchy of the hang by asserting that on the wall, ‘Both high and low are unprivileged areas’ (O’Doherty, 1976, pp. 16-17). Inside the gallery space, the ease of visibility of artworks on the wall is linked with the artwork’s author and their status outside of the gallery space. In Chapter One, I made reference in various ways to the importance and power of visibility as an omnipresent character of the reputation-based economy. O’Doherty observes how in the early formation of the field of art, visibility is of vital importance, when he states:

You overhear a lot of complaints from artists about being “skied” but nothing about being “floored”. Near the floor, pictures were at least accessible and could accommodate the connoisseur’s “near” look before he withdrew to a more judicious distance. One can see the nineteenth-century audience strolling, peering up, sticking their faces in pictures and falling into interrogative groups a proper distance away, pointing with a cane, perambulating again, clocking off the exhibition picture by picture. (O’Doherty, 1976, pp. 16-17)

Foucault’s study of the specific layout of the early military camps comes to mind as O’Doherty describes the careful and precise hanging layout of paintings. Depending on the status of the artist, the paintings were placed and positioned carefully, depending and according to a defined ascending hierarchy.

Larger paintings rise to the top (easier to see from a distance) and are sometimes tilted out from the wall to maintain the viewer’s plane; the “best” pictures stay in the middle zone; small pictures drop to the bottom. The perfect hanging job is an ingenious mosaic of frames without a patch of wasted wall showing. (O’Doherty, 1976, pp. 16-17)
O’Doherty observes how the salon exhibition typifies a nineteenth-century organisational revolution, the same revolution which Foucault’s history of hierarchy reveals. In this regard, O’Doherty states: ‘Space was discontinuous and categorisable, just as the houses in which these pictures hung had different rooms for different functions’ (O’Doherty, 1976, p. 16). O’Doherty makes specific reference to the birth of hierarchy and how society and culture were becoming finely tuned to the manifestations of this new social order as follows: ‘The nineteenth-century mind was taxonomic, and the nineteenth-century eye recognised hierarchies of genre and the authority of the frame’ (O’Doherty, 1976, p. 16). At the beginning of this chapter I made reference to Foucault’s remarks on the institutional spread of organisation to places such as hospitals, when hygiene became of the utmost importance to fend off the spread of germs, meaning that beds were placed in such a way that air could circulate around each bed (Foucault, 1977, p. 172). O’Doherty’s detailed description of the salon could act as a metaphor for Foucault’s theories relating to the new medical care of the time, with an emphasis on the prevention of contagions, when O’Doherty remarks: ‘One and one only: each picture was seen as a self-contained entity, totally isolated from its slum-close neighbour by a heavy frame around and a complete perspective system within’ (O’Doherty, 1976, p. 16). Hans Abbing’s (2002) definition of ‘cultural asymmetry’ (Group A looking down on Group B, etc.), included in Chapter One of this study, resonates with O’Doherty’s remarks of a system of hanging where artworks take on a character and almost resent being placed beside another artwork, or, as he refers to it, as a ‘slum-close’ neighbour.

The modernist and postmodernist architectural evolution of the salon-style hang exhibiting space became what O’Doherty refers to as the ‘white cube’ space, which
despite the contemporary fluxes and ideological sways remains the consistent design template for art galleries. In this regard O’Doherty defines its key attributes as follows:

A gallery is constructed along laws as rigorous as those for building a medieval church. The outside world must not come in, so windows are usually sealed off. Walls are painted white. The ceiling becomes the source of light. The wooden floor is polished so that you click along clinically, or carpeted so that you pad soundlessly, resting the feet while the eyes have at the wall. (O’Doherty, 1976, p. 15)

In Chapters One and Two of this study, with the aid of Hans Abbing and his theories on what he calls ‘the exceptional economy of the arts’, Abbing describes the close connection art making has with a sacred act, a spiritual endeavour forming links with religion. In the special architecture designed to house art, O’Doherty recognises how these religious associations, along with other powerful persuasive elements, are reinforced. He notes that: ‘Some of the sanctity of the church, the formality of the courtroom, the mystique of the experimental laboratory joins with chic design to produce a unique chamber of aesthetics’ (Doherty, 1976, p. 14). He concedes that the unique combination of these associations produces an effect that is ‘so powerful’ that ‘once outside it, art can lapse into secular status’ and ‘conversely, things become art in a space where powerful ideas about art focus on them’ (O’Doherty, 1976, p. 14). O’Doherty elaborates further on how the formal design decisions of the typical gallery space support a perception of the suspension of time. In this regard he asserts:

Unshadowed, white, clean artificial – the space is devoted to the technology of aesthetics. Works of art are mounted, hung, scattered for study. Their ungrubby surfaces are untouched by time and its vicissitudes. Art exists in a kind of eternity of display, and though there is lots of “period” (late modern), there is no time. This eternity gives the gallery a limbolike status . . . (O’Doherty, 1976, p.15)
Capturing through recorded methods a suspension of time embedded in the gallery space, O’Doherty notes the gallery installation shot, calling it ‘one of the icons of our visual culture’, in his 1970s critique and commentary. He is making an early observation of a strand of what is now produced under the guise of professional practice (O’Doherty, 1976, p. 15). The installation shot of an artwork formally photographed in its rightful context (more often than not a white cube space) has become a key staple of the professional apparatus packaged and referred to as ‘documentation’. The contemporary installation shot showcases and encompasses in a manageable two-dimensional hard copy or screen-based format the aesthetic and magical relationship between architecture and the art that O’Doherty describes above. In this regard, he posits:

Here at last the spectator, oneself, is eliminated. You are there without being there – one of the major services provided for art by its old antagonist, photography. The installation shot is a metaphor for the gallery space. In its ideal it is fulfilled as strongly as in a salon painting in the 1830s. (O’Doherty, 1976, p. 15)

Above, O’Doherty removes the viewer from the space of the gallery, replacing it with the frame of the photograph, connecting the camera lens metaphorically to reinforce his discussion around the influential resonance the salon exhibitions of the nineteenth century still have on the contemporary art-showing process.

*A little bit of history repeating itself . . .*

In Chapter Two of this study, I explained how I used the social research design theories of Pierre Bourdieu to help systematise an approach towards Phase One of my research project. I will now return to this design and to his theories to aid in describing and contextualising *A Structuring Structure*. Also in Chapter Two of this study, I referred to
Bourdieu’s tiered analysis schema\textsuperscript{41} In order to contextualise the research project entitled \textit{The Gatekeeper Project}, which I bracket and see as a sample of what Bourdieu calls the ‘habitus’ (i.e., the habitus defines the subjects which occupy a field of social study). In the case of this research project, these subjects are artists, and in the case of \textit{The Gatekeeper Project}, it is a project that enabled a close study and form of interface between the formal, academically-trained artistic habitus and the practices of informal, non-academically-trained artistic habitus (i.e., professional artists showing alongside amateur artists). According to Bourdieu the habitus constructs and controls its own set of conditions, and in turn is controlled by the conditions that it constructs, producing a field of power which it – the habitus – occupies. In his publication titled \textit{The Rules of Art} (1996), Bourdieu elaborates on the specific conditions of the artistic and literary field (citing Flaubert as an example). In this regard, Bourdieu refers to a ‘circle of belief’ or a circle of value that is generated over time around the habitus. Within the contemporary sense and in relation to my research, this ‘circle’, as Bourdieu terms it, could be subsumed by the term ‘reputation’ and the circle/field that Bourdieu refers to as ‘an economy’. Bourdieu states:

\ldots The sociology of art and literature has to take as its object not only the material production but also the symbolic production of the work, i.e., the

\textsuperscript{41} This footnoted material acts as a reminder of Bourdieu’s tiered analysis from Chapter Two. The ‘habitus’ encompasses the sum of the parts of an individual’s make-up, their upbringing, their value systems, moral codes; the embodied, inherent perceptive faculties of the individual. Bourdieu used the term ‘habitus’ as an analytical definition to help objectify the subjects of his study. In the case of his criticism of taste, the object of his study was the subject of what prompted and influenced people to aesthetically like and dislike. Bourdieu refers to the space that the ‘habitus’ occupies as ‘the field’. ‘The field’ comprises a space held in place by tangible and non-tangible structures. Within ‘the field,’ ‘the habitus’ occupies and manages the structures, producing forms of ‘practice’ that are influenced by the embodied forms of ‘capital’ that ‘the habitus’ accrues over the course of their lifetime. According to the Bourdieusian philosophy and literature, ‘capital’ comes in ‘social,’ ‘cultural’ and ‘economic’ forms. The form capital takes depends on the particular ‘habitus’, for example: the individual who has accrued a large network of influential social connections throughout their life, could be said to possess ‘social capital’. The person who has gained and aggregated educational-related status possesses ‘cultural capital’, and the sum of these two forms of capital could contribute to aspects of ‘economic capital’, where the two come together to produce some kind of financial or symbolic reward. (Bourdieu, 1986, [approx.3 screens]).
production of the value of the work or, which amounts to the same thing, of belief in the value of the work. It therefore has to consider as contributing to the production not only of the direct producers of the work in its materiality (artist, writer, etc.) but also the producers of the meaning and value of the work – critics, publishers, gallery directors and the whole set of agents whose combined efforts produce consumers . . . (Bourdieu, 1992, p. 37).

Following this line of thinking, and reflecting on the wider frame of reference in accordance with what Bourdieu states above, i.e., the significance of the structures that bring together value assigners – I sought to capture a sample of such a structure from the field of artistic power, which, as Bourdieu states, works as ‘a manifestation of the field as a whole, in which all the powers of the field, and all the determinisms inherent in its structure and functioning, are concentrated’ (Bourdieu, 1992, p. 37). The space I sought out was and is a key exhibiting structure within the Irish art context, one with a history that echoes in the international story of the art academies and the salon shows of nineteenth-century Europe. It operates in many ways as a ‘micro-economy’ as Foucault suggests – within its own set of parameters and systems. This members’ organisation also fitted with my early research design, seeking and locating artistic situations where the artistic professionalistic apparatus was absent from the process.

As an organisation, it has a membership of individuals/artists whose position in the visual arts mirrors Elkins’s findings in relation to the traditional and discipline origins of art education. The space that represents and houses this membership is a site-specifically designed gallery space, which resonates completely with O’Doherty’s astute observations of the white cube gallery space.

Once a year this key structure holds an annual exhibition made up of its membership, associate membership, an invited cohort of usually international counterpart members
from similar organisations and, most significantly, a large selection of artworks that come from an enormous application of works made to the organisation by a wide cross-section of the artistic habitus. The membership is made up of a group of artists who have gained prestige and various levels of success throughout their careers and who have gone through a series of formal procedures to be elected to the organisation’s membership. Within the membership, there is an elected, titled and defined hierarchy of members who carry out various duties in the running of the organisation, including an elected president, secretary, keeper, treasurer, etc. In accordance with this hierarchy, at formal and official gatherings, the membership wear robes which decoratively and symbolically match their position within the membership. An example of one of these formal occasions is the prize-giving ceremony, which is organised to coincide with the annual exhibition (see naomi-sex.com project entitled A Structuring Structure). The organisation’s art historical context and direct connection with the salons of Europe is pertinent in accordance with the theories of Bourdieu who in The Rules of Art (1996) refers directly to the mechanics and power that the artistic salon yield. He says that they are not only places where like-minded artists can come together and become highly organised around their individual forms of practice, but that they also make real ‘through direct interactions, the continuity from one of the fields of power to the other’ (Bourdieu, 1992, p. 51). In this regard the organisation’s membership and board is made up of representatives of many fields of discipline, including writers, political figures, architects, etc. Cast in the analysis theories of Bourdieu, it is a site of high concentration and volume of social capital. I will return to this point in more depth as I describe and unfold the narrative of the project with the aid of the sound transcriptions of the selection process contained in the appendix of this thesis and visual documentation included on the website accompanying this submission.
Having reflected on the significance of this annual event in the art world calendar and the kind of value it could bring to my research activity and enquiry, I contacted the organisation’s curator in order to gain permission to observe the selection processes for the annual exhibition of its membership. As it turned out this was an unprecedented request, which then had to go through a formal procedure and an in-depth negotiation process in order for the organisation to grant me the permission. The outcome of this negotiation was positive and I was given permission to conduct an observation of the process on day one of a three-day process. I was also given permission to observe and document the entire preparation for the event, including the hand-in day of artworks, the selection process (just over one day as cited above), the hanging of the artworks in the space and the opening of the event, including the prize-giving ceremony. In line with Phase One of my research schema outlined in Chapter Two and aspects of the ‘boundary crossing’ activity of the trickster, I saw this artistic field-based project and the permission I was granted as a subversive placement of my position as an artist, i.e., an artist being let observe other artists select artworks for display in a way that had never occurred before.

To set the scene, so to speak, I will footnote a summary of the initial stages of my official observation of the event. To gain permission to use the data collected after the observation within the appendix of this thesis and the whole negotiation of the project from beginning to end spanned a three-year period of time. On arrival, the curator met me and explained that the annual membership show is the only event which is not a curated exhibition and operates as a separate entity from the other programme of events (which presumable, as one of the head curators, she is more involved in). She then showed me the layout of the gallery space where the main activity took place for the selection process. As evidenced in the documentation shots, the space is a pristine exhibiting space which, as one enters, is met by a main rectangular reception area, with all surfaces mainly white polished or reflective surfaces. To the right of the reception there is a corridor which to its left leads to a medium-sized rectangular gallery space. This space is named after one of the organisation’s members. To the right of the reception corridor there is access into an interim space which connects to another rectangular medium-sized gallery space directly to the right of it. The interim space has windows to its left and is filled with natural light, unlike the other showing spaces. It works as another reception area and contains a large dominant staircase, at the left-
fieldwork and research was the actual selection process itself. It occurred a full week after the hand-in of work. Arriving early at the organisation on the third day of the selection, I was brought to the interim reception space (as described in the footnotes); here there were two rows of chairs awaiting the selection panel that day. The chairs had been placed in two rows by the same team of technical staff who assisted in the hand-in process. I brought sound recording equipment and two cameras in an attempt to capture as much visual/aural information as I could. The panel of members arrived at approximately 10am and took their chairs. The full group was made up of 11 members, 7 men and 4 women – with a minimum estimated age of approximately 50. One of the members of the panel was known to me and began to introduce me to the rest of the panel and took me through the structure of the selection process; he also assisted me with my recording equipment. As evidenced in the sound transcribed data in the appendix my sound recording equipment was noted by the member of the panel known to me on a couple of occasions to remind the panel that they were being recorded.

hand side of which is access to two main, much larger gallery spaces upstairs. After this initial introduction to the spaces and the event, the curator returned to her duties for that day, which seemed to be to assist with the presentation of the event. I settled into the observation period. At this stage of the process, I was in day two of the handing-in of artworks by the artistic habitus. To cater for this stage of the process, the organisation hired a team of technical and (what seemed like) highly experienced staff who were on hand to help both the administrative staff and the individuals submitting artworks. The hand-in occurred in the main reception area, where a number of tables had been placed by administration staff responsible for accepting the artworks. The tables formed a line to the reception. In front of the line, three orderly queues of individuals holding their artworks remained passing through for the entire time of my observation. As I noted above, to enter a work for consideration, the professionalistic apparatus was not required. However, as I observed, a payment was made for each work and a name and details of the work, i.e., its title, price and medium were recorded by the administration staff who processed those details and then handed the submitted artwork to one of the various technicians who then alphabetically stacked the work in one of two spaces allocated for the purpose. The first was the named rectangular gallery space to the left of reception, the other was in the basement of the gallery space, a large dark windowless space which I will refer to in further detail as I describe my observation of the selection process. As I noted in my field notes and the documentation shots of the process, the technicians handled all of the submitted artworks using white gloves. By the end of this first phase of my observation, the room (in particular the named gallery space) became full of submitted artworks, becoming a viewing spectacle in itself.
In terms of the selection process structure, as evidenced in the visual documentation on the website accompanying this submission, the technical staff (wearing white gloves) formed a queue working in alphabetical order taking works from the titled gallery space (see footnotes) into the interim space, and then taking it in turns to place each work on a large rectangular table lined with protective packaging material. This table was then placed in front of the seated panel.

When an artwork was placed on the table, a vote of initial interest was required for a vote to be taken by the entire panel. If there was no interest in the work from any members of the panel, the work was recorded as ‘unaccepted’ by the administrator present. It was explained to me that for the sake of diplomacy, the word ‘unaccepted’ was used instead of ‘rejected’. When artworks were placed on the table, a member of the panel called for a vote. The work then required a majority of the panel to vote for it in order for it to be ‘accepted’. This meant that at least 10 out of 11 of the panel needed to be in favour of the piece for it to be accepted. If the piece received a maximum of 9 out of 11 votes, it was placed in what was called the ‘possible’ category, which meant it would be put in another category of work, which would go through a second viewing at a later stage in the day.

The day was split into a number of sessions. In an attempt to document the variety, pattern and tone of the day, the transcribed material in the appendix is split into time slots. Session 1 is a session after the morning coffee break, held in the well-lit interim space as cited in the footnotes; Session 2 was recorded after lunch in the basement of the gallery space as cited in the footnotes, and Session 3 was held back again in the
interim space and was the shorter session at the end of the day, evidencing the second viewing of the ‘possible’ category referred to above.

If casting the panel (made up of the organisation’s membership) using Bourdieu’s conceptual thinking tools, my research could bracket the selection panel as possessors of a high concentration of what Bourdieu refers to as ‘social capital’. To serve as a reminder of this definition of capital, Bourdieu says in his text *The Forms of Capital* (1986) that capital is ‘accumulated labour in its materialized form or its “incorporated”, embodied form ….’ (Bourdieu, 1986 [approx. 3 screens]). In Chapter Two, I used Bourdieu’s use of ‘cultural’ capital\(^{44}\) to determine the artistic habitus showing at the railings event. As the data collected at the event revealed, the artistic habitus surveyed possessed low levels of cultural capital, as they were mainly self-taught artists. Social capital works in a more elusive manner and cannot be as quickly identified or nailed down as cultural capital. On a pragmatic research level, for example, if conducting a questionnaire or looking at an artist’s CV, it would be difficult to pinpoint levels of social capital. Bourdieu uses the term to categorise a kind of value that comes from the complex network and world of social connections, for example, being well connected to influential persons or groups of people who may have influential sway in the field of power. In this regard he says that social capital is ‘made up of social obligations (“connections”), which is convertible, in certain conditions, into economic capital and may be institutionalised in the form of a title of nobility.’ In the case of the selection panel above, this definition can neatly be assigned to them as they were all given individual titles of nobility, assigned to them by the organisation – based on the organisation’s micro-economy and structural hierarchy, for example, president,

\(^{44}\) Refers to the accumulated educational qualifications of an individual.
treasurer, etc. I could observe the social connectivity quite literally on the day, in that the group were obviously well known to each other and seemed comfortable referring to each other on a first name basis, keenly aware of each other’s opinions, knowledge of the field and each other’s practices throughout the process. This can be evidenced throughout the sound transcriptions in the appendix.

In Chapter Two I explained my decision around the issue of aesthetic judgement that arose in *The Gatekeeper Project*, which again arises in the contextualising and writing up of this project *A Structuring Structure*. My reluctance to discuss in any detail the actual artworks I observed in the process comes from an attempt to avoid diluting the real underpinning of my enquiry, which is to capture, assess and articulate the conditions and conditioning of the reputation economy. With this in mind, although the appendix reveals the panel descriptions and remarks with regard to the loose criteria they adhered to in order to make a judgement, within this description of the project I shall avoid making reference to the formal attributes of the artworks involved in the selection process.

Instead I want to return to what Bourdieu refers to as a circle of belief that is generated around an artist (Bourdieu, 1996). Similar to the character of social capital, this works in an elusive manner. How is it possible to reveal and capture what one influential person says about an artist casually or informally among a group of other influential people? It’s the kind of activity that is often made reference to in the art world but not in any concrete manner. Having the permission to record and transcribe the panel’s selection process meant that in terms of this informal discursive activity, my research
project became enabled – generating an entity and a text-based object, which works as an actual document of this evasive informal discourse.45

Within the appendix, in Sessions 1, 2 and 3, it is evident that the panel and the technical staff have a good working relationship and that all parties involved have a good knowledge of the processes and stages of the event. The panel is cordial, with the staff members remaining friendly and engaged at all stages throughout the day – there is a sense that everybody has done this before and that nothing too unexpected in the proceedings will take place, with everything being conducted in an orderly manner.

With regard to the selection process, throughout the day, the panel consistently ask the technical support or the administrator whom the artist is that they are viewing. The process is not promoted or advertised publicly as an anonymous selection of artwork, nor is it made known to its applicants that the name of the artist will be referred to during the selection process. The anonymity of the process remained a grey area of discussion when I asked the curator on the day of the observation. The name of the artist is placed on a discreet label which is attached to the back of every artwork submitted. The name is not always visible, however, this information seems to be an orientating yardstick in which begins a discourse around the piece, eventually leading to a selection decision. At no point does the panel select a work for exhibition where they do not make the name of the artist known to themselves – in other words, they never accept an artwork anonymously. In some cases one member of the panel or of the technical or administrative staff will know more than the rest of the panel about the artist once the work comes up for consideration or once the name of the artist has been called out.

45 It should be noted that all panel members and artists involved are recorded anonymously in accordance with the negotiated terms I reached with the organistion.
In relation to one male artist whose work was considered, one panel member admired the work and was informed by the technical staff that the artist ‘won a prize last year’ (Appendix I). This is an aural indication of the artist’s relationship with the organisation. A coupling of both social capital and cultural capital can be observed, where the artist has previous connections with the selection process and has not only been accepted by the panel previously but has also achieved the accolade of a prize (boasting his cultural capital). This reminder given by the technician reaffirms the panel members’ initial observation of the work and the piece is voted on. One panel member reveals a wider frame of reference in relation to an artist’s practice, stating: ‘He’s been doing large drawings for years’ (Appendix I). Later on in the session, in relation to a female artist, a member of the panel asked: ‘Who’s that?’ then answers himself, stating the artist’s name and then asks if anyone is interested in voting, saying: ‘Anyone interested? No?’ Another panel member asks: ‘Do you know her?’ and the first panel member remarks, ‘I do, yeah, she’s nice.’ Although the above may be slight instances evidencing social capital, in Session 1 there is considerable discursive activity around one applicant who is socially known to the members of the panel and who is himself a member of a related artistic members’ organisation as follows (Appendix I):

M – Who’s this artist?
M – This is (artist’s name).
M – It’s very beautiful.
M – He’s very good.
M – He is very good, yeah.
M – He’s in (names other well-known members’ organisation).46
W – They are absolutely gorgeous.
S – Okay, we’ll vote on this piece here?

In the following discussion, again in Session 1, the artist in question, whose work comes up for consideration, has been written about in a popular mainstream Irish

46 This other members’ organisation is state-funded with a proportion of the membership receiving an annual stipend once they become a member.
newspaper, so again a social network of connectivity can be observed. One panel member informs the rest of the panel as follows (Appendix I):

M – Seen that before didn’t we?
M – Seen two of his before.
M – There was a feature on him in last Saturday’s (names newspaper).
M – A piece on him in the (name of newspaper)?
M – Yeah last Saturday, magazine.
S – (artist’s name).
M – I like that.
M – It's nice.
M – Give it a vote.
S – Four, five, six possible.

In Session 2 in the afternoon, which took place in the basement, as the transcribed material evidences, it took some time before the panel and the technical staff got themselves organised for this session. In general, it was a far more uncomfortable setup and the panel members on several occasions complained about the poor visibility of the work and how cold it was in the space. The basement was large, with numerous cubicles of work, some of which was part of the submitted works for the annual exhibition, but there were also other artworks of members in storage. The process in the afternoon was much the same as the morning session except for slight levels of impatience around the poor conditions and the coldness of the space. In Session 2 another artist is noted by the technician as an artist who took part in the organisation’s alternate curatorial programme as follows (Appendix I):

S – She’s been up already, (name of artist).
M – Oh that’s a beautiful painting, she’s a very good painter this girl, (name of artist).
S – Do you go along with that?
M – Sure, yeah.
S – (artist’s name) was in the (name of contemporary curated show) and…
W – I like that.

The above gives an interesting insight into the cross-section of the artistic habitus that submit work for this annual members’ exhibition. As an exhibition, it is generally
perceived as a show that is more inclined towards traditional artistic ideals. However, the artist noted above is an example of an artist who took part in one of the organisation’s curated exhibitions (N.B. see footnotes – the curator informed me other programmes of exhibitions operate separately to this annual selection event). This separately programmed curated exhibition consists of a highly selective grouping of artists; it is widely regarded as an exhibition that aims to promote and forefront the cream of the Irish contemporary artistic crop. In my observation, artists belonging to these select groupings were a common occurrence; I also observed several works submitted by members of the informally self-taught artistic habitus who took part in the survey included in the appendix for The Gatekeeper Project. This informal work was also observed by one of the panel members when she makes reference to an artwork that she knows has been made by an artist who shows at the railing events as follows: W – Fresh off the railings (Appendix I). Reflecting on this annual selection process, it becomes clear that it serves as a large filtering structure and barometer for a wide field of the artistic habitus – contemporary, traditional, formally taught, self-taught, etc.

In the afternoon sessions there was greater concern voiced around the quantity of works being accepted. One of the panel members seemed to be responsible for taking note of each work that was accepted. At one point in the afternoon he announced the following: ‘We have exactly 100 selected.’ This was followed by another panel member asking: ‘How many should we have?’ He answered: ‘A hundred and sixty-seven was last year.’ (Appendix I). He reminded the panel on several occasions throughout the day about the total number of works accepted. The second viewing of works in the ‘possible’ category occurred at the very end of the day and was a fast-paced and much more vocal session. The panel member above (responsible for keeping track of accepted works) began
Session 3 by again updating the rest of the panel on how many works had been selected so far. In the ‘possible’ category, the selection rules change and the voting system requires only a majority to be accepted. As evidenced in the transcribed material, there is a much more assertive approach towards the selection of works. For example, one panel member declares: ‘I want that, I want that in, I want that in folks, come on.’ In the ‘possible’ category, the panel members are keenly aware of the new voting system and more vocal about what works they want in and more definite second time round on seeing the works and deciding whether or not it should be accepted as the following reveals: M – ‘The possibles is a great category, you know, when you look at it again?’ (Appendix I).

As well as sound and visual recording in my field observation, I attempted to construct a calculation over the course of one hour to attain a measure of the decision time taken over each work. This hour of close observation took place in the morning in the interim space – 157 works were viewed, and out of this 122 works were ‘unaccepted’, 21 were placed in the ‘possible’ category, and a total of 14 were accepted to show. Having timed each decision in that hour, I could calculate that the average time spent making their decision worked out at approximately 14.4 seconds, with the accepted works taking the longest to decide over, at approximately 24.5 seconds. According to my own field notes and experience, the process is intensive and exhausting, and is required to be done over three days. On a practical level, the panel needs to move through the work quickly. That year they were required to view 2,700 works. At several times throughout the transcribed material, the panel members make reference to how much work they had already viewed; they did this by asking what letter of the alphabet\(^\text{47}\) they were on – in

---

\(^{47}\) The artworks were stored and viewed alphabetically.
other words, how much work they still needed to do. What helped in the speed of the process is that there was no paperwork – as stated above, it is a process that does not require the professionalistic apparatus, which usually consists of a number of documents that would need to be read in relation to each work. What I observed, however, is that even though no actual CV was submitted with the work, an aural CV of sorts was given informally with the works of interest to the panel, i.e., panel members or staff inform the other panel members as to where certain artists were based, what prizes they may have won, other shows they were in, etc. As evidenced in the summary above, this continual reference to aspects of social and cultural capital was pivotal in arriving at a selecting decision.

Most of the works that were unaccepted didn’t even attain a vote and in some cases in the appendix sound recordings the artists who produced works like this (ones that were quickly processed with no votes) were generally unknown artists to the panel and their works were often met and described in a negative or ironically disparaging manner as follows (Appendix I):

M – Look at the eye socket.
M – Well, it’s a powerful statement, there’s no doubt about that.
M – Too powerful a statement.
M – Yeah, too powerful.

Another example taken from the transcribed recordings is as follows (Appendix I)

W – Oh dear.
M – He’s scary.

And in the ‘possible’ category session, the panel members became more vocal in this regard as follows (Appendix I):  


In actual fact, as my calculations and research reveal, it is extremely difficult to achieve acceptance through this selection process. That year (2010) a total of 2,700 works were submitted, and from the open selection process described above, 266 pieces were accepted over the course of the three days. That meant that a total of 2,434 artworks were unaccepted by the panel. The curator informed me that many of the same artists submit works year in, year out, never gaining acceptance. It seems like an illogical pursuit when one takes into account what the chances are of a piece being accepted.

When the selection process was completed, all accepted works were placed on large pallets for the hanging of the show. The unaccepted work was placed back in the rectangular gallery space (please see image below and naomi-sex.com project entitled *A Structuring Structure* of this unselected work stored and stacked ready for collection).
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Fig. no. 11: Naomi Sex, 2010, *A Structuring Structure*
How to define an artwork in this storage space after its official exclusion from the show awaiting collection? Is it reduced merely to material and object? It has passed through an average 14.4 seconds of decisive consideration where a potential of worth could have swayed in its favour, but stacked back here with what O’Doherty might refer to as its ‘slum-close’ neighbours, its value is undefined. This work sitting awaiting collection is reminiscent of O’Doherty’s remark that outside the gallery space system ‘art can lapse into secular status’ (O’Doherty, 1976, p. 14).

O’Doherty’s observations of the continued mystique and allure of the gallery space might go some way to explain why so many artists who submit works to this event, even in the face of ‘unacceptance’ or rejection, repeatedly go back for more. This space is the archetypical white cube; on the one hand a contemporary artist may aspire to see their work in the cleansed palette that the space offers, or on the other hand the space is coupled with traditional values, the history of the salon and the nostalgia of the masters or the Impressionists, which may produce aspirations of a different kind in the self-taught artists who look to align their work to such a history. The space’s connectivity with religion, spirituality and belief may even appeal to the innate belief in the unknown, the potentiality, the ‘what if’ factor …. This might be a lucky year for being accepted.

In terms of the collection day for the unaccepted works, I was asked to be sensitive with regard to how I photographed applicants collecting their works, as many of the individuals found the collection of their essentially rejected artworks came with a stigma of inferiority, and found it humiliating. In most of the photographs I took the

48 Please see surveyed material Appendix H revealing that many of the artists surveyed at the railings event aspire to the work of the Impressionist painters. This survey was conducted by the artist John Graham as his piece of work included in *The Gatekeeper Project*. 
individual faces of people were cropped because of the terms of negotiation I made with the organisation.

Casting this high number of rejected works in the theories of Bourdieu, with regard to his particular reference to the power of the artistic and literary salons, he asserts: ‘Thus it is that the salons, which distinguish themselves more by whom they exclude than by whom they include, help to structure the literary field ….’ (Bourdieu, 1992, p. 53). As posited by Bourdieu above, if cast in his theories it could be argued that the small number of accepted works is irrelevant to the organisation’s status in the field and instead it is the large number of unaccepted or rejected artworks that reinforces the position of this organisation within its field of power. In his other publication, The Field of Cultural Production, he states: ‘The literary or artistic field is a field of forces, but it is also a field of struggles tending to transform or conserve the field of forces’ (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 30). When observing the high number of unaccepted works that every year passes through the selection process above, noting the humiliated feelings of the artists as they collect their works, this could relate to the ‘struggle’ Bourdieu refers to. In a sense, the annual ‘unacceptance’ becomes a conditioned, ritualised struggle, which is sustained. This is true with regard to a process, which has managed to sustain itself for over 200 years, attracting high numbers of applicants every year. Reflecting simply on the economics of this ritual: for each work that is submitted a fee was applied for administrative costs – €10.00 per work. This gives the members’ organisation a significant income of €27,000 before the show opens its doors to a general buying public. On this level alone, the advantage of sustaining the annual event’s allure for the vast number of unaccepted applicants becomes clearer.
Historically, as the *Salon Des Refusés* exemplifies, the selection of art is a highly contentious and sensitive dynamic. Reflecting on the tone of the discourse of the panel cited above referring more negatively and sarcastically to the works that are not selected, and then the sensitivity of the unaccepted hand-back day cited above, there is justice in the seemingly psychological feeling of inferiority felt by many individuals whose works were unaccepted – their works were deemed inadequate by the panel, and in most cases this view is not articulated verbally or even voted on. For a process that is 200 years old, this social pattern is set. Abbing’s example of Group A looking down on Group B, while Group B look up to Group A can be observed here. The hierarchies of Foucault’s history of social order remain intact. However, if considering Bourdieu’s theories of the field and looking at this scenario conversely, one could actually reveal a type of veiled, hidden dependency in the relationship the organisation, its members and this selection process has with its large cohort of annual unaccepted applicants.

In relation to this veiled dependence, I will conclude the outcome of the above project by returning to the theories of the contemporary commentator, Gregory Sholette. In Chapter Two, I made reference to Sholette’s text entitled *Dark Matter*, in which he refers to ‘informal’ art practices, saying they should be recognised for their ‘oppositional charge’, which he claims is often ‘hidden in Dark Matter’s gravitational field’ (Sholette, 2005, p. 98). Elaborating further on this perspective, he teases out the relationship between the formal art world and the more informal practices of what he calls ‘hobbyists’ and ‘failed artists’, which to a certain extent could be assigned to the large cohort of annual unaccepted applicants above. Sholette rhetorically asks what would happen if this form of practice simply disappeared? (Sholette, 2005, p. 96). To answer his question, he refers to a study conducted at Columbia College of Chicago,
entitled *The informal arts: finding cohesion, capacity and other cultural benefits in unexpected places* (2002). Sholette quotes the paper as follows:

The formal and informal arts operate on a two-way continuum upon which information, personal financial benefits and other resources flow back and forth … the informal arts create employment for the professionally working artists, play a “research and development” role, and provide knowledge and committed audiences for the formal arts sector. (Wali et al., 2002, cited in Sholette, 2005, p. 97)

Sholette elaborates on the above findings, going as far as to assert that there is a real ‘co-dependency’ that is hidden, yet it bridges the two forms of practice. He points out that informal practices provide employment for the formally trained artists in a variety of ways as follows:

Another aspect of this co-dependency involves those artists who make a living photographing the work of artists for portfolios and for grant applications. And there are artists who take on administrative tasks such as grant writing … One can see why the Columbia study uses the phrase “two way continuum.” (Sholette, 2005, p. 98).

He takes into consideration the price of materials, such as paints and canvas, and how the price remains competitive because of sustained interest from informal practices benefiting formal practices. Referring to the study above, Sholette surmises that the ‘pejorative associations embodied in words such as amateur, unskilled, and dilettante’ will require a radical shift in the thinking by those ‘who mould cultural values’, meaning a changed ‘emphasis away from a reverence for collectible objects and brand names’ and one more ‘towards the far more ephemeral practices of creative activity itself’ (Sholette, 2005, p. 98). He proposes that this shift would mean a monumental ‘challenge’ to the ‘very heart of the modern art market and its roots in capitalist society dating back at least to the eighteenth century’ (Sholette, 2005, p. 98).
Re-looking at the selection process I observed with reference to Sholette’s activist propositions, criticism could be applied to a process that continues to re-stage its ceremonial selection process every year, which for all intents and purposes operates as a foregone conclusion: not officially, or perhaps even consciously, but it can’t be denied that by using barometers of social and cultural capital, in many occasions given as a form of aural CV, the selection panel already know what types of practice will be included in their exhibition and what types of practice will not. In accordance with Bourdieu and Sholette’s theories, this selection process needs its cohort of participants, not so much the successful ones, but the failed ones more so – it needs them not only financially but also psychologically in order to bolster its structural position and adequacy within a moving, changing field of power. If the panel truly wanted to make its event all-inclusive, which in many ways it purports to do (by not requiring the professionalistic apparatus), the work could be viewed by a panel made up of external members and/or viewing the works anonymously over a much longer time frame.

Having said that, the procedures of this event do offer a refreshing dynamic where work is viewed and evaluated in the real, not through a screen like most documentation of artwork is viewed and evaluated within the contemporary art world. As evidenced in the appendices there is a healthy discursiveness that takes place around much of the work submitted – one that may not articulate itself using a highly critical vernacular. On the other hand, this discursiveness is fluid and not overly mindful of a political awareness common in the professionalised contemporary art world. There is a unique character to the event that makes it interesting and unlike other contemporary events, in that there is an innate theatricality at play. This includes its staging, the ceremony, the ritual and its groups of players. At the opening, its members wear their robes like costumes for their
annual play. With these aspects of the event in mind, in the next and final chapter, I will enter it by describing Phase Two of my research schema. This is the chapter where I will describe and contextualise the performative articulation of the research outcomes from Phase One of the research period. Phase One of this study was the initial research period, carried out predominately within the field of contemporary artistic play yielding various strands of material outlined in Chapter Two in relation to _The Gatekeeper Project_ and in this chapter with regard to _A Structuring Structure_.

Chapter Four: Evolving a practice to articulate the outcomes of research

In Chapters Two and Three, I attempted to unfold the narrative of The Gatekeeper Project and A Structuring Structure. These two projects are both bracketed by Phase One of my research schema (described in Chapter Two). If this were a non-practice-based PhD, at this point in the written dissertation the researcher might well include a written account or report citing, detailing and summarising the outcomes from their research period. Appropriate to a practice-based PhD and in the case of my project, I have sought to do this through practice-based means. This activity is bracketed by the second phase of my research schema.

In this chapter I aim to describe, contextualise and rationalise the second phase of my research schema by way of reflexively accounting for it with the aim of conveying how a form of practice evolved to aid in appropriately and conceptually articulating my enquiry and its research outcomes. In terms of the artworks I produced throughout the research period featuring on the website and submitted as a part of this study, I will refer specifically to the performative works that I made in the later part of the research period – they are the piece entitled Rehearsed Practice, and the other example is the piece entitled Next – Previously – Meanwhile (see naomi-sex.com projects entitled Rehearsed Practice and Next – Previously – Meanwhile).

I will include a short description of the two works at this juncture. Rehearsed Practice takes the form of a live lecture which recounts, through words and actions, details from two previous artistic projects detailed in Chapters Two and Three of this study, i.e., in Rehearsed Practice I attempted to reference and comment on my research by using
actors to construct and separate my artistic persona and enact the structural hierarchies within a constantly shifting artistic field. Synched movements and repeated actions with dialogue attempted to comment on a history of art practice and on a homogenised and generic field of artistic presentation. In the piece, I become an amateur actor myself, performing alongside trained actors, testing my own rehearsed performative skills in front of a live evaluating audience. This 'amateur' status, coupled with the evaluation of talent, are two key points of reference contained within the content of the lecture itself (please see still image below and naomi-sex.com project entitled Rehearsed Practice).

Fig. no 12: Naomi Sex, 2011, Rehearsed Practice

The second piece Next – Previously – Meanwhile is tightly bound to Rehearsed Practice and is linked in terms of its content. This performative work attempts to further
elaborate on, articulate and explore the psychology and mechanics of the contemporary artistic field. The piece initially appears to document a live, recorded performative lecture. It ultimately becomes evident that there was never a live audience present and the work is constructed for the camera. Within the scripted dialogue, reference is made to the fact that the piece is a document. The video attempts to draw attention to and critique the professional artistic apparatus and in particular the contemporary value system attached to the artistic document and its role as a form of commodity in the art industry. It comprises three sections subtitled as Next, Previously and Meanwhile. In the first section, Next, three speakers set the scene for the piece, which plays out as a type of symposium within a tiered lecture theatre. The most complex section, Previously, then changes the pace of the piece and attempts to re-enact key dramatic moments from the live and previous performance entitled Rehearsed Practice. This re-enactment is performed backwards: the original dialogue has been reversed for the actors using phonetics. The sequence is then reversed in the edit so that it plays forward in the final video with inevitable and obvious corruptions of articulation and movement. This strategy attempts to metaphorically construct a reflexive, critical response to this research project. The last section, Meanwhile, brings the viewer back to the lecture scenario for a mock conclusion to the symposium using a question and answer session couched with an absurd use of props and dialogue. The reverse scene in particular references the repetition of certain actions and discourse within the artistic field. It specifically relates to the patterns observed and documented in the annual selection process conducted by one of Ireland’s key artistic structures in the previous project entitled A Structuring Structure (see image below and naomi-sex.com project entitled
Instead of now offering a detailed written description of each of the works as I have
done for the more field-based practice projects conducted in Phase One, i.e., *The
Gatekeeper Project* and *A Structuring Structure*, I see the works produced in the second
phase of my research period, i.e., *Rehearsed Practice* and *Next – Previously –
Meanwhile*, as having a different research agenda. In Phase One, the practice-based
projects cited above sought to yield material toward my enquiry, whereas the task of the
second phase of practice was and is to articulate material rather than yield material.
Both *Rehearsed Practice* and *Next – Previously – Meanwhile* attempt to conceptually
interweave and incorporate the material collected in Phase One (described in Chapters
One and Two of this thesis) and to articulate that content on practice-based terms within

Fig. no. 13: Naomi Sex, 2012, *Next – Previously – Meanwhile*
a manner that relates to aspects of my enquiry. Another function of these works is to act as a form of disseminator and to broadcast and reveal the outcomes of the research period to a wide and varied audience.

As I cited above in this chapter, I do not intend to overlap the articulation of these works by providing a detailed written description of each of the performative works; instead I aim to utilise the textual support for the works produced in the second phase of practice in this chapter to contextualise the works via the conceptual influences that helped to shape and frame them. My hopes are in the way that I organise this contextualisation process it will echo and mirror how the works themselves attempt to operate within a contextually and conceptually relevant arena, i.e., the context of the lecture within a symposium.

As discussed in Chapters Two and Three, *The Gatekeeper Project* and *A Structuring Structure* both emerged from an intensive time of practice-based orientation occurring in the initial stages of the research period. Although furthering my enquiry in terms of my research, *The Gatekeeper Project* as an artistic project manifested itself as a discreet event with a minority of individuals becoming privy to the nuances of the negotiation required for the event to go ahead, as well as its outcomes and rationale. On reflection, some kind re-dissemination of the event seemed appropriate. Without further creative action, the project *A Structuring Structure* could have remained evidenced in a static set of photographs (see naomi-sex.com project entitled *A Structuring Structure*) offering perhaps a pictorial, analytical and documentary-style articulation of the annual selection process I observed. The documentation of both *The Gatekeeper Project* and *A Structuring Structure*, as evidenced on this study’s accompanying website, could simply
act as evidence and proof of their happening – they serve as an accompaniment to a ‘showing and telling’ of the work after they occur. Without a textual or verbal support, they don’t tell of the social play and power dynamic inherent to each of the projects, nor the interplay and interdependence that binds the two projects by modes of art practice, i.e., informal and formal practice as described in Chapter Three. They don’t convey a sense of criticality in how they may be encountered and as documents they could be interpreted passively with a disproportionate focus being paid to the formal attributes of how the various works were photographed and documented. More pertinently, these documents don’t speak of the embodied character that is so much a part of the contemporary field of artistic play. Reflecting on these critical observations I had of the documents evidencing Phase One of my research period, I directed my focus of attention towards constructing a more conceptually appropriate mode of articulating my research. I will now begin describing how a new process of art making came about to help in that task.

I am not a performance artist but . . .

The term “performance” is slippery even within relatively well-defined contexts. In today’s economy, it not only refers to the productivity of one’s labour but also to one’s actual, quasi-theatrical self-presentation, one’s self-performance in an economy where work has become more dependent on immaterial factors. As an artist or writer or curator, you perform when you do your job, but your job also includes giving talks, going to openings, being in the right place at the right time. (Lutticken, 2012 [approx. 2 screens])

In the above quote the writer and curator, Sven Lutticken posits that in a sense all contemporary artists have become performative. He observes that these levels of performativity can be disguised and appear in an understated way couched in familiar formal educational formats such as a seminar or lecture. As mentioned above, the
documentation of *The Gatekeeper Project* and *A Structuring Structure* both act as effective accompaniments to a ‘show and tell’ scenario. This became evident to me when I gave talks and lectures about my research to various groups nationally and internationally, showing the documentation of projects conventionally via PowerPoint presentation and speaking over the slides as they came up during the slideshow. There has been a recent proliferation of events in which an artist can prepare their work for showing and telling scenarios as described above, i.e., seminars, talks, lectures or, more informally, conversations. I will discuss this at a later point in this chapter and in reference to what is being called the educational or pedagogical turn in art practice.

In a sign of how rapidly the art world moves through phases and phrases, at one of these recent events organised in Dublin by GradCAM, a conference entitled *Collaborative Change? – Commons, Network, Exchange*, it was claimed by one speaker, Renée Ridgway (a representative of an online artists writing forum *n.e.w.s*), that ‘reputation-based economy’ as a definition has even been replaced in some European countries by the term ‘attention-seeking economy’ – an ever more literal turn of phrase to pinpoint the basis of how exactly the engine of contemporary art is mobilised (Ridgway, 2011). In his literature, Foucault refers to a ‘field of visibility,’ and uses the history of surveillance as a way to examine the power embedded in observing and being observed (Foucault, 1977). A field powered by visibility is pertinent to the particular nature of the artistic reputation economy. The artist talk, the seminar, the lecture format has become a contemporary discursive arena in which artists can make themselves, their work and their ideologies visible; interestingly, it is beginning to overshadow the traditional...
exhibition of works occurring in a gallery space. In relation to this kind of visibility, the art critic J.J. Charlesworth remarked: ‘the ability to present itself is a form of power’ (Charlesworth, 2008 [approx. 2 screens]).

In terms of my own experience, not coming from a performance background, it did occur to me that there was a sense of understated theatricality and performance involved in my psychological preparation for these events. The more talks I delivered the more I became practised and rehearsed at delivery in an attempt to combat nerves and in order to hone the narrative of each of the projects contained within my research. Reflecting on my rehearsal process, I saw conceptual potential in this process.

Influenced by Lutticken’s observations, my own rehearsal process and aspects of trickster theory,\textsuperscript{50} I worked on predicting, scripting and rehearsing everything I would say for one of these lectures, including my gestures, inflections, tone and accent (Appendix J). In terms of artistic practice, these actions could be contextualised by classic examples of artwork, for example, artists such as Dan Graham with his performance *Performance, Audience, Mirror* (1975) where a reference to every self-conscious bodily function is in front of a live audience or John Smith’s 1976 video piece entitled *Girl Chewing Bubble Gum*, in which the voice of a narrator acts like a director directing a mundane street scene; the voiceover plays with the notion of scripting and acting out everyday banal living (Smith, 1976).

In terms of performance, by utilising a script and rehearsal process, I acknowledge that more purist performance art practices do not generally rate the rehearsal process that is

\textsuperscript{50} In Chapter Two, I outlined with the aid of literature by Helen Lock and Lewis Hyde the premise of trickster theory.
so heavily relied on by the theatrical disciplines – a prominent contemporary example is
the performance artist Marina Abramovic. In a printed dialogue with Abramovic, her
collaborator Ulay and Heidi Grundmann, Ulay states: ‘The spontaneity which is an
important factor in our work comes about because we do not rehearse or repeat a
performance’ (Stiles and Selz, 1996, p. 758). In this respect calling myself a
performance artist in relation to my evolving practice may be counter to a whole swathe
of opinion within the community of contemporary performance artists. Demonstrating
how these rigid lines between performance and theatre are now commonly being
transgressed, the American performance collective MYBARBARIAN in a live interactive
performance piece produced for The Creative Time Summit playfully refer to the
counter-rehearsal ideology held traditionally within the performance art community. At
one point in the piece, one of the performers posits a question in a self-conscious
manner about the piece he is performing in: ‘Is this theatre or social practice?’ Another
performer answers, stating: ‘Theatre is conservative, while social practices are
progressive.’ This is followed by another performer’s ironic response: ‘As theatre
people, we have an understanding of social practice, Laurie Anderson and I.’ This is
again followed by another performer asserting: ‘If you rehearse, you can’t call yourself
a performance artist – sorry’ (The Creative Time Summit, 2012, [approx. 1 screen]).

With these transgressions in mind, I conducted an early experiment where I was given
the chance to try out my usually private rehearsal techniques. I was asked to deliver a
talk on my research activity to a group of students as a ‘professional practice’ lecture. I
attempted to tune into what Lutticken observes in the contemporary artistic field as a
type of performative professionalised state. As I was familiar with the context and
students who would be present, I predicted with a good degree of accuracy who would
be there to introduce me, what he would be wearing, how he would introduce me and which students would be present on the day. As the group assembled for my talk, every member of the group received a copy of the script I had prepared, including the introductory speaker, who luckily played along with the scripted material. The aim of the experiment attempted to prompt a different level of engagement with the material I had prepared and perhaps a less passive consumption of the content of my lecture. The group followed the script page by page and I read and performed from the script I had prepared to the group, referring to the slideshow of documentation from *The Gatekeeper Project* cited above (Appendix J).

Continuing to play with the academic script format, I conducted the experiment a second time, in an unfamiliar context. I was invited to talk at a research-based symposium in Denmark along with a cohort of other international speakers and researchers. As I didn’t know any of the participants or presenters, a good deal of preparation was involved. The event turned out to be a terrifying experience and the Danish audience received the material in far less of a playful manner than the earlier experiment carried out in Ireland. However, repeating the exercise within an international arena greatly contributed to the development of a new strand of performative practice to articulate my research.

Learning from these various experiences, I began to bridge my rehearsed, scripted actions more firmly to the conceptual underpinning of my enquiry. This led me to think of how scripting and making reference to my own self-consciousness within a

---

51 The event was a part of the Nordic Summer University, which comprises a group of academics, scholars and artists from Nordic countries. I responded to a call out from the group to the theme Artistic Research – Strategies for Embodiment – Language & discourse, documentation & dissemination (Nordic Summer University, 2011).
performance/lecture could act as an informal device juxtaposing with the formality of the typical lecture scenario. Making reference to my own particular inflections or accent within the format of an academic script could, I felt, help contextually frame my research narrative and make reference to the relationship between formal and informal art practice contained within my research projects and the relationship between The Gatekeeper Project and A Structuring Structure. After the initial experimental stage, I focussed my attention on developing the conceptual underpinning for my actions and the contextual influences that could aid in honing it in terms of my research area.

Typically at a lecture the speaker reads from his or her academic script. With the production of my scripted hybrid, i.e., a document that blends an academic script with a theatrical one, a script that the audience members receive a copy of instead of just the speaker – here a nod to traditional Japanese theatre Noh can be observed. Noh theatre is often described as a form of ‘museum’ theatre with the actors operating under intensive scrutiny and observation. As they take their seats, members of the audience all receive a copy of the script that the actors have rehearsed and worked from. This amplifies the audience’s levels of concentration and observation in a powerful manner. The supplement to the performance means there is no room for error or adlibbing, as the actors need to work with precision and complete accuracy because the audience has been let in on the act, so to speak, and knows what to expect and where. The complexity and intensity of performing in a Noh production is, for the actor, often mirrored by an omni-observant audience. The writer, Donald Richie, who specialises in the subject of Japanese culture states:

Going to the Noh in Japan is very like going to a chamber music recital elsewhere. Many have the text open in their laps . . . Even with the text, as with
the score of a Schoenberg quartet, one must study it both before and after performance for the subtleties to become apparent. (Richie, 1965, pp. 79-80)

This reference to a field of evaluating visibility and scrutiny echoes with the artistic field and the characteristics of a reputation-based economy. I developed the early experimental stages above to produce a piece to feature at a symposium I co-organised in conjunction with this study entitled ARTICULULATE. For the new piece, entitled Rehearsed Practice, the live audience featuring in the video documentation of the piece have received a copy of the script (Appendix K). The aim of this was to provide a type of conceptual distraction in the form of a supplement or accompaniment to the artwork, which mirrors, for example, the supplement of the press release or artist statements supplied at most exhibition openings. The intention was to draw the audience’s focus to and from the script, creating a type of tension between the act of viewing the performance and attempting to read and scrutinise the correct recital of the script, thus creating a tipping of the value system from the supplement over the actual live event.

I will return to the aspects of theatre that helped shape my thinking towards the development of Rehearsed Practice and Next – Previously – Meanwhile in the latter part of this chapter. At this juncture I want to punctuate the chapter with a number of bullet points which aim to summarise the above material towards a structure of my research schema for Phase Two of the research period.

**Research Schema — Phase Two**

- Influenced by Lutticken’s observations adopt a general ‘performative’ professionalised state as a conceptual impetus

---

32 In the introduction I refer to this event that I co-organised in conjunction with this study.
• Informed by a prominent, contemporary site of presentation and dissemination utilise the site of academia and the lecture as a context for practice
• As a container to articulate the content of my research engage in the production of academic scripts to develop a practice.

I will now look to the theoretical influences and the historic and contemporary artistic practices that aid in contextualising my evolving performative practice. As I make reference to these influences I will also encompass a rationalisation and contextualisation for the two remaining bullet points below that make up the second phase of my research schema.

• The employment of humour as a mode of criticality and reflexivity
• A flattening of cultural references, i.e., high and low culture acting as formal visual and conceptual influences

**Exposing the mechanics of presenting in the public eye**

Following my early experiments, I looked to theoretical work done in the area of language and self-presentation specific to the lecture. In his essay *The Lecture* (1981), Erving Goffman refers to the lecture format in a theatrical sense, and how it can act as agent for the observational power play between presenter and audience within pedagogical situations. According to Goffman there are many forms of fictional, illusive and perceptual devices at play within the delivery of the typical lecture. According to Goffman the person presenting and formalising his ideas in public and to a specific gathered audience acts as a form of an institutional representative who embodies a network of power-related systems. In this regard he asserts:
Through evident scholarship and fluent delivery the speaker-author demonstrates that such claims to authority as his office, reputation, and auspices imply, are warranted. Thus a link is provided between institutional status, reputation, and the occasion at hand. (Goffman, 1981, pp. 191-192).

In Goffman’s seminal work *The Presentation of the Self in the Everyday* (1959), he suggests that individuals ‘act’ continuously when engaging in even the slightest of social interactions. He refers to what he calls the ‘dramaturgical’ principle (Goffman, 1959, pp. 1-19). This principle infers that in our everyday lives we are basically acting, sometimes in a rehearsed sense and sometimes not, and that our homes and jobs are fixed stages that furnish semi-permanent props we use in our act. In this regard, Goffman’s theories correlate with the contemporary observations of Lutticken’s professional performative artist.

Goffman’s theoretical use of language refers to individuals as ‘actors’ and ‘players’ that consistently reinforce his theories throughout his work. He divides these mini acts into categories, stating that the individual or actor expresses himself or herself in such a way that aims to project an impression to the other players with whom he comes into contact. Embedded in these mini acts are aspects of power being played out by the manner in which the individual chooses to express himself. Goffman asserts:

Regardless of the particular objective which the individual has in mind and of his motive for having this objective, it will be in his interests to control the conduct of the others, especially their response to him. This control is achieved largely by influencing the definition of the situation which the others come to formulate, and he can influence this definition by expressing himself in such a way as to give them the kind of impression that will lead them to act voluntarily in accordance with his own plan. (Goffman, 1959, p. 15)
Goffman’s theories help contextualise the strategies I employed for the piece *Rehearsed Practice*, in the way I utilised actors to literally act out and help stage a shifting field of play and to aid in embodying a shifting power between player, audience and presenter.

Returning to the setting of the lecture, although remaining theatrically understated for the most part, the above normative ‘mini acts’ and ‘plays on power’ are somewhat exaggerated and heightened within the more overtly staged set-up of the presenter presenting to an audience within the lecture theatre. These heightened elements of performance are observed by Goffman in his work entitled *The Lecture*, appearing in the publication *Forms of Talk* (1981). In its printed form, *The Lecture* acts as a kind of meta-work; it is written as if it is a lecture that Goffman is delivering about the subject of lecture-giving – a lecture about lecture-giving . . . .

Maintaining that the lecture is a means of transmitting knowledge, Goffman describes the various formulae for giving lectures, which he says depend on the audience capacity and its general demographic. According to Goffman, the presenter is usually required to augment his lecture and ‘pitch his remarks down to fit the competence of a large audience’ and remain to a tight time awareness. In some cases ‘he is encouraged to fit his remarks into the stretch of time that such an audience might be ready to forebear’ (Goffman, 1981, p. 170).

Goffman continues to unravel how, within that academic and conventional structure, there are various approaches to how an academic script is read, and various forms of expression employed in the aural delivery of the text. According to Goffman, within our society, forms of spoken words can be categorised into ‘three main modes of
animating.’ He divides these forms of speech into ‘memorization, aloud reading and fresh talk’ (Goffman, 1981, p. 171). In the case of fresh talk, Goffman maintains that this method of animating gives the impression that the presenter is tailoring his talk or lecture to his surroundings and can adapt his method of presenting with ease. He states that ‘memorization is sometimes employed in lectures, but not admittedly’ and that these various animating modes require differing forms of ‘production’ (Goffman, 1981, p. 171). He notes this through the subtle shifts in delivery, through speech, tone and expression, which relates to the material and content of the lecture. For example, ‘In the case of fresh talk, the text is formulated by the animator from moment to moment, or at least clause to clause’ (Goffman, 1981, p. 172). According to Goffman, successful and experienced presenters often display the ability to perform fresh talk in a seemingly convincing manner. However, he posits that the occurrence of fresh talk is actually an illusionary set of processes as follows: ‘Fresh talk itself is something of an illusion of itself, never being as fresh as it seems. Apparently we construct our utterances out of phrase-and-clause-length segments, each of which is in some sense formulated mentally and then recited’ (Goffman, 1981, p. 172).

Goffman gives further insights in relation to the ‘turning point’ for the presenter who has gained sufficient experience in delivering talks. He remarks that they can begin to use their abilities to perform fresh talk as they are presenting, while simultaneously engaging in ‘backstage’ thinking. For example, they can begin to wonder what they may do after the lecture. Their experience can allow them to do this without these backstage streams of thought being revealed to the audience, as ‘should such preoccupation become evident, the illusion that they are properly involved in communicating will be threatened’ (Goffman, 1981, p. 172).
As cited above, the conventional structure of the lecture is in accordance with academic conventions. This structure means that its format has a tendency to purport to be an objective and non-emotive account. However, Goffman reveals that these academic conventions are often transgressed and there are many ways the ‘textual self’ of the presenter may be embedded in the content of a lecturer’s delivery. This can come into play by way of past relevant personal experience or as an amusing aside or an historical retrospective of a senior academic recounting his life tales. This ‘textual self’ can also be contained in a lecture through what Goffman calls ‘additional footings.’ For example, aspects of his lecture which are not included in the text or paper that is being delivered (Goffman, 1981, p. 174). In this regard, Goffman gives an example as follows:

I speak of distance-altering alignments, some quite briefly taken, which appear as a running counterpoint to the text, and of elaborative comments and gestures which do not appear in the substance of the text but in the mechanics of transmitting it on a particular occasion and in a particular setting. (Goffman, 1981, p. 174)

Goffman’s definition of ‘fresh’ talk is pertinent in contextualising the play I attempted to produce between audience and their reception of a knowingly rehearsed delivery of material; i.e., in the piece Rehearsed Practice, all members of the audience received a copy of the script dialogue which included notes on my own self-conscious actions, etc. Gesture, inflection, accent, tone, delivery and my own amateur acting ability are exploited in what could be described as multi-layered scripts for performance. My amateur status juxtaposed with professionally trained actors in the work reflects the collision of professional with amateur within the content of my research. In a later part of this chapter I will discuss in more detail my decision to include myself in these performances as actor, performer, artist, researcher and individual, as a way to implicate
myself overtly in the work and in the conflicting hierarchical field of artistic practice that I attempt to articulate in these performative works.

My scripts and presentation format also propose quite a pragmatic function in that they aim to recount my research enquiry and outcome. According to Goffman, the presenter is akin to a storyteller and a narrator of past encounters, a narrator who is a mediator of those encounters ‘to the present site’ and to a gathered audience. In this regard, he asserts that lectures are like ‘stories or jokes’ and rely to some extent on a ‘first and only illusion’ for their successful reception. He says that as a part of this mediation of material, ‘the speaker may, of course, shift into the intimacies and informalities of question and answer sessions’ (Goffman, 1981, p. 178). Within the artistic field, an artist who used the lecture scenario in a pioneering manner and whose influence remains a dominant and permanent fixture within the community of contemporary art practitioners is Joseph Beuys. In the accompanying still, Beuys makes a rare visit to Ireland in the 1970s, delivering one of his famous lectures using chalk and a blackboard (Hayes Lerm and Walters, 2011). With this strategy he couches the complexity of the content of his lecture in a form of storytelling using the familiarity of a child’s pedagogical experience. The lecture situation becomes visually discursive and highly performative because of the drawing activity performed by Beuys. Without the usual podium/presenter model, Beuys produces a type of levelling of his presenting position in the space.
Cast in Goffman’s theories, Beuys alters the situation, producing a more conversational situation and contributing to parity within the space between presenter and audience.

According to Goffman, for the presenter, the less formal two-way conversation requires a shift in production and the ability to ‘fresh talk’ in a convincing manner. Goffman remarks that the shift in production can be manifested informally by a shift in bodily...
activity such as ‘changing from standing to sitting position’ or ‘drinking a glass of water, and so forth’ (Goffman, 1981, p. 176). Other extraneous factors can interfere with the successful transmittance of a lecture, and can come in the form of what Goffman terms ‘noise’. Noise in the musical sense is defined by a sequence of sounds that cannot be understood in a regular or mathematical pattern by the brain. Goffman maintains that noise can come from other sources such as the involuntary physical or biological attributes of the presenter himself. For example, the presenter may unknowingly cause distraction to his delivery by his preponderance to ‘fidget a little, scratch occasionally, and may feel cause to cough, brush back his hair . . . sniffle, take a drink of water’ (Goffman, 1981, p. 183). Goffman also observes verbal faults that give rise to elements of ‘noise’ or breakdowns in a fluid transmission of material from presenter to audience such as ‘lisps, harelips, laryngitis, affected speech, “thick accent”, a stiff neck, denture whistles and so forth’ (Goffman, 1981, p. 183). In some cases these breakdowns can (in the spirit of ‘fresh talk’) inadvertently become a part of the lecture itself as the presenter may offer an aural apology for the disruption.

Again Goffman’s theories are pertinent in how I attempted to tune into the character of the lecture scenario by way of the predictable technical and transmission breakdowns that often occur. In the piece Next – Previously – Meanwhile, for example, one of the players punctuates the script with the question: ‘Is this a performative lecture or a lecturative performance?’ The question could conceivably be ‘Is this a PC or a Mac?’ – the kind of predictable technical breakdown or query raised by a speaker experiencing problems at the podium.
I will now look to key artistic practices that help contextualise this form of performative practice. I will do this by noting briefly the history of Institutional Critique, citing the work of Andrea Fraser, a key artist from the movement who used performative strategies coupled with the context and arena of the lecture or talk to conduct a critique of the artworld systems of production. I will then move on to more contemporary examples of artistic practice and specific artists who have acted as key influences on my mode of performative articulation.

**How to creatively critique – a contemporary history**

The movement of Institutional Critique emerged from the birth of conceptualism in the 1960s. The artists who typify the movement are, for example, Marcel Broodthaers and Daniel Buren, who were based in Europe, and artists such as Michael Asher and Hans Haacke who were based in the United States.

This grouping of artists explored and exposed the mechanisms by which they produced art and in many cases they looked to the gallery or museum as a site and context for their concepts and looked to the art historical canon, tropes and value systems as content for their works. In his writings and his works, Haacke interestingly refers to the theories of the sociologist Pierre Bourdieu and later collaborated with him with a publication entitled *Free Exchange* (1994) Bourdieu aided in theoretically framing Phase One of my research activity). In an example of his artistic actions, in 1974, Haacke utilised the text for an exhibition press release to position a polemic entitled *All the Art That’s Fit to Show*. In it Haacke claims: ‘There are no “artists”, however, who are immune to being affected and influenced by the socio-political value-system of the society in which they live . . .’ (Haacke, 1974, cited in Welchman, 2006, p. 55). The influence of Bourdieu’s
theories can be seen above – Haacke seems keenly aware of the field of factors influencing artists, including notions of how social and cultural capital work as undercover engines mobilising the systems of art. In the same statement, he asserts:

“Artists”, as much as their supporters and their enemies, no matter of what ideological coloration, are unwitting partners in the art syndrome, and relate to each other dialectically. They participate jointly in the maintenance and/or development of the ideological make-up of their society. They work within that frame, set the frame, and are being framed. (Haacke, 1974, cited in Welchman, 2006, p. 55).

This awareness of the frame of production is one of the key characteristics that helps bracket the work made by artists from the movement of Institutional Critique. The initial pioneers of the movement were later then followed in the 1980s by artists such as Andrea Fraser, Renee Green and Fred Wilson. These artists engaged in more performative, interventionist practices which aimed at actually infiltrating and occupying the systems of art. Defining the movement from her perspective, Fraser states:

Institutional Critique aims to transform not only the substantive, visible manifestations of those relations, but their structure, particularly what is hierarchical in that structure and the forms of power and domination, symbolic and material violence, produced by those hierarchies. (Fraser, 2006, cited in Welchman, 2006, p. 306)

From the movement’s more recent history, I will take Fraser as a pertinent example in relation to my own research. In a panel discussion held in 2007 on the subject of feminist strategies in contemporary art (Fraser, 2007) Fraser retrospectively speaks on the autobiographical influences shaping the content and intent of her practice. She draws on the experiences of her own mother – while acknowledging a bias judgement she argues that her mother was a good painter who never enjoyed any professional
success in the art world. This, Fraser maintains, is down to her being a female in a male-dominated arena. Her mother’s unfulfilled artistic aspirations embedded in Fraser’s practice show a desire to interrogate the system that governed and constructed those aspirations. Akin to Haacke’s partnerships with Bourdieu, Fraser too found influence in the sociologist’s theories. In his introduction to her publication entitled *Museum Highlights*, Bourdieu writes the following analogy to help describe Fraser’s mode of practice:

Imagine a cleric, of no matter what creed, who discovered that “religion is the opium of the people” and that “the agents of religion struggle for the exclusive right to control the benefits of salvation.” Would such a cleric be able to continue priestly work? If so, how? This is precisely the position which Andrea Fraser has quite consciously and deliberately placed herself. (Bourdieu, 2005, cited in Fraser, 2005, p. xiv)

Fraser presents her writings as a practice-based activity. *Museum Highlights* is a collection of texts and essays that in some cases accompany live performances. She refers to the publication as a ‘constellation’ of works. In it she asserts a highly critical set of polemics aimed at the museum as the traditional location and site for art. In her artist statement, Fraser is explicit about what her function is as a practitioner: ‘This is how I would like to understand artistic practice, that is, as a form of counter practice within the field of cultural production’ (Fraser, 2005, p. 10). She acknowledges that her particular mode of practice operates on multiple registers, and is underpinned by forms of cultural exclusivity, agency and power.

The position I occupy in the execution of the functions of my profession is that of a producer, an author, an agent. And this position is one of privilege. I am the institution’s representative and the agent of its reproduction . . . My power, as an artist or would-be intellectual, to appropriate objects, texts, representations, and practices symbolically – conferring value and interest where before there was
none – is always linked to the economic power to appropriate them materially. I am the intermediary. (Fraser, 2005, pp. 10-11)

Using performative strategies informed by the institution of which she claims to be a representative, the same institution she critiques, Fraser, cast in Hyde’s theories of the trickster, acts as a type of double agent for and within the field of artistic practice. In her seminal piece *A Gallery Talk* (1989), performed at the Philadelphia Museum of Art, Fraser conceived of a fictional character, Jane Castleton – a gallery guide working for the museum. The voluntary status of the character is particularly relevant to Fraser’s conceptual critique of the precarious labour conditions and the hierarchical museum practices in the United States. She refers to the paradoxes and status of museum docents and says: ‘While docents are usually trained by the professional staff, I would say that they aspire less to professional competence’ and more to a relationship with the ‘objects within the museum’ in a way ‘that really only can be acquired through an imperceptible learning over time and applied to those who can take their time’ (Fraser, 2005, pp. 110-111).

In the piece, Fraser performs to scripted dialogue she has written for her character Jane Castleton who Fraser prefers to ‘consider her less as an individual’ but a representation of ‘a site of speech constructed within various relations constitutive of the museum’ (Fraser, 2005, pp. 110-111). In the performance, the fictional role of the character is tested in a real context and performed in front of a genuine group of museum attendees who have gathered at the museum’s scheduled time for one of the regular gallery tours. For the piece, Fraser dresses in the normal tour guide’s uniform and begins by conducting the tour and welcoming the group of unsuspecting attendees. Throughout
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53 A ‘docent’ is the term used for a museum guide in the United States.
the course of the performance Fraser enacts her script, which playfully couches her critique of the museum within a characterised body and use of language that symbolises and represents the museum. An ironic reminder to the attendees to make sure they have paid for the tour is followed by Fraser’s open admittance that she is performing a position; in this admittance she ‘embeds’ a factual reference to the common labour conditions shared by the docent and the artist. In an inverted sense, she is literally performing the standard function and duties of a docent by informing and educating the public. She states:

I myself did not pay an admission fee. Uh. I’m not a Museum member, nor am I a Museum employee. I am a visiting lecturer, a guest of the Division of Education. Uh. I am also, like the Board of Trustees and the Museum Guides, a volunteer. It is thus my privilege, as a guest, as a volunteer – and, shall I say, as an artist – to be able to express myself here today simply as a unique individual, an individual with unique qualities. (Fraser, 2005, pp. 96-97)

As the tour continues, ‘Jane’ acts out a script, the content of which unravels as a tightly woven and multi-layered sardonic polemic directed towards the cultural politics underpinning the museum, yet all the while framed by typical art historical and architectural information about the context of the museum. In one instance, she opens back a large curtain revealing a picturesque view of the park in front of the museum and remarks how ‘young people are drawn to the area, Philadelphia attracts a huge labour pool.’ Continuing in the same tone of sarcasm, she makes a quip, acknowledging the business-style rhetoric that has permeated cultural policies, she remarks:

. . . Philadelphia is liveable . . . You can choose from five professional sports teams, a world-class symphony, 100 museums, the largest municipal park system in the country, and a restaurant renaissance the whole world is talking about. Plus: eight million square feet of new commercial office space . . . . High tech, Healthcare, Medical Publishing and Printing, General Business Services, Financial Services, Heavy Manufacturing (and) Fashion. (Fraser, 2003, pp. 98-99)
There is a constant blurring of boundaries, and a de-stabilising action being performed towards the conventions of cultural hierarchies, as her performance operates as an ‘artwork’ in one sense, yet plays around in accordance with the function of the volunteer who is employed to assign and advocate professional knowledge about ‘artworks’ in another sense. Her script applies an equitable value to all of the objects in the museum. At one point she stops at a water fountain and treats it with the same artistic prestige as the Diego Rivera painting hanging on a wall next to it. In her appraisal of the fountain, she uses well-worn postmodern critical jargon saying: ‘Hmm . . . a work of astonishing economy and monumentality, it boldly contrasts with the severe and highly stylized productions of this form’ (Fraser, 2003, p. 104).

Fig. no. 15: Andrea Fraser, 1989, A Gallery Talk

Fraser’s sharp and crystal combination of language and context as exemplified in A Gallery Talk are indicative of how ‘the trickster’, according to Lock, contributes to a critical cultural discourse. In this regard, Lock states: ‘The trickster’s linguistic world thus operates according to his/her rules which – being devised by a trickster – are made precisely to be broken, to keep signification evolving and vital’ (Lock, 2002, [approx 2 screens]).
Lock refers to the postmodern appeal of ‘the trickster’ inherent in their ability to operate in a self-reflexive manner. Self-consciousness enables them to demystify and reveal through a ‘manipulation of language, and truth – eluding ambiguity, tricksters have often been held to embody’ (Lock, 2002, [approx 2 screens]). In *A Gallery Talk*, Fraser playfully uses ‘self-conscious’ devices to conceptually express and come clean about her double agent position within the work. At one point, she tells the tour group that for a mere $775,000 they could assign their name to the museum shop if they wished. She adds to this by declaring that if she had that amount of money she would call the shop ‘Andrea’. In mock self-deprecation, she continues with ‘Andrea is such a nice name’ (Fraser, 2003, pp. 106-107).

At this juncture, I want to reiterate the space from which artists such as Fraser pitch their practices, that is, the context and movement of Institutional Critique. This reiteration aims to serve as a reminder as to how I see the content of this chapter functioning in terms of my research and importantly how it connects with my research outcomes and the overall enquiry. By citing the history of the Institutional Critique movement and using examples from its recent history such as Fraser, I am attempting to align my own practice, in particular the performative works occurring in the second phase of research, with other practices that critique the system their work is a part of. The premise for my critique is based on the material that Phase One of my research yielded; for example, this is evidenced in Chapter Two, where *The Gatekeeper Project* revealed that there are groups of artists who engage in forms of informal artistic production and that there are deep and entrenched separations existing between this form of production and the more formal art practices. In Chapter Three, *A Structuring Structure* gave me the basis and the authority to argue that even though the above
separations exist, there remains hidden and veiled co-dependent relations between formal and informal forms of practice – these co-dependencies are based on power, perception and a set of conditioned traditional value systems bound up in conventional structures of hierarchy and control.

It might be asked, as a body of research is there anything to be gained or learned from these observations and revealed hidden facts? In the manner in which I am attempting to frame, couch and produce artworks to articulate this content, i.e., via performative lectures, I aim to draw the attention of the wide field of cultural production, which is ironically powered by visibility to the content of my research. Within the performative works, _Rehearsed Practice_ and _Next – Previously – Meanwhile_, I aim to use the structures that exist in the field of power, for example, _the artists talk_, etc., as a context and a formal device to set up and prompt not only a critique but also a form of visibility, i.e., a re-looking, a re-evaluation and an acknowledgement of those same structures. This prompting action aims to trigger modes of reflection from an audience that may encounter the works. These reflections might ask, rhetorically, within the artistic field of play, what is at stake in the contemporary moment? How might the dominant structures and our own forms of entrenched conditioning be examined and tested so that the notion and definition of contemporary might be liberated from a field of visibility with an overemphasis on professionalised production which in Chapter Two Fox posits as ‘toothless’? My study proposes these critical questions and also endeavours to offer a form of response to that critique. This response takes the form of a practice-based proposition contained within the performative works I produce in the latter part of this study. These performative works aim to _test out_ through inhabiting the models and structures of visibility used by artists in order then to draw visibility to those same
models and structures. The proposition asks the audience to consider art practice itself acting as an effective container to articulate and call into question the tangible and intangible structures that hold the field of practice in place.

With regard to this reflection activity, I want to revisit the bullet point below before I continue the contextualising process of the performative works Rehearsed Practice and Next – Previously – Meanwhile.

- The employment of humour as a mode of criticality and reflexivity

**Humour as a critical tool**

As evidenced by Fraser’s practice, she utilises humour in a particular manner. Humour and the sub-categories of humour such as playfulness, wit, sarcasm, etc., are dangerous attributes to announce as an artist or indeed anyone that they use with any degree of success. In terms of my own practice, specifically the performative works, I will emphasise that I ‘attempt’ to use humour and encompass playful devices – as Lock states in relation to trickster theory – in a manner that plays ‘seriously’ (Lock, 2002).

Simon Critchley’s theories on humour argue that humour is a skill that nobody can claim expertise over. In that regard, it has powerful universal agency and in a sense no individual can say whether another is wrong or right for either finding something funny or unfunny (Critchley, 2003). Within my attempts, I aim to ‘embed’ a critical reflection and study of the space I inhabit in the hope of informing a greater understanding of the drives, registers and ‘aspiration’, as Fraser observes, that fuel and rule that space. As a method of conceptually managing my research, aspects of humour, as Critchley asserts, ‘might well
be a management tool,’ but humour is ‘also a tool against the management’ (Critchley, 2003, p. 14). It has critical properties. In this regard, Critchley states: ‘humour might be said to be one of the conditions for taking up a critical position with respect to what passes for everyday life’ (Critchley, 2003, p. 41).

The contemporary artist Hayley Newman’s practice helps contextualise my own attempts at utilising humour as a form of critical response to the mechanics of the artworld. To exemplify how Newman harnesses humour in order to conduct her subtle critique, I will introduce her practice by referencing her seminal work, the Connotations series. This is a body of still images with accompanying texts which uses fiction and institutional formats and conventions as strategies to reframe the contested space between the document and the live performance. According to Newman, the work ‘assumes the mannerisms of an archive: an institutional-looking information panel introduces the series and each photograph is accompanied by a text, which provides data such as dates and locations, all of which are entirely fictional’ (Newman, 2003, [approx. 3 screens]). The images to a certain extent depict staged instances featuring Newman, but are accounted fictionally by the text accompanying each still image. The still images fig. no. 16 and 17, with the accompanying text, are examples of these exhibited works. Aspects of how ‘the trickster’ operates and Critchley’s theories on the critical properties of humour can be observed with regard to Newman’s conceptual approach. In relation to the Connotations series, Sally O’Reilly wrote: ‘This conversion of the non-existent event to neat commodity of text and photo is a distinctly wry comment on the status of performance art in history and the contemporary art market and, predictably, it was from this series that Newman sold her first piece of work’ (O

34 The more purist performance artists pre-dating the contemporary climate of work held the belief that live work involving the body should not be documented, and that it is a temporal event that should exist and be experienced in the space and by the audience and performer.
By using the institutional frame to actively deceive and fool the audience, she simultaneously reveals and criticises aspects of art practice’s institutional relation with the value of the document post-performance. Newman remarks that her conceptual concerns benefited ‘retrospectively from a historical awareness of the role of documentation in establishing the “performance” canon in the 1960s and 1970s’ (O Reilly, 2003 [approx 2 screens]).


**Crying Glasses (An Aid to Melancholia) 1995**

On public transport in Hamburg, Berlin, Rostock, London and Guildford

Photo: Christina Lamb

*Over a year I wore the crying glasses while travelling on public transport in all the cities I visited. The glasses functioned using a pump system which, hidden inside my jacket, allowed me to pump water up out of the glasses and produced a trickle of tears down my cheeks. The glasses were conceived as a tool to enable the representation of*
feelings in public spaces. Over the months of wearing the glasses they became an external mechanism which enabled the manifestation of internal and unidentifiable emotions.

In this regard O’Reilly proposes that the Connotations series ‘fast-tracks straight to document’ (Newman, 2003 [approx. 3 screens]). There are other examples of contemporary artists who have used the premise of the document to contain an artwork. Thomas Demand is probably the most prominent artist who utilises this strategy within his photographic works that are taken of fictional constructs, usually made from cardboard. Connecting these forms of strategy with my own mode of production, in the piece Next – Previously – Meanwhile there is an attempt made for the piece to exist as a document. This is operating contra to the first piece, Rehearsed Practice, which had a life as a live performed piece. Next – Previously – Meanwhile, however, plays with that premise and embeds itself in a fictional lecture scenario, which is performed strategically to camera. In this regard, the conceptual intention of the piece is informed by the space of the reputation economy, the state of artistic professionalism and the value of the artistic document as an aspect of the apparatus of the contemporary artworld. It aims to predict its exhibiting fate and that it is most probably a virtual one, where its main captive audience will be those who choose to view it by clicking their mouse, via their laptop screen. In this regard the piece makes self-conscious reference to its future; for example, in the concluding segment where the performers enact a question and answer session, there is reference to who will view the work and what space the work will be viewed in. At one point in the dialogue one player looks directly into camera and asks: ‘A view for who though’?
Returning to Newman’s work, another piece from *Connotations* is particularly pertinent in terms of helping contextualise my performative works. Fig no. 17 depicts *Lock-Jaw Lecture Series*, which again presents a still image exhibited with the accompanying text, seen below it.

![Image of Hayley Newman during a lecture](image-url)

**Fig. no. 17: Hayley Newman, *Lock-jaw Lecture Series* from the series *Connotations* Performance Images: 1994-1998, 1998.**

1997-1998. Lectures given at Chelsea College of Art, Middlesex University, Sheffield Hallam University and Dartington College of Art

Photo: Jonny Byars

*Over the period of a year I was invited to give a series of lectures on my work. Before each lecture I visited a local dentist and had my mouth anaesthetized. With my mouth made immobile, I gave my feeblest apologies to the students and staff before attempting to talk on my work.*
The fictional text lends itself to misinterpretation. If the viewer was not informed by the fictional premise of the *Connotations series*, it might be understood that Newman delivered a lecture in numerous educational venues between 1997 and 1998. In the image above Newman appears in a still photograph with her head back, eyes closed, and with what appears to be a large syringe being inserted into her mouth by somebody wearing surgical gloves. In the accompanying text Newman refers to her textual self (in accordance with Goffman’s theories), relaying to the audience that before each lecture she had been to the dentist that morning and would apologetically acknowledge that her delivery and speech may suffer from the after-effects of being anaesthetised. Newman’s fictional premise could relate to Goffman’s use of the term ‘noise’, which interferes with presenting and speaking in public. ‘Noise’ can come in various forms, including the physical and biological attributes of the presenter – more often than not these physical or biological conditions can be involuntary and the result of wracked nerves. For the inexperienced speaker the feeling of uttering those first few words could conceivable relate to the numbness and lack of mouth and faculty control brought on by being anaesthetised, which Newman plays with in presenting the context of this fictional work.

By presenting and subverting the vulnerability of the presenter/audience dynamic in such a way, Newman debunks, informalises and playfully criticises the formality of the lecture theatre and perhaps highlights the artist’s often uneasy position as lecturer within the educational frame.

Aspects of how Newman uses the formal format of the lecture to make less formal the entrenched hierarchical structures helps to put my research activity into context. There
are various forms of criticism evident in Newman’s intent, some of which subtly unravel issues and prod at the contemporary relationship artists have with presenting within formal contexts. She uses the perceptive value of ‘the document’ of an artwork to construct and elaborate on a story that in her case may never have happened in the way she presents it. By mischievously recounting false facts about previous artworks, her work alludes to slippages that occur commonly within the typical artist’s talk. Her work opens up questions about this form of dominant professional practice and the culture that has developed around it. How many artists have learned to elaborate effectively and convincingly using understated strands of fiction that may hinge on formal and cleverly anchored, slick still imagery of previous events? What part of their past practice do artists choose to narrate? More broadly, within contemporary culture how premeditated and strategic has the space and site of documentation and record-taking become within the professional practices of artists? As Goffman remarks, people, in this case artists, want to posit the most effective projection or ‘impression’ of themselves and they angle the content of their material and their behaviour towards this aim (Goffman, 1959, p. 15). According to Goffman, these impressions are an embedded aspect in which social power dynamics ‘twist and turn’ when players interact with each other and present themselves in front of a field of multiple players.

**Contextualising artmaking within the educational arena**

In order to broaden out the frame of reference that aids in contextualising my artistic position, I want to now shift the discussion to the wider state of play within the contemporary art field. This is done in order to place my work within its rightful contemporary context of production and genre of practice. As cited earlier in this chapter there has been a recent rise and proliferation of discursive events, which are
now commonplace within the cultural and artistic field of production. These new kinds of discursive activities sit within what is now being referred to as ‘the educational turn in art practice.’ The opposition to this turn may well be the group of commentators that refer to it in a less positive manner as ‘the academicisation of art practice.’ In any event, both groups are acknowledging the influence of academic formats or models which have led to a hegemonic occurrence of talks, conversations, conferences, symposia, etc., being organised by or involving artists, and being held in spaces which traditionally house artistic presentations and exhibitions.

In their publication entitled *Curating and the Educational Turn* (2010) Paul O’Neill and Mick Wilson bring together the main protagonists on the subject and use the publication to posit what such a turn might mean. In their introduction, Wilson and O’Neill observe that within the artistic field, lectures and talks, etc., were traditionally ‘peripheral to the exhibition, operating in a secondary role in relation to the display of art for public consumption’ but now within the contemporary climate, these ‘discursive interventions’ have become ‘the main event’ (O’Neill and Wilson, 2010, p. 12). They cite numerous examples to qualify their observations, including high profile events such as the *Platforms of Documenta 11* in 2002 and the *Unrealised Manifesta 6*, an experimental art school, which led to the subsequent *Unitednationplaza* and *Night School Projects* in 2006 organised by the artist Anton Vidokle. They also include smaller projects that may not have had the same high profile or status as the above examples, but still use
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55 The academicisation of art practice refers, in a more negative manner, to academic formulae being applied to art practice. The reasons for this are directed towards a more cynical development of postgraduate study, for example, MAs and PhDs.

56 Unitednationplaza is exhibition as school. Structured as a seminar/residency programme in the city of Berlin, it will involve collaboration with approximately 60 artists, writers, theorists and a wide range of audiences for a period of one year. In the tradition of Free Universities, most of its events will be open to all those interested in taking part. Unitednationplaza is organised by Anton Vidokle in collaboration with Liam Gillick, Boris Groys, Martha Rosler, Walid Raad, Jalal Toufic, Nikolaus Hirsch, Natascha Sadr Haghighian and Tirdad Zolghadr (Vidokle and Zolghadr, 2007, [approx 1 screen])
educational models strategically for artistic and critical means, for example, the 
Paraeducation Project curated by Sarah Pierce and Anne Fletcher. At the ICA London, 
in conjunction with the Nought to Sixty (2008) event, a panel discussion led by O’Neill 
and Wilson entitled You talkin’ to me? Why art is turning to education? (2008) led to 
the aforementioned publication Curating and the Educational Turn (2010), which 
includes a close reference to the Paraeducation Project by Fletcher and Pierce. The 
project is explained in the footnoted material below and is intended to give a close 
illustration of how O’Neill and Wilson are bracketing forms of contemporary art and 
curatorial practice within the educational turn. A more pertinent contextualising 
example in terms of my own research is another project by Vidokle entitled A Crime 
Against Art (2007). Vidokle co-organised this piece with the curator Tirad Zolghadr. 
The two accepted an invitation to participate in an established art fair ARCO 07 held in 
Madrid. They used the invitation to organise what effectively was a mock trial in a 

space just off the main art fair space (Vidokle and Zolghadr, 2007). Although not 
exactly situated within an educational context, the piece is highly discursive. To 
produce the work they got together a cohort of experts from the artistic field, asking 
them to take on the formal protocol and roles typical of a judicial trial. The characters 
for the piece included a judge, the accused, the public prosecutors, a counsel for the 
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57 According to Pierce, the project came about through a collaboration with the curator Anne Fletcher 
(who is based in the Netherlands), because she was asked to produce an exhibition that was meant to 
respond to ‘the cultural pulse’ of the Netherlands. At the same time a state policy entitled the Culture 
Nota had been published that proposed that cultural research and discursive activities were not important 
and shouldn’t be prioritised at the time relative to state funding. This document, which was released in 
2008, subsequently saw a 50 per cent cut in cultural funding in the Netherlands; in a manner of speaking 
the document symbolised a type of cultural crisis. In their discussions Pierce and Fletcher sought out a 
critical and pragmatic response to these new cultural policies in the form of what Pierce refers to as a 
‘quieter’ type of event that resisted the art industry’s ‘fixation on the visual’, an event that paid no heed to 
‘who showed up at the event’ or ‘who appeared on a panel’, an event that ultimately resisted ‘displays of 
capital’ in the way that typical art exhibitions do. According to Pierce, the result is an ongoing event that 
takes Paraeducation as its umbrella title and attempts to gather small groups of people together in an 
informal discursive manner. They may, for example, take a reading of the works and theories of Jacques 
Derrida as their focus for coming together. By adopting educational models even on a purely pragmatic 
level, these events take up ‘less space’ and ‘less resources’ to activate a participatory form of cultural 
critique. (ICA, 2008, [approx 2 screens])
defence and other witnesses, including experts in the field of art. Vidokle and ‘Zolghadr’ took on roles themselves and playfully positioned themselves as ‘the accused’. Although the victims of the crime remain unnamed and couched in intellectualised and formalised debate, at one point in the proceedings the public prosecutors, played by the curators Chus Martinez and Vasif Kortun pictured below, put forward a statement pointing the finger of blame firmly at Vidokle and Zolghadr.

Fig. no. 18: Anton Vidokle and Tirdad Zolghadr, 2007, *A Crime Against Art*

Martinez and Kortun accuse Vidokle and Zolghadr of being members of a ‘new bourgeois’ who have acted as ‘co-opters’ in an artistic field that is underpinned by the dominant capitalist system of thinking, which, according to the public prosecutors, has effectively contributed to a non-autonomous field of contemporary artistic production effectively causing the closing down of creative autonomous potential. This accusation is then further elaborated on when they claim that Vidokle and Zolghadr are occupying
a hypocritical position within that arena. In one sense their practices and actions claim
to operate as an alternative to the dominant artistic models and frameworks where they
propose to ‘open up spaces of potentiality’ with projects such as the Unitednationplaza,
yet in another sense it could be argued that they are hypocrites by the fact that their
practices take up the invitation of a mainstream art fair in order to produce a piece
where they themselves feature as the central actors. Typical of any debate and akin to
the kind of discourse found at a conference or symposium, the dialogue circles,
crossfires and tos and fros. The piece is playful and at various points in its staging as a
courtroom drama, Vidokle and Zolghadr break character by smiling overtly. In that
sense the piece reads as a type of farce, where everyone in the circle is playing a game
and is in on the joke, with the joke otherwise hidden and obscured by language itself.

The shrewdness and strength of the piece is perhaps not in its use of play but more in
how it inverts and subverts Vidokle’s and Zolghadr’s artistic positions within the
context of a commercial and high profile art fair. They pay heed to the general,
performative profile of the contemporary artist with the use of characterisation. By
taking on acting roles, they bend their own positions and reputations as artistic activists
to acknowledge the problem of attempting to escape the very value system that has
helped shape, frame and fuel their own artistic positions within a shifting and dynamic
field of play. This example of practice-based activity and the formal attributes of the
work cited above are pertinent in terms of my research and aid to rationalise and
contextualise the decision I made to occupy an acting role (however amateur it may be)
in the two pieces – Rehearsed Practice and Next – Previously – Meanwhile. In this
regard, I aim to implicate myself in the work and in turn within the very system I am
attempting to critique – because I too participate in the systems and enable the
structures that have produced the very same characteristics I am conducting a critique of. In a similar vein to the formal attributes of the courtroom in the piece described above, the use of the lecture situation aims to lend a sense of objectivity to the placement of my subjective position within the works. With this context as a type of conceptual strategy, I endeavour to acknowledge and tease out my subjectivity by drawing attention to and including aspects of self-consciousness and idiosyncratic conditioning within the performances, which are in line with Goffman’s theories of the textual self being played out within the non-emotive formality of the lecture context. In this regard, I aim to problematise my subjectivity within an objective situation in the hopes of bringing aspects of insight with an ‘intersubjective’ articulation of content and subsequent reading of the works.

**Concluding from a place where high merges with low**

The above contextual factors act as key cornerstones that have helped shape and inform the new performative works that I have produced for this study and aid in bolstering the intention behind the works as pieces that aim to articulate, with a sense of criticality, the outcomes of my research. To conclude this chapter, I want to refer to the last bullet point comprising the second phase of my research schema and continue by detailing this bullet point with pertinent examples.

- A flattening of cultural references, i.e., high and low culture acting as formal visual and conceptual influences

Summarising my entire research project, it could be said that it is a project that has created, observed and attempted to debunk the structural orders and hierarchical conventions of the artistic field. In attempting to do this it has observed collisions of
opposing ideals, for example, professional with amateur and formal practice with informal. To reflect these collisions metaphorically within the performative works that I produced to conclude my research project, as well as the above contextual factors I also drew on an eclectic range of cultural influences, spanning and merging both high and low culture. Weaving through these conscious influences is a little similar to steering through a cultural menagerie in a bumper car. As I attempt to capture these influences in the following and concluding section of this chapter, it will become evident that in some cases my metaphorical bumper car stalled longer at some cultural junctures than others.

For example, in the piece Rehearsed Practice, the particular way that the actors are positioned in the piece fleetingly derives from a popular and classical piece of culture – The Class Sketch. This, a famous piece of satire, comments on the defined hierarchical class system in Britain in the 1960s. It was produced for The Frost Report and performed by John Cleese, Ronnie Barker and Ronnie Corbett (The Frost Report, 1966).

Fig. no. 19: The Frost Report, 1966, The Class Sketch
Cleverly and humorously, the subject of the sketch is connected to the performers’ stature as seen in the accompanying image – in this regard the performers embody the hierarchy and the space in which they aim to mock and comment on. Building on this influence, in *Next – Previously – Meanwhile*, the staggering of body next to body is kept, but shifts to a seated position typical of the formal arrangement at a conference. The image below is taken from research conducted on YouTube and is a recording of a recent contemporary symposium entitled *Why Art Matters* (*Why Art Matters, 2009*).

Fig. no. 20: Still of symposium entitled *Why Art Matters*

Conducting this kind of visual research aided in deciding on a number of performers to enact the conceptual basis of my research, which proved a challenge. A division of artistic persona using actors is a strategy used in both of my performative works. Within Irish theatre, the playwright Brian Friel uses two actors to play the same part in his play *Philadelphia Here I Come* (1964). In the play, one actor plays the public persona of the character Gar O’Donnell and the other actor plays the private persona. The play is set in rural Ireland in the 1950s and centres on Gar’s decision to emigrate to America and his
imminent departure to Philadelphia. The play is set in a stiflingly repressive Catholic Ireland. Gar is an only child, his mother having died when he was a baby has meant that he has always lived with his painfully predictable and silent father S.B. O’Donnell, or ‘Screwballs’ as Gar Private affectionately nicknames him. Throughout the play, Private is only seen and heard by the audience. The complexity and combination of language with the staging of a double personae embodying the same character allows the viewer to access a greater depth of meaning and other layers of understanding in terms of the play’s subject matter and Gar’s character. Not only do these additional layers relate to the character of Gar himself but also to the wider context and wider frame of cultural reference that the characters symbolise and embody. In that respect, the play distils a distinctive Irish character and conveys successfully the psychology of the Irish mentality. For example, in the footnoted excerpt, the nightly routine and repetitive predictability of his father’s dinner time ritual is captured with crystal wit and clarity by Gar’s private persona.58  Friel’s characters imbue an entrenched set of behaviours

58 Private: And here comes your pleasure, your little ray of sunshine. Ladies and Gentlemen, I give you – the one and only – the inimitable – the irrepressible – the irresistible – County Councillor – S.B. – O’Donnell! (Trumpet – hummed fanfare. Continues in the smooth, unctuous tones of the commentator at a mannequin parade.) And this time Marie Celeste is wearing a cheeky little head dress by Pamela of Park Avenue, eminently suitable for cocktail parties, morning coffee, or just casual shopping. It is brown Viennese felt, and contrasts boldly with the attractive beach ensemble, created by Simon. The pert little apron is detachable – (S.B. removes apron) – thank you, Marie Celeste – and underneath we have the tapered Italian-line slacks in ocelot. I would draw your attention to the large collar stud which is highly decorative and can be purchased separately at our boutique. We call this seductive outfit ‘Indiscretion’. It can be worn six days a week, in or out of bed. (In polite tone) Have a seat Screwballs. (S.B. sits down at the table.) Thank you. Remove the hat. (S.B. takes off the hat to say grace. He blesses himself.) On again. (Hat on.) Perfectly trained; the most obedient father I ever had. And now for our nightly lesson in the English language. Repeat slowly after me: another day over.

S.B. Another day over.

Private: Good. Next phrase: I suppose we can’t complain.

S.B: I suppose we can’t complain.

Private: Not bad. Now for a little free conversation. But no obscenities, Father dear; the child is only twenty-five. (S.B. eats in silence. Pause) Well, come on, come on! Where’s that old rapier wit of yours, the toast of Ballybeg coffee houses?

S.B. Did you set the rat-trap in the store?
coupled with learned self-conscious actions so that, although couched with humour, the play is melancholic in its conclusion, which sees no change to the cyclical social pattern that has been set in stone, it would seem. In terms of my decision to use three performers instead of two in the works, this involved a particular conceptual rationalising. With only two performers, the reading and interpretation of the pieces could have remained narrow and circled around the self and a version of the self- reflected in the creation of alternate persona that mimicked my speech and my synced gestures. This could have reinforced a heavier weighting towards a subjective recounting and perhaps more indulgent perspective on the content of my research. To aid in the challenge of this decision and in the piecing together of the staged formality of Rehearsed Practice and Next – Previously – Meanwhile a nod can be found to a classical reference to the work of Samuel Beckett – in particular his meta work entitled Play, which sees the three central characters, two female and one male, recite their lines while positioned in life-sized urns. The piece tells the story of a love triangle between the three characters, albeit told in fragments and at an incredibly accelerated pace as the characters deliver their lines at an almost inaudibly fast pace. Typifying Beckett’s tight reference to script and demand of delivery, the entire play requires perfection in terms

Public: Eye

Private (Hysterically) Isn’t he a riot! Oh my God, that father of yours just kills me! Wait – wait-shhh-shhh-

S.B.: I didn’t find as many about this year.

Private: Ooooooh God! Priceless! Beautiful! Delightful! ‘I didn’t find as many about this year!’ Did you ever hear the beat of that? Wonderful! But isn’t he in form tonight? But isn’t he? You know, it’s not every night that jewels like that, pearls of wisdom on rodent reproduction, drop from those lips! But hold it – hold it –! (S.B. takes out a handkerchief, removes his teeth, wraps them in the handkerchief, and puts them in his pocket. Private exhales with satisfaction.)

Private: Ah! That’s what we were waiting for; complete informality; total relaxation between intimates. Now we can carry on . . .

(Friel, 1984, p. 48)
of timing and synching and is repeated and recited twice by the actors. The uniform of the urn, the repetition of lines and the formal relationship between the male and female actors anchors the piece to a generic domestic space; in that sense the gender of each individual actor becomes less important, and the focus is more towards a whole wider arena of social play. For these reasons, the appropriation of this formal strategy was key in my performative works and in the decision to choose three actors, one male and two female, including myself, rather than having just myself and another female actress enact the scripted dialogue.

![Image](image.jpg)

Fig. no. 21: Samuel Beckett, 1963, *Play*

Far sillier inspiration came for the difficult reverse scene featuring in *Next – Previously Meanwhile* came from the 1970s ‘cheesy’ comedy entitled *Top Secret* (*Top Secret*, 1984). In the spoof, Val Kilmer plays an American rock star who, while touring Europe, gets himself entangled in a race against time and the East German High Command to locate a new super weapon. Although entirely goofy, the film is actually full of quite witty visual puns and gags. In one key scene, Val Kilmer’s character and his love interest (played by Lucy Gutteridge) enter an old bookshop following a lead for information. The entire scene is performed in reverse, and in one take – then this scene
was reversed in the edit producing a jarring effect where as a viewer you become aware that something is not quite right. There are several giveaways to the audience, including a dog running backwards passing the actors towards the end of the scene.

In *Top Secret*, the actors do not attempt to speak in reverse; however, bringing the acting challenge to new heights, when directing the television series *Twin Peaks* the filmmaker David Lynch used the same strategy to construct a dream sequence (*Twin Peaks*, 1991). Using and deconstructing phonetics, Lynch directed the actors to learn their lines completely in reverse. As I found making the piece *Next – Previously – Meanwhile*, reversing actions with language simultaneously is not an easy feat. The central thrust of *Twin Peaks* is based on a crime investigation held around the murder of a popular teenage homecoming queen ‘Laura Palmer’. The FBI special agent who is in charge of the investigation is Dale Cooper (played by Kyle Maclachlan). Solving the case makes up the entire premise for the long-running TV series. In Cooper’s dream, the sequence features Cooper himself, a girl who looks like Laura Palmer and, rather randomly, a dwarf in a red suit.

![Image](image.png)

*Fig. no. 22: David Lynch, 1991, Twin Peaks*
The sequence is shot in a surrealist-type set with red painted walls and red furnishings. The dwarf becomes central in the scene and does most of the speaking in reverse, which is subtitled for the viewers’ benefit. He reveals that the girl is actually his cousin and not Laura Palmer and that she is ‘full of secrets’, implying that she may help towards solving the burning question of who Laura Palmer’s killer is. The scene is abstract and obtuse – typical of David Lynch’s experimental oeuvres. The reversing of language contributes to the veil of secrecy and premise of the series. The subversion of speech shapes the space and context that the scene plays out in; it becomes a nowhere space unanchored to reality. It acts as a kind of code that requires conceptual breaking – a performative riddle where language itself is the metaphor for hidden information and veiled alternative realities. The scene plays with previous discoveries, occurrences and histories within the series and reverses them over and back like a ping-pong ball. Typically with a series such as Twin Peaks, each programme in the series would begin and perhaps end with the inclusion of some kind of summary of what happened in the previous week’s programme and for the benefit of the viewer a sneak view of what to expect in the next week’s program. An overt reference to popular culture and a more typical mainstream viewing experience rationalises and puts in context how the piece Next – Previously – Meanwhile is literally punctuated by text for each section of the piece.

Within the piece Next – Previously – Meanwhile, I attempted to utilise Lynch’s reversal strategies, folding previous works into the piece, retrospectively retelling the narrative of The Gatekeeper Project and A Structuring Structure as told in the piece Rehearsed Practice, attempting to retell it from a lateral perspective using reversal techniques. Reversing histories through the use and manipulation of language itself seemed
conceptually apt in the case of *A Structuring Structure*, which as a project observed the same practices and procedures being enacted annually by the artistic institution for over 200 years, resonating with the historic formation of the white cube gallery space.

Within the piece *Next – Previously – Meanwhile*, the three performers use drawings of different-shaped noses as props in the last scene, which is a type of question and answer session – a typical conclusion to conferences or symposia. Reflecting on the eclectic grouping of cultural references that have aided in the evolution of my performative works – for instance contextualising this scene – the nose holds various connotations such as an exaggeration of the truth, or holding a position of superiority over others. On a personal and subjective level, the nose can be an extreme point of self-consciousness exemplified, for example, in the modern day Hollywood remake of the play by Edmond Rostand entitled *Cyrano de Bergerac*, the ‘rom-com’ film *Roxanne*, the actor Steve Martin plays Charlie Bales, an unlucky in love fireman with an enormous nose (*Roxanne*, 1987). The film follows Bales on his quest to win the heart of the new girl in town, Roxanne, played by Daryl Hannah. Hannah plays the typical blonde bombshell while Martin’s character, Bales, represents the antithesis of the Hollywood heartthrob because of his misfortune in the nose stakes. At all times throughout the film, Bales’ nose remains a major point of self-consciousness and an issue he repeatedly has to account for and endeavour to overcome, with humorous outcomes.

Relating also to the nose scene in *Next – Previously – Meanwhile*, the writers Sally O’Reilly and Cathy Haynes produce what they call an ‘occasional publication’ entitled *Implicasphere*. As a publication, it exemplifies what the scope of employing cultural eclecticism in a piece of work can culminate in. They base the content of each issue
around a single word. The issue they entitle *The Nose* is a key example of their publication and is helpful in regard to contextualising my cultural referencing system and, by coincidence, my use of the nose as a multi-registered signifier in the work. O’Reilly and Haynes state the issue is dedicated to ‘tracing the associations that ooze and spurt from’ the nose (2006). The publication takes the format of a broadsheet, which is folded strategically to feature different aspects of the content that O’Reilly and Haynes have put together. The reference system is hinged associatively to the nose. Other than that the assemblage follows no chronology and no cultural or philosophical hierarchy. For example, they place theoretical musings by Sigmund Freud dating from 1887 next to a vile-sounding recipe named *Jellied Moose Nose* by Eleanor A. Ellis, sourced from *A Northern Cookbook*, published in 1999. The patchwork of associative linkage offers a way of thinking in the round about the subject. Through O’Reilly’s and Haynes’s lens, the nose, a central and focal feature of one’s face, often overlooked in terms of its significance, opens up in terms of its symbolic and metaphorical meaning.

In an excerpt they include from *A Chapter Upon Noses*, taken from the *Prenological Magazine* dating from 1881, LN Fowler writes his account of how the nose is ‘the most prominent feature on the face’ and it ‘ought to have some character in it, and it is generally conceded that it has.’ He then follows with his classifications of the nose including: 1. The Roman Nose; 2. The Greek Nose; 3, The Jewish Nose; 4. The Snub Nose; and 5. The Celestial Nose. Interestingly, according to Fowler, the Greek nose is bound to notions of aesthetics and beauty. He states:

> The Greek nose indicates refinement, artistic taste, and love of the beautiful. It is the nose, as the name implies, that formed the national Greek type, in which race the instinct for the beautiful in art and nature reached its highest development. “The owner of the Greek nose,” says the author of the Notes on noses, “is not without some energy in the pursuit of that which is agreeable to his tastes; but unlike the owner of the Roman nose, he cannot exert himself in opposition to his
tastes.” It is not uncommon to find this form of nose both in women and men; it is especially beautiful in women. The noses of poets and artists often have the form, or manifest a tendency towards it. (Fowler, 1881, cited in Haynes and O’Reilly, 2006)

Fowler’s classification is pertinent in terms of the nose scene within the piece Next – Previously – Meanwhile. Within my enquiry, the issue of aesthetic judgement required navigation. This navigation was dictated by my enquiry, which is cast effectively in the theories of Sholette cited in Chapter Two as follows:

My aim in other words is not to separate art from non-art, the rubbish from the dross, but to examine how these self-defined cultural practices operate within a changing economy involving material and symbolic rewards and penalties, visibilities and shadows… (Sholette, 2011, p. 6)

Within Next – Previously – Meanwhile the nose props attempt to problematise the navigation of aesthetic judgement and its bind to subjectivity via practice-based means. In this regard, humour and absurdity are coupled with the symbolic subjective, self-conscious connotations of the nose to come together to help in that teasing out and reflexive process. An attempt to express and articulate the content of my research findings, in particular the co-dependant relations veiled yet existing between formal and informal practice can be found embedded within the scripted dialogue accompanying the nose scene, which alludes to a form of absurd dependency between the nose and its positioning on the face.

In this chapter, I have attempted to lay out and rationalise the second phase of my research schema by way of firstly constructing a context for that second phase of practice. Secondly, I attempted to refer to key theories, forms of artistic practice and the contemporary genre in which those works are placed. I aimed to evidence the
conceptual influences that aided in articulating a criticality within my performative works by employing humour and an assemblage of cultural influences that endeavoured to reflect the aims and outcomes of my research period by making, or attempting to make, visible and create a structural buckle in the tiers of the conventional hierarchy of the artworld. Following this last chapter, I will offer a brief summary and conclusion to the entire research project.
Conclusion

At this juncture, I will reflect on the content of Chapters One, Two, Three and Four. I firstly surveyed and relayed the character of the contemporary space artists operate in by defining the artistic field as a ‘reputation economy’. Then, focusing and exemplifying the structures of the reputation economy, I used the significance and state of artistic professionalism as a type of condition within the field. I then theoretically defined the symbols of professionalism as an apparatus and attempted to build an argument to posit that the inhabitants of the artistic field, i.e., artists and cultural producers alike, through the act of pure production causing saturation, render the highly visible professional apparatus – a key operative structure in the field – invisible.

Using this premise as an entry point for a period of research, I then attempted to frame a rationale for describing my research outline as a schema rather than a conventional methodology. Outlining that my research schema was conceptually motivated and enquiry-led, I described how I consciously sought out artistic contexts where the apparatus was displaced. Following the points of my research schema Phase One, I described the quasi-ethnographic position my practice straddled in order to yield material towards my enquiry. Following this, I explained the field of informal practices and the outcome of what occurred when I produced an interface between formal and informal practice through the curated project The Gatekeeper Project. Taking a key example of an operational and historic structure in the Irish artistic field, I then used the project entitled A Structuring Structure to observe the conventions around the annual exhibition and selection process held within this key institution. It is here that I discovered another collision between informal practice and formal practice, i.e., this selection process filters over 2,500 artworks exemplifying both forms of practices.
I then described how in this space (which occupies one of the top tiers of the artistic hierarchy of art practices) it has become normal for the two forms of practice to come together. This period is brief, just for the period of the selection where all the works are stored and evaluated together. I then described how this collision allowed me to observe the procedures around this event and the persuasive informal discourse that powers and fuels the choice made in terms of which artworks are selected and which are unaccepted for exhibition. Then, with the aid of various theoretical framing, I attempted to summarise that the field of artistic practice contains many veiled realities, and the one that my research gave me the authority to report on was the veiled co-dependency that formal artistic practice has with informal practice. I exemplified this through the observation I made of the above selection process and the manner in which the large number of informal practitioners who attempt to exhibit their work within this annual show are in fact bolstering the position of the structure, and are heavily relied upon in order for the structure to maintain its psychological and financial position within the field. With these research outcomes in mind, I then described how I evolved a contextually relevant form of artistic practice to articulate these outcomes. Coupled with my own art works, I used key examples from contemporary art practice and the art historical canon to contextualise the performative lectures I produced in the second phase of my research period. I concluded by aligning the use of cultural flattening as appropriate means to embed a sense of criticality within these works in the hope of providing a commentary on the veiled hierarchical co-dependencies existing in the field of artistic practice.

My hope is that throughout the process of my research period and through the various facets of practice that I have conducted, the overall project culminates in and acts as a
containment of practice and text-based knowledge, allowing for flexible and easy access to interested parties. To summarise, I will attempt to put forward why I feel this project holds value and can offer some kind of contribution in terms of a body of research.

The project endeavours the following:

To note and capture the informal character of the artworld reputation-based economy

To use art practice to produce original fieldwork, which occupies unprecedented terrain

As a consequence of original research, to reveal and make visible the structures of the artistic field and the co-dependencies that exist within the field of operation

To formally articulate research findings within the academic arena and via art practice, i.e., through the use of performative presentation and self-conscious theatrical devices

In terms of the live performative works, i.e., Rehearsed Practice, to offer an alternative presenting model for the articulation of art practice and research within the contemporary art world and the knowledge-producing domain

I see my PhD as attempting to produce a form of art making that enables the establishment of art practice as a proposition (i.e., a rigorous and formal presenting model in and of itself contributing to an equitable status for art practice within the third and fourth level teaching and learning environment and to the wider contemporary artworld as a whole).
I see the premise of my project as attempting to firstly operate in an experimental manner (i.e., I use artistic methods to re-enact and articulate my research findings within what is conventionally a formal and academic context). Secondly, I specifically encompass a minimal use of props and humour within the pieces to make use of the critical properties that humour embodies. Producing artworks that both strive towards the experimental and the critical are two key characteristics of contemporary, innovative art practice. On this basis, this project aspires to offer an experimental model produced through art practice to further enhance and contribute to the field of contemporary art practice and discourse. As cited above, my project attempts to use artistic strategies for critical purposes; I contextually cite my practice within the pedagogical arena. My form of artistic strategy includes a specific disseminating process (i.e., the performative lecture as a platform from which to present and show my work while simultaneously ‘broadcasting’ my research findings). This is a creative form of production, which offers alternative and creative formats for the presentation of art practice and research within the artistic learning environment.
Appendices

Appendix A: Email generated by the performance artist Amanda Coogan

Below is an example of an email generated by the performance artist Amanda Coogan in relation to information about an upcoming event. Please note the information below the signing off making reference to upcoming events.

Best wishes,
Amanda

Yellow, an ArtFilm
The Jameson International Film Festival
February 2012

Labour, a Live Exhibition
Performance Space - London - 9 February
The Void, Derry - 24 February
The Lab, Dublin - 10 March

What is Performance Art?
Booklet
Irish Museum of Modern Art

www.amandacoogan.com
Appendix B: Email sent by the artist (Irish visual artist Colm Desmond)

Below is an example of an email sent by the artist (Irish visual artist Colm Desmond) appearing in the sender details and the subject bar of a blanket invitation sent to a list of contacts.

(Sic)

Subject 'OFF THE STREET' – Colm Desmond/Oran Ryan
Wednesday, 2 March, 2011 11:38

From: This sender is "colm desmond" <p.colmdesmond@gmail.com>

Message contains attachments
1 File (446KB)

OFF THE STREET – Colm Desmond (visual artist) and Oran Ryan (writer) are collaborating in a joint installation of photographic and text pieces as part of a week-long programme of events for Library Ireland Week.

At DIT Library, 2nd Floor, DIT, Kevin Street, Dublin 8, from Monday 7 March (opening event 6pm) to Friday 11 March (inclusive). Readings/talks by writers and poets each evening from 6pm. Artist/writer talk Friday 11 March 6pm.

Please check programme and link attached for details

Best regards
Colm
Appendix C: Email for an upcoming artistic event where the senders have prefaced the email with an apology for cross-posting

Below is an example of an email for an upcoming artistic event where the senders have prefaced the email with an apology for cross-posting.

(Sic)

Apologies for any cross-posting

LINK CULTUREFEST invites you to the launch taking place between 6pm and 9pm on Friday 25th May, in Block B, Smithfield Square, Dublin 7.

LINK CULTUREFEST is a new weekend festival that aims to showcase and celebrate the culture, art and people that make up the diverse community that exists in Smithfield and its surrounding areas.

Between the 25th and 27th of May, LINK Culturefest will host local and international artists, musicians and curators in a series of events for the public. The three-day programme will feature an International Artists’ Exchange with organisations from Marseille and Lisbon, as well as showcasing a series of art exhibitions, live concerts, open studios, artist talks, live street art, outdoor screenings and performances.

Here in The Market Studios we will be presenting LIVESTOCK "always dangerous" on Sunday 27th May, 5pm to 8pm as part of the festival. Below and attached is information on LIVESTOCK "always dangerous" along with the main festival programme and map.

We look forward to seeing you!
Appendix D: The Minister for Research and Innovation, Sean Sherlock TD

6th June 2012: The Minister for Research and Innovation, Sean Sherlock TD, will officially open a major DIT Research and Innovation Showcase, taking place on campus in Aungier Street, Dublin 1 on Tuesday 19 June 2012, 3pm to 7pm.

Innovation @ DIT, which is open to the public, will demonstrate the breadth and depth of research currently taking place in DIT. Visitors will include representatives of funding agencies, industry partners, policy makers, academics from DIT and across the higher education sector, as well as professional organisations, and potential research students.

DIT holds the best record amongst Irish higher education institutions for commercialising its research and the Showcase will highlight industry-focused research in the following thematic areas:

New Materials and Technologies (including nanotechnology, photonics, inorganic pharma and nanomaterials)
Information and Media Technologies (including antennas, digital media and electrical power)
Environment & Health (including food, pharma, sustainability and radiation science)

There will also be presentations on funding opportunities for industry.
Appendix E: Proposed submission for ‘Invisible’

Title: Made by Graham Cahill, by Naomi Sex

Graham Cahill is currently the head gallery technician at the Royal Hibernian Academy, Dublin; he has spent the past 10 years working with artists to assist in the realisation and presentation of their shows. Along with other highly prestigious shows, he has been part of the team that installed the acclaimed ‘I Not I’ – Samuel Beckett, with Philip Guston and Bruce Nauman at the RHA. He has also headed the recent James Coleman installations at the RHA and IMMA. In 2008 he installed the Kerlin Gallery showcase at the New York art fair. As part of his job description at the RHA he works with a team of other technicians, organising and structuring the various and diverse challenges that each artist’s show and installation brings. The most requested type of installation assistance by both galleries and artists for Cahill and his team requires the building of false walls.

Intrinsic to the gallery/museum vernacular, ‘the false wall’ is used to superficially disguise, reveal, emphasise, abstract and temporally change aspects of the gallery’s architecture. Conventionally, during the installation of a show, the gallery technicians build these false walls prescribed to the artist’s wishes. The walls are usually built using 4ft by 8ft sheets of plasterboard supported by a timber built frame. The walls are then finished with a plaster finish, meticulously sanded, and then white washed with white emulsion paint. The show opens. Focusing on the art and the artist, the viewer commonly remains completely oblivious to both the existence of the false walls and the technicians who built them. The show ends and the team of technicians de-install the show in preparation for the next exhibition.

This proposed piece is informed by my current research and the curatorial thematic title and descriptor for ‘Invisible’. It considers the hierarchies of the showing process by revealing the role and importance of the gallery technician.

If this proposal is accepted, Cahill will be hired to build a series of connecting false walls using 4ft by 8ft plasterboard sheets; these walls will be built and positioned in the window of The Gallery; the structure will be built to replicate an accordion-style screen. Historically, these screens had a practical use and were frequently found in theatre dressing rooms, and were used as a discreet partition to get undressed behind. Informed by this function of discretion and secrecy, the temporary sculpture purports to metaphorically allude to the concept underpinning the work and the show’s title. As opposed to his conventional pre-show opening install, Cahill will construct/install the work on the day of the show opening and throughout the show’s duration. He will also deconstruct/de-install the work within the shows run. These install/de-install times will be planned strategically and will happen at scheduled times.

If accepted, the fully built/installed work will literally interrupt the audience’s viewing experience. The ‘false wall screen’, poses to physically divide the outside and inside of the space. Cahill’s presence in this proposal and his consistent activity in the exhibiting space is intended to act in a playful and transparent manner commenting on the realities and common practices of operating within the professional art world.
N.B. I am aware of the disruptive nature this work poses and how its realisation will affect the business of the Gallery. This is a considered aspect to the proposal. If accepted, I am interested in entering flexible negotiations with both the curators and the gallery director in order to best realise and facilitate the work within the context of the ‘Invisible’ show and the Gallery space.
Appendix F: Artist statements by Cormac Browne, Sinead McCann and Margaret O’Brien.

Please see below artist statements by Cormac Browne, Sinead McCann and Margaret O’Brien. Please Note John Graham’s work is described on the link to his website included on naomi-sex.com

Artist: Cormac Browne

Title of piece: Red, White, Green

Description
This performance based piece uses the uncertain figure of the wine “expert” at a trade fair to question the relationship between the curator/gallerist and perceptions and realities of the knowledge economy and market economy of the wine world, which shares many parallels with the art world. The work continues a wider exploration of the role of humour as rupture to the normative and quotidian.

Artist: Sinead McCann

Title of piece: Public Notice No. 1

Description
This piece grew out of a period of time I spent working in Coolmine, drug-stabilizing programme. The voices from the speakers depict experiences of people in recovery from drug abuse. They bring to this public space the voices of marginal groups who sleep and exist on the streets of Dublin. These spoken narratives interrupt the normal function of the street and the thought process of the passer-by.

Artist: Margaret O’Brien,

Title of piece: Halting Site

Description
I am using the architecture of the site (the bars) and materials specific to this event (cable ties) to create a temporary sculptural installation. Following on from recent modes of practice, I am using the cable ties in vast multiples, re-presenting the context of this object from that of functional to decorative. The length of the cable ties has been carefully considered so the excess appears like a spike once fastened around the bars. The white colour is also intentional in an attempt to white wash the “space”, as it would occur in a traditional gallery space to remove all traces of the previous exhibition in preparation of the coming exhibition. In this instance, the bars of the Green, or “walls of the space”, are transformed into tall narrow cacti, rendering them useless in terms of a hanging space on the day. This leaves open to question the relationship of the artist to the politics of the gallery space or commissioner, and addresses hierarchies that operate within the art industry.
Appendix G: Email correspondence in relation to the allocation of a space for The Gatekeeper Project

Below is an email correspondence in relation to the allocation of a space for The Gatekeeper Project. Please note to keep consistency with the write up of A Structuring Structure, all individuals details remain anonymous below; (Sic)

Hi Naomi,

I am contacting you on behalf of the (name of group). We have allocated you a space for the upcoming exhibition. Although we are concerned that the format of your work may not be in keeping with our exhibition rules. (name) in the (name of council) could not explain exactly what type of art you will be exhibiting. But we allocated you a space anyway. On the basis that you have to understand that the rules are there for everyone. It makes the exhibition an even playing field for everyone. All we can do is to see if your work fits in with our exhibition. Hopefully it will.

Regards
Chairwoman of committee
Appendix H: Questionnaires written and conducted by John Graham for *The Gatekeeper Project*.

Each questionnaire contains two pages. Please note to keep consistency with the write up of *A Structuring Structure*, all individuals details remain anonymous below;

---

**Questionnaire**

*THE GATEKEEPER PROJECT* curated by Naomi Sex.

St Stephens Green Railings, Dublin, 21 – 23 August, 2009

Exhibitor's Name: [Redacted] Stand: [Redacted]

1. Can you briefly describe the works you are showing here?
   - Acrylic paintings and sketches of animals and scenes from nature

2. What is the primary reason for showing your work at Stephens Green?
   - To exhibit and get the public's opinion, possibly sell, and fun because it's different to my day job

3. One of the stated purposes of the Stephens Green exhibitions is to 'promote the visual arts to the public of Dublin'. How do you think the public might benefit from these events when there are already galleries and museums dedicated to the visual arts in Dublin?
   - Anybody can exhibit at Stephens Green and is very affordable to do. Not a lot of people are drawn to galleries, but if walking by the railing, they can't help having a look.

4. How often do you visit museums and art galleries?
   - Approximately once a month (more if I have time or happen to pass by one)

5. What is your favourite artwork by another artist?
   - Almost anything by Renoir (except his very early work and his later dry spell)

6. What inspires you?
   - Animals, nature other artist work

7. As a means of getting to know someone people sometimes ask, 'What is your favourite colour? Is this still a relevant question, and if so how would you respond?'
   - I don't think it's a very relevant question, but my answer would be pink/purple.
8. How much time do you spend making art?

Varies greatly. I can spend a couple of months painting non-stop in my spare time and then go months without doing anything.

9. Where do you normally make your artwork?

At home in my bedroom.

10. How much time do you spend promoting your artwork? – for example seeking working and exhibiting opportunities, looking for funding support, working on promotional literature, website etc.

Not much, as this is my first time exhibiting.

11. Where would you most like to exhibit your work?

The Green Gallery.

12. What is the normal price range of your work?

€50 - €200.

13. Have you been to art college or had any formal art education, if so please give details?

No. Only as far as leaving cert and some student run classes in college.

14. What do you think the perception of gallery artists is of the artists who exhibit on the railings?

Depends on the artists. Some of the rail artists also exhibit in galleries.
THE GATEKEEPER PROJECT curated by Naomi Sex.

St Stephens Green Railings, Dublin, 21 – 23 August, 2009

Exhibitor’s Name:  

1. Can you briefly describe the works you are showing here?
   - Oil Paints
   - Glass Paints
   - Water Paints

2. What is the primary reason for showing your work at Stephens Green?
   - For Sale
   - To Meet Others in Art
   - Makes Art More Accessible
   - Easy to See

3. One of the stated purposes of the Stephens Green exhibitions is to ‘promote the visual arts to the public of Dublin’. How do you think the public might benefit from these events when there are already galleries and museums dedicated to the visual arts in Dublin?
   - Makes art more accessible
   - Easy to see

4. How often do you visit museums and art galleries?
   - Once - Twice
   - 6 Months

5. What is your favourite artwork by another artist?
   - Vincent Van Gogh

6. What inspires you?
   - Love

7. As a means of getting to know someone people sometimes ask, 'What is your favourite colour? Is this still a relevant question, and if so how would you respond?'
   - Yellow + Black
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. How much time do you spend making art?</td>
<td>3/4 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Where do you normally make your artwork?</td>
<td>Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How much time do you spend promoting your artwork? – for example seeking working and exhibiting opportunities, looking for funding support, working on promotional literature, website etc.</td>
<td>Not much. Need to develop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Where would you most like to exhibit your work?</td>
<td>Anywhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. What is the normal price range of your work?</td>
<td>£300 – £100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Have you been to art college or had any formal art education, if so please give details?</td>
<td>Yes, Art Lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. What do you think the perception of gallery artists is of the artists who exhibit on the railings?</td>
<td>Of the same ilk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questionnaire by John Graham for The Gatekeeper Project
www.johngraham.ie
Questionnaire

THE GATEKEEPER PROJECT curated by Naomi Sex.

St Stephens Green Railings, Dublin, 21 – 23 August, 2009

Exhibitor’s Name: [Blank] Stand: 126/127/128

1. Can you briefly describe the works you are showing here?
   - Monochrome portraits in Sepia watercolour
   - Also, remnants in colour
   - All of the smallest character type subject.

2. What is the primary reason for showing your work at Stephens Green?
   - Getting my work seen and known by people

3. One of the stated purposes of the Stephens Green exhibitions is to ‘promote the visual arts to the public of Dublin’. How do you think the public might benefit from these events when there are already galleries and museums dedicated to the visual arts in Dublin?
   - Much more relaxed atmosphere than an art gallery.
   - Many more people get a chance to view the artists’ work.

4. How often do you visit museums and art galleries?
   - Not as often as I should!

5. What is your favourite artwork by another artist?
   - A classic ‘The Chinese Girl’ by Tretchikoff

6. What inspires you?
   - Faces – expressions – character
   - Old faces

7. As a means of getting to know someone people sometimes ask, ‘What is your favourite colour? Is this still a relevant question, and if so how would you respond?
   - Used to be relevant, that is not any more
8. How much time do you spend making art?
   *Most of my time*

9. Where do you normally make your artwork?
   *At home, in my studio*

10. How much time do you spend promoting your artwork? – for example seeking working and exhibiting opportunities, looking for funding support, working on promotional literature, website etc.
    *All the time. You never stop!*

11. Where would you most like to exhibit your work?
    *Around the country - also the States (America)*

12. What is the normal price range of your work?
    *£350 - £750*

13. Have you been to art college or had any formal art education, if so please give details?
    *N.C.A.D. Kilmainham St Dublin - Early 60s*

14. What do you think the perception of gallery artists is of the artists who exhibit on the railings?
    *Not as far up the food chain as they are!*

---

Questionnaire by John Graham for The Gatekeeper Project
[www.johngraham.ie](http://www.johngraham.ie)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Can you briefly describe the works you are showing here?</td>
<td>Landscapes, birds from Danube Delta (Romania) and from Ireland, plus portraits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What is the primary reason for showing your work at Stephens Green?</td>
<td>To sell my paintings if possible, to be remarked and to make friends among the other exhibitors, trying to find groups to paint together and improve my skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. One of the stated purposes of the Stephens Green exhibitions is to ‘promote the visual arts to the public of Dublin’. How do you think the public might benefit from these events when there are already galleries and museums dedicated to the visual arts in Dublin?</td>
<td>The public will be inspired to try themselves to paint, they benefit indeed because these type of exhibitions suggest love for the art among ordinary people. Not only very famous; this makes art more approachable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How often do you visit museums and art galleries?</td>
<td>Not very often, but I have a lot of albums at home and I see a lot of art on Internet, sent by all my friends who know that I appreciate art very much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What is your favourite artwork by another artist?</td>
<td>Nusies by Van Gogh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What inspires you?</td>
<td>Music and dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. As a means of getting to know someone people sometimes ask, ‘What is your favourite colour?’ Is this still a relevant question, and if so how would you respond?</td>
<td>Bleuvert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How much time do you spend making art?</td>
<td>Not enough time, but probably 10% of the days of a year usually (I'm an engineer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Where do you normally make your artwork?</td>
<td>In a spare room where I keep my art materials and sometimes in the open air.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How much time do you spend promoting your artwork? – for example seeking working and exhibiting opportunities, looking for funding support, working on promotional literature, website etc.</td>
<td>I am working on my own website which will be ready soon and I participate to St. Stephen's Greene usually, but until now I didn't spend time promoting my work out of my family and friends circle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Where would you most like to exhibit your work?</td>
<td>I would like to have a space inside where to be able to expose better my works with more distance between them, with a larger audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. What is the normal price range of your work?</td>
<td>50-90 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Have you been to art college or had any formal art education, if so please give details?</td>
<td>I attended a 3 year school of art called People's Art in Romania which I graduated. The teacher I had was a famous Romanian painter. The school contained also art history classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. What do you think the perception of gallery artists is of the artists who exhibit on the railings?</td>
<td>Probably they see them as having fun and the quality of paintings as being extremely diverse and, discursive but they also see them as being passionate...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questionnaire

THE GATEKEEPER PROJECT curated by Naomi Sex.

St Stephens Green Railings, Dublin, 21 – 23 August, 2009

Exhibitor’s Name:  
Stand:  

1. Can you briefly describe the works you are showing here?
   Mixed subjects - landscapes + figures in Pastel and Acrylics

2. What is the primary reason for showing your work at Stephens Green?
   To Sell!

3. One of the stated purposes of the Stephens Green exhibitions is to ‘promote the visual arts to the public of Dublin’. How do you think the public might benefit from these events when there are already galleries and museums dedicated to the visual arts in Dublin?
   The Stephens Green exhibitions show the diversity of artwork being produced by mainly non-professional artists.

4. How often do you visit museums and art galleries?
   Only galleries when come across one when I travel around the country.

5. What is your favourite artwork by another artist?
   On The Screen - Simon Mason aka Nomis - I love his Acid Film Troop!

6. What inspires you?
   Flowers, landscapes

7. As a means of getting to know someone people sometimes ask, ‘What is your favourite colour? Is this still a relevant question, and if so how would you respond?
   Yes it still relevant and I diagnose the colours I like working with - I e. emetic colours
8. How much time do you spend making art?

3/4 hours most nights

9. Where do you normally make your artwork?

Home studio

10. How much time do you spend promoting your artwork? – for example seeking working and exhibiting opportunities, looking for funding support, working on promotional literature, website etc.

Not a lot

11. Where would you most like to exhibit your work?

Indoors!! Ideally small venues

12. What is the normal price range of your work?

£50 - £500

13. Have you been to art college or had any formal art education, if so please give details?

Art college in Cork (many years ago!)

14. What do you think the perception of gallery artists is of the artists who exhibit on the railings?

I reckon they see us as fairly amateur and not much of a threat to their business.
Questionnaire

THE GATEKEEPER PROJECT curated by Naomi Sex.

St Stephens Green Railings, Dublin, 21 – 23 August, 2009

Exhibitor's Name: [Redacted]  [Redacted]  Stand: [Redacted]

1. Can you briefly describe the works you are showing here?
   Landscapes

2. What is the primary reason for showing your work at Stephens Green?
   Reaction & Maybe Sell

3. One of the stated purposes of the Stephens Green exhibitions is to ‘promote the visual arts to the public of Dublin’. How do you think the public might benefit from these events when there are already galleries and museums dedicated to the visual arts in Dublin?
   Most people display here as they won't be accepted in galleries

4. How often do you visit museums and art galleries?
   Once or Twice a year

5. What is your favourite artwork by another artist?
   A Rainy Day in Paris (Claude Monet)

6. What inspires you?
   Nice Scenery

7. As a means of getting to know someone people sometimes ask, 'What is your favourite colour? Is this still a relevant question, and if so how would you respond?
   Colour Don't Matter.
8. How much time do you spend making art?

4 or five hours a day when I get at it.

9. Where do you normally make your artwork?

At home.

10. How much time do you spend promoting your artwork? — for example seeking working and exhibiting opportunities, looking for funding support, working on promotional literature, website etc.

7 hours per week.

11. Where would you most like to exhibit your work?

Art Gallery.

12. What is the normal price range of your work?

£300.00 upwards.

13. Have you been to art college or had any formal art education, if so please give details?

No.

14. What do you think the perception of gallery artists is of the artists who exhibit on the railings?

Amateur artists.

Questionnaire by John Graham for The Gatekeeper Project
www.johngraham.ie
**Questionnaire**

**THE GATEKEEPER PROJECT** curated by Naomi Sex.

St Stephens Green Railings, Dublin, 21 – 23 August, 2009

*Exhibitor’s Name:* [Redacted]  
*Stand:* [Redacted]

1. Can you briefly describe the works you are showing here?

   **LANDSCAPES, SEASCAPES IN [OILS]**

2. What is the primary reason for showing your work at Stephens Green?

   **TO MEET OLD FRIENDS [ARTISTS]**

3. One of the stated purposes of the Stephens Green exhibitions is to 'promote the visual arts to the public of Dublin'. How do you think the public might benefit from these events when there are already galleries and museums dedicated to the visual arts in Dublin?

   **OUTDOOR ART IS ALWAYS POPULAR.**

4. How often do you visit museums and art galleries?

   **Whenver I can**

5. What is your favourite artwork by another artist?

   **COROT**

6. What inspires you?

   **ALL NATURE**

7. As a means of getting to know someone people sometimes ask, 'What is your favourite colour? Is this still a relevant question, and if so how would you respond?'

   **COLOUR GREEN**
8. How much time do you spend making art?

9. Where do you normally make your artwork?

2 - 3 hours

10. How much time do you spend promoting your artwork? – for example seeking working and exhibiting opportunities, looking for funding support, working on promotional literature, website etc.

None

11. Where would you most like to exhibit your work?

On the green

12. What is the normal price range of your work?

Reasonable prices £100 - £300

13. Have you been to art college or had any formal art education, if so please give details?

Yes 2 years George College

14. What do you think the perception of gallery artists is of the artists who exhibit on the railings?

Not too well
**Questionnaire**

*THE GATEKEEPER PROJECT* curated by Naomi Sex.

St Stephens Green Railings, Dublin, 21 – 23 August, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibitor’s Name:</th>
<th>Stand:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Can you briefly describe the works you are showing here?

   *Oil Painting*

2. What is the primary reason for showing your work at Stephens Green?

   *To exhibit your talent*

3. One of the stated purposes of the Stephens Green exhibitions is to ‘promote the visual arts to the public of Dublin’. How do you think the public might benefit from these events when there are already galleries and museums dedicated to the visual arts in Dublin?

   *Broader range of art to choose from*

4. How often do you visit museums and art galleries?

   *Once or twice a year*

5. What is your favourite artwork by another artist?

   *Painter of Light - Thomas Kinkade*

6. What inspires you?

   *Life itself*

7. As a means of getting to know someone people sometimes ask, ‘What is your favourite colour? Is this still a relevant question, and if so how would you respond?’

   *By expressing my opinion on the different colours that create art.*
8. How much time do you spend making art?
   
   ABOUT 4 HOURS A DAY

9. Where do you normally make your artwork?
   
   WORK SHOP

10. How much time do you spend promoting your artwork? – for example seeking working and exhibiting opportunities, looking for funding support, working on promotional literature, website etc.
   
   NONE

11. Where would you most like to exhibit your work?
   
   GALLERY

12. What is the normal price range of your work?
   
   €35 – €120

13. Have you been to art college or had any formal art education, if so please give details?
   
   NO

14. What do you think the perception of gallery artists is of the artists who exhibit on the railings?
   
   WE ARE BARGAN TOWN ARTIST

---

Questionnaire by John Graham for The Gatekeeper Project
www.johngraham.ie - [Redacted]
**Questionnaire**

**THE GATEKEEPER PROJECT** curated by Naomi Sex.

St Stephens Green Railings, Dublin, 21 – 23 August, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibitor’s Name:</th>
<th>Stand:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Can you briefly describe the works you are showing here?

   OIL ON CANVAS about motorsport

2. What is the primary reason for showing your work at Stephens Green?

   TO LET PEOPLE SEE IT. MARKETING!

3. One of the stated purposes of the Stephens Green exhibitions is to ‘promote the visual arts to the public of Dublin’. How do you think the public might benefit from these events when there are already galleries and museums dedicated to the visual arts in Dublin?

   IT ALLOWS THEM TO VIEW ORIGINAL ART WITHOUT THE “BARRIER” OF THE GALLERY DOOR

4. How often do you visit museums and art galleries?

   NEVER

5. What is your favourite artwork by another artist?

   Elvis by Warhol

6. What inspires you?

   Speed

7. As a means of getting to know someone people sometimes ask, ‘What is your favourite colour?’ Is this still a relevant question, and if so how would you respond?

   CAD RED LIGHT IS MY FAVORITE

   AND IT IS VERY RELEVANT
8. How much time do you spend making art?

Every day

9. Where do you normally make your artwork?

Home Studio

10. How much time do you spend promoting your artwork? – for example seeking working and exhibiting opportunities, looking for funding support, working on promotional literature, website etc.

2 hrs/day

11. Where would you most like to exhibit your work?

In Public

12. What is the normal price range of your work?

€250 – €1500

13. Have you been to art college or had any formal art education, if so please give details?

No

14. What do you think the perception of gallery artists is of the artists who exhibit on the railings?

They think we're s**ss
**Questionnaire**

**THE GATEKEEPER PROJECT** curated by Naomi Sex.

St Stephens Green Railings, Dublin, 21 – 23 August, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibitor's Name:</th>
<th>Stand:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Can you briefly describe the works you are showing here?
   - **POP ART STYLE PORTRAITS: ORIGINAL HAND PAINTED IN ACRYLICS ON 20" x 20" CANVAS (STRETCHED)**

2. What is the primary reason for showing your work at Stephens Green?
   - **TO GAIN EXPOSURE**

3. One of the stated purposes of the Stephens Green exhibitions is to 'promote the visual arts to the public of Dublin'. How do you think the public might benefit from these events when there are already galleries and museums dedicated to the visual arts in Dublin?
   - **CUTS OUT GALLERIES COMMISSION, SOME PEOPLE ARE RETICENT TO ENTER GALLERIES AND FEEL UNDER PRESSURE TO PURCHASE**

4. How often do you visit museums and art galleries?
   - **NOT VERY OFTEN. PERHAPS ONCE IN THE LAST YEAR.**

5. What is your favourite artwork by another artist?
   - **POP ART ALSO LIKE MONET**

6. What inspires you?
   - **FAMOUS ICONS OF ROCK AND OF FILMS**

7. As a means of getting to know someone people sometimes ask, 'What is your favourite colour? Is this still a relevant question, and if so how would you respond?
   - **NO ONE HAS ASKED ME THAT QUESTION BUT IF ASKED I WOULD SAY MY FAVOURITE COLOUR IS CERULEAN BLUE.**
8. How much time do you spend making art?
   
   4 hours each evening

9. Where do you normally make your artwork?
   
   Have a studio at home. My attic is converted and is used for my art only

10. How much time do you spend promoting your artwork? – for example seeking working and exhibiting opportunities, looking for funding support, working on promotional literature, website etc.
   
   Always on the look out for suitable venues. Constantly looking

11. Where would you most like to exhibit your work?
   
   I do Merrion Square Railings every Sunday. But I would like an indoor venue that would attract the general public with easy access to the passing trade.

12. What is the normal price range of your work?
   
   €150 - €275

13. Have you been to art college or had any formal art education, if so please give details?
   
   Self taught but went to evening classes to improve my technique. Art teacher: Catherine Lawlor

14. What do you think the perception of gallery artists is of the artists who exhibit on the railings?
   
   Frowned upon by many.

Questionnaire by John Graham for The Gatekeeper Project

www.johngraham.ie - [Redacted]
**Questionnaire**

**THE GATEKEEPER PROJECT** curated by Naomi Sex.

St Stephens Green Railings, Dublin, 21 – 23 August, 2009

Exhibitor’s Name: [Name Redacted]  
Stand: [Stand Number]

1. Can you briefly describe the works you are showing here?
   - Still life studies in acrylic
   - Impasto

2. What is the primary reason for showing your work at Stephens Green?
   - To make a living.

3. One of the stated purposes of the Stephens Green exhibitions is to ‘promote the visual arts to the public of Dublin’. How do you think the public might benefit from these events when there are already galleries and museums dedicated to the visual arts in Dublin?
   - Can’t have enough art displayed.
   - Buyers like to meet or talk to the artists.

4. How often do you visit museums and art galleries?
   - Not often enough. Every month or so.

5. What is your favourite artwork by another artist?
   - Van Gogh: "Sunflowers".

6. What inspires you?
   - Everything.

7. As a means of getting to know someone people sometimes ask, 'What is your favourite colour? Is this still a relevant question, and if so how would you respond?'
   - Colour reflects mood. So yes it is a relevant question. My favourite colour is purple whatever that means.
8. How much time do you spend making art?

I spent every day, 10 am to 4 pm.

9. Where do you normally make your artwork?

In my studio, in my back garden.

10. How much time do you spend promoting your artwork? – for example seeking working and exhibiting opportunities, looking for funding support, working on promotional literature, website etc.

I have my website, I try to contact galleries every three months to get new outlets. Exhibit on Regent Sq every Sunday.

11. Where would you most like to exhibit your work?

National Gallery, Venice!!

12. What is the normal price range of your work?

£500 - £5000

13. Have you been to art college or had any formal art education, if so please give details?

No. Self taught.

14. What do you think the perception of gallery artists is of the artists who exhibit on the railings?

Some might think they are better than us. But most realise we are all trying to make a living from art, in every way we can.
Questionnaire

THE GATEKEEPER PROJECT curated by Naomi Sex.

St Stephens Green Railings, Dublin, 21 – 23 August, 2009

Exhibitor’s Name: [redacted]  Stand:

1. Can you briefly describe the works you are showing here?

MIXTURE OF LANDSCAPES, FLOWERS, BIRDS

2. What is the primary reason for showing your work at Stephens Green?

TO SELL AND GET MY NAME KNOWN

3. One of the stated purposes of the Stephens Green exhibitions is to ‘promote the visual arts to the public of Dublin’. How do you think the public might benefit from these events when there are already galleries and museums dedicated to the visual arts in Dublin?

ART WORKS ARE CHEAPER THAN GALLERIES

4. How often do you visit museums and art galleries?

5-6 TIMES A YEAR

5. What is your favourite artwork by another artist?

I LIKE TOO MANY TO NAME
NOT ONE FAVOURITE

6. What inspires you?

NATURE

7. As a means of getting to know someone people sometimes ask, 'What is your favourite colour?' Is this still a relevant question, and if so how would you respond?

NOT A RELEVANT QUESTION

BUT I WOULD SAY BLUE
8. How much time do you spend making art?

2-4 Hours a week

9. Where do you normally make your artwork?

Home

10. How much time do you spend promoting your artwork? – for example seeking working and exhibiting opportunities, looking for funding support, working on promotional literature, website etc.

Very little

11. Where would you most like to exhibit your work?

Local Exhibitions

Galleries if they didn't take so much commission

12. What is the normal price range of your work?

£250 - £1,000

13. Have you been to art college or had any formal art education, if so please give details?

No

14. What do you think the perception of gallery artists is of the artists who exhibit on the railings?

Not serious or good enough

For a gallery
**Questionnaire**

**THE GATEKEEPER PROJECT** curated by Naomi Sex.

St Stephens Green Railings, Dublin, 21 – 23 August, 2009

Exhibitor’s Name: [Redacted]  
Stand: [Redacted]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Can you briefly describe the works you are showing here?</td>
<td>Doll CHARACTERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What is the primary reason for showing your work at Stephens Green?</td>
<td>TO EXHIBIT PUBLICLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. One of the stated purposes of the Stephens Green exhibitions is to ‘promote the visual arts to the public of Dublin’. How do you think the public might benefit from these events when there are already galleries and museums dedicated to the visual arts in Dublin?</td>
<td>SHOWS MAINSTREAM WORKS RATHER THAN SELECTIVE GALLERY WORKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How often do you visit museums and art galleries?</td>
<td>VERY REGULARLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What is your favourite artwork by another artist?</td>
<td>WORKS BY ENSOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What inspires you?</td>
<td>SIMPLICITY OF LIFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. As a means of getting to know someone people sometimes ask, 'What is your favourite colour? Is this still a relevant question, and if so how would you respond?</td>
<td>NOT RELEVANT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. How much time do you spend making art?
   Few Hours Per Week

9. Where do you normally make your artwork?
   At Home

10. How much time do you spend promoting your artwork? – for example seeking working and exhibiting opportunities, looking for funding support, working on promotional literature, website etc.
    Website

11. Where would you most like to exhibit your work?
    At an Exhibition

12. What is the normal price range of your work?
    €300 - €400

13. Have you been to art college or had any formal art education, if so please give details?
    No

14. What do you think the perception of gallery artists is of the artists who exhibit on the railings?
    Snobby Attitude.
Appendix I: Sound transcriptions from *A Structuring Structure*

N.B. This material has been edited so that all parties involved remain anonymous and at any part of the recorded material that in any way helped identify any individual this is notated as [Extracted material] below.

All parties included or referred to in the transcribed material below have been recorded anonymously using the following system:

W = Woman  
M = Man  
S = Organisation Staff

**Session 1**

*Morning Recorded Session held in the main gallery space on the first floor*

S – Are we ready to start?  
M x 2 – Yeah.  
M – Almost, yeah.  
M – It’s (artist’s name).  
M – It is (artist’s name).  
W – Do you know where that station is?  
M – It’s probably the (names place).  
[Extracted material]  
W – It’s interesting.  
M – Yes. We’ll go for it.  
M – Good.  
W – What is it? Is it paint? Is that paint?  
S – And this one?  
M – I think we’ll leave it.  
M – Possible?  
M – Possible.  
M – Is this another one by (artist’s name)? I think we have one.  
M – That’s another one?  
W – Is it a second one?  
S – Yeah.  
W – No to this.  
M – No.  
W – No.  
[Extracted material]  
W – That’s a finger.  
W – No.  
M – No.  
M – No.  
M – We accepted that before?  
M – Getting worried.  
M – How many have you?  
M – 79.
M – So we’re at 80.
M – Unicorn?
M – This is also by the same artist that we accepted.
W – It’s lovely
M – This is the same (artist’s name).
M – Let’s put one of them in.
M – Is that one of one?
S – No two.
M – Lean forward a little (speaking to staff member)
M – I’d give it a vote.
M – I would give it a vote.
M – No.
M – We rejected two of (artist’s name).
M – That’s very nice.
M – You would not, I think it’s very nice.
M – It’s lovely.
M – We did, we accepted one of them before.
M – No we didn’t accept it.
M – No.
M – No.
[Extracted material]
M – (artist’s name).
W – No.
[Exerted material]
M – Who’s it a portrait of?
[Extracted material]
M – Crossword.
M – Crossword still alive.
M – Anyone?
M – Yeah.
W – Yeah.
M – Will we bring him around will we? Sit it down there now.
M – An etching? Indaglio
M – Will we move them quickly, we’re taking a long time.
W – No.
M – No.
W – Same artist?
[Extracted material]
M – No.
S – None of them?
M – No.
M – Hang on, let’s see, maybe we’ll take the middle one?
M – You’ll have to call for a vote S – Do you want to vote?
M – Why not?
M – No.
M – No.
S – No?
M – No.
M – What’s the medium in that, is it guasch or watercolour?
W – It’s very interesting.
S – Watercolour.
M – It’s a crazy mount, but it’s a nice painting.
W – Yeah.
M – I’ll give that a vote.
S – We’ll take a vote on it.
M – Yeah.
S – One, two, three, four.
M – Anyone voting for that?
M – No.
W – We did yeah...
M – There was two by this artist already?
M – Yeah.
M – Two small ones.
M – Strange that.
M – No, take it away please.
[Extracted material]
M – That one there.
M – Do you want to have a quick look?
W – Yeah.
M – No.
W – No.
M – The first one was good.
M – Almost.
M – Almost.
M – Are they stitched on? No they’re not.
[Exerted material]
M – (artist’s name).
M – (artist’s name)?
M – No.
M – Is it, no it’s two separate ones … what’s the name?
S – (artist’s name).
M – Overcoat.
S – Anybody, no?
S – Did you guess the title?
M – I got eyes that see through.
S – Yeah, I know.
M – Boots and shirt.
M – No.
M – Is that a (artist’s name)?
M – That’s flash isn’t it?
M – That is pretty good isn’t it?
M – That’s (artist’s name).
M – These are very, these are extraordinary.
M – These are good.
W – Yeah, I think they are.
M – And the other one there is something else.
M – The one on the right.
M – Okay let’s vote on the one on the right.
M – The left.
M – A double whammy.
M – No.
M – It’s actually falling apart.
M – Maybe it’s deliberate.
M – A self-destructive painting.
[Extracted material]
M – Do you want kitsch?
S – I love it.
M – Who is the artist?
M – (artist’s name)
M – No.
M – Any takers?
M – No.
M – I like the one on the right.
M – I think they’re happy accidents.
M – Do you?
M – I’d give that right one a vote.
M – Let’s vote on the one on the right.
M – Put those two in ‘possible’, we’ll have a look at it later.
M – No.
M – Just one of one?
W – Is it well executed?
M – I’ll let you make up your own minds.
M – I think it’s conte.
M – Okay any votes for that one?
M – No votes?
M – Landing strip is it?
M – No.
W – No thank you.
M – No.
M – Oh right. Is that the title of it?
W – No thanks.
M – (artist’s name).
M – Oh it is, yeah.
M – I kind of like that, I like that.
S – There is a third one inside.
M – Well we could vote on them, could we?
M – Yeah let’s vote.
S – This one?
M/W – Possible.
W – This one is kind of nice.
M – I like that one there.
S – He won a prize last year.
M – He was what?
S – (artist’s name).
M – It’s lovely.
M – Yeah, we’re voting on this one.
M – No.
M – Same artist?
S – Yeah same artist.
M – No.
M – What’s the name on that?
M – It’s a shame about the framing, it kills it.
M – I like that.
M – Are we voting on any of this?
W – No, the framing on it.
M – Pity. They almost have something there.
M – What about the one that’s near (staff member’s name)?
M – No.
M – No votes.
M – Drypoints is it, who’s the artist?
W – I like that, I think I’ll vote for that.
M – (artist’s name), she’s an invited artist, that’s a lovely piece.
M – Is she invited?
M – What’s her name?
M – (artist’s name).
M – Let’s take a vote on that, let’s take a vote on it.
S – Possible.
M – Possible, yeah.
M – (artist’s name), yeah I like that.
M – Possible.
M – No.
W – No.
M – No, I’d say.
S – I love this one.
[Extracted material]
M – Wow!
M – Who’s the artist?
S – (artist’s name).
M – No.
M – Same person?
M – No.
M – No.
M – Are we still on L?
S – M.
M – M.
S – No.
M – I don’t think we need to see it, do we?
M – Actually yeah, I think we do, yeah.
M – I think she… what’s the artist’s name?
M – No it’s not. Did he have a piece in last year?
M – Is it (artist’s name)? (artist’s name), he had a piece in last year, yeah.
S – Did he?
M – It was a better piece, it was better than this one.
S – Can you see it?
M – Any votes?
M – It is trying to say something, yeah.
S – One vote, okay.
M – He had a better one in last year.
M – It’s not the worst.
M – No, it’s not the worst actually.
M – Is that (artist’s name)?
M – That’s a good painting.
W – It’s a bit… it’s intense.
M – I still like it.
S – We can we take a vote on it so then?.
S – One, two, three – that’s going in.
M – It is different, yeah.
M – No.
M – No.
M – No.
M – Is that (artist’s name)?
S – It is yeah.
M – Maybe that one there is, that’s kinda better than the large one.
M – I’d give that one a vote.
M – What’s the title of (describes a work)?
S – This one? (title of work).
M – (title of work).
M – Wonder how it’s done?
S – Are these two no?
S – Are they in?
M – Possible (states).
S – Possible.
M – No.
M – That’s the other (artist’s name).
S – Yeah.
M – Yeah, it’s a bit…
M – One more, go on.
M – No.
W – No.
M – Is it a drawing?
M – (artist’s name).
M – (artist’s name) Who?
M – (artist’s name).
M – He’s been doing large drawings for years.
M – He makes drawings.
M – Let’s take a vote.
S – Take a vote on the painting?
M – Hang on, hang on, we have three here.
M – The one on the right? The one in the middle.
S – Possible, drawing in the middle.
M – Is there one more?
S – They’re all possibles.
M – Maybe that one facing down?
S – No?
M – No.
M – Probably the way it is, that’s a solid black anyhow.
M – Hairdresser is it?
M – Any votes on that?
M – No.
W – She has invited work in, just to let you know.
M – Who’s the artist?
M – (artist’s name).
S – She has one big invited piece.
W – It’s a nice drawing.
M – We already have one.
M – It’s a huge piece.
[Extracted material]
M – Will we vote for this?
M – Show of hands please.
M – Give it a vote.
[Extracted material]
S – Okay we’ll take a vote then.
M – Okay, one on the right.
S – No.
S – This one here?
S – No.
S – No.
M – No goers.
M – Wow!
M – Is it oil paint?
M – It’s kind of phenomenal.
M – That’s lovely.
S – (artist’s name).
M – It’s strange.
M – What’s the system there (staff member’s name)? What’s happening behind?
S – They’re filling in the forms.
M – Very good – double jobbing.
M – Any votes anyone?
M – No.
S – One, two, three, four.
S – No?
M – Pardon? I’m afraid not.
M – The one on the left, let’s vote on the one on the left.
M – Actually the one on the left is quite good.
M – Left.
S – Possible.
S – It’s possible.
[Extracted material]
M – Is it a triptych?
S – Not a triptych.
M – What are the titles on it?
M – (title of work).
S – Do you want to take a vote on any of them?
M – Is that a lamp?
M – Is it one?
M – Yeah I like that.
S – Ya have to hear the title.
M – What’s the title?
S – (title of work).
M – What’s the title?
M – (title of work).
S – One, two, three, no –
M – Not bad.
M – These are carborundums are they?
M – (artist’s name).
M – She’s an invited artist.
M – Oh well…
S – No mixed medium.
M – Mixed media.
M – The one on the right?
M – Yeah the one on the right is alright.
S – This one?
M – I’ll give it a vote.
S – No?
[Extracted material]
S – No?
M – Who’s that? (artist’s name). What is the title?
M – Anyone interested? No.
M – Do you know her?
M – I do, yeah, she is nice
M – Is this a second time?
W – Is this the same artist?
M – No.
S – No?
M – No.
W – No.
W – No.
M – Two out of ten, that sums it up.
S – This is (artist’s name)…
M – Is it? I kinda like that, it’s a bit shiny.
M – Is it a bit shiny.
M – Who’s the artist? They’re very hot.
M – I don’t like the framing.
S – We take a vote then?
M – Yes.
S – Six, seven, eight – possible.
S – How many?
M – Is it (artist’s name)?
[Extracted material]
M – No, no.
M – Is it better than (artist’s name)?
M – It is.
W – That’s kind of weird isn’t it?
M – Is that a monoprint? Does it say on the back?
S – Drypoint.
M – Drypoint?
W – Carborundum?
S – Carborundum.
S – (artist’s name)
W – It’s nice.
M – Yes.
M – Okay (staff member’s name).
S – This one? This one?
M – Move it on, sorry (artist’s name). I’m jumping the gun.
M – What’s the title?
M – (title of piece) is it?
S – There is a third.
M – Who’s this?
W – No.
M – The one on the right.
M – Best to vote on the one on the right.
M – No? Possible?
M – Is that possible, is it?
S – Yeah.
M – Finished?
S – Yeah.
M – Who’s the artist?
S – (artist’s name).
M – (artist’s name), yeah, he does that kind of work.
M – If you look at it, sorry, the line is cut through, see that? – I like it.
M – That’s fantastic.
M – He’s a serious painter.
M – No, you’re Okay I’ll move this one.
S – Okay, we’ll take a vote, two, three, four, five – possible?
M – Possible.
M – Possible.
M – Anyone for this one?
W – No thank you.
M – No.
[Extracted material]
M – I like this one.
W – What’s the name?
M – (artist’s name) is his name.
M – Is it the same fella as before?
M – Yeah.
[Extracted material]
M – Nope.
[Extracted material]
M – Same artist is it?
M – It looks tiny, doesn’t it?
M – No.
M – What letter are we on now?
M – Mc’s.
S – We’ll be finished them now.
M – We’re flying through it.
[Extracted material]
M – No.
W – Oh it’s (name of place).
[Extracted material]
M – It isn’t really.
M – Lovely drawing.
S – No?
M – The one on the left.
M – Do you want to bring them around so you can have a close up?
S – There’s a third one.
S – No?
M – I don’t think they hold up.
M – No they don’t hold up.
S – No?
M – No.
M – Anyone want to vote on any of these?
M – The one on the right.
M – That’s worth a possible?
M – Is that the same one?
M – I like that one.
M – It is a better piece, it’s better.
S – Possible? Gone? Gone.
S – Very slick isn’t it?
M – Look at the eye socket.
M – Well, it’s a powerful statement, there’s no doubt about that.
M – Too powerful a statement.
M – Yeah, too powerful.
M – Did we accept one already?
S – There are two pieces.
M – I’m not mad about that one.
M – The other one is better.
M – Yeah I think so.
M – Any votes for this?
S – This one?
M – No.
M – Change?
M – Who’s this artist?
M – This is (artist’s name).
M – It’s very beautiful.
M – He’s very good.
M – He is very good, yeah.
M – He’s in (name of organisation).
W – They are absolutely gorgeous.
S – Okay, we’ll vote on this piece here?
M – Okay, yeah.
S – Yeah.
S – Middle?
W – Yeah.
S – Possible?
[Extracted material]
S – No I’m not, and this piece? Possible?
S – Possibles.
S – Okay, so this one is accepted.
M – Did we accept the small one?
M – No the big one.
M – Just the big one we accepted.
M – No.
M – Seen that before didn’t we?
M – Seen two of his before.
M – There was a feature on him in last (name of publication).
M – A piece on him in the (name of publication)?
M – Yeah last (name of day).
S – (artist’s name).
M – I like that.
M – It’s nice.
M – Give it a vote.
S – Four, five, six possible.
M – Who is it?
M – Don’t know.
S – It’s (artist’s name).
M – That’s familiar.
M – It is a good name for an artist, yeah.
M – It’s the same artist, same one?
M – Same guy?
M – Okay that’s the same artist? How many have we got? Two.
M – I’d give that a vote.
M – Give that a vote.
M – That’s not bad at all.
M – Is that it, is it? Good.
M – Any votes?
M – Yeah I’ll give it a vote.
S – All the same artist.
M – What’s the one on the right?
M – No.
M – No.
M – Want to bring it close? Anyone want to vote on it?
M – Anybody want to vote on it?
S – Four? No.
W – I like it.
S – No?
M – Yeah I’d give it a vote.
M – No?
M – Is that one of two?
M – It does go to show, we can subvert abstraction.
M – Okay, bye.
M – What’s our headcount now?
M – That’s (artist’s name) he’s got a (name of studio)?
M – Hold on, we have another one here.
M – Nice brush work.
M – Is this the same artist?
S – No.
M – Time is lunch?
M – Five minutes.
S – Downstairs, NOPQRS.
S – Then we’ll have to do the possibles.
S – Any votes?
M – That’s (artist’s name) as well, we have accepted a small one anyway.
M – Last M yeah?
M – No.
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M – No.
M – No.
W – No.
S – Okay, are we ready?
S – N.
M – No.
M – No, can everyone see? It is? Are we? Yeah?
S – Is that N over here?
M – You can get up if you want.
W – No.
M – It’s amazing how the light is.
M – No.
M – That one (panel member’s name)?
M – Are they same artist yeah? No.
M – No.
M – Do you want me to stay in here, you can take this chair if you want? Alright.
M – We might need it tilted forward a bit.
S – Yeah.
M – What letter are we on?
S – N.
M – I can’t see a thing.
M – I can’t see.
M – No it’s alright, there’s nothing to see.
M – Can you see that (panel member’s name)?
M – Yeah I can thanks (staff member’s name).
M – No they’re not black, they are monochromatic.
M – Is that (artist’s name)?
M – Yeah.
M – That’s (artist’s name).
M – Is it just one of those is it?
S – Just one.
M – I’ll bring this close up to people.
M – Quite a fine printmaker.
M – Will we vote on the (artist’s name)?
M – Yep, that’s in.
S – That’s an acceptance.
M – No.
M – No.
M – No votes.
M – Is that the (names nationality) artist?
S – Yeah.
M – We might have to look at his closer.
W – Is it shiny? It’s very interesting.
M – It’s lacquered, you know (names nationality) lacquering.
W – Very subtle, beautiful.
M – It’s lacquered, just in case you’re wondering; it’s not a kitchen top.
M – Ok? Wanna vote on it?
W – Yeah.
M – Yeah.
S – Possible.
M – Eh, just tilt them forward a little bit please, yeah grand. No.
M – No.
W – No.
S – No? Grand.
M – Any votes?
M – No.
M – No.
M – Let’s have a look at this?
M – What’s the title?
M – Quite impressive, is it photographic or what is it? It’s a photograph.
S – It’s a photo – montage inkjet print.
W – Is it painted on the photograph?
M – No it’s actually… it may have a faded background, it’s a photo on canvas.
M – Photo on canvas? No.
S – Are you going to vote on these?
M – What’s the name?
S – (artist’s name) or (artist’s second name).
M – It’s not too bad though.
M – It’s a pity it’s not a painting.
M – It’s a photograph?
M – It’s a photographic process on canvas.
W – I think it’s a photograph.
M – It’s a photograph; put it in tomorrow.
M – Are we judging it in the wrong category? It’s judged in the wrong category.
M – It’s a good photo though isn’t it?
M – It’s probably heightened, you know.
M – No.
M – Just tilt it forward.
M – No.
M – No.
M – Which is better? Is the light better that way?
W/M – No.
M – No.
W – No, Thank you.
S – She’s been up already (artist’s name).
M – Oh that’s a beautiful painting, she’s a very good painter this girl (artist’s name).
S – Do you to go around with that?
M – Sure, yeah.
S – (artist’s name) was in the (names contemporary exhibition) and …
W – I like that.
M – It’s quite thick, the paint, let’s just get an idea of the density of the paint, it’s quite buttery and scored into.
W – Yes, yes.
M – Okay.
S – Will you vote on that piece then? In.
M – No.
[Extracted material]
S – Are these no’s?
M – Shame about the frames, because the paintings… well.
W – (Panel member’s name), are you taking off your jacket?
M – Yeah.
S – No’s?
M – Anyone want to vote?
M – Could we see that one please?
W – Shame.
M – Terrible.
S – Okay, No.
M – No.
M – Oh what’s his name?
M – (artist’s name).
M – Let’s see this.
S – Just stick this on.
S – Yeah.
M – Are they all the same (panel member’s name)? Is it collage?
M – No it’s paint, I like this one actually.
M – Who’s the artist?
S – (artist’s name).
M – No they are a bit makey-up-y.
M – Not worth the effort.
M – Can’t say we don’t study the work.
M – He’s bending over backwards.
S – So it’s no to all of these?
M – No.
M – Is it collage (panel member’s name)?
M – Yeah it’s collage.
M – There seems to be a necessity for a lot more of this in this light, it’s not going to make any difference though is it?
M/W – No.
M – Anything in glass needs to be tilted a bit maybe or the light at the same time, No.
M – Yeah we’ll end up feeling the things.
M – Two of those are there? They’re not bad now.
M – I like the smaller one.
M – Hang on, let’s have a look, this is another one of these, I think, photo montages.
M – (artist’s name).
M – Is it?
M – What’s it say on the back?
M – Acrylic on water paper.
S – It’s acrylic.
M – No that’s a painting.
W – I like the little one.
M – It’s lovely, yeah, the little one.
M – Let’s just see.
M – Are we going to vote?
S – Okay. We take a vote on this one, and this one? Possible.
M – Who’s the artist?
S – (artist’s name) from (names place).
M – No.
M – No, thanks.
M – It’s better here than where I was.
M – I like it.
M – You need to tilt it back.
M – The light is terrible isn’t it, we need to… it’s very hard to see.
M – I wonder can we come around a bit. If we were to sit around along here?
M – And have this here?
S – With the fluorescent over ye?
M – Yeah.
S – Yeah we can move it.
M – It would be quicker in the end.
M – Is it any better this way?
M/W – Yes.
M – I think we need to.
M – We’ll all sit along here.
S – Yes that’s fine. Can we take a vote on these?
M – Yes.
S – One, two, three… possible.
M – Bring the pictures back when we’re looking at them.
M – Yes it is.
M – No. Anything with glass will need to be tilted forward.
M – No takers?
M – Any takers, No – no takers.
S – One of one.
M – Tilt it forward – No.
M – No.
M – No.
M – Tilt it forward slightly.
M – It’s (names place).
S – It is (names place), I’d say.
M – I don’t know if they read all that well…
M – No they don’t read so…
W – No, close up they don’t.
M – The one on the right is pleasant enough.
S – Do you want to have a look?
M – Well it’s not very well painted – a bit heavy handed.
M – Do you want to vote on them individually? – No.
M – I’d give a vote to that one.
M – Let’s have a vote on the right.
M – What’s the artist’s name?
S – (artist’s name).
M – No.
M – No.
W – Oh no.
M – I like the frame though.
M – Tilt it slightly please. No.
M – If anyone wants to vote on anything, just say it.
S – Yeah.
M – No.
M – No.
M – No.
M – No.
M – (artist’s name).
M – Okay.
M – These are different, they’re nice aren’t they? Will I pass them around?
M – They are all very similar, so do we accept them? Two? We take two?
M – One, I’d go with.
W – One.
M – I like this one and this one.
W – Yeah I like those too.
S – Okay we’ll vote individually on these ones then.
M – That one in the middle is very attractive.
M – Well take these two though – they work, they support each other.
S – This one is a no is it?
M – Yeah.
M – Let’s vote on those two together then.
S – We…
M – We have exactly 100 selected.
W – How many should we have?
M – A hundred and sixty-seven was last year.
M – We still have the possibles to go through.
M – I’d be inclined to go with one of these personally, I move for a vote for one of
them, and am going to vote for that one there.
M – I’d go for the one in the middle.
M – The middle one.
W – It’s kind of waxy.
M – I wouldn’t vote for any of them.
M – Would you not?
M – I’d like to get a vote anyway, can I get a vote for the middle one.
M – Alright.
M – Yeah, I’ll…
M – No.
M – No.
M – Any votes on that?
M – Any takers?
W – No thank you.
W – No thank you.
M – No.
W – No thank you.
W – Looks like (artist’s name).
M – I’d say it is.
M – Who’s the title on the one on the left?
M – No the other one.
M – Yeah that’s her.
[Extracted material]
M – Not bad.
M – They’re nice actually
M – They both by the same artist?
M – Lovely.
W – That’s all very, very good.
M – Yeah it’s lovely.
M – I don’t like the signature.
M – No it’s a pity isn’t it? Take away the signature and we’d get something else.
W – I think we should go for this one.
S – We’re voting on this one on the table.
M – The (names subject matter).
W – Is that one for sale, the head?
S – No he’s not.
M – Neither are for sale.
S – No.
W – Can you do that, can you?
M – You can, yeah.
M – No, they are little mini (artist’s name).
W – Oh dear.
M – He’s scary.
M – How much are they charging for that?
S – They are charging €3,000.
M – Yeah, good value for money
M – No.
M – No.
M – Well, as an idea it’s okay, but I mean it’s…
S – (artist’s name).
M – The one on the left has something, has it?
S – Do you want to see them on their own?
M/W – Yeah.
S –
M – No.
S – That one’s a no.
M – Any votes on this?
M – That one’s not bad.
M – Any votes on that one?
M – I’ll give it a vote.
S – One vote up?
M – I’ll give it a lash.
S – Two, three, four, five, six … possible.
M – Possible.
S – I’ll leave that to you then.
W – Yep.
S – Goats?
M – Give her a …
M – Yeah.
W – They’re very shoddily framed, unfortunately.
M – No.
M – No.
W – No.
M – No.
M – Girls chatting.
S – There’s some outside ....
W – You’re right, it is.
[Extracted material]
M – Any takers?
M – There’s an awful lot of twins.
M – No.
S – Nothing?
S – Sorry, I got two.
W – Red is awful.
M – It is, woeful.
W – It’s falling apart.
S – The whole thing is going to come apart here; I’ll take it over there. I tell you what
I’ll just do this.
M – How many have we in?
S – You don’t need it here, no?
M – (artist’s name).
W – No thank you.
W – It’s not bad.
M – It’s not, it’s nice.
M – She really ....
W – Is it a (names subject matter)?
W – (names subject matter).
M – Who’s the artist?
M – Who’s the artist in that?
M – The name of the artist ....
S – Oh sorry, these pieces are ... and that ....
M – Oh these are (artist name)?
S – Yeah.
W – That has something.
M – Yeah, it does.
M – Yeah.
M – She’s a working artist. I know her.
W – I’m going to vote on that one.
M – I’ll give that a vote.
M – Yeah.
M – I’m surprised how good it is.
M – Yeah, it’s nice, it is yeah.
W – Nicely done, you know.
W – Yeah.
S – We’ll take a vote on this one then, on the table?
M – I’ll give that a vote.
W – Yeah.
S – And the one on this side?
M – Yeah.
W – Yes.
M – Yeah.
M – Okay.
W – It needs to be marked, it’s not marked?
S – No, it’s one of the possibles you looked at.
M – Any takers?
M – No.
W – No thank you.
M – No.
W – It’s hard to get in.
W – I think the use of design ....
M – Yeah (names subject matter). Not too many (names subject matter) is there?
W – It’s saying something about the world around you know.
M – There’s one here.
M – Yeah.
M – That’s it, people are painting their chickens.
M – It’s a nice colour to use ....
W – Nice use of containers.
M – Yeah.
W – Those are okay.
M – I like the one on the left.
W – Yeah.
M – Yeah.
W – I like the middle one.
S – (artist’s name) is the artist.
M – Whose are they ?
W/M/S – (artist’s name).
M – I like the middle one as well.
W – I like the middle one.
M – All three of them are quite, like ....
M – Yeah.
S – Do you want to have a vote on these? Do you want to have a look at the middle one?
S – One, two, three ....
M – It’s lovely.
S – Four, five, six, seven.
W – Possible.
M – It’s possible.
S – The middle one?
M – The middle one.
M – Middle one.
S – It’s accepted.
M – Accepted.
S – And the far side?
M – I like that one.
M – Yeah, I’ll give that a vote.
S – Possible.
M – Possible.
M – Two possibles.
S – That’s accepted yeah, accepted?
M – There’s two possibles.
M – I don’t know, I don’t know. (panel member’s name) might know. (Panel member’s name) who’s that chap?
M – I don’t know.
M – (artist’s name).
M – He used to exhibit in (names place) with (artist’s name).
M – Did he?
M – Yep the two of them together.
M – Yeah.
M – (artist’s name)?
M – (artist’s name) yeah.
M – Is this the same artist?
S – (artist’s name)
M – No.
M – Any takers?
M – No.
W – No.
S – No to both of these?
M – No.
M – Any takers?
W – No.
M – No.
M – It’s getting tougher to break down isn’t it?
W – If only.
M – Are we still on “O’s”?
S – Yeah, “O’s”
M – What’s the one on the left like?
W – Yeah, what kind of ....
S – Your left? My left?
W – This one?
S – This one?
M – No, the other one.
M – That was the one on the left.
W –This is it then?
M – Same artist is it?
S – Yeah.
M – What’s the other one?
M – (staff member’s name), if you could bring it over here please.
M – Did we see that one?
M – No.
M – I like that one really.
S – Yeah?
M – I’d give that a vote.
M – Oh, it’s got paper and stuff ....
W – Yeah.
M – Yeah.
W – Collage.
M – Yeah, yeah, no.
W – No, no, no, no.
M – Don’t think ....
S – Let’s vote. Anyone?
M – I’d give it a vote.
M – No.
S – Pick one here.
M – Small one.
M – Yeah small one.
S – No. And then this one?
M – Make the possible did it?
W – No.
S – No. Seven for possible, twelve for accepted.
M – Oh, they’re nice water colours.
S – These are water colours.
M – (artist’s name) no?
S – No.
M – No.
W – No.
S – (artist’s name).
M – (artist’s name), she’s based in (names country).
M – She’s (names nationality); she’s a (names nationality) isn’t she?
W – That’s the (names place).
M – It’s (names place).
W – (names place).
M – That’s...
M – (names place).
W – Ah, oh yeah.
M – Yeah.
M – She’s not no, she’s (names nationality).
M – Oh right, okay.
M – That’s great.
M – I think they’re very good water colours personally.
W – They are yeah.
M – Yeah
M – They’re as good as you’ll get.
M – Yeah.
S – Which one are we starting with?
M – She’s made some fine work.
W – That one there.
S – One, two, three, four, five, six. It’s possible the middle one?
W – Definitely, it’s gorgeous.
M – I think we should get one of these entries in; she’s a very well-known artist.
M – I think so, you know, a good (names nationality) artist; it’s great to get international work in.
S – This one?
S – So three possibles?
S – So that’s a no.
M – Three possibles? Surely we... all right.
M – Ah we should accept one of them. Come on, just get it done. The one on the right.
M – I don’t like that.
M – I’d vote the one on the right.
M – She’s a very good water colourist.
W – I’d vote for that one there.
M – So would I.
M – I mean, it’s great.
S – Accepted?
M – What about the other two?
S – And two possibles?
W – I like the ....
M – I like all of them, and am going to vote for each of them equally.
M – Yeah, I would vote...
S – That’s not enough votes ....
M – I like the two outside ones.
S – That’s got enough votes to be possible. What about this one?
M – Possible.
W – That’s possible as well.
M – I like the middle one.
M – She’s a (names medium used) ... of the best kind.
W – More work needed.
S – White chalk on black paper.
W – What’s the point about the sketch book edging on the paper?
M – None.
M – I know, it’s a contradiction, isn’t it? Because it makes it look like a sketching.
M – Yeah.
M – Everything is set up like a ....
M – I’ll let you pass that one around there.
M – Has this, that one, got anything there does it?
M – That one there.
M – Does it have something?
W – Mean something there, yeah.
M – That’s quite well handled up there.
M – I think it has...
M – It’s not that bad but it’s ....
M – Boring? Not bad but boring?
M – Yeah it is, yeah.
W – Yeah, very boring.
M – Yeah, it’s terribly boring. And the signature gives it away.
S – Both of those yeah?
M – I’m going to vote for the one on the left.
W – The one on the left, yeah.
S – Two.
M – Any takers?
M – No.
M – No.
W – No.
M – No.
S – On any of them?
W – No.
W – No, no, no, no.
M – Any takers?
S – Same artist.
M – He always tries every year, you know.
M – Who’s that?
W – You’re not serious?
M – (artist’s name).
M – I haven’t a clue, but I just kind of recognise it and the signature. The shape on the bottom right.
M – People never learn.
W – Has he ever got in?
M – No.
M – No. I just recognise him each year.
M – (artist’s name) is the same, he applies every year.
W – That (names specific colour) .... (names specific colour) is so out of ....
M – I know yeah, it’s terrible isn’t it? Out of a skip.
W – Oh my goodness.
M – Any takers?
M – None at all.
W – No?
W – I think the middle one’s amazing actually.
M – Yeah, okay.
M – What do you think?
M – I don’t know ....
M – She was invited from the art show as well.
M – Was she, yeah?
M – Was she?
M – Yeah.
W – Yeah.
M – She was what?
M – She was invited from the art show.
M – What’s her name again?
S – (artist’s name).
M – For the what show?
S – For the art show ....
S – (names title of show)
M – She’s in then ....
M – It’s actually .... I mean, they’re very well executed.
S – This one?
W – I’d vote for the middle one.
W – The middle one, the hare.
M – Let’s vote.
W – Yeah.
M – (Staff members name) an we have a look at the middle one on its own.
S – This may be upside down.
M – She takes a bit of getting used to.
W – That’s wonderful.
M – No, the other way.
M – I’d go for the middle one.
M – Or this, the small one.
W – Yeah.
M – The small one?
W – (names subject matter).
S – This piece?
M – (artist’s name) are popular this year.
S – The middle piece?
M – Okay.
M – Give it a go.
S – One, two, three ... no.
M – Ah.
S – And this piece here?
M – No.
W – No.
M – Actually no.
W – Not that.
S – Okay.
M – No, it’s a… it’s...
M – What is it?
M – A (names subject matter)?
M – I think it’s some kind of (names subject matter), that’s found...
W – A (names subject matter)?
M – No.
W – A bit damp that, that castle isn’t it?
M – They can get the damp proofers in any time.
S – Okay.
M – No.
M – No.
W – No.
S – Did we vote no?
M – It’s not brilliant.
M – Who’s the artist?
S – (artist’s name).
M – Oh (artist’s name)?
W – Good name.
W – Self-portrait.
S – (artist’s name)? No?
M – ...Yeah they are, aren’t they?
M – She was on (names TV channel).
M – Oh she does, wasn’t she on the …?
M – Okay, votes for this one?
M – What does she do again?
M – She used to do art classes as well, or art programmes on (names TV channel).
M – This is what do you call her, (artist’s name) is it?
S – Yeah.
M – (artist’s name) yeah.
M – What’s … eh? Any of them there any good? What’s the middle one like (artist’s name)?
M – The middle one up close ....
M – Well, there’s plenty of life in it you know?
M – Is it ... the middle one’s okay you know.
M – I think the middle one’s good.
M – Is he a kind of railing artist?
M – I don’t know.
M – He’s gone full-time with the art; he used to be with the (names state body).
M – Yeah.
M – Yeah.
M – I’d … I’d … I’d definitely give ....
M – Give the middle one a ....
M – He won a prize last year as well.
S – These end ones are no’s yeah?
M – No, no I would like to have a vote on that.
S – Okay, we’ll start doing them all individually – this one?
M – What about that one, is it a good one?
S – That’s a no. The centre one?
S – Possible.
M – Yeah.
M – The third one?
S – Is a no.
M – It’s well painted though.
M – They’ll be sorry yet.
M – Yeah he does, yeah.
S – That’s a really fine little title.
M – That’s not a good recommendation.
M – No, I suddenly change my mind now.
M – No I don’t think ....
M – Any takers?
M – Any takers?
M – No.
M – No.
S – One, two, three, four, five, six ....
M – Stick them closer ....
W – Six? One is for sorrow, two is for joy ....
W – Three for a girl, four for a boy, five for a ....
S – The title of the work is (names title of work).
M – That’s right yeah.
W – What’s six though?
M – I can’t remember what six is.
W – Six? Six?
M – It has a (names subject matter).
W – Good man.
W – Good, good, I’ll go for that.
M – It’s a (names subject matter).
W – Yeah.
M – That’s a beautiful ....
M – They’re like (names subject matter) or something.
M – Yeah.
S – No?
W – They are (names subject matter).
M – They are (names subject matter).
M – They are really, yeah.
M – Any takers?
M – No.
M – No.
W – No.
W – That’s from that (artist’s name) girl who was ...?
M – Well, it looks like it.
W – Yeah.
M – Probably isn’t. Just a ....
M – Definitely the ears ....
M – Any takers?
M – No.
M – This is the second one of these we’ve had.
W – Is it?
M – Who’s the ....
W – Yeah.
W – I’ll have that.
M – It shows the old and the new.
W – I must go and do a lottery ticket immediately.
M – And the bridge yeah... Is that the (names place)?
M – Yeah.
M – Or the (names place).
M – It looks a bit dodgy in that.
M – (names place).
S – That’s the (names place)
M – (names place)
W – Oh the Girl With The Dragon Tattoo.
[Extracted material]
M – Any takers?
M – No.
M – It’s very atmospheric.
S – No, come back for ....
M – Do you like it?
M – No I do not!
M – Oh wow!
M – Any takers?
M – No.
M – No.
W – No.
W – There’s nothing as bad ....
M – Yeah.
M – It’s very (names nationality) though isn’t it? Must be an artist ....
M – She’s pick pocketing there ....
M – Any takers?
W – There’s a new device ....
M – It’s like a chamber of horrors.
W – Look at that.
M – (names subject matter).
W – What do you call it?
S – (names subject matter).
S – No.
W – No.
W – Okay.
W – Oh?
W – (artist’s name). It’s (artist’s name).
M – I like the ....
W – It’s (artist’s name), is it?
W – No.
M – Yeah it is.
W – Yeah.

[Extracted material]
M – Yeah. It’s (names subject matter) as the (names subject matter).
M – It is.
W – Is that (names subject matter)?
M – (names subject matter).
S – That’s (names subject matter).
W – Is it?
M – We’re not doing very well down here are we?
S – We’ve taken five or six.
M – Have we?
M – Well the works been... pretty terrible.
M – Any takers?
M – No.
M – No.
W – No.
M – You know what’s wrong with this ....
M – Pardon?
M – You know what’s wrong with this?
M – I don’t really fancy that.
M – Ah well ... I’ll get him later.
M – That’s the third one by (artist’s name).
M – No.
M – Is that one by (artist’s name) is it?
M – No. It’s not a (artist’s name).
M – No.
M – No, it’s (artist’s name).
M – How could you vote for that?
W – Ah Jesus Christ.
M – No.
W – No.
S – No?
M – Ah, no, no, no.
M – Any takers?
M – No.
W – Triple gin and tonic.
M – ... That’s a bad sign.
M – I think so.
M – Terrible.
S – It’s on the little trolley.
W – Little trolley?
M – Any takers?
M – No.
M – No.
W – What is it?
W – It’s shiny stuff ....
W – Must be a new material is it?
M – No.
M – Has this one here got something?
W – No.
W – It’s (names subject matter) yeah.
M – Yeah, this is (artist’s name).
M – Wheeler?
W – Looks very nice, doesn’t it? Yeah.
M – It has got something, hasn’t it?
M – It has, yeah.
S – So (artist’s name) is this artist.
M – Yes.
M – That is a nice piece.
S – One, two, three, four...
S – If you want a piece by this artist.
S – ... Four, five, possible.
M – Possibles yeah.
M – Any takers?
M – No.
W – No.
M – No.
W – No.
M – Shouldn’t have made it the down here.
M – No, looks very different ....
W – Really?
M – Compared with upstairs.
W – It is, it is very hard.
M – Upstairs is wonderful.
M – It is, it is a clear disadvantage to being called down here.
W – Yeah.
W – I don’t think so.
M – You don’t think so?
W – No.
M – Okay, well ....
W – It makes you see closer, to say like? Some type of? No?
M – No.
W – Yeah, I think the farmer has, like, locked up emotions.
W – Impressive, yeah.
M – Pardon?
M – Probably postpone the inevitable.
M – Maybe ‘cause we’re going to have to clear up soon.
W – Is it?
W – Is that the front?
M – No.
W – Look.
W – It is yeah.
M – Every time.
M – Live line is the main art form now.
M – It is yeah.
S – Yeah there’s a (artist’s name) here.
M – It is yeah.
M – What is the story there?
M – It’s oil on canvas, remember ....
M – Oh that’s our model above in the (names gallery).
M – (artist’s name).
W – Is the artist yeah.
M – Who’s the artist?
W – The artist?
M – (artist’s name).
M – Well it looks good.
W – Yeah.
M – I think that should be in.
M – Can we bring it around ....
S – Sure.
M – Just to show them. Just to get the light on it.
W – It’s pretty good.
M – It’s pretty well painted. Isn’t it?
W – Yeah, yeah.
M – Quite photographic.
M – Very, very well done.
W – Yeah very close.
W – Must have been done from photographs.
M – Ah they all are yeah, most of them are. Sure that’s not a bad thing either.
M – Strange sort of distortion that you get from a photograph, you know like that big hand there and that small hand there.
W – Yeah, yeah.
M – Is it too literal, is it?
M – I don’t know.
W – What do you mean literal? What do you mean by “literal”? 
M – It is a bit, isn’t it?
M – Well give it a vote.
M – I mean it’s well done but, give it a vote, do you want to give it a possible?
W – For God’s sake, give it a ....
M – Give it a possible?
W – Yeah.
M – Possible?
W – Possible yeah.
W – Yeah.
M – Is there any chance of seeing the possibles upstairs later?
W – Yes?
M – It depends if … it depends on how many there are.
W – Yeah.
W – Thanks.
S – It’s the same artist.
M – Any takers?
M – No.
W – No.
M – This one is a peach.
M – At the moment, there’s lots of possibilities.
W – That’s the joke, there’s only one!
W – God the frame on this one!
M – One frame would have been enough.
M – That’s a very disconcerting frame.
M – One frame would have been enough.
W – And the size of the whole thing.
W – It has ruined it, pretty much.
W – Yeah, yeah.
M – Any takers?
M – No, no.
W – No.
W – Extraordinary.
M – Any takers?
W – No way.
W – Is that the secret? Is that why they entered more than one?
M – Any takers?
W – No, no.
M – No.
W – Is that one crossing the border between graphic design and ....
S – It’s that fire, it’s actually making a red glow.
W – No, no, no.
M – No.
M – Any takers?
M – Will I turn off the fire (names staff member)?
W – I think the fire is shining off it.
M – Yeah.
M – I might redirect it.
W – Yeah.
M – Yeah, just turn it around the other way.
M – Bring it down there.
M – Thanks.
M – That’s it.
S – That’ll keep you warm.
W – That’s a great fire actually, isn’t it?
W – Yeah.
M – No.
W – Is that not (artist’s name)?
M – Any takers?
M – No.
M – No.
W – No.
W – The Prussian.
W – The frame almost gives it away, doesn’t it?
W – Even if you think it a good painting, the frame belongs to eh ....
W – No.
M – One of one.
M – No.
M – No.
W – Yeah.
W – No.
S – Three, apparently.
W – I think we saw them before.
W – Yeah.
M – Any takers?
W – No.
W – Where’s that?
M – Any takers?
M – No.
W – No.
W – No.
S – These two...
W – No.
M – No.
W – No.
W – God.
M – No.
M – Any takers?
W – No.
[Extracted material]
S – There’s a technical difficulty at the moment.
M – What’s that?
M – No...
M – Pictures?
W – Jesus!
[Extracted material]
M – How many of these artists?
M – Three, three more.
M – Four.
M – Yeah, (artist’s name).
M – Maybe move that over to that side of this.
M – Ah, just keep going.
M – Just keep going.
W – Keep going.
M – No.
W – No.
M – No.
W – No.
M – Just keep going.
M – No.
M – Any takers?
M – No.
W – No.
W – Oh my God!
M – What about the (names subject matter)?
W – Oh my God.
W – Apparently (names subject matter) are in at the moment.
M – (names subject matter)?
M – Not as much as they were last year.
W – Love (names subject matter).
W – Really?
M – Last year you’d had lots of (names subject matter).
W – Yeah.
M – Very few in comparison to this year.
M – I wouldn’t mind having a look at the (names subject matter) a bit closer.
W – Alright.
W – Is it this one is it?
M – Lots of horses this year.
M – Here we are, (artist’s name).
M – I went to college with him.
M – Did you?
M – Yeah.
M – What’s his name?
M – (artist’s name). He went off and studied in (names place).
M – How would you make ...Why would you make?
M – Give it a rosette.
M – That’s like … that’s (names subject matter).
W – It doesn’t look well that bull.
M – No.
M – It doesn’t, you’re right.
[Extracted material]
W – Oh my goodness me.
W – That’s original alright.
M – Well if you’re going to do it, you might as well do it properly.
W – Cubism?
W – Yeah.
M – Yeah that’s Cubism at its best.
W – That’s so bad.
M – Most of them are learning how to mix...
M – No quality.
M – The rubbing of the hands.
W – That’s the word.
M – Any takers?
W – No.
M – Any takers?
W – No. Either of them?
M – (artist’s name).
M – Yeah.
M – It’s not.
M – Somebody really enjoyed getting up every morning just doing that, with a cup of coffee listening to (names radio presenter).
W – Yeah.
W – Right.
M – No.
M – Yeah.
W – Oh no.
W – No.
M – It is, there is a lot of kids alright.
W – Yeah.
[Extracted material]
M – Alright.
S – This is the right way up.
W – Are you sure?
W – Oh.
W – Is that what it’s called?
W – What’s the title?
M – It’s the wrong colour ....
S – It’s untitled.
M – It’s the wrong shade of green isn’t it?
W – It’s weird.
M – It’s a pity, because otherwise ....
[Extracted material]
W – Oh my goodness me.
W – No way.
M – That’s the fella who made (names subject matter).
M – Oh, anyway.
M – How do you guess?
S – Two different artists here I’ll show you.
M – It’s not very good, is it?
M – No.
W – No.
M – No.
S – This is a different artist.
M – That’s quite good actually.
M – That’s not bad now.
M – Yeah, I would vote for that.
W – Yeah.
M – They’re nicely drawn.
M – Yeah.
W – I love the perspective; it looks like they’re cut out.
M – Nice perspective ....
M – Do we have any kids in the exhibition yet? Did we accept any?
M – I don’t think so.
M – I don’t think we’ve accepted a single one.
W – That’s nicely done.
W – Will we vote on that?
M – Vote on that.
W – Yeah.
W – Yeah.
M – Okay.
M – That’s, do you know where, that’s the back of (names place) yeah.
W – The back of (names place) isn’t it?
W – That bad?
M – It’s terribly ....
M – Toned down ....
M – Terribly hard image.
S – Vote please.
S – Possible, stay in?
M – No.
M – Thanks guys, I think you did me a favour.
M – Saved you from embarrassment.
M – No, something kind of made me put my hand up.
M – It’s getting to that stage.
M – That’s nice.
M – And is this all the same artist?
W – Is that all watercolour yeah?
S – Watercolour and pencil.
M – I like that one.
M – Yeah, it is nice.
M – The pencil is a bit large isn’t it?
S – This small one down the end here?
M – A bit uninteresting.
S – One, two, three, four... No. The middle one?
W – No.
W – No.
S – The end one?
W – No.
W – It’s not getting in.
S – Alright.
W – Walking around ... phew.
W – That’s the hard part.
M – That’ll teach you.
M – That’ll teach you to walk around, and expect something in return.
M – Any takers?
W – No.
W – The dark one?
W – I don’t think so.
M – No.
W – The one with the dark colours.
S – I don’t know if you want to see these close up from the start, from a distance?
W – Yeah.
M – Don’t give them away.
W – Stay back there.
M – May I just ....
W – I’d go for ....
M – Well what do you think?
W – I don’t like that.
W – Yeah.
W – No.
W – No.
W – And why would you say that?
W – I don’t know, I just don’t like ....
M – Actually there’s a consistency between the three of them.
W – Palette.
M – Is it a dry look consistency?
M – I like the one on the right, I’m going to vote for it. I ask for a vote on the right.
M – Okay.
W – I like that.
M – I think we’ll give it a go actually, because it’s ....
S – That’s a possible. The middle one?
W – No.
S – And the end one?
M – No.
M – They had a character, which at least is quite distinctive.
W – And the kind of consistency.
M – What?
M – Who me?
W – Thank you.
M – What has it the consistency of though? That’s the question.
M – Yeah I know.
M – These have consistency, yes.
M – And character.
M – Sorry about that.
W – You’re sorry about that.
W – One, two, three
M – He has quite a few characters there.
M – I think I know the man ....
M – It’s a while since we’ve accepted one.
M – Of his?
M – Of anything.
W – No.
W – No.
W – No.
M – It will be a while too.
M – Yeah.
W – What letter are we on now?
M – Hang on a second here now ... Is this...?
S – What letter?
W – Are we on “N” now?
S – It’s “P”. (artist name) it’s “P”.
M – Ah yeah.
M – I think this is quite sophisticated, I would watch before you make a kind of...
M – Snap judgement.
M – Not based on that.
M – Yeah could be actually.
M – She’s … I think she’s a very good painter. Personally now, I’m not going to...
M – Actually they’re very nice.
M – They’re beautifully done.
M – They’re a beautiful job.
M – They are nice close up. I don’t like them from a distance.
M – Yeah.
M – But that’s got to do with the light.
M – Yeah.
M – I think you have to be a bit forgiving here.
M – Work like this can be affected by here, and you’d think it’s kind of cheapo stuff, but it’s not.
M – Yeah.
W – Think we should look at ....
M – Vote on the right?
W – Okay.
M – Have another look at it.
M – Have another look at it yeah.
M – Upstairs.
S – That’s a possible. This one?
W – No.
W – No.
S – That’s unacceptable.
M – I’d like to see it in proper light. Daylight.
M – Down here?
M – Yeah you do have to, you have to be ....
M – You have to make allowances for it.
M – Yeah.
M – No.
M – Let’s make allowances now.
M – No.
M – Are these by the same artist? This one coming up?
M – No.
M – Any takers?
M – No.
W – No.
W – I like that.
W – It’s very delicate.
M – Who’s it by?
W – I like the gentle touch.
S – (artist’s name).
S – Oh, actually ....
S – That way up.
M – It doesn’t work that way up at all.
W – Are you sure?
M – No it doesn’t.
W – I liked it the other way.
M – Yeah, yeah.
M – Any vote on that?
W – Is it upside ... (names staff member), is it upside down?
S – No now it’s the right way up, there’s an arrow.
M – Any vote?
W – No.
M – No.
S – Is that a no?
W – No.
W – I would have voted on it the other way up.
W – Yeah.
M – Any takers?
S – Nothing?
S – Two.
M – We’re still on “O” yeah?
S – We’re on “P’s” now, we’ve been on “P’s” for the last while yeah.
M – On what? “P’s”? 
M – Well that was an “O” anyway.
M – Yeah that “O” came back again.
W – What’s that? A word piece?
W – What’s written on the board there?
M – That’s lovely.
M – Yeah.
W – Is that handwriting?
M – I think it is.
[Extracted material]
W – It’s important.
S – The title is (names title)
M – It’s very....
M – Can we just move it back a bit in the light?
W – I must not be rejected from the (names organisation).
W – Should have written that.
W – What’s the painting in it?
M – No.
M – It’s not like you should read everything ....
S – So that’s a no yeah?
M – Any takers?
M – Yeah, I’ll take it.
W – Yeah.
M – I think it’s ... interesting.
M – Put it in the possible?
M – Possible.
M – Possible.
M – Possible.
W – Possible.
M – Any takers?
M – No.
M – No.
S – And (artist’s name).
M – No.
M – No.
W – No thanks.
M – Which one is (artist’s name)?
W – That.
M – The one with the mud on your face there.
S – Is that a no to all these, or do you want to vote on any of them?
M – No.
S – Okay.
[Extracted material]
M – No.
M – Any takers?
W – I kind of like the blonde...
M – Too much has…
W – No?
M – Unless somebody wants one?
M – Does anyone want to vote on the one on the left?
W – I’d vote for that.
M – I’d vote for that yeah.
S – Two.
W – Mammy and Daddy.
S – This is an etching.
W – An etching?
M – That’s not bad, it’s gutsy enough.
M – (artist’s name).
M – Anyone know?
M – No.
M – Mind yourself there now.
W – I like it.
M – Are they by the same person?
W – Yeah.
W – Yeah.
W – I’ll have a look at that now.
M – This is a drawing, I like this one here.
W – I like that there. It’s gorgeous.
W – Is that a (names subject matter) or something?
M – Yeah it’s a (names subject matter) yeah.
M – It’s a (names subject matter).
M – I like it.
M – Okay, we’ll take them one by one?
M – Yeah.
O – Okay, this one here?
M – Yeah.
M – No.
S – No. Middle one?
M – Yeah, no.
S – One, two, three, four, five, six, that’s definitely in possibles. This one?
M – Wouldn’t be the worst one. What medium is that middle one?
M – It’s drawn, it’s watercolour and pencil.
M – Oh you wash over it?
M – Yeah, yeah.
M – Any takers?
W – No.
W – No.
M – No way.
W – What is the medium there?
S – It’s painting on glass.
W – There’s something shiny on it as well. Shiny paint on glass.
M – Shiny paint on glass.
M – Made it, made it look like (names subject matter).
M – Any takers?
M – No.
M – No.
M – Can we see the rest of that?
W – Where’s the rest, yeah?
S – Oh no that’s it. (artist’s name), that’s the artist.
W – Oh my God.
M – Anybody going for that? That’s kind of psychedelic.
W – Yeah, (names place).
M – That native (names place) exactly.
M – That’s really got an (names place) theme to it.
W – Cubism?
M – Any takers no?
M – No.
M – But it’s also like rail paper so it’s not quite ....
W – That’s actually a cloth strapped over it.
M – That’s ....
M – It’s actually painted on.
M – Painted yeah, it’s painted.
M – God, how long would you say it took him?
M – But it’s wrapped, wrapped around the sides.
W – Mustn’t have had any pleasure out of doing that.
M – No. That’s (artist name).
M – Any takers?
S – Yeah it’s the first of the “Q’s”.
M – It’s not (artist’s name) is it?
M – I think so, yeah.
W – Ah no it’s not.
M – Do you like that?
W – Yeah.
M – Jesus.
S – Are we going to take a vote?
M – That’s ....
W – There’s good colours...
S – We’re going to take a full circle so ....
W – I would vote for that.
M – I’ll give it a vote.
S – One, two ....
M – Yeah, I’ll give him a vote ‘cause I know him well.
W – I think that has resonance actually.
M – Give him a vote and so we can see it upstairs.
M – Yeah give him a ....
M – You need to give him a vote to keep him in there.
M – Yeah I do know him, yeah, yeah. I mean he’s ....
W – Do you like the painting?
M – Gone.
W – Gone.
M – That’s what it’s about.
M – Any takers?
S – No?
W – Nice bit of colour there.
M – You could warm your hand on those.
W – Yeah.
M – Any takers?
M – No.
W – No.
W – Oh my goodness.
M – No.
M – No?
M – No.
W – That’s how I feel at the moment.
W – At least you don’t look like that.
W – Thank the ....
M – Is it (artist’s name)?
S – Yeah it is.
W – Yeah, it’s really nice isn’t it?
M – You really have to look at her work up close.
W – It’s gorgeous.
M – It’s marvellous work isn’t it?
M – She won a prize last year.
S – Just tell me now, if you want me to go a bit slower.
W – That’s lovely, thank you.
W – That’s lovely.
M – Yeah.
M – ... just the (names subject matter).
W – That’s the texture of sand or something.
W – Yeah.
M – She’s also an invited artist.
M – Who is she, (names panel member)?
M – (artist’s name).
M – Oh (artist’s name) yeah.
W – Well then she has to be in.
M – Well she has one in anyway.
M – No, well ....
S – She has one automatically in anyway, but it’s upstairs.
M – Oh. That’s her ....
S – That’s hers to submit.
W – That’s lovely.
M – Well I’d give her that one anyway.
M – Yeah.
W – Yeah.
M – We’ll vote on that.
W – Okay.
W – That whole thing, has the surface of it there just got a little dab on it? See the way this, it looks like a little bit has come away there. And there. You see there?
W – I do that too.
W – Deliberately.
M – It is sometimes but ... yeah.
M – The problem is just that ...
W – Maybe we’d just mention it to her.
S – It would just be easier to do it ....
M – Just note it, note it.
W – That’s a very nice drawing.
M – That’s a lovely drawing.
M – This is ... Is that ....
M – (artist’s name).
M – (artist’s name) is her name.
M – I like that drawing.
M – I like that.
M – (artist’s name)?
S – No, (artist’s name).
M – (artist’s name).
M – I like the (names place).
W – Yeah.
M – Yeah, it’s nice.
W – So it’s close to going over?
M – I like the head.
All – I like the head, yeah.
M – Can we turn it around, can’t see the head.
S – Sorry.
M – Head.
S – So that’s on the ....
M – Vote on the head.
S – ... this one is in then? And the other piece?
M – I’d vote on the other piece, I think the other piece is good.
W – Very direct.
S – It’s a possible, is it? Possible?
M – Give it a possible yeah.
M – Well done.
W – (names subject matter).
M – Who’s this?
S – (names subject matter) yeah.
[Extracted material]
M – Well I can’t bear it.
M – Are we done?
M – Are we voting for (names subject matter)?
S – Voting for the bear. One, two, three...
M – (names subject matter).
W – Oh no.
W – Well now I know what you want for your birthday.
W – Oh no.
W – A (names subject matter).
W – No don’t even lift it over.
W – Oh no.
M – What’s the title?
W – Oh no, save yourself the time and energy.
W – I’d say it’s the (names subject matter).
M – Why me?
W – Bore me.
W – Jesus Christ.
W – I love it up here.
M – Why me, (names subject matter)?
W – Why me?
[Extracted material]
W – It’s magnificent really.
M – It’s not a bad little painting.
S – Take it away?
W – Take him away.
W – Take it away.
M – That’s a portrait of my grandfather.
M – It’s very well painted that.
M – Bring back the crane separately.
[Extracted material]
M – This is an artist you want now at the front desk.
M – (artist’s name).
M – Yeah.
M – Oh yeah.
M – Can you come closer? Eh ....
S –Yep.
M – They’re the (names subject matter) aren’t they?
M – Yeah, yeah.
M – Yeah.
M – Yes.
M – This is (artist’s name), yes?
M – Absolutely.
S – No?
M – (artist’s name) work.
W – No.
W – I don’t get that now. Am I just stupid? Because I don’t get that.
W – Come on.
M – A good artist that.
M – She is, she is, but, oh dear.
W – Oh dear.
S – Two more, that’s it actually. There we go.
M – Leave it at that stage.
S – Three works.
S – On the trolley down there.
M – Who’s the artist?
W – (artist’s name).
M – Any takers?
M – Did she have a piece in last year … some … is she from (names place) is she?
W – No.
S – Or maybe the other four?
M – Is she from (names place)?
M – (names place) maybe?
W – (names place).
M – Nobody going for any of them no?
M – I’ll go for the one in the centre.
S – Do you want to see ... It’s kind of hard to see them all together is it … or?
M – We’ll leave the ladder down, and we’ll look at the one in the centre by itself.
M – The (names subject matter)?
S – The other two, are the other two no’s or ...?
W – (names subject matter) walking.
M – Does that make any difference?
M – No.
M – I’d like to see, is this a different artist?
W – No, no they’re all the same.
M – They’re all the same.
M – Oh I see it now; I see the one coming up behind us.
W – Alright.
M – There’s no enthusiasm is there?
W – No.
W – No, this is a bit...
M – No.
M – In fact there’s a distinct lack of ....
M – There’s something ....
M – What’s the name of the artist?
M – ... about the pose, about (names subject matter) posing.
M – What’s the name of the artist?
S – (staff member’s name)?
M – (artist’s name).
W – (artist’s name).
M – (artist’s name).
M – (names subject matter) sounds ... it just doesn’t wash.
M – Is this one of one?
S – One of two.
M – Where’s the other one?
M – Oh yeah this man’s kind of ... I mean I know it’s an intense dream experience, you know?
W – Yeah.
M – But it’s actually quite good.
W – The light is...
M – He’s not a bad artist though. He’s ....
M – Ah no, we’ll keep going.
W – What’s the detail like?
S – (artist’s name).
M – Ah (artist’s name).
M – (artist’s name) – he had one in last year he did?
W – He did yeah.
M – I’d give him a vote.
M – A (names subject matter) one as well.
W – Yeah.
M – He’s a nephew of the (sporting personality)
M – He’s (names a personality) son.
M – Son?
M – He’s a relation anyway.
M – Alright yeah.
M – Yeah.
M – Possibility.
S – Two, there’s two more and that’s it.
W – Is there text in there? Is that some of the ....
S – No that’s possible, that’s possible.
M – That’s in possible, okay.
W – You have to see that straight.
M – Oh yeah, this is ....
M – She’s got photo montage work in ....
M – (artist’s name), she was a prize winner last year was she?
M – Okay yeah?
M – No.
M – Yeah.
M – These are photo montage pieces.
M – No, I know they’re up but until they’re fully assembled.
S – I’ll tell you, it’s just that these’ll tear.
W – Tear, yeah.
M – It's a painting, it's not.
W – Yeah.
W – Finger marks all over the front of it.
M – Yeah.
M – Right the story is ....
M – It is a painting, they’re not photos.
M – I like that one.
M – Yeah.
S – It just says multimedia on it so ....
M – Yeah.
M – They are nice yeah.
W – Sorry about that.
M – Let’s vote on them separately.
M – I like...
M – Actually they’re quite nice ....
S – Okay, we’ll take a vote then?
M – Yeah, separately, separately.
S – This one?
W – No.
M – No.
M – No.
S – This one?
M – Yeah.
W – Yeah.
W – Yeah.
S – That accepted?
W – Yeah.
W – Yeah it is accepted.
S – It is accepted.
M – Yeah.
M – Doubtful, maybe.
W – Yeah
S – The large one’s accepted too.
M – No.
M – Yeah.
M – They’ll sell as well you know?
W – Yes.
M – How much are they?
W – That’s not everything.
M – How much are they?
W – That’s unaccepted.
M – How much are they?
S – They’re six hundred and fifty for this size.
M – Yeah.
W – They’ll sell.
M – They’re very cheap.
W – They are a good price actually, aren’t they?
M – Cheap.
M – What price is the big one there?
M – Will we accept them down?
S – That big one is seventeen hundred.
W – Who’s that?
M – Pardon?
S – No this should be ....
S – These two are accepted.
[Extracted material]
W – Sorry.
W – Okay, perfect.
S – These are by the same artist are they?
W – No.
W – No.
S – Do you want to have a closer look at it?
M – Yeah actually, let’s ....
M – Get our hands back ....
M – I don’t like that.
M – No, I don’t like that.
S – No, this middle one is it?
M – Middle one is better.
M – The middle one is half interesting.
M – Terribly badly framed.
W – Yeah.
M – Yeah, it is yeah.
M – It’s standing out isn’t it?
W – Yeah.
M – It does yeah.
M – It’s really ... you’re right (staff member’s name).
S – Do you want to vote on any of them or is it just ... grand.
W – I think, I think the other two don’t add to it ....
M – They don’t, no.
W – Whatever quality you see in the one on the right the other two ....
W – Yeah.
W – The paint on the one in the middle is appalling isn’t it?
M – Yeah.
M – I like the one in the middle but the frame is ....
W – Yeah, me too. But the frames are ....
S – Yeah, okay, right.
S – Three works ....
M – No.
W – No.
M – No.
S – Are they all no’s?
M – The dark one on the left.
W – That’s the best yeah.
M – The dark ....
W – It’s very like the photograph from last year.
M – What’s the ... (staff members name) on the left ... the artist’s name?
S – (artist’s name) – (title of piece).
W – Don’t like the ....
M – I don’t like the title.
M – No, no.
M – Well forget the title.
M – I know.
M – Don’t mind it.
M – Terrible texture.
W – I know.
M – I like the mood.
M – It’s...
S – Is it a no?
M – Yeah, it’s a no.
W – Grand.
W – Look at that.
M – Is that pencil on paper?
W – That’s beautiful.
M – Well I would have supported it but ....
W – I love that.
S – Pencil on paper.
M – That’s lovely yeah.
W – Beautiful.
W – I’ll vote for that. That’s by the artist ....
S – (artist name) is the name of the artist.
W – Oh (artist name) ....
M – What’s the subject?
M – (names subject matter).
M – That’s (names subject matter), is it?
S – Moving along.
M – (names subject matter).
M – (names subject matter) yeah.
M – Yeah.
M – Yeah.
W – Yeah.
M – Yeah.
M – Yeah.
W – Yeah.
M – By the look of it ....
W – I think this person also does photography.
M – (artist’s name), really?
W – See.
W – Yeah.
M – Great name isn’t it? (artist’s name).
W – Yeah.
M – Yeah.
M – So that one, that’s in is it?
W – Yeah.
S – That’s in.
M – Is this the same artist?
S – No.
M – ...both the same.
W – They’ve just gone up have they?
W – They’re both ....
M – No, that’s what I meant, sorry.
M – Any takers?
M – No.
M – No.
M – No.
S – Do you know a (artist’s name) do you? That’s the third one of his.
W – No.
W – I’ve heard of (artist’s name) before.
W – I think its photography.
M – Yeah, it’s a song. (artist’s name) something or other.
M – No, no as a person.
W – (artist’s name) is a band.
W – (artist’s name).
M – Here we are teddies.
W – I don’t think so.
M – Is that (artist’s name) yeah?
S – Yeah.
M – Yeah.
W – Yeah.
M – She used to paint (names subject matter).
M – She was a painter for years.
M – Do you not mean (names art college)?
M – What?
M – But sure...
M – (artist name).
W – Did she get in?
M – No.
M – Pardon?
M – No.
M – No.
M – We’re just about to vote on it.
W – Oh right.
S – Back to back?
M – Turn it to the side.
M – Nothing?
M – That’s a side one anyway.
M – Any takers?
S – This is her third work.
M – No.
M – No.
W – No.
M – No.
W – No.
M – What’s the centre one called?
S – Night ... Night.
W – Good night.
W – Good night and thank you.
W – And goodbye.
M – Good night Irene, good night.
W – Oh my goodness me.
M – No takers?
[Extracted material]
M – Yeah.
M – Upside down, upside down.
W – Oh God.
M – Looks good that, doesn’t it?
M – Yeah, it’s ....
M – That’s the way to hang it, yeah.
M – Yeah, the inflection is all wrong, isn’t it?
W – Yeah.
S – Vote no, yeah?
M – I don’t want to say ....
W – Buckets of technique going on there, buckets.
M – Are you sure?
W – No but I mean it’s about as realistic, the (names subject matter).
M – Why me, is it?
M – A lot of this stuff is all (names subject matter).
M – Ah, how’s is going head?
W – Yeah.
W – Do you see what I mean about having a problem folks?
M – No, no.
M – What? Oh yeah he’s seriously ....
[Extracted material]
W – He is yeah.
M – Exactly.
M – Yeah.
M – Groovy.
M – That’s not a (names subject matter).
W – It’s a (names subject matter). Is it a (names subject matter)?
W – It’s a mystery. It’s a (names subject matter) yes.
M – What’s the medium?
W – Two (names subject matter).
M – (names subject matter) is says, (names subject matter).
M – Reflection yeah?
W – The problems are ....
M – Any takers?
W – It’s a no.
M – No.
M – No.
M – There’s a lot of photography.
[Extracted material]
W – No takers.
M – Who? With ....
W – The artist.
W – You know what the danger is here.
M – Sorry.
M – That the ... okay.
W – Ah.
S – Do you want to see it any closer?
M – No.
W – No.
M – No.
W – No.
M – No.
M – No.
S – Do you want to see these up close?
M – Eh, not too close.
M – No, no.
W – No.
M – A hundred and ten.
W – (names title)
W – (names title)
M – Yeah.
M – Yeah.
W – No.
M – Redundant.
M – That’s right yeah ....
M – They all look so sad, don’t they?
M – Ah no.
M – You need to change the title.
W – Peat ink?
S – Yeah, pen on ink.
W – And ... failure.
W – No.
S – Want a closer look at any of them?
W – No.
M – Yeah.
S – Yeah?
M – I’ll have a closer look at that one there yeah, please.
M – No.
W – No.
S – No?
M – No.
W – It is very cold down here, isn’t it?
M – It is yeah.
W – Of course it is.
W – Isn’t it?
W – Surrounded by icy concrete hasn’t warmed up since the winter.
S – Did you say you’re cold?
W – Yep.
S – I’ll move the heater a bit closer.
W – Thank you.
S – You know if you start cooking.
M – No.
W – You know we’re in trouble when you start to sizzle.
W – On one side.
W – Yeah.
W – Venice is very popular.
M – Isn’t it yeah.
W – I blame (names airline). That’s what it is.
M – Yeah.
M – That one there.
M – The one at the end.
M – This one? But the, but the figures are ....
M – They’re watercolours?
S – Here, I’ll...
M – Shame.
M – It’s like another ....
M – Shame about the figures.
W – Why are they bad?
M – Well they’re ... The intensity’s wrong.
W – Yeah, it’s true.
M – It’s well done that.
M – Yeah.
W – Isn’t it better without the ....
W – Better without ....
M – Yeah.
W – It’s better without the (names subject matter).
M – Yeah.
W – No.
S – Want to vote on any of them?
W – No thanks.
S – No?
M – I think we had yeah; I’d like to vote on this one here.
M – Okay.
M – We’re voting on ....
M – Which one are we voting on?
M – This one.
M – The middle one, the middle one.
M – The one on the ....
S – This one ....
M – It’s the best of the three.
W – Yeah.
S – Two, three, four, five, six, seven...
M – I’ll give it a ....
S – It’s a possible.
M – It’s a possible.
M – It’s a possible.
W – I don’t know what I’m doing.
S – It’s gone into possible yeah?
M – Which one?
M – It didn’t, it wasn’t in the category though was it? (artist name)?
S – Yeah.
M – Not bad. I like the one on the left. That’s a big change for him.
M – Let’s have a look at them.
M – Can you tilt ... if you can, if you can manage.
W – Yeah.
M – I like that one on the right.
M – This is ....
M – A (names subject matter).
W – Yeah.
M – What about your left hand there?
M – It’s quite ... I like this one ....
M – Yeah. This one on the ....
M – Do you like that one?
M – I like that one.
M – I like this one too, yeah. Either that one or the one on the left.
W – The middle one.
W – I like the middle one too.
W – I think I like the middle one.
M – We’re divided.
W – Well ....
M – I like, I like that one.
M – We’ll vote.
S – We’ll put those two together, do you want to see, like, would that ...?
W – No.
M – We’ll vote on this one first, the one on the right-hand side first.
M – Yeah.
M – This? We’re voting on this...
M – No, the one on the right-hand side.
M – This one, okay.
M – Yeah, okay.
S – That’s in.
S – And then this one?
M – I’ll vote for that one. No one else likes it, but ....
W – I like it.
W – All except ....
S – And this one here?
W – Yeah, I like that.
M – Oh...
M – I’ll...
M – We’ll give it a possible?
M – Yeah, I’ll give it a possible.
M – Looks like a possible to me.
W – Definitely yeah.
W – Is that somebody’s phone down there?
W – Go way.
M – Yeah.
S – Sorry excuse me there.
M – It’s a, it’s a ....
M – Yeah.
M – What did you say it was?
[Extracted material]
W – No.
M – I wasn’t even there that day.
M – And the artist’s name?
S – (artist’s name)
M – I don’t know.
W – His name is familiar to me now.
W – (artist’s name) he worked in (name) magazine, (name) magazine.
M – (name) magazine?
W – His wife is a (names profession), very nice people.
M – Nice ... I don’t ....
M – No, it’s just ....
M – One piece.
M – Whoa, it’s ....
M – Oh is she here now?
M – Is it? She is.
M – She is yeah.

M – Give it a vote.
W – Who’s she ....
M – She had a show in the (names gallery).
S – Here and she had a show in the (names gallery).
M – I’ll give it a vote, the show in the (names gallery).
M – Give it a vote.
M – We should yeah.
M – Can we have a look at it there, show to look at it again.
M – Let’s ....
M – Okay we’ll put it down.
M – Yeah.
M – Might be dry by then.
W – Yeah.
W – Jesus.
M – Might be what?
W – Might be dry.
W – This is wonderful illustration.
W – Yeah.
M – That really is. Illustration.
M – Yeah, yeah, yeah.
M – It’s interesting though.
S – No?
M – No.
M – That isn’t great now.
W – Rushing.
M – Children’s story book.
M – Yeah.
M – Yeah.
M – She like’s them like that now.
M – Does she yeah?
M – Does she?
M – Something peculiar about that.
S – Etching.
M – No.
M – No, no.
W – No.
M – Is her name on it?
W – What’s the price on that ....
S – (artist’s name)
M – That’s a film star is it?
W – No.
M – (artist’s name)
M – What’s the title? The title?
S – Title? (names title).
M – (names title).
S – Three of those as well ....
S – There’s two small works here.
M – Oh this is (artist’s name)
M – (artist’s name), yeah. Two little ones.
W – The little ones are so cute.
M – Can you turn this down a little bit, just to ....
S – Yeah.
M – It’s nice.
W – It’s lovely.
M – Yeah, it is lovely yeah.
M – He’s not here.
M – I know that.
M – Isn’t that funny.
M – Yeah.
M – Yeah.
S – Would you like them better ...?
W – Sure, yeah.
M – They’re lovely yeah, I’ll have those.
M – I think we’ll ....
S – Anybody want another look? No?
M – No, I think we’ll start voting on them.
M – Yeah.
S – Okay the big one then?
M – Yeah.
M – Yeah, I’d vote for the other one.
M – I’d go for the two small ones.
M – I’d go for the two s ....
M – Complimented yeah?
S – Is that a vote (panel members name)? That’s accepted.
M – That’s accepted is it?
S – Yeah. And there’s two separate ones. Did you want to vote?
M – Do them together, do the two smalls ones together.
S – Okay do you want to vote these in?
M – I don’t think that one was accepted to be honest.
M – The big one?
S – No.
M – Can we go again for the big one?
M – Vote the big one again.
S – Do it again? Hang on.
M – The big one?
M – Yeah it’s in.
S – No it’s not.
M – There’s two of us down.
S – No they’re not, okay, that’s a possible.
M – Let’s have another look, I like the two small ones.
S – Vote on the two small ones?
M – Vote the two small ones in.
M – Yeah.
W – Yeah.
W – Yeah.
M – Are they a pair?
S – Two, three ....
M – Yeah that’s the two small ones in.
S – Four, five, so that’s everyone, is it?
M – Yeah, yeah.
M – (names title).
W – Yeah.
M – Who’s this guy?
M – (artist’s name), he was a student of (artist’s name)
S – That’s going into the possible is it?
W – That’s going into possible yeah.
M – Oh (artist’s name) really?
W – Yeah.
M – Are we still playing?
M – He’s a yeah, a (names place) -based artist. He lives in (names place).
W – He lives in (names place) is it?
M – It’s hard to be a student of (artist name) is it?
W – Yeah.
M – He lives on the edge of (names place) and most of his work is kind of about the little islands in (names place).
M – Oh right, yeah.
M – A bit like (artist’s name)? (artist’s name) also was a student of (artist’s name).
W – Isn’t that weird?
[Extracted material]
M – I was going to say, I don’t think (artist’s name) is … possible.
M – For (artist name)?
M – That’s what I’d do anyway.
M – Does he?
M – He was yeah, he was a student.
M – He was a student, I didn’t know.
M – He was yeah.
S – Back-up pieces.
M – Yeah.
M – (artist’s name)?
S – No.
M – I like (artist’s name).
S – Same artist.
M – Yeah destroyed.
S – No?
W – No.
W – No.
M – The railings.
S – Okay just rest that up against that.
M – Yeah.
M – Yeah.
W – Yeah.
W – Yeah.
M – Looks good.
W – That’s where they’re from.
W – Fresh off the railings.
M – Fresh off the railings yeah.
W – Oh my goodness.
M – Still raining.
M – Yeah.
W – No.
M – Enamel or something like that.
W – No.
S – How are we doing guys?
M – You’re on “R”.
S – Is this good?
W – Is there a break in this, this afternoon?
M – One of one.
W – I quite like this.
M – Yeah.
M – Boy.
W – Who did that?
M – Yeah.
S – A guy called (artist’s name).
M – I like that.
W – I like that yeah, it has appeal.
W – His (names subject matter)
M – Will we have a vote?
M – Yeah.
W – Possible.
M – But there’s something about it.
S – It’s okay, it’s a possible.
W – That’s a possible.
M – Possible.
M – Possible.
M – Possible, okay then we’ll accept.
W – Later on.
M – Okay.
M – It’s in.
M – It’s in, it’s in.
W – Alright.
M – Let’s vote for it then.
M – Now here’s real art coming, is that (artist name)?
S – Yes it is.
W – That’s exceptional.
M – These are fabulous aren’t they? He’s a great water colourist.
M – Yeah, he has…he’s showing at the moment here isn’t he?
M – What’s the medium?
W – Yeah.
S – That’s watercolour.
M – Is it watercolour yeah?
W – It’s lovely.
M – Tilt it down just a little bit (staff member’s name) please.
W – That’s lovely.
M – Should we vote for both?
M – Vote for both.
W – Yeah.
W – Yeah.
M – Yeah.
W – Yeah.
M – Both.
M – Vote? Well he’s got an invited piece as well.
W – Oh is he?
M – You can’t ever get enough of a good thing.
M – Okay, you’re right yeah.
M – Okay.
M – There’s a exhibition on at the …. 
M – Something about numbers.
M – No watercolour prices.
M – What?
M – There’s no watercolour prices.
M – Is there not?
M – No.
M – It’s a shame.
W – (artist’s name)
W – We won’t invite anyone and say no to.
M – Get rid of me while you’re at it.
S – Any … votes?
M – Any votes?
W – No.
S – See that one close up?
W – Thank you.
M – Can you see it close up now? To me it’s close up.
S – It does actually.
S – Anyone want to vote on it?
W – Thank you.
M – Yep, it’s good yeah.
S – Votes for that one? Four.
W – That’s a no.
S – No?
M – No.
S – Do you want to leave …. 
W – Very good that one.
M – Yeah.
M – One hundred and twenty minutes … Portrait four.
M – Alright.
M – Sorry?
S – Are you finished with all these pictures?
W – Yeah.
M – Any takers?
M – A few minutes.
W – Here by nine.
W – What time is it now?
M – It’s a quarter to four.
M – Quarter to four.
M – Quarter to four.
S – I’ll just take…
M – No, no, there’s no takers.
W – Ah, it takes a while to kind of see …
M – Yeah it does, yeah.
M – It does grab the attention.
W – Drink!
W – Yeah.
W – Drink, drink.
M – Who’s that by?
W – That’s from the …
M – It’s nice.
M – Very …
M – Any takers?
W – Very watery artist.
W – Yeah, yeah.
M – I’ll give that a vote.
M – Even though it’s kind of generic.
M – No.
S – There’s two there.
W – Is that an armchair?
W – Pardon?
W – Is that a photograph?
M – It looks quite …
S – There’s a second one, he has a second one.
W – That’s amazing.
M – It delivers a kind of something.
M – Yeah, I’ll give it a vote.
M – Composition.
M – The frame is heavy, try and ignore the frame.
M – Yeah.
W – All the possibles upstairs and then we’ll …
W – Painting?
M – We’ll overlook the frame.
W – Start with down here tomorrow morning.
W – Will we vote on it?
M – Do you like it yeah?
W – I think a little note to the painter, please …
M – That’s a maybe, is it?
M – Address your framing issue.
W – That’s … That one … accepted?
W – His email is (artist’s name).
W – That’s in yeah.
S – Here, I’ll take that down.
W – (staff member’s name), would it be wise to …
W – That’s the same guy.
S – So there’s a second work by this artist, that I’m just locating.
M – (artist’s name).
W – Is that painting, is that real painting?
M – That’s the same artist that we just accepted.
W – Yeah.
W – But is that really a painting?
W – It’s not.
W – Yeah.
W – Photographs yeah, yeah.
W – Sometimes people paint ....
M – Photographs.
W – Sometimes people get photographs.
W – I can’t really ....
W – It doesn’t really look like one.
W – Take a picture ....
M – He’s a former (names profession).
M – Yeah.
M – From (names place).
M – Yeah.
M – I remember he did a drawing about forty years ago and then he comes ....
S – We’ve just taken one of his, we have one of his.
M – We took the … that was the ....
M – Especially when it’s, like, a photograph.
W – Just take a photograph, might as well have taken a photograph.
M – I like the competition.
M – Yeah.
M – He probably doesn’t even see that ....
W – He doesn’t pick that up.
M – Does he not, no?
W – No.
M – I think we’ll accept him, well the last one we accepted.
M – Yeah.
M – What do you think? Are we voting it in or out lads?
S – We’ll take a vote on this one then.
S – He does have a second work, if you want to wait to see it?
W – That’s the way to see it.
M – Give him a vote. Give him a vote.
M – Give him a proper vote.
S – Two, three, four…
S – Okay so, it goes in too?
M – Possible.
W – Possible. Yeah.
M – It’s possible.
M – Any takers?
M – No.
S – (names title).
W – It’s that what it’s called?
S – Yep.
W – Imaginative composition.
M – Bit of fun, isn’t it?
M – Yeah, it is yeah.
M – It’s …. a kind of large ..... 
W – It’s kind of weird, isn’t it?
M – Yeah. It’s a (names specific medium used).
M – He’s holding his own there.
M – He’s holding his own?
W – That’s a funny way to put it.
S – One ....
M – Large.
W – What’s the ....
M – Figure.
S – Two, two ....
S – Two, three ....
S – Three, it’s going, going gone.
W – (names subject matter) you know?
W – Yeah.
S – It got a bit dusted.
W – Good God, who is this?
S – Your man…
S – Closer look at this?
M – No.
M – No.
M – No.
M – Who’s the artist?
S – Eh…
S – Eh… (artist’s name).
M – Where is he now, where’s ....
M – Okay.
M – Who’s the artist on this one? This is cute.
S – (artist’s name).
M – Interesting isn’t it?
M – Yeah it is, it’s quite…
M – It is interesting yeah, yeah.
M – He never touched the surface anyway.
M – Okay.
M – Right.
M – He has a piece in every year.
M – What’s his name?
M – (artist’s name).
W – Yeah.
M – Yeah, I’d give it a … yeah.
M – It’s quite a painting.
M – Yeah.
W – Yeah.
M – Yeah.
S – Should focus.
M – Take a vote on it?
M – Yeah.
W – Yeah. I think it’s going in.
M – Give it a vote.
M – Give it a vote.
M – We get it in to possible.
W – Possible.
M – Possible.
W – Oh.
M – Take a vote on that?
M – No.
M – No.
W – No.
M – No.
W – No.
W – Yeah.
S – Do you need a hand?
S – No, I’m alright thanks.
M – Coming up to (names organisation).
M – Any takers?
M – Have we not seen this one before, no?
M – No.
M – The road is strange isn’t it?
M – And I never want to see them again.
M – Oh.
M – No.
M – No.
W – No.
M – What’s the title, what’s the title?
S – (names title).
W – It’s a (names subject matter).
W – 3D?
M – Collective, collective vote, is it?
W – Oh God.
W – Not even good.
W – Goes the man.
S – That green one there.
S – We’ll take a break at four. For fifteen minutes.
M – Okay.
W – Fifteen more minutes.
W – That’s traditional.
M – I don’t think I’m even going to last that long.
M – I’d give that a vote.
M – I don’t, I can’t, actually I can’t.
M – Well you’ve got to tell ....
S – Interested in this one for a vote?
W – Is that…?
M – It’s nicely ....
M – Yeah.
W – Okay.
M – No.
W – A maybe?
M – Yeah, he paints some interesting stuff. I like the way...
M – Yeah.
W – A man could ....
M – What to put it in as maybe then?
M – Maybe, yeah maybe.
M – Maybe.
M – Maybe.
M – Second ....
W – No.
W – Oh.
M – No.
M – No.
W – Finito.
M – What are we on?
W – Finito.
M – Number?
S – Four.
W – Oh.
M – Just a second, this is his second one is it?
S – Of his? It is yeah.
M – This is the second one?
W – In the (names subject matter).
M – Oh yeah.
M – Okay yeah, the guy who did the (names subject matter). I prefer this one actually.
M – I prefer this one.
M – I prefer the other one.
W – Oh this is desperate.
W – This is the guy who did the (names subject matter)?
M – Yeah.
M – Yeah.
M – Did we accept that, or did we put it in possible did we?
M – We put it in possible. You know the other one ....
M – Is this better or is the other one ....
M – I prefer the other one.
W – The light is wrong in this ....
M – I think the other one is ....
W – Much more subtle.
M – The other one is much better.
W – Yeah.
W – The light is wrong.
M – Yeah.
W – It’s confusing actually.
M – Yeah.
W – Hey.
S – We’ll take a vote on it anyway will we?
W – No.
M – Yep.
W – No.
W – No.
M – No.
S – Eh, this is his first one ....
M – Alright.
W – Is that board coming off the wall?
M – Worse, they’re getting worse.
M – Who is it?
W – What?
S – The guy is ....
W – Oh right, and what’s that called?
S – (names title).
W – (names title).
M – No, I don’t think so, is it?
M – A tube of bean sauce.
M – Is that (artist’s name) ....
S – That’s (artist’s name) again.
M – (artist’s name) again.
W – No.
M – Any takers?
W – I’d be interested in that.
W – No.
M – No?
S – Is that the lot?
S – It is yeah.
M – I like that.
W – What is it?
M – It’s (names subject matter), or trying to ....
W – It’s (names subject matter).
[Extracted material]
M – Any votes for that one?
M – I’d give it a vote anyway.
S – One.
M – I don’t know what that is anyway.
M – We’re all getting very tired.
M – We’re not getting down into the basement earlier ....
M – Oh Lord.
S – That’s Ascension.
W – Is it?
W – Oh is it?
M – We badly need a cup of coffee or a smoke.
M – Ah yeah.
W – Yeah.
W – Did he say Bosch?
W – This is … This could be interesting.
W – It’s a real naïve piece.
W – I think that is quite interesting.
M – I like that.
M – I like that.
M – Is that a silk screen or is it a ....
M – Could you tilt that forward.
W – Yeah, tilt it forward.
M – Tilt it forward.
W – A bit more.
M – I like that.
M – More. Tilt it more.
W – Yeah.
M – So do I.
W – Yeah I like that.
W – Yeah. I’d give that a vote.
S – Have a vote? One, two, three, four…
W – Who’s the artist?
S – Five, six, seven, eight. That’s into possible. (artist name).
M – Oh, (artist name).
S – Above average.
M – Yeah, yeah. It’s different from ....
M – Every year.
M – Can’t see that properly.
M – Is it one? Just one is it?
M – Yeah.
M – Just one.
S – Three ....
W – Look at the amount of work.
S – Four ....
M – Come on, come on.
M – Ah come on.
S – Five, six…
W – It is very good.
M – She’s seventy years of age.
M – What?
M – Who’s that?
M – She’s (names nationality).
W – There’s two pieces over there.
M – Is it in? No?
M – No it’s in possible.
M – It’s in possible, yeah okay.
S – Two small works here.
M – It’s possible.
M – Possible.
M – She’d be devastated.
M – I know yeah, she’s ....
M – How long has she been here?
M – She’s been here forty years.
M – Forty years.
W – What’s the other one say?
S – The other one says (names title) there is a third work, I’m not sure if it’s come out already.
W – Yeah.
W – It’s called (names title)
W – No.
S – Any takers? For any of them?
M – No.
M – No.
S – No? Going, going, gone.
M – No.
M – Am I in your way?
M – No, it’s grand.
S – No?
M – Great pub.
W – It’s a great pub, yeah.
W – Is it …?
W – Blue.
M – Yeah.
W – No.
M – Yeah.
W – It’s black.
W – Oh is it?
W – Black yeah.
M – No.
W – It is definitely.
W – No.
W – In real life?
W – It is black in real life.
W – How many …. 
S – Another (artist’s name) now.
M – I like that drawing.
M – Yeah, so do I.
M – I think it’s quite a nice drawing, that.
S – Will I bring it round?
M – Yeah, I can’t see it.
M – Oh aye.
M – That’s a lovely drawing.
M – That’s nice.
M – No, it’s like … got a nice feeling.
M – Charm.
M – Have another look at it.
M – Let’s have a vote on that one.
M – No glamour …. 
M – It’s anti-glamour, but it’s a lovely drawing.
S – … Five, six, seven. So it’s possible.
S – No, it’s … you’ve got two, two, three only.
M – That group possible. The arm was putting me off.
S – Okay, then it’s possible.
S – Possible.
W – Yeah.
S – Here I’ll pop it in.
M – Alright, thanks.
M – I’m sure …. 
W – Thank you.
W – (names title).
W – No.
M – Heaven.
M – No.
W – Vote on the pair of them?
M – (names title).
M – Very good.
M – No.
M – Yes? No?
M – No.
W – Oh no.
M – No.
M – No.
M – Ah.
[Extracted material]
M – Oh this is an invited artist.
M – (artist’s name).
W – Oh yes I found a very good artist.
S – (panel member’s name), I’ll bring this one around.
W – I like that.
W – He had that lovely little figure last year.
M – Oh.
M – Yes.
S – Sorry.
M – Yeah, that’s good.
M – I like that.
W – I prefer the other one.
M – I prefer the big one.
W – I prefer the big one.
W – See the tiger theme.
S – Will we vote, vote on the small one.
M – Yeah vote for the small one.
M – I would vote for that.
S – One, two, three, four ....
M – Which one’s that?
M – We’re voting on the small one.
S – The small one.
M – The small one.
S – No, it’s a possible. And the big one?
M – I like the big one.
W – Like the big one.
M – Should share the two ....
S – Oh it’s in.
M – Okay.
S – No it’s not, one more it’s in.
M – One more and it’s in?
M – Give it one more.
M – He’s an invited artist as well so ....
S – They’re both possible then.
W – (panel member’s name) did you put up a hand there?
M – Yeah, I put my hand up.
M – Yeah.
M – So did I.
W – Who’s the dissenter?
M – (panel member’s name).
M – (panel member’s name).
M – Someone must not have ....
M – It’s a (names subject matter).
M – This is a (names subject matter).
M – Oh.
W – Wow.
W – It could turn into a mask if you put two holes in it.
W – Yeah, and you could wear it.
M – Eh, any takers?
W – Eh, well we’ve seen two of this style already.
[Extracted material]
W – Oh.
S – Want to see that closer?
M – Yeah.
M – We saw the one with the (names subject matter).
M – The one ....
W – It’s a hard work as well.
W – Is that the one with the …?
W – The (names subject matter).
W – The (names subject matter) yeah.
M – I like that.
W – Something about that.
M – The artist’s name is ....
W – It’s kind of quirky, yeah.
M – Yeah, might be worth.
M – Yeah move it on there yeah.
M – Yeah, it’s good yeah.
M – I know it yeah, I’m voting for it.
M – Three minutes to four.
W – Three-fifty ....
S – Okay, no more?
M – Alright, a vote on this?
S – Whatever.
W – Yes, yes.
S – We’ll stop at four, and then what we really need to do is to move the possible upstairs and get them cleared.
W – Yeah.
S – Because we’re open in the morning. So we need to have everything out of that area, and decided on, does that sound okay?
M – Yes.
W – Yes.
M – Yeah.
S – What about this one? One, two, three, four, five…
S – Are we doing the possible here as well?
M – We’re just doing this, a second now.
S – Any other votes for this one?
W – Any other votes?
M – Yeah.
S – Five, six, seven, eight.
W – That’s possible.
S – That’s possible yeah?
M – Is it in?
S – Do you want to do the possibles here?
M – Yeah.
S – After break.
M – Yeah.
S – There’s about twenty possibles to see.
M – The ones that we did, that we did here, I suppose yeah.
W – We can’t bring them up, no?
M – We need to see them in the light.
M – Yeah, it’s the light, the light.
S – Yeah. I’ll have a chat to (staff member’s name).
W – Can’t drag them all the way up ....
M – It’s only twenty.
S – This is it then, and then we’re breaking, alright?
M – Aye.
M – No.
M – No.
M – No.
W – No.
M – It’s no excuse.
M – Is that a joke is it?
M – My attempt at a joke.
W – Oh dear.
S – No?
W – No.
W – No good at art college anyway.
S – Yep, always.
M – Sure?
W – No.
M – See the name on that?
M – (artist’s name).
S – That’s eh, (artist’s name).
W – No.
W – No.
M – I like that, through there.
M – Alright take a vote on this?
M – Yeah, take a closer look.
M – Is it a bit greasy?
M – No. Yeah you’re right it is.
M – It’s a (names subject matter).
M – Everyone want to vote on this?
S – Everyone want to vote? This one?
S – Anyone? One.
S – The other one?
S – No.
S – None.
M – Who’s the artist?
M – I like trees.
M – Don’t know.
S – (names title).
M – Is that like the other one?
S – Fifteen minutes, then there is thirty-five possibles that we’ve just seen.
M – Down here?
S – Down here, which I think we should see but the main thing we need to do is clear out all the possibles from upstairs, and then just take down everything to the atrium, because we're working tomorrow and we won't have that space.
M – So we start here next now?
S – Yeah, do the thirty-five. Start looking at the possible ones you marked as possibles just now.
W – Yeah.
S – And then go up and do the sixty-odd from upstairs that we saw yesterday and the ones we saw today.
M – Are we ....
S – The ones we saw twice yesterday.
M – Are we just finishing off then with possibles, or do we come back then and start selecting more?
S – To be honest we’ll probably just get all the possibles done today, and then what we’ll do is finish everything down here first thing in the morning. And then get on to the photography, large canvas and sculpting.
W – No.
M – W, X, Y, Z here, there’s very few.
S – There is, there’s actually more there’s “ST’s”, there’s “RT’s”.
M – Where would you get a cup of coffee?
S – Back down here.

Session 3 – The Possible Category held back in the main gallery on the first floor

M – Staying in Dublin tomorrow?
M – Yeah.
M – A hundred and thirteen selected, we’ve twelve architectural drawings, that would make a hundred and twenty-five.
S – What we want to do is bring that pipe over there.
S – Yeah.
W – It’s either in or out?
M – I’d say pick fifty?
M – Up to fifty?
W – I want that, I want that in, I want that in folks, come on.
M – You need to think about the ....
M – You need fifty per cent, isn’t that right?
W – I want to know, it’s either in or out.
M – I know but you need at least fifty per cent to get it in, isn’t that right?
W – No.
M – No. What’s the fifty percent for?
M – No this is different, it’s not the same thing, it’s a fifty per cent gets it in now.
W – It’s a majority ....
M – Traditionally it is yeah.
M – You get more that fifty per cent, it’s in.
M – It says a majority.
M – Are you aware of that, everybody, it’s fifty per cent?
M – That’s the way it works at this stage. Normally before we did the possibles there was a fifty per cent, so we’re reserving the fifty per cent for this now.
W – So fifty per cent
M – Fifty per cent plus and it’s in.
W – Hang on, one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten. So five more.
M – Not on this one, no. It doesn’t really work in that room.

M – (artist’s name) I think this is worthy if you look at the lines and stuff in it.
M – Good painting.
M – It’s in.
M – Reading between the lines.
M – Reading between the lines.
W – This is our great big skirt.
M – There’s another one with that.
M – Yeah, there’s a big one.
W – I didn’t like that one, I didn’t like that other one.
M – The other one … we need to look at the two of those, it’s in, it’s on one of the trays.
M – We’ll find it.
S – Oh I know where it is.
M – Yeah.
W – Yeah.
S – Yeah.
M – Why did she put it in such a big frame?
M – I know what you mean as well, but I met her in (names place), she’s (nationality).
M – Was one of these acceptable?
M – No not her.
M – I’m gonna vote for it anyway.
M – I’d say it’s probably … it’s not deliberate, you’re right, how could it be? ‘Cause that’s the plate.
W – Can you move this other one?
W – There’s no name on this.
M – So we’ve voted on the other one anyway, the grey paper one, a bit. Anyone for that?
M – No.
M – No.
M – That’s (artist’s name).
M – (artist’s name)
M – Yeah, that’s in. Accepted.
M – (artist’s name)?
M – Yeah.
M – I know what you mean by that.
W – I hate that too, sorry. But I like the (names subject matter).
M – I met her up in (names place) and I have to say....
W – I think the left one is....
M – You have to say what?
M – I just liked her. She’s a (nationality) girl working in (names place).
M – I think the right one’s too ....
W – Is it trying to be ....
M – Go to the left one first. Okay left one.
M – Listen, as long as she gets in.
W – It’s in.
W – It’s in.
M – Leave the other one there.
M – No, no, you got it wrong, this one’s in. That one’s going out, we’re only taking one.
O – Okay.
M – On your left.
M – This one here.
M – The back one.
M – Have I interpreted that correctly, we’re only taking one, isn’t that right?
M – Yeah, just one.
M – I don’t … I wouldn’t go for this one.
M – No, I don’t think so.
M – No, banal.
M – It’s good to see them again, yeah.
M – It is yeah.
M – Banal.
M – This is ...
M – No.
W – No.
W – No.
M – We took one of them already.
M – We did yeah. She has one in, doesn’t she?
W – Yeah ....
W – Yeah.
M – She has one in doesn’t she? We’ll leave that then.
M – Okay.
M – That’s ....
M – Upside down?
W – Gentle lady, yeah.
M – We took one of those already didn’t we?
W – We took one of those.
M – We took the big one.
M – She was in already?
M – Yeah, she was.
M – Okay.
M – We took all of those ... I think we did, or else there’s another one of those.
M – We’ve taken that one.
W – No, we’ve taken that.
W – That’s it.
M – How many do we need to get in now?
W – We need six.
W – We just need six to get in?
W – Yeah.
W – No.
W – No.
M – Remember it’s fifty per cent plus that gets the piece in. So if you’re not sure, you don’t want the piece in then keep your hand down.
M – That’s ....
M – We’ve already accepted one or two of those.
M – No.
M – We’ve two of (artist’s name).
M – No.
M – No.
W – No.
W – No, Jesus no.
M – No.
M – No.
M – Do we have the frame?
M – We were giving it a chance; in fairness we’ve given this a chance.
W – No way.
M – No.
W – Dear God.
W – Yeah.
W – Yeah.
W – It’s the (name of organisation) is it?
W – It’s beside ....
W – The (names place)?
W – Yeah.
M – Yeah.
M – Yeah.
W – It’s kind of similar, maybe.
W – Yeah.
W – No.
W – No.
[Extracted material]
M – Yeah.
M – The Houses?
M – We’ll take one of these.
[Extracted material]
M – We’ll take ....
M – This one?
M – Yeah
M – The small one.
M – We’ll take the little one.
W – This one? So that’s one, two, three, four, five that’s in. And the other one?
M – No.
M – No, two’s enough.
M – Yes.
M – We’ve taken one of (artist’s name) ones already, the large one. This one goes
   with it, the (names subject)?
W – And the big one.
W – Please not that one.
M – This is (artist’s name) as well, is it?
M – That’s her as well, yeah.
M – That’s two?
W – One.
M – We have one.
M – We have one already.
W – We have a ....
M – We have ....
M – Just leave it with the large one.
M – Unless you want the gold one in?
M – This one? A vote on this one?
M – The (names place).
W – That’s a no?
M – There’s two votes there already.
W – Okay.
M – What about the (names subject)?
W – And the smaller piece?
M – And the smaller piece? One, two, three, four, five, that’s in.
M – It doesn’t take much to get something in now, so just be careful.
M – Yeah.
M – Use your arm carefully.
M – Yeah, this is really interesting here. Now look at that.
W – Kind of weird isn’t it?
W – Yeah.
M – I don’t think so.
M – No, I don’t think so.
M – It’s good though isn’t it?
M – Yeah.
W – Yeah.
M – And this quality?
M – No.
M – I don’t think so.
M – No.
W – No.
W – I like that.
W – No.
W – Me either.
M – There’s no fun being sent.
[Extracted material]
W – No.
W – No.
M – See this one here.
M – No.
W – Signature is terrible.
M – No?
M – No.
W – No.
W – No.
M – We’ve accepted one of this artist’s work already.
W – One’s enough.
M – One’s enough, no.
M – It’s (artist name) isn’t it?
M – Yeah.
M – No.
W – No.
W – No.
W – No.
M – No.
M – I’ll vote on it.
M – One up?
W – No.
[Extracted material]
M – We’re getting tired I think.
W – Yeah.
M – Yeah.
W – (artist’s name) won did she?
W – Yeah.
M – Yeah.
M – We’ve just one of this artist, the other artist’s work as well.
W – No.
W – No.
M – Yeah, I’ll give that a vote.
M – There’s another one.
M – It wasn’t on when I was there earlier.
M – The one of the (names subject).
M – Was that not one we looked at yesterday?
S – Yeah, you have yesterday’s possible.
W – No.
W – No.
M – Are we going to replace it? Again?
W – No.
M – Yeah.
M – Are these for definite now?
M – We went through a second possible.
W – Everything we vote on ....
M – Oh yes, of course, excuse me. Any takers?
All – No.
S – Is this the next one?
M – Yeah.
M – Oh I don’t like that.
M – No.
S – One, two.
W – It isn’t all that convincing is it?
W – No.
M – Yeah, is a (names subject) or something is it?
M – I’d vote for that one.
M – It’s a (names subject).
M – (names subject)?
M – I think it’s a (names subject)?
[Extracted material]
M – I think that’s what the problem is.
M – This is (artist’s name) big drawing.
M – We’ve a painting of his ....
M – Painting?
M – I think we have one of his in, don’t we?
W – No that’s ....
M – A painting.
W – No.
M – I think we’ve a painting of his coming up.
M – I think with his painting … oh did we? No.
M – No. We’re going to look at the paintings.
M – Oh no.
W – No, no, no.
M – They’re getting tougher now.
M – No.
W – Yeah.
M – The possibles is a great category, you know, when you look at it again?
M – No.
W – No.
M – No.
M – These are the paintings.
M – She an invited artist, and ....
M – I thought we took that one first time around?
M – I thought we did as well, actually.
W – The one on the right?
M – I thought we lost the one on the right.
M – Can we put in the one on the left, actually?
M – No we didn’t ....
M – Okay, the one on the left.
S – This one?
M – This one, yeah.
S – …Two, three, four, five six, seven that’s it.
M – The one on the right was voted out the last time.
M – No.
W – No.
M – Now this is the two paintings … these are the two paintings by (artist’s name). We just rejected his large drawing.
M – I like the one on the right.
M – The one on the right.
M – Yeah.
M – One on the right.
W – One on the right.
W – Which one?
M – Vote on the one on the right.
M – Yeah.
W – Yeah.
S – It’s a bit orange
M – One more?
M – One more.
M – Vote for the one on the left?
M – Has it come to this?
M – No.
W – This piece?
M – No, no.
M – Apologies again.
M – Well we gave it a lot of thought the first time round, you know. Trying to decide whether to put one of these in, so. Which is why two of them ended up in the possible.
W – Yeah.
W – No.
M – Two ended up in the ....
M – No.
M – It’s a bit ....
M – No.
M – (artist’s name)
M – Alright ....
M – I really like that one.
W – Who’s the artist?
S – (artist’s name)
M – That it?
W – Yeah.
M – Eh, who’s the artist there?
S – (artist’s name)
M – Oh ....
M – I’ll give that a vote yeah, I like it.
M – Not enough, no?
M – Not enough, enthusiasm no?
[Extracted material]
W – That’s right.
M – Can we put that in then?
W – Yeah, okay.
M – I think we’ve accepted one of these ones that (names staff member) has.
W – Yes.
M – We did yeah.
M – Yeah.
M – No, this is the one.
M – This is the one we’re hoping to ...
M – Oh, is it?
M – We’ve already accepted that ....
W – Why have we accepted that?
W – Who’s that artist?
W – Yeah.
M – Yeah.
M – Beautiful drawing.
M – Will we accept it?
M – I suppose we should yeah.
S – One.
W – I thought we put that in?
M – No, you see we did, you see this is our second time looking at the piece. Third time looking at the piece.
S – Two, three ....
M – This is the final.
M – Yeah.
M – We shortlisted it yesterday.
M – We just did the rejects first.
M – No.
M – No.
M – No.
M – (artist’s name)
M – I’ll give this a ....
M – Has he another piece?
M – We’ve rejected all the others.
M – Ah right.
M – This is the only piece of his. We’ll get it in?
M – No.
M – No.
M – (artist’s name)
W – Oh no.
W – I’ll give it a vote.
M – We rejected his other two.
M – No.
M – I’ll give him a vote then.
[Extracted material]
M – Yeah.
M – How many are there?
W – Four.
M – The string is broke.
W – I like her.
M – I like that, very nice.
W – That’s a nice piece.
M – That’s in.
W – Yeah.
M – We’ve one of them already.
M – That’s (artist’s name).
M – (artist’s name)
M – That’s in.
M – We’ll get one of each?
M – Forgotten which one we ....
S – (artist’s name), one, two ....
M – She’s ... one has already been accepted, and these two are in possible so...
W – Yes.
W – I love the ... I love the darker one.
W – Yeah.
M – The darker one.
M – Yeah.
M – Okay.
W – Yeah. The one on the ....
M – Which one are we voting for?
W – The one near (names staff member).
M – The one on the right there.
W – It’s in?
M – Yeah.
M – What about the one on the left? Will we take that too?
M – I think we’ve enough, we’re running out of ... room.
M – We might lose one space.
W – This one deserves it.
M – There’s thirty-two in there, we’ve no room left.
M – Yeah.
S – That’s been accepted?
W – Yeah.
S – So it’s number twelve ....
W – Yeah.
W – How much more room do we have so?
M – Say, at the most about thirty.
M – Any takers on that?
M – No.
M – Is it a pen drawing?
W – Yeah, it’s a pen drawing.
M – It’s a pen drawing.
W – I think it’s a fine drawing.
M – It’ll have to be selected.
W – Yeah.
M – Will we give it a ....
W – How many more people?
M – I’ll give it a ....
W – Yeah.
M – Vote for it?
M – Is it in?
W – Yeah.
M – Sometimes it takes a while.
W – Who’s that?
W – It does now.
M – Now.
M – I don’t know, I think (artist’s name) is great. I don’t really ....
M – We have one of his other ones.
M – This is, this is ....
[Extracted material]
M – This is probably the best of ....
[Extracted material]
M – Yeah.
[Extracted material]
M – I think (artist’s name) is just good.
W – I like it.
M – It’s one of his better ones.
M – I think (artist’s name) is a good painter.
M – Let’s take … let’s have a vote on it.
W – What are we to vote now?
M – All of it.
W – Is it in?
[Extracted material]
W – Let’s vote for it now.
M – I’d have this one.
[Extracted material]
S – Nobody else? Two, three, four ....
M – That might be going a bit far.
M – No, actually I’ll take my hand down.
[Extracted material]
S – Is that it?
M – Is that in?
S – No, it’s not in.
W – I like it.
M – This is (artist’s name) yeah.
S – Accepted?
S – Yeah.
S – And then…
W – I like this one.
M – That one I like.
M – I like that too.
S – One, two, three, four, five, six, and that’s in too...
M – That’s not good, that wouldn’t have my vote.
M – Sure I know.
W – Looks like a footprint.
M – I kind of like that one myself.
S – This one? One, two... two people?
M – Are we going to vote? I’m going to vote.
M – Who is it?
S – Three ....
M – No idea.
M – Yeah, I’ll stick my hand up. It’s kind of quirky. I like it.
M – Yeah.
M – Something good.
M – This is the (names subject) is it?
M – (names subject).
M – It’s (names subject).
M – Yeah I like that, d’you know, I know it’s (names subject) and things, but it’s not well executed.
W – I’d let that in.
M – Is it because it’s a (names subject matter)?
W – No.
W – No.
M – I think it works well.
S – This one’s back? It’s unacceptable.
M – We whittled these down to just the one, didn’t we?
W – It’s horrible, it’s so hard, it’s like a ....
M – No, it’s terrible.
M – It’s gimmicky.
W – It’s gimmicky.
M – Didn’t we accept one already, anyway?
M – No, we rejected.
M – This is the last one.
M – Unless you like this? This is the (names subject matter).
M – (names subject matter).
W – No, no, it’s weak.
S – We take a vote? One, two, three, four, five...is that it, is it?
S – Six.
W – Is that in?
M – Yeah.
M – Who’s this by?
W – I don’t...
S – (artist’s name)
M – (artist’s name)
M – (artist’s name)
M – Like it?
M – Yeah, I’d be good for a vote.
S – Three? Any more takers?
W – It’s like (names place).
M – It’s terrible, it’s like ....
W – No.
S – This one?
W – No.
M – Very ordinary isn’t it?
S – One, two, three, four, five, six ... it’s in.
M – Yeah.
W – What?
M – (artist’s name).
M – I thought we rejected that one yesterday.
M – Didn’t we pick one?
M – Yeah, and we rejected the other one.
M – Oh is it, is this one of two?
M – We rejected a painting.
M – The painting.
M – We rejected the painting.
W – It’s not the same person.
M – Are you ready for this drawing?
M – Is that for sale? Is it for sale or is it a ....
S – We’ll get a vote going, any takers? No.
S – Rejected?
M – Oh yeah.
M – Is it the same artist?
M – It’s the same artist.
M – It is the same yeah.
M – It’s like the (names subject matter).
M – I’d have gone for the drawing over the painting.
S – One
M – I think it’s better.
M – I think the drawing is better.
M – Tickled.
M – Yeah.
M – Bring the drawing back, bring the drawing back.
M – It’s deformed.
M – I think the drawing is better.
M – We’ll have two votes, we’ll have two votes. Who thinks the drawing is better? Who thinks the drawing is better?
M – The drawing is better.
M – Who thinks the drawing is better?
M – What?
M – Then we’ll vote on the drawing then.
W – Alright.
M – Voting.
W – No.
S – Painting.
W – I like the painting.
M – I like the painting. I think it’s super.
S – One, two, three, four...
M – Don’t stare.
M – Yeah, that’s lovely.
W – I think that’s fabulous.
M – Yeah.
M – That’s lovely.
M – The texture ....
M – That’s lovely.
W – That’s in.
M – Great.
W – I don’t believe it.
W – I don’t believe it either.
M – Ah no, it’s ....
S – You just rejected that one, didn’t you?
M – Yeah I know, it’s kind of like ....
M – It’s the type of piece we should be looking at now.
M – It’s, it’s ....
M – Good.
M – These are, these are from downstairs.
M – I think this painting is worth a ....
M – I like that, I’ll vote for that.
M – (staff member’s name) have we enough votes for that?
S – One, two, three, four ...Yeah we do.
M – I’ve a feeling we’re taking too much.
S – Yeah.
M – We’ve a hundred and forty-two ....
M – Is that the right way for that is it?
W – No it’s not.
M – It still doesn’t ... is that the right way?
W – Yeah.
S – Does it need ...
M – (artist’s name) I like (artist’s name), what’s the medium?
M – I just think we’re taking too much.
M – Tempra?
M – Only one?
M – That’s the only one.
W – (names subject matter)
M – Any votes for this?
M – Show me one.
M – We rejected the other.
M – Yeah.
M – We rejected one.
W – No.
M – Are we doing okay for ....
M – We don’t have it in.
M – We’re getting a bit tight for numbers.
W – Yeah.
M – This is … he’s an invited artist.
M – I like the one on the left.
W – I like the one on the left.
M – I like that one on the left.
M – Smaller is better.
W – I like the bigger one.
M – I like the bigger one too.
S – We’ll take a vote on the larger piece.
S – One, two, three, That’s not in.
M – Is there another vote for that? That’s it is it?
S – The smaller one now.
M – Oh the large piece, are we voting for the large piece?
S – No, there wasn’t enough for that.
W – Small piece then?
M – Small one right.
M – We’ll vote for the small one now.
S – One, two, three …. 
M – Yeah it’s a lovely wee thing.
M – Not in?
S – No. He’s got a piece with writing in now.
M – Who’s the artist?
S – (artist’s name)
S – Yeah.
S – There’s two different artists there sorry.
M – The drawing on the right.
S – Vote for this one?
S – Any votes? One, two …. 
W – I like that.
S – Three...
M – I’ll vote for that yeah.
M – Yep.
M – Yeah, that’s nice.
M – Dramatic quality.
S – Four, five …. 
M – Six.
W – We got to vote on.
W – Yeah I think that’s in.
S – Hands up, for this?
M – There’s two, I see two.
M – No. There’s only one.
M – No.
M – We’ve got one in.
M – (artist’s name)
M – (artist’s name)
M – (artist’s name) that picture’s in.
S – And then, one, two, three, four, five, six, that’s in.
W – What’s that called, what’s the title?
M – (names title).
M – I like it.
S – Folks we need to ... one, two, three, four, five.
W – Is it a painting?
M – Yeah.
M – Another one?
M – Two big pieces.
S – Six.
M – I don’t think so.
W – No.
M – No.
M – No, it doesn’t suit the ....
S – One, two, three, four, five ....
M – Five? It’s not in.
M – No.
W – And it’s not reserved is it?
S – Votes on this piece? One, two, three ....
W – No.
S – Three?
W – No.
M – Not sure about this.
W – Artist?
M – That’s (artist’s name)
W – (artist’s name)
S – One, two, three, four, five, six ....
M – She doesn’t have ....
M – She has a thing going, yeah, I think it’s great.
M – Did we have more than one of those inside?
W – We have the containers, the containers one.
M – Okay.
M – We have one, if not two. I suppose we’ve two. We took two.
M – Two. Two’s enough.
W – No.
M – No. That’s a bit dull isn’t it?
M – It is.
M – We’re going to be short on space.
M – This one stands out in the light does it?
M – No.
W – No.
W – No.
M – No.
W – No.
M – I don’t like that.
W – No.
M – The car is good.
M – Yeah.
M – Where’s the other two?
M – That piece ....
W – That’s the other one over there ....
M – Yeah.
S – That’s the other one alright.
W – There’s something about it.
M – It’s okay, I like that yeah, I’ll give that a vote alright.
S – One, two, three, four, five, six ....
M – Did we take any of these watercolours?
M – Don’t think so.
M – Just to let you know, there’s a hundred and fifty in now. And we’ve to do
photography and architectural drawing. There’s a hundred and fifty in.
W – We haven’t done all the ....
M – Our target is a hundred and seventy. You know?
M – So we need twenty more, and we still have ....
S – We’ve got ....
M – Architectural drawings.
M – We’ve twelve architectural drawings.
S – We’ve got photography.
M – And architectural drawings.
S – Most of them are small.
M – I don’t know.
W – We still have photography, some photography, and large canvases so ....
M – And large canvases?
W – Yes.
M – Yeah.
S – Yeah.
M – Oh.
M – I think we ....
W – I think we’ve a lot to do.
M – We have to be selective.
M – We’ve taken a lot of small ones haven’t we?
M – Yeah we do have a lot of pieces.
S – There’s always a lot of small works in the show, so if you’re up to one-fifty and
where you want, I’d suggest you don’t put any more in, because we’re going to get
really stuck for space.
M – But don’t we … can we have one of the rooms anyway, where the walls that would
be hung en masse?
S – I know...
W – We do that anyway.
M – We do that every year.
M – We do that anyway, you know?
M – There’s a lot of small ones this year.
M – Yeah.
M – I’ve noticed that.
[Extracted material]
M – Yeah I think so.
W – Okay, anyway, this piece?
W – No.
M – No.
M – Unfortunately you can’t just ....
[Extracted material]
M – You just arrived when we were turning fifty.
M – Have we taken an (artist’s name) one?
M – Yeah.
M – We took one.
M – We took one.
W – Yeah.
M – Oh that’s good.
W – I have to say I love the one on the left. One by the (names subject matter).
M – I would vote for one of those as well ....
M – Which one?
W – I love the one on the left.
S  – Okay, let’s go for this one, any votes?
M – No.
S  – One, pick, Two, pick, this one ....
S  – That one? Okay.
M – I would take a vote on it.
M – It's good work, isn’t it?
M – Yeah.
M – It’s like, it’s like a ....
M – No I don’t think we have one of his.
M – Yeah.
W – I forgot ....
S – Votes on this piece? One, two, three, four ....
M – Did we look at this piece?
M – Yeah we looked at that ....
M – It suffers ....
M – Did that make it in?
S – No.
M – Did you want it in?
M – Well, I voted for it ... democracy and all.
M – Any votes for this?
S – Any votes?
M – No.
S – One, two...
W – What’s the next one?
M – We have one of his ....
W – We have one of his ....
W – Have we one of his?
M – We have, a small one.
W – The one in the (names subject matter) ....
M – One of the old...
M – I’d vote for this.
S – One, two, three. No? Okay.
M – It's just too much information.
M – We have one of his.
M – Do you have one of his already?
M – We do.
M – Definitely we do?
M – Yeah, the darker one. The darker one.
W – Yeah we did take it ....
M – So we’ll leave it then.
M – Lovely picture.
M – We’ll leave it.
S – We’ve already taken two of this.
W – Take another one?
M – I want to have a look at this.
   [Extracted material]
S – Voting for it. One, two, three, four, five, six.
W – There’s three...
M – No.
M – No.
W – No.
M – Is it sold?
M – The figures are ....
M – Figures kill it.
W – Yeah, yeah.
M – Just as well, when you bring it up to the light.
W – No.
S – No.
M – I’ll look at the back of the canvas if you don’t mind please?
S – Yeah, sure.
M – Okay, thanks.
W – What did you learn from that?
M – Well I know it’s not photographed on.
W – Oh right.
M – Yeah.
W – No.
M – No, it’s too ....
M – Do you like it?
M – I’ll give it a vote.
M – One of these?
M – No.
S – Any votes on this? One, two, three ....
W – We took a small one here didn’t we?
W – Yeah a small one.
W – Which of the small ones?
W – One’s enough.
M – We took a small one.
M – We did yeah. It’s gone.
M – I like it too but ....
W – No.
W – No.
M – We’ve a lot to go through.
S – One, two, three, four, five. It’s in.
S – It’s in.
S – One, two, three ....
M – Who is it?
M – Oh yeah.
M – Is that in?
S – It’s in.
M – That’s, you know (artist’s name), she great, lovely touch.
M – She’s a painter?
M – Yeah a painter.
M – Great.
M – Can you not see it there?
W – Is there only two pieces?
S – Get that one out of the way.
S – Then what we have tomorrow is (mutual placement?) large canvases, photography, okay?
M – The staff are leaving?
M – This should almost be a decision not for us.
[Extracted material]
M – No, no.
M – Are we going to vote on this one all, or individually?
S – Vote on this one.
S – One ....
M – I’ll give it a vote.
S – Four ....
M – I don’t think we can at this time.
S – Okay.
W – Yeah.
M – Maybe next ....
M – I know yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah.
M – Next is (artist’s name)
M – What’s she do?
[Extracted material]
S – (artist’s name)
M – Paints?
M – Hard worker that lad.
M – Yeah, we’ve got a couple in this year.
M – (artist’s name)
M – Sorry?
S – (artist’s name)
M – Oh yeah (artist’s name) yeah.
S – One more and it’s in.
M – One more? Come on, come on.
M – Well what can you do?
Appendix J: An excerpt from the script for Rehearsing Custom and Practice

Below is an excerpt from the script for Rehearsing Custom and Practice

‘Rehearsing Artistic Custom and Practice’

Script by Naomi Sex

Characters in the play
Naomi Sex
Philip Napier
Tom Lawton
Terri McInerney
Clare Breen

Group of approx 40 to 70 third-level art students from the Fine Art Department, painting, sculpture, print and media students.

Scene
The play is set in the National College of Art and Design (a prominent Irish art college) in a standard tiered lecture theatre named after an Irish fashion designer; Sybil Connolly. Typically for formal presentations, seminars, conferences and symposium the college uses The Sybil Connolly room. It seats up to 150 people and has a staged area with a podium where a speaker usually positions himself or herself in front of a projection screen where keynote and PowerPoint presentations are displayed.

Act one of a one-act play

The Sybil Connolly room is being used as a venue for a seminar series the college has organised for the forthcoming graduating fine art degree students. Every week a different speaker presents on an aspect of ‘professional practice’ to the group of students in an attempt to prepare them for what to expect after graduating at the end of the academic year. A general understanding of what constitutes ‘professional practice’ for a visual artist can mean any of the following things: how an artist conducts their art practice (meaning the basic way in which the artist realises their work for a show), how they materialise and produce their work, it can classify the way an artist conducts themselves and their work in relation to the art industry and how they present themselves and their work), and it can also allude to an artist’s sense of business-like expediency in how they engage with the art industry.

Set in a contemporary Irish context within a recessionary economy the play is staged at a crucial time of structural change for the college, and the future curriculum of all courses being taught. The subject of ‘professional practice’ (now commonplace) was up until relatively recently an unclassified and untaught aspect of the art school curriculum. Its appearance in artistic discourse coincides with the naming of an artist’s career as a form of ‘practice’. These types of specific classification were introduced to the artistic field through the introduction of postgraduate studies in the form of MAs and PhDs
across the UK and Ireland in the eighties and nineties, leading to an increased recognition and shift to viewing art making as a form of ‘research’.

**Character description**

Naomi Sex is female with brown hair tied up, 5 ft 5 height, medium build, wearing loose clothing.

Relationship to other characters in the play: Known by most as a lecturer in the college, and is specifically known by some of the ‘students’ as their supervisor.

Philip Napier is male, dark hair, dark distinct moustache, 5 ft 7 height approx., medium build, wearing black polo neck with a blazer jacket over it.

Relationship to other characters: Holds position of head of the Fine Art Department at the college.

Other supporting characters, Tom Lawton, Terri McInerney and Clare Breen are a part of the group of degree year fine art students.

**Character description** – Diverse group of male and female students

(Naomi hands out scripts, stands by laptop, fidgets, looks at screen, looks at mobile phone, fidgets, looks at mobile phone).

(Philip confidently stands in front of the group of students to introduce Naomi as the speaker for the professional practice series. He begins address with one hand holding the script and the other hand gesturing, and expressing his introduction, he speaks with a distinct northern Irish accent).

‘One of the things I am interested in is this idea of practice or practices, and how they might become a kind of norm, and the relationship the term “practice” has to art making. So “professional practice”, for instance, was something that has only recently been added to the fine art curriculum here at NCAD, but up until about ten years ago, “professional practice” was not labelled as such and students of art and artists had to rely on their own sense of business acumen to survive in an ever-increasing professionalised art industry. (pauses, and looks intently at the group) Now though, you guys have valuable access to workshops knowledge and resources under the umbrella term of “professional practice” so it could be described as a type of norm now or model that we look to, do you know? (pauses again) and what I am really interested in is how we might observe it as a type of model in an artistic sense, and how that model can be played out in various contexts in various different ways. So in light of that (smiles towards Naomi Sex), I thought I would ask Naomi Sex to present today. Some of you might know her as a lecturer in the Fine Art Department, but she is also a student here, engaged in a practice-led PhD at the college. Naomi’s PhD enquiry among other things is observing some of those norms and models I have just mentioned, but I’ll let her explain how, so with out further ado….’ (Looks toward Naomi with a knowing smile and then discretely leaves the room).
(Naomi, smiling uncomfortably, laughing slightly and speaking with a Dublin accent, begins her presentation).

‘Philip asked me here today to talk about my PhD project (pauses) but I thought it might be a bit too much to try and talk about it as a whole, so I’m going to talk about one project that sort of sits within the enquiry and I think probably gives a clear idea of what it is I am researching and what it is the work is attempting to do…’ (uses right hand to gesture a circle at first, then uses left hand to join it).
Appendix K: Full script that accompanied the performative presentation entitled *Rehearsed Practice*

*Rehearsed Practice* by Naomi Sex, with Darina Gallagher and Dave Layde.

So *(Eh)* (ringing hands gesture) what I thought I would do with this *(Eh)* kind of 10 minutes or so (headlights hand gesture) is try and explain as clearly as possible (holding two melons in my hand) what I have been up to for the past two, two-and-a-half *(so-so hand gesture)* years.

In my research (political gesture) I have been really looking at this kind of space that as artists (circular horizontal hand gesture) we navigate in, and look at how the mechanisms (circular vertical holding gesture) of that space work.

The word economy *(said assuredly)* is relevant, not really in the terms of the economic crisis that we are in, but because of this space that artists (circler motion with left hand) manoeuvre within – Richard Whitley (pecking-bird hand gesture) the management scientist calls it ‘a reputation economy’ *(states)*.

As an artist you’re a player in a dynamic field of other players, and what you do (left hand juggle), who you show with (left hand juggle), and where you’ve shown, maybe the things you’ve said or the instances that have occurred throughout your career (one hand pecking hand gesture) stay with you and with the other players you come in contact with.

These things you’ve done, made, said – they maybe reiterated or repeated by other players in your field either in your favour or not. It’s like this trace of stuff that follows you around (moves hands around in circle) – as a reputation – accruing value or ‘capital’, as you move through your professional career.

So I am really interested in this stuff, and a big part of my research (headlights hand gesture) is attempting to map that space and trying to capture the psychology of that space *(square off hand gesture)*, so the way I’m doing it is by separating (two hands spread out gesture) out the type of practices we engage in as artists, and the various types of artistic production – so like there’s the making of art (mid-Atlantic inflection), which is one form of production … (left-hand gesture to one side) but then there is other stuff – like the building of CVs, the recording of artworks through documentation, the writing of statements, biographies that kind of thing – supplementary practice which is really the way (both hands out gesture) we trade in our economy.

All economies are underpinned by some form of apparatus (hands together, pecking gesture). An apparatus is a kind of technical thinking term used by Foucault, and with it he describes entities with strategic power-related functions, for instance, discourses (headlamps hand gesture), institutions, laws, police measures and the network (jazz hands gesture) that is established between those elements and *(said clearly)* individuals, as he noted – ‘the said as well as the unsaid.’
The artist’s reputation economy is also underpinned by an apparatus (hand claw gesture), which can be made tangible by the kind of supplementary practices that we construct to represent ourselves, and our work.

(Eh) - Scene shift

I began to think of the alternative – I asked myself where does the apparatus appear to be absent from the art-showing process? I produced a number of projects with an alternative context in mind.

I’ll try and describe two of the best examples to fit into this short time that I have. (Eh)

Scene shift

The first was a project I curated that involved me inviting four professional artists, all academically trained with contemporary art practices, to show at a well-known amateur artists showing event (Coincidently it took place directly across the road from where we are here today in Newman House — on the railings of St. Stephen’s Green).

The amateur artists group rent the railings of St. Stephen’s Green from Dublin City Council three times during the summer months allocating a 6 x 12 foot section of the railing to each of their exhibitors for a fee of €25 for the weekend. At the amateur event, the artwork is hung on the actual railings ‘crudely’ some may say, with plastic cable ties. The artwork is tightly hung on the railing without much spatial allowance. It’s outdoors and there are preparations made for bad weather but in general there is a relaxed attitude to the risk of damage. The artwork is priced overtly – not discretely like the typical white cube space; cash and money exchanges are visible and spoken about overtly. The artist sits vigilant beside their work throughout its showing and is avidly willing to explain their work in person. The work is exposed to a large cross-section of members of the public and they participate regularly and assertively in dialogue with the artists and their artworks. The professional apparatus is prevalent in the form of websites, evidencing critical appraisal in the media, incomes made, biographies, CVs – the word ‘amateur’ becomes problematic on closer inspection. At first glance the perception was that the event was all-inclusive, and there was no request made for an apparatus. On closer involvement it wasn’t straightforward and in terms of how the actual artworks were made and presented, it became clear that it was not an all-inclusive event. The professional artists whom I invited to show wished to make their work through various means, like performance, installation, sound, relational methods – the typical methods of art-making prevalent in contemporary art practice.

I made a request to rent my section of the railings and was made aware that there were stipulations regarding how the work was made and shown. There were rules. The work had to be two-dimensional, it had to be in a frame, it had to have a price and no less than eight pieces should be shown at one time. I wrote to the committee to explain that the artists I had invited wished to use other methods and could they make an allowance. I then entered a lengthy and prolonged negotiating process with the committee controlling the event. They finally agreed to let the artists I invited to show at the event.
This permission was granted under the condition that the section of the railings we showed at was located on the other side of the Green, and not close to the regular exhibitors. We were given a space on the south side of the Green (where we are today), not near any other exhibitors. In terms of the event’s organisers, this is considered the quieter and less desirable side of the railings in terms of exposure and sales. The artists I invited to show exhibited over three days, they, their artworks, and my highly visible role as a curator became one of curiosity and genuine interest, with repetitive and challenging probing from members of the general public . . . (Eh) differing from the conventions of the usual discrete curated exhibition.

Scene shift

So (Eh) this project helped activate psychological separations that exist in the large field of artistic production, illustrating that within that large field, there are smaller fields of practice that sit beside each other under the umbrellas of ‘Art’ and ‘Artist’ (Move hands close and far apart) but never usually come in contact with each other – and when they do, these separations and differences can translate in quite a physical and visual way, and maybe ways that are unpredictable.

Now just briefly, I’ll speak of the other project – (Eh)

Scene shift

This is still in its development and reflection stage in terms of my research and so I won’t speak too much about the finer details of it. I made a request to observe the selection process of the oldest and largest open submission of artworks in the country. It occurs in an artistic establishment, and my guise as a type of ethnographer throughout the observation was an unprecedented arrangement. Coincidently, this selection of artwork occurs to the right of where we are today in Newman House. It is one of the last professional and prestigious events where the apparatus is not required in the process – all that is required is a name, an address, a fee and details of the work. These are submitted along with specifically unwrapped artworks, which then go through a large administrative process. The selection is governed by a panel of artists who have gained recognition throughout their careers and are a part of a group with prominent historical academic titles that they assign to one another. The selection process is over 200 years old and is rooted in artistic history, both nationally and internationally. The submission of the work takes place over a week annually and the organisation takes in close to 3,000 artworks – predominantly paintings.

To be selected the artwork needs to rely on the voting system, a vote is called (Eh)

This needs to have consensus of the panel with an overwhelming majority needed in favour of the work. The works are then accepted, unaccepted or placed in a ‘possible’ category. The possible category requires just a majority vote. Stripped of all periphery information that is usually found in the apparatus, the panel need to rely on their own artistic and professional view of the artworks, and what they may inherently know about the author of the artworks; these become evaluating and orientating factors for the panel.
Notification is sent to the artist who is then required to collect their work if unaccepted, or if it is accepted the work is then placed in a large art exhibition. (Eh) –

**Scene shift**

This observation will offer a way for me to document how one type of key structure in the field of art works as a filter in a reputation economy, and how forms of capital such as **social** as well as **cultural** are important factors in the process of shaping artistic careers.

**Scene shift**

Now I’m in the process of trying to wrap all this stuff up. It will probably take (Eh) another year.

In the last 9 minutes 39 seconds or so (so-so hand gesture) I have acknowledged a reputation economy, and I have attempted to describe forms of artistic occupation, and maybe forms of artistic preoccupation.
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