CHAPTER 3: A TAXONOMY OF RHETORICIANS’ FILM AND VIDEO PRODUCTION

In his 2015 Chair’s Address at the Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC), Adam Banks declared the essay to be “dominant genre emeritus” to great cheer from the audience. He explained the need for us to “embrace technology issues, not as part of what we do, but as central to what we do.”

In this chapter, I examine the work of a number of scholars who are doing just that, as I construct a taxonomy of moving-image work made by rhetoricians. As with most taxonomies, these categories are neither exact nor comprehensive, but they are helpful in mapping out the film and video work being done. I end each category by examining how the principles of feminist filmmaking can strengthen the quality and ethics of our work.

Let’s start with how important moving image scholarship is to a rhetorician’s professional trajectory by discussing:

COMMITMENT LEVEL

As with other digital production genres, not every rhetorician who produces moving images considers her or himself a filmmaker or wants to work in the medium again. In homage to caper thrillers, prison dramas, and Orange is the New Black, the feminist T.V. phenomenon du jour, but also acknowledging that film and video production can incarcerate us in prolonged technological mazes, I have come up with two criminal-themed categories. The first is:

Lifers

Bonnie Kyburz defines being a lifer succinctly when she says, “my film work defines my scholarship.” Lifers see moving images as either their medium of choice or a medium they aim to work in throughout their careers. Lifers also theorize the role film and video production plays in our field. Sarah Arroyo’s Participatory Composition examines the effect of video sharing sites like YouTube on Rhetoric and Composition and the culture at large, and Bump Halbritter’s Mics, Cameras, Symbolic Action explores connections between filmmaking and writing pedagogy.

Projects like Enculturation’s “Video and Participatory Cultures,” a special issue coedited by Arroyo and Geoffrey Carter, allow lifers to encourage others to join the debate. As Carter explains, “Not everyone in that collection was keen on doing a video issue at first. I knocked on a lot of doors to get people to contribute something, and I owe a great deal to Alex Reid for agreeing to give it a shot early on.” Lifers can be catalysts, inviting others to see film and video connections to their work. Carter continues:
Ryan Skinnell was a perfect example of someone I had to convince that his work on Derrida's archive might be applied to video cultures like YouTube ... he finally consented to give it a shot, and since that time his work has been cited in a number of different places by people starved to find ways scholars are talking about this exploding forum.

Lifers are the motor behind filmmaking’s journey into and through Rhetoric and Composition. We need as many committed lifers as we can get if film and video production is going to have an enduring presence in the field.

Now let’s look at:

**Casual Offenders**

Scholars who have produced a couple of films and videos, or published an essay touching upon film and video production, I call casual offenders. They don’t necessarily identify as filmmakers or have an invested interest in film and video production’s role in the field. However, they are crucial to strengthening the role of moving images in Rhetoric and Composition. To begin with, there are more casual offenders than lifers, so their sheer numbers help. More importantly, casual offenders often blend their other scholarly interests with their film and video work, bringing innovative ideas to the field’s filmmaking practices. We lifers also merge our other interests with our filmmaking work. However, since for many of us filmmaking is our central area of research, some casual offenders have a wider spectrum of non-moving-image scholarship to incorporate into their film and video work.

Because, as I will address in Chapter 4, learning to make moving images can be a daunting process, the feminist filmmaking principle of mentorship is key to how lifers and casual offenders relate to one another. As a mother whose children have attended a few conferences, I am often contacted by women I hardly know seeking advice on how to handle motherhood and academia. When it comes to film and video production, the mysteries are just as deep. Whether we are sharing information about where to purchase equipment, how to learn editing softwares, or how to argue for the value of our moving image work, mentorship is key. Not only is it important for lifers to mentor casual offenders, we lifers must mentor each other as we develop our craft and our arguments for the value of moving-image work.

Mentorship can often lead to collaboration, from presenting on video-based panels to making moving images together, like Megan Fulwiler and Jennifer Marlow did on their feature documentary *Con Job*. Whatever our level of collaboration, it is important to practice the ethics of interdependence as we engage with each other. If the ideas of all who are involved in the production are taken into account, we’ll end up with richer films and videos. Lifers and casual offenders are still a small group,
making it imperative for us to work together in a constructive and non-competitive manner to strengthen the role of moving images in the field.

Let’s now look at how the work of lifers and casual offenders can be categorized into different **KINDS OF PRODUCTION**. We’ll start with:

**Video Essays**
You’re currently watching a video essay, a genre that consists of an academic text read by the author or authors, accompanied by moving and still images, and music. Here is how Arroyo defines it:

My videos are primarily comprised of found footage and usually take on theoretical concepts. I rely heavily on sampling and juxtaposition, and I assemble imagery not to literally represent the concepts but to evoke them through calling up feelings, connections, and associations in viewers. I rarely shoot my own footage, and when I do, I simply use my phone or other amateur digital camera.

Most rhetoricians working on video essays edit together clips from already existing moving images and/or stills. When filmmakers use images to illustrate something as it is being discussed, such cutting to a woman teaching while she describes her pedagogy, we call it B-roll. Video essayists rely on B-roll to bring the scholarly arguments we’re making with words visually to life.

Bahareh Alaei explains her process this way, “I work primarily with found video on sites such as YouTube and Vimeo. My projects generally center around layering my visual and aural interpretations of theoretical concepts in order to, hopefully, generate multiple trajectories of meaning to my audience.” The multiplicity of words, images, and soundtrack Alaei describes is one of film and video production's most valuable contributions to rhetorical scholarship, providing three different channels that are in constant conversation with each other as we watch and interpret the author’s message. Like an opera, where three characters confess their secrets simultaneously in one aria, a video can support, contradict, and poke fun at itself all at once. If done well, this multilayered interaction can deliver complex rhetorical ideas that cannot be replicated in other formats.

The first video essay I ever watched is Arroyo and Alaei’s, “The Dancing Floor,” which explores connections between YouTube and Gregory Ulmer’s reimagining of the Greek concept *chora*. Arroyo and Alaei show how *chora*, which argues for the value of emotion and irrationality for invention, can be used to understand the practices behind YouTube remixes and video responses. They focus on a series of videos made in response to a YouTube remix of scenes from 80’s Brat Pack films set to Phoenix’s song “Lisztomania.” Arroyo describes how the footage they used performs their argument:
[W]e worked hard to find footage that exhibited professional, calculated, grounded dance in the first section. In the second section, you won't see anyone standing on the ground; everything is in motion, flowing, and water-like, and the video footage matches up with the voiceover ... the video is, quite literally, performing what we are saying. It is not, however, a literal interpretation, as in power point slides that accompany a lecture. Rather, it is appealing to the senses more abstractly, thus giving viewers a double whammy of the material with the imagery and words in the voice over.

“The Dancing Floor” presents complex arguments through every one of its layers. The three operatic characters—narration, image, and soundtrack—make profound points through their simultaneous singing. Although most video essays use footage shot by others, some don’t. I often film my own images so I can create something that fits my vision for the project. Like other lifers, I also blend my own images with those captured by others, as I’ve done in this video book. I will discuss fair use and copyright in Chapter 4, but I want to mention here that the images we quote work as citations and are mentioned in video essays’ end credits, as are cited alphabetic writing texts.

Although in many video essays we hear the authors’ disembodied voices as you’re hearing mine now, sometimes scholars film themselves delivering the text, as Jonathan Alexander does here. Besides portraying the speakers we’re hearing, some video essays intersperse clips made by others with their own work, letting us hear the footage. Here Alex Reid remixes interviews with fellow scholars like Sherry Turkle and Internet entrepreneurs like Charles Leadbetter with footage of himself analyzing the connections between the clips. Through this approach, he seems to converse with others featured in the video. Instead of the author, he appears to be one more in the mix.

Now that we understand video essays, let’s turn to:

**Remixes**

Unlike video essays, remixers use little or no narration, relying instead on clips they edit together. For “Master Hands, A Video Mashup Roundtable,” five rhetoricians remixed scenes from the 1936 film *Master Hands*, which features a day at a Chevrolet plant. Richard Marback remixes *Master Hands* with footage from manufacturing strikes and the film *8 Mile*, to counter the celebratory sense of the original. Jody Shipka, on the other hand, remixes it with 1950s educational videos on how to use film projectors and with home videos she has found at flea markets and estate sales. Her remix highlights the relationship between two different technologies and the role cars played in the lives of those who drove them.
Besides short moments of narration, remixes use title cards to make their arguments, quoting from scholars or breaking down the video into sections. The soundtrack can also play a particularly strong role. For “Rhetoric and Revolution,” Byron Hawk edits images of George Bush and of hands in different positions to accompany Trent Reznor’s “The Hand that Feeds” in order to critique political and cultural forces that survive through exploitation. Kairos is key to remixers as they decide how much footage to use, for how long, and where to place it.

During his address, Banks urged us not to cite the same traditional theorists over and over. He suggested that we instead seek diverse voices such as “Dreamers working for undocumented students” and “feminist collectives.” He explained the need to diversify our citation practices by saying, “The moment where we will have some intellectual freedom as scholars and as an organization will be not just when the demographics of our conferences and our faculties look like America, but when our citation practices and works cited lists do too.” In other words, like feminist filmmakers, he sees the urgency of featuring diversity in our work. Because images work as citations in video essays and remixes, we need to be aware of who we choose to feature on screen. Here is Alaei describing her process:

> When I need to include bodies in my composition, I look for figures that speak to what my project is about and generally don't fit into the stereotypical configurations of people in many professional media outlets (highly attractive, thin, generally young). I try to include a kaleidoscope of individuals of different ethnicities, gender orientations, ages, and body types. Other times, I'll notice in the editing stages that I'm not satisfied with the range of people I'm presenting so I'll set out to remedy that.

Not all video essay and remix topics lend themselves to the process Alaei is describing, but for the topics that do, it is important to strive toward diversity. One way to achieve this goal is by practicing strategic contemplation as we decide what images and music engage best with our ideas. Taking the time to reflect on how our use of someone else’s footage and music will affect those who created it makes for a more ethical approach to citation. We rhetoricians have years of experience tackling those very questions as we decide how to cite other people’s alphabetic writing.

Let’s now turn to a different production genre and discuss how lifers and casual offenders approach:

**Documentaries**

Unlike video essays, which are a new genre, documentary filmmaking is as old as moving images themselves. Rhetoricians’ documentary work can be divided into two categories. We’ll begin with:
Academic Documentaries
The defining feature of academic documentaries is that they create new knowledge about our field and/or its practices. My short documentary “Lifting as We Climb” examines the history of the first 25 years of the Coalition of Women Scholars in the History of Rhetoric and Composition by using interviews with founding members and past presidents, footage of the 25th anniversary gala, and Coalition photos. We not only hear and see those who shaped the Coalition’s first quarter of a century, but we can visually experience some of its trajectory through the featured stills, because unlike the footage—which was shot in 2014—the photos span two decades.

Besides providing historical accounts, academic documentaries examine our approaches to theory and pedagogy. In Take 20, our field’s first feature academic documentary, Todd Taylor filmed prominent scholars discussing their experience teaching writing and examining how graduate school prepared them for such work. While Taylor relies on his participants’ voices and gestures to analyze his topic, Gail Hawisher’s graduate students take a more conceptual approach to representing their literacy practices in Transnational Literate Lives. Shafinaz Ahmed uses images of herself writing longhand and typing, followed by her braiding her hair as we hear her read a poem about her relationship with her grandmother. We then see her and a colleague discussing one of her poems. The richness of process Ahmed is able to share with us would not be possible in alphabetic writing.

Whether they focus on our history or current practices, academic documentaries are made for members of our field and participate in disciplinary conversations. Let’s now examine the other approach to documentary in the field by turning to:

General Interest Documentaries
A small, yet growing number of lifers and casual offenders make documentaries that are meant for audiences beyond Rhetoric and Composition. The target audience for Vanishing Borders is immigrant women. In a similar vein, in her documentary “Fixing The Standard: The Black Women's Reclamation Of Power,” Shewonda Leger interviews black women and men about their choice to wear their hair naturally, as opposed to chemically straightening it. Her target audience is black women. Unlike academic documentaries, general audience documentaries can screen at film festivals, as Vanishing Borders has. Because the topics these films discuss require no previous knowledge of our field, they are open to outsiders in ways academic documentaries are not.

One could, of course, create a scholarly piece about the rhetoric of choosing to let one’s hair go natural and interview the same people Leger interviewed for her film. As a matter of fact, Leger could blend some of her interviews with narration that analyzes their rhetoric and ties it to existing scholarship in a video essay, which she could then publish in one of our digital journals. I used that very strategy when linking interview clips from Vanishing Borders to Gloria Anzaldúa’s notions of
cultural hybridity. In order to contribute to our field’s knowledge, general interest documentaries need to take an extra step to connect the stories they tell to disciplinary conversations. In Chapter 5 I discuss various ways to make general-interest documentaries count toward tenure and promotion, but I’ll say here that festival, university, and community screenings can be considered part of our scholarly production if adequately framed.

Some documentaries made by lifers and casual offenders seem to straddle the line between general and academic audiences. In Casey Miles’s documentary “Katie L – Femme: Doing it Wrong,” Katie Livingston, a Ph.D. student in Rhetoric and Writing at Michigan State University, analyzes her gender and sexuality through personal stories while making brief connections to how being an academic has shaped her understanding of her femme lesbian identity. Her discussion of the field is minor enough that it wouldn’t alienate general audiences but present enough that it might help reviewers at one of our journals see the documentary as publishable. As more rhetoricians start making general-interest documentaries, we may see more work like Miles’s that straddles the line between the two. We may also start to consider general audience documentaries to be something we do as a field.

As with every taxonomy, there are a few pieces that don’t fit anywhere, but which are important in pushing the edges of the conversation. I’ll call this category:

**Experimental and Animation**

Robert Leston explains that his goal for his video “A Table Without Organs,” was to “do a project that was essentially visual, an art piece.” Leston made the video for a Modern Languages Association panel titled MLArcade, where eight scholars—myself included—created video essays, remixes, and documentaries tracing pinball’s intersections with rhetoric. Leston shot his own footage alongside his daughter, Alex, who is featured in the video. The only words we hear are a poem Alex wrote, and which she utters while staring into the camera. Without video essay narration or participant interviews, Leston’s work remains abstract to the viewer. As does Bianco’s “dogwalking in cemetery woods,” where images she filmed during four months of walking her dog in the Allegheny National Cemetery are accompanied by poetic, stream-of-consciousness narration. Much like experimental work by Maya Deren and Luis Buñuel, Leston and Bianco’s videos question our preconceived notions of narrative and storytelling, pushing the boundaries of the moving image work we can make in our field.

There are also a small number of rhetoricians working with animation. In “Vulnerable Video: A New Vernacular,” Ryan Omizo examines the allure of YouTube’s popular videos showcasing seemingly mundane activities, arguing that it is the sense of vulnerability they create that attracts viewers. To exemplify vulnerability, Omizo uses his own animation in which a pink bunny suffers terrible fates. One reason animation is not more popular in our field is that it is time-
consuming and difficult, something Omizo refers to when he jokes that the bunny he has crafted may “flame its creator for his rudimentary skill in animation.” And yet, much like experimental work, animation opens new opportunities by allowing us to create visuals that are bound by our imagination and technical skills, not by what our cameras can capture or by what others have crafted before us.

Jamie “Skye” Bianco works squarely within feminist filmmaking. Not only does she do work that addresses social justice. She also asserts that when editing footage, it is vital “to think about what it means to treat the living and the real as an object inventory out of which we make selections, try to tell or argue, and try to create affective impact. This leads to questions of investments and positions ‘are your investments and positions the same as your subjects?” She believes that “in particular situations” it is important to have “final cut approval by subjects or participatory editing.” She is also interested in documenting diverse communities. When approaching a project, she wants us to ask, “What communities, practices, etc., do we not live ourselves? What would it mean to learn through permissive documentation? Who becomes the ‘subject’?” Like Bianco, who practices the ethics of interdependence, strategic contemplation, and fostering diversity, other lifers and casual offenders also rely on principles of feminist filmmaking when working on their projects.

Whether one is making documentaries or experimental work, the ethics of interdependence are key to forging strong relationships with those in front of and behind the camera. Leston not only asked his daughter to appear on screen but involved her in the creative process. Their collaboration took place over caffeinated breakfasts discussing the project, as well as during the actual shooting, where both proposed and evaluated ideas. Leston says, “I thought that if I talked to her about my concept, she’d offer some really good ideas for how to achieve concretely what I was somewhat tentatively trying to get at abstractly.” She concurs, “[T]he questions I found myself asking helped direct the project into being more approachable.” As we work with participants and crewmembers, it is important to let them express their views for the project and to take them into account so we end up with richer pieces.

As with video essays, it is important to keep diversity in mind for documentaries and experimental work whenever the topic allows it. When working on *Lifting as We Climb*, I wanted to highlight the role of women of color in the Coalition, which is why two of the six participants I interviewed were black women. To focus the documentary on gender alone would have provided an impoverished version of the organization and its work.

Often linked to diversity is feminist filmmaking’s call to address social justice. The documentary genre is generally associated with social justice, so it makes sense for us to continue that legacy. Fulwiler and Marlow’s *Con Job* analyzes our field’s
exploitation of our own colleagues by inviting adjuncts to tell their stories. Scентers-Zapico’s *Generaciones’ Narratives* showcases the rhetorical and language dexterity of U.S./Mexico border inhabitants, an often vilified population. Leger’s “Fixing The Standard” follows the feminist axiom that the personal is political and makes strong statements about race and gender through its exploration of black people’s relationship to their hair.

And now let’s look at **PUBLICATION PRESENTATION**, which examines the role moving images play in publications by lifers and casual offenders. The first category is:

**Supporting Video**

Filmmaking rhetoricians often insert their moving image work into alphabetic essays. They may use their films or videos to provide a different facet to their argument, as Reid does with “Assemblages,” or they may use alphabetic writing to analyze the moving images they’ve produced. In “National Identity, Normalization, and Equilibrium,” I embed three scenes from “PERFECT” and analyze the rhetorical strategies used by participants in these scenes. Lifers and casual offenders also embed academic documentary work into alphabetic writing texts, analyzing what they’ve uncovered through conversations with their participants, as Scентers-Zapico does in *Generaciones’ Narratives*, where he uses clips of interviews with English-and-Spanish-speaking participants. The clips help us experience the sort of cultural and language diversity he describes in his text. Jennifer Sano-Fanchini, Donnie Johnson Sackey, and Stacey Pigg take a similar approach in “Methodological Dwellings,” featuring video interviews where scholars in our field examine their relationship to feminism.

While the videos in “Methodological Dwellings” were shot for the purpose of writing the article, we also use alphabetic writing to analyze work that was made for other purposes within the field. Drew Kopp and Sharon McKenzie Stevens analyze the way that writing programs use moving images to control how they’re perceived by students, faculty, administrators, and the public. They write that “[d]igital video provides an effective and efficient means to make writing program work visible on our terms” (Kopp and Stevens). In order to prove their point, they embed and analyze videos created by writing programs.

Alphabetic writing can also be used to situate a video we’ve created within disciplinary conversations, as bonnie kyburz does in “i’m like... professional.” kyburz introduces her video by explaining that she originally wanted to make a feature documentary about DIY filmmaker M Dot Strange, but ended up “repurpose[ing] the film as a short documentary for an academic audience.” After viewers watch the video, she has a “q&a” section, where she suggests discussion questions about her film, and a “Special Features” section, in which she discusses
how the Sundance Film Festival influences her own work as a filmmaker and academic.

The work published as supporting film and video uses alphabetic writing to analyze, deepen, and situate the ideas provided by the embedded moving images. Now let’s look at the opposite approach in:

**Standalone Video**

Standalone videos are published on their own or with short introductions. If there is any writing at all, it quickly sets up the scene before ceding center stage to the video essay, documentary, or remix. In their short introduction to *Con Job*, Fulwiler and Marlow describe their project and lay out their argument for telling the story as a documentary by writing, “[w]e have chosen film as a medium with the power to provide a visible portrayal of the lived material conditions of labor in higher education and to reach as wide an audience as possible.” Sometimes the introduction explains a particular function of the piece. When publishing “Lifting as We Climb” in *Peitho*, I was asked to write an introduction discussing how the documentary helps viewers envision not only the Coalition’s beginning but also its future.

Since most adults are familiar with documentaries, introductions for academic documentaries don’t need to do too much heavy lifting. However, because video essays are an emerging genre that many in our field have never experienced, an alphabetic writing introduction can help viewers situate themselves. In their short introduction to “The Dancing Floor,” Arroyo and Alaei provide summaries of the theory and arguments presented in each section of the piece. This can be useful because the complexity of some video essays can be hard for viewers to take in on a first viewing. For one thing, we’re used to highlighting or underlining alphabetic writing and we can’t do so in video essays. We also reread complex paragraphs, but rewinding a video is a bigger interruption than lifting our eyes to revisit a section. Moreover, we can’t really slow down a video the way we slow our reading speed when faced with a difficult passage. And then, of course, there are the images and music competing for our attention as we listen to the text. For these reasons, heavily theoretical video essays benefit from short introductions, and all video essays should include transcripts for viewers to read when digesting a video essay after viewing.

The principle of feminist filmmaking that best applies to publication presentation is mentorship. Because filmmaking is an emerging practice in our field, many rhetoricians interested in picking up the camera are reticent to do so because they don’t know how to publish moving-image work. We can help them by discussing the above models with them and explaining how to best argue for the value of our moving-image scholarship to journal editors and reviewers, a discussion I cover in detail in Chapter 5.
And now that we have an albeit inexact sense of our field’s current moving image work, let’s turn to Chapter 4, where I explain the journeys lifers and casual offenders go on when learning and practicing their craft.
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