**Research title**:

**The Drawn Portrait in Contemporary Printmaking:** A journey between analogue and digital Smart-phone digital photography, analogue drawing and printmaking and how it changes the image.

**Situating the investigation -** This research explores the potential of digital photography within the context of the drawn portrait as manifest through contemporary printmaking methodologies. Furthermore, it seeks to question how methodological choices affect the meaning embedded within the resultant image. The research will be situated in the context of fine art printmaking from its artisanal roots to 21st Century digital applications and seeks to answer three main questions. How can artists use smart phone photography to serve as a basis for drawn portraits and prints? What affect does smart phone photography have on the process of drawn portraiture and printmaking? Does the process from a smart phone photograph to a drawn portrait or print alter the meaning of the image?

The research will offer insights into the materiality of drawing and printmaking through the use of new creative and technological approaches to drawn and printed image reproduction. It will test boundaries of current digital photography, drawing, print practice and associated material approaches in new ways that fuse the historic, new, or appropriated. It will offer artists and printmakers advances in silkscreen methodologies that are akin to drawn qualities yet with the mechanically reproductive capabilities of multiplication. Finally it will offer technical information on contemporary fine art silk-screen and digital printmaking tools, processes and how they can be applied in the visual arts.

**Introduction**

I am in transition from a creative industrial career to one of doctoral research study; there is much to learn. That said I am hugely inspired by the challenge with its new lessons, structures and rewards ahead.

The informative and positively challenging supervision input from Director of Studies, Dr Catherine Baker and Dr Lawrence Green has ensured I investigate the premises of my established practice, approach to art, academe and scholarly writing. I have learned how to be vulnerable. Rather than conceive, draw and print in secure styles of depiction and representation. I have learned the value of challenging my habit formed norms to enable new (to me) methods to be developed within the context of contemporary portraiture. This is positive and makes for constant creative review of art and the act of decision-making within drawing practice. Pursuing my research from this vulnerable position is an indication of how I shall continue – by being open to new thinking, research methods, artistic approaches and learning outcomes.

I have begun my theoretical research with a wide-ranging exploration of knowledge in my research domains. Much is new (to me), although some of my thinking has been percolating in my brain over the last 30 years or so, and it is now time to substantiate generalities of thought with deeper research thinking, understanding and knowledge.

My literature review has been broken down into the main question of study: Contemporary Portraiture, and the 3 practice based domains of ‘digital Photography; Drawing; Print Making’. These strands with their own paths, structures and histories will be collated to form an integrated knowledge base to provide the foundation for the overall research plan.

I shall continue this exploration of practice and theoretical research until I have satisfied myself, and peers, that the research has reached an academically robust stage. At that point I will bring together the three stands under the overall question and address, through my research activities and acquired knowledge, what Contemporary Portraiture means when considered in analogue and digital domains and the implications to practice and expanded image-making processes.

As well as investigating the practice of portrait making through smart phone photography, drawing and fine art printmaking I will explore historic and contemporary technical solutions and materials. My method involves testing boundaries of print practice and associated material approaches in new ways that fuse the historic, new, or appropriated. This involves experimental approaches that are located within the material encounter and what this interface is capable of communicating within the realms of image construction. This work is systemically archived via: <http://printsanew.jonnieturpie.com/screen-tests>

**Methodology**

My academic PhD research methodology reviews existing research, writing and artistic practice. Investigations are structured to embrace the overall question while addressing the specificity and characteristics of digital photography, analogue drawing and printmaking. In parallel with theoretical research I am pursuing practice-based elements in Contemporary Portraiture whereby the aim is that distinction between the two is lost and a synergy of theory and practice is reached.

The balance between theory and practice is equal. The environment of each area of study is complimentary with the quietness of the library and writing room and the tactile nature of the artist’s studio and print room. Practical outcomes enable sharing of research findings to happen more readily, facilitating material-based discussion of techniques and material encounters with peers. This dialogue is captured and forms the basis for academic papers and journal articles.

Addressing the three strands in the overall context brings into play ethical questions of past analogue practice and evolving digital applications in the fine art portraiture context. Ethical research extends my question of what constitutes Contemporary Portraiture and the bounds of my practice. Future research will be situated in a wider global framework and submits my research to wider critical analysis.

**Initial written research**

*Getting it Right : Contemporary Portraiture - doing justice and the maker in the made.*

*Getting it right*was preceded by two early pieces of PGCERT writing. The first was my ethical statement, which focused on fundamental issues of my research on the role of the artist and their responsibility to subjects of their portraits.

The second derived from the PGCERT Writing Retreat challenge to write what ‘I Want To Say.’ This exercise was a valuable method to get down on paper at speed, the core driving questions/issues/concerns for the ensuing research. The 2500 words also provided the opportunity to share with supervisor’s my early research writing. The feedback was valuable and pointed me towards robust academic writing requirements, rather than my, from time to time ‘outlandish claims’. I have learned to apply critical analysis and substantiate claims through reference to high quality, peer reviewed, published works which I shall refine and apply throughout my scholarly research.

**Theoretical Research**

In this theoretical research I will clarify, problematise, illuminate and provide insight while making provocations to further study. To illustrate my academic methodology I include my second‘Getting it right’ subject: **Doing Justice through drawing – and how something of the maker may exist in the thing that is made.**

**Drawing Choices and Traces of Self**

It is my contention that in order to do justice to the making of a drawn portrait of another person one must spend time and energy developing the range of artistic skills and methods necessary to make informed choices and judgments on how one can represent the subject through drawing. What paper, tools, grounds, techniques, technology or materials can be used in making a particular drawing. When embarking on a drawing these questions are asked. One hopes to make the right choices, through reflection one may not have achieved such aims, learning from decisions made whilst becoming more aware of one’s developing artistic capabilities. I propose that these decisions leave traces of the self in the drawing.

When embarking on making a print from a drawing, the process involves the transference of the singular, unique drawn image into a reproducible medium synonymous with the language of printmaking. With its own characteristics, one draws on knowledge acquired through the learned encounters of working in that medium and ask another set of material focused questions. What medium, ink, paper, etc. One is focused on the technical expertise, methods and parameters of the medium that if not performed well will not produce a satisfactory image. Again, like drawing decisions, these print decisions leave traces of the maker and their predilections. This material analysis will further develop by addressing the wealth of epistemological thought and in particular Aristotle’s postulations on experiential learning.

**Rights and Responsibilities**

There is a responsibility on the behalf of the portrait artist, more than many artists genres to ‘get it right, to represent the sitter. Whether in traditional terms of ‘likeness’ whereby the sitter in the portrait session has committed their time (and money) to the artist to get their portrait right, and from the artist to do justice to the representation and interpretation of the subject.

**Drawing Decision Histories**

Artistic decisions are borne of the artist’s imagination, learned and drawing skills at the time of making a work and have the potential to ‘hold’ something of the maker in the work. These decisions ‘have history.’ They are not innate qualities, but are learned, consciously or unconsciously, over the artist’s development. Doing justice to a subject is made by the maker as they bring their perceptions to the work as it is drawn. It is a personal view, but one that is made through experience of seeing, selecting and interpreting subjects through the artist’s chosen medium. It is only then that they will get to a position with the work and its reflection of the subject, that they will say ‘it is right’, an embodiment of the sitter. This will be in the making of the work and it is through the process of making that the essence or soul of the subject may be reflected, and audiences will assess what of the artist is woven into the work and who is able to access it?

**Getting their image ‘right’ - Its personal.**

I have identified the situation of doing justice and its impact on the role of the artist, which demands further time and focused research. Getting their image ‘right’ is important in order that the final drawn and printed image represents and embodies the selected person from the many I meet, and photographed to draw. I know I want to draw them and because I do, I want to make a good job of it; ‘good’ means I feel the final work embodies on paper something of the personality of the subject. The initial choice is in many ways primarily a visual one. The face is exciting, intriguing, sculpted, weathered, aged, attractive, cultured, from a diverse origin. The physical is matched on some occasions by a knowledge of the subject, friend, family member, colleague; on other occasions I have no knowledge of the subject, but am drawn to make their portrait because of their physical image and the context they are in - traveller, art viewer, worker, dreamer.

Initial choice of a subject is subjective and is the first indication of myself in the work. To have chosen to devote and invest artistic attention to a particular subject indicates I value them, a sense that there is something to be drawn. Initial aesthetic judgements are starting point of portraits, however beyond this lies the crux of my research which aims to unpack this process of contemporary portraiture through careful scrutiny of seemingly intuitive motivations. Research into what ‘portraiture objectives’ may be in play between the maker and sitter/subject that go unspoken at the point of selection and may make themselves known as the process towards the completed portrait is pursued. Works and choices over time will reflect myself, and the psychological history I bring to choice of subject.

Suffice to say at this point, that I know and acknowledge this deep and personal underpinning of the work

**Smart Phones**

Many of my artistic decisions are made in the world with a smart phone to hand. And always discreet. Why ‘discreet’ you may ask? Because the discreet image is the foundation to begin doing justice to the person and their image. I know this because in many photo sessions I will only select one digital photograph to begin a drawing. I will discard anything from 3 to 30 frames in favour of the ‘one’ that I feel represents the starting point for my interpretation of the subject, the portrait beginning. On occasion, I have intentionally met subjects more than once, as I have not been satisfied that previously photographed images have captured my perception of the person. Again, these are subjective choices in the context of making the artwork. The act of drawing enables subject reflection and my motivation to represent them, and to get their image right.

**Drawing and Portraiture**

The portrait artist brings their artistic abilities and sensibilities to the work and, in the case of drawing, there is a broad and deep history that informs contemporary drawing decisions.

Deanna Petherbridge has researched and written a ‘Mstressful’ analysis of many factors at play in the making of drawings over centuries of European Art. *The Primacy of Drawing*, (Petherbridge.D 2010.) gives the opportunity to delve into the processes, complexities, analogue and digital foundations to drawing practices. She is also adept at pointing to the basics that sometimes pass us by as we plough on in our ‘own’ approaches.

**Scale Matters – The Physicality of drawing.**

“Scale Makes a Different Drawing”*,* the author writes, the smallest of drawing brings in the aspect of scale, as artist Joseph Herman addressed so practically:

‘I know from experience that if I sit hunched over a small page on the table, I will make a different kind of drawing than when I stand in front of the large sheet of cartridge on the easel. Hunched over the small page, my drawing is likely to be intimate, reflective and *involve me in a greater inward concentration* (Petherbridge italics). Standing in front of a large sheet, I am likely to give outward things priority.’ (Petherbridge.D. 2010. p298)

This recognition of the effect of the physical and how it can affect the act of drawing indicates how the physicality embodied in the process demands further investigation. Salons of the past portray the ‘stand up at the easel’ position as a convention adopted by the drawing artist. There are physical reasons why, under particular schools of learning, standing it is considered important to accurately measure the subject. As artist Dryden Goodwin reflects in his Guardian interview: ‘William Coldstream, Slade Professor of Fine Art, developed an approach to drawing and painting from direct observation that pushed the emphasis on measurement to an extreme. Students were encouraged to stand before their model and use plumb lines and pencils to measure what they were seeing.’ (Berning.D. 2009.)

For artists not adopting the standing position the sketchbook is firmly established as a methodological approach. It affords what is often described as a more intimate drawing experience. Modern technological advances have linked the sketchbook to its more modern counterpart, the tablet with its electronic stylus being closely-aligned to the pencil thus mirroring the physicality of the process whilst firmly embedding the activity in a different realm; the digital. Both activities echo the ‘hunched’ maker though critical reflection reveals that this process can contribute to overtly detailed ‘cold’ drawings. How is it that this contemporary version can cause such a removed result? What happens within the technologically dominated methodology that brings about a shift from ‘intimate’ to ‘cold’? It is my intention to further research this critical methodological occurrence.

**Copying – Art?**

Copying tends to be referred to in art practice, as copying from a master to advance the aspiring artist’s skills to be entrusted to work on greater works, by greater artists culminating with the embarkation on to their own works.

I do not copy from other artists, but begin by tracing from a photograph, that I have made and selected as a starting point – is this copying? – How does it affect my ‘style’? – Am I a fraudulent drawer?

‘A copy is defined in the Grove Dictionary of Art as a: ‘non-fraudulent manual repetition of another work of art. The contemporary notion of authenticity has tended to obscure the fact that the exercise of copying has been a central feature of art practice since antiquity. Unlike the forger, the copyist produces a work that, while taking another for work as its point of departure, it is not intended to deceive the spectator.’ (Duro.P. Petherbridge,D. 2010 p266):

I particularly like the distinction of motivation between the forger and copyist in that the copyist does not intend to deceive. S/he does not imitate, and the drawing artist does not imitate without bringing something of themselves to the paper, through the pencil.

In making a drawing the artist cannot ever achieve a pure 100% representation of the form of the chosen subject, and what they give to the drawing is their interpretation of the subject through their drawing skills, insights and approach. Drawing from a photograph cannot represent 100% the photographic image and what would be the point of such an exercise? Much mechanical detail must be left out and in making decisions as what to leave out or include, the artist is imbuing something of themselves in the drawing.

**Photography. What have you done?**

The accuracy of drawing debate was brought to the fore with the invention of photography and its first accessible process – the daguerreotype. Prior to photography portrait artists were the point of call for a subject seeking a representation of themselves, however with the daguerreotype a new artisan with a machine ‘could do the job as well, or more realistically.’ This brought into question the value / uniqueness of the portrait artist and the question as to how the drawing would differ from the mechanical reproduction, no matter how skilled or stylish the operator, later to be titled the photographer, might be.

This is ably highlighted by Charles Blanc, the instigator of the musée des copies in 1871:

“‘What is drawing? Is it a pure imitation of form[[1]](#footnote-1)? If so, the most faithful of all drawings should be the best; then no copy would be preferable to the image fixed upon the daguerreotype plate or traced mechanically… But neither of these instruments gives us a drawing comparable to that which Leonardo da Vinci or Michael Angelo would have made.” (Blanc.C. Petheridge.D 2010. P281)

This is a major claim for the artist’s drawing over the daguerreotype. But Blanc goes on to make an important observation on the distinction between the drawing and the photograph: ‘The most exact imitation, then, after all, is not the most faithful, and the machine in seizing the real does not always catch the True.’

*“In seizing the real does not always catch the True.”*  This is a truly far-reaching and prescient observation on the proprietary of the photograph and future claims that “…the photograph never lies”.

Blanc goes on to point out that the drawing is not a copy, but the work of the mind.[[2]](#footnote-2) ‘Why? Because drawing is not a simple imitation, a copy corresponding mathematically to the original, an art reproduction, a plesonasm. Drawing is the work of the mind.’ (Petherbridge.D. 2010. p100)

In the case of drawing then, and now, the mind is at work and integrated with the skills of eye, hand and through the pencil brings interpretation of the subject to the paper.

**Copying, Drawing and Photography.**

In continuing her analysis of copying, drawing and photography Petherbridge points to the portrait of the artist Degas on his deathbed by RB Kitaj. She posits that Kitaj selects elements of the photograph to highlight his interpretation of the scene and his mentor, the deathly Degas. The Kitaj artwork takes the viewer closer to the subject, and ‘seems to reflect the psychological need to lessen the glassy stare of his last anguish.’ (Petherbridge.D. 2010. p281)

Petherbridge’s description of the artistic representation of the subject indicates the choices made by artist to interpret his subject, by choosing what to include, enhance or diminish in the portrait. These decisions are personal and subjective, even though they are inspired by a photographic representation of the subject. She does not deny the decision of the artist to be inspired by the photograph and points to a psychological need in the artist’s methods to reflect a subject close to his heart. Kitaj’s artistic decisions give something of himself to the artwork and make it a ‘Kitaj’.

**Style, Signature. The Maker in the Made**

Can pursuing the act of copying help us locate the maker in the made? Patricia Cain in *Drawing*: *The enactive evolution of the practitioner,* (Cain, P. 2010) asks the question of herself and other drawing artists: “How do we think we draw? Through processes of copying drawn works of art she reflects upon how her brain and body interact and how she thinks, as she draws. Cain copies from other artists begining with a Rubens. She observes the marks made by another, and her take on another artist’s mark making, which created a conflict between ‘her natural style, or signature’, and that of the other artist. She makes clear that she has her own approach, ‘signature’ and ‘drawing vocabulary’ that she must not apply in the act of copying as she is trying to exclude herself from the drawing process.

These lessons learned from copying are useful in assessing what of oneself the artist is applying while drawing a subject. When drawing one unconsciously brings a drawing vocabulary from an individual ‘toolset’ developed over time. It could be argued that this toolset is not wholly learned and it may have been partly inherited from forebears as a foundation enhanced by further artistic gathering, and internalised by the artist, to be applied in the act of drawing. Being unique it could be perceived as one’s style or signature.

Cain took a major step by deciding to copy a self-portrait by another artist: Danny Ferguson. “By copying this self-portrait, I am copying Ferguson’s act of seeing himself. Questions arose in my mind as I drew: Is this what he sees of himself? Am I seeing what he sees? And rather than trying to see what he saw, I felt like I was losing myself in what he saw, and this was part of becoming more **accurate** about what I was trying to reproduce in the drawing.” (Cain, P. 2010. P122)

Cain’s immersive research reveals an increased emotional involvement when taking on a charged project of a self-portrait, by another artist. The questions she asked of herself while drawing and the feeling of transference she experienced when drawing a copy of another person’s self-portrait are resonant of the process of drawing an original portrait. Her description of “losing myself” is a feeling one experiences when immersed in drawing a face, and attempting to reflect its owner.

She observes that when she copied the self portrait “she came to think about how the copying process also involved the re-enactment of the approximation (or balance) between what is seen (accurate representation) and what is sensed (what the artist gives of him/herself in a drawing).” This balance is applicable in the drawing of an original portrait. Her introduction of what is ‘sensed is what the artist gives of themselves’ is a strong pointer toward answering the question of: “Where is the maker in the made?”

**Drawn Vs Photographic Image**

With the knowledge that the artist gives something of themselves in the making, and taking us back to the drawn and photographic image, Roland Barthes’ valuably makes a succinct demarcation of the two:

*‘when distinguishing between the coded drawing and the photograph as a ‘message without-code’: the denotation of drawing is less pure than photographic denotation, for there is never a drawing without style.’*

(Barthes. R. and Howard. R.1982)

Barthes asserts that drawing has ‘style’ as opposed to the scientific detail of accurate denotation. This can only come from the artist who is puts, consciously or unconsciously, something of themselves in the artwork. They are doing this as they create a drawing that captures and reflects the subject to their artistic satisfaction, thereby doing Justice in their artistic terms, to ‘get it right’ and put the maker in the made.

**Likeness, Pre and Post Photography**

‘Getting it right’ in many cases of portraiture, prior to photography would be for the artist to achieve a likeness of the subject. As John Cage points out: ‘Until 20th century psychoanalysis and it's modern theoretical offshoots discarded the notion that human character may be inferred from external, and especially facial, characteristics, the representation of likeness was seen as one of the most important tasks of portrait art. …..

…… photography brought a sense of liberation to the portraitist, and one of the most striking evidences of this is the new type of confrontational portrait, especially cultivated amongst artists and writers and for example in a remarkable group of male heads taken in the 1860s by Julia Cameron, across the genders. These isolated and closely groomed heads imply a proximity which would have been unthinkable without the psychological distancing of a mechanical device.’ (Woodall J, editor. 1997 John Cage.)

A contemporary of Cameron was Pre Raphaelite Dante Gabriel Rossetti who employed photography, or in one pertinent case employed a photographer, to capture a likeness for his realist paintings of his model and muse Jane Morris. Rossetti directed the sitter to pose and the photographer to photograph the range of poses.

As Colin Ford in the Burlington Magazine reports the letter from Rossetti to Morris: “The photographer is coming in on Wednesday. So I'll expect you as early as you can manage.” The photographer was John Robert Parsons (c1825-1909), and the result of his visit to Rossetti's house in Cheyne Walk, Chelsea, is one of the most compelling sets of Pre Raphaelite images known to us. (Ford. C. Burlington magazine records : Parsons and Rossetti)

**Photography – new ways of seeing.**

Hiring a photographer and model by a painter of renowned reputation is an indication of how the new medium could be adopted as a aid/tool for the artist. Furthermore the new image making that Cameron brought to light could inspire painters to a new way of seeing. A series of 18 poses fixed on photographic paper, would have provided Rossetti with images of his model/muse in a different light than when she sat for him for many of his paintings. One can imagine that this would be the first time he had an array of images before him as visual references to analyse, see afresh and interpret on the canvas.

“It is known that Rossetti often attended exhibitions of photographs, and he certainly knew Julia Margaret Cameron's work. (Scharf, A.1974.) At the beginning of 1866, he wrote to thank Mrs Cameron for 'the most beautiful photograph you so kindly sent me. It is like a Leonardo [sic].' Rossetti's close-up portraits of women's faces are painted and drawn equivalents of 'the world's first close-ups', as Cameron's portraits have been called. In her case, the rather melancholy Mariana, by Dante Gabriel Rossetti. (1868-70) or, at times, emotionless expressions on her sitters' faces derive at least in part from the necessity of sitting absolutely still for four or five minutes at a time. There is a pervasive look of melancholy on the faces of Rossetti's women too. He regularly pushes his subjects forward into a closer relationship with the viewer than he had done at the beginning of his career. Like Cameron's 'famous men and fair women', they seem almost to burst from the frame. Photographic composition by the artistic photographer is perhaps having affects on the artistic composition of the painter. A symbiosis that will develop as the photographic medium matures and will demand further research.

**Photograph Vs Picture - Ingenuity vs Genius.**

Before leaving the subject of likeness for the artist and the early applications of photography it is worth noting the abhorrence some felt to this mechanical medium that the more progressive artists of the period embraced. John Ruskin in his Slade Professor lecture at Oxford in 1870 railed against modern life in general and again photography as an indicator of this dangerous direction of society: ‘ almost the whole system and hope of modern life are founded on the notion that you may substitute mechanism for skill, photograph for picture’.

Later in his life Ruskin carried on his view that: ‘photographs are false, they are only a matter of ingenuity, while art is a matter of genius; the artist must use them with extreme caution, though they may serve some of his needs; portrait photographs are ‘horrid things’, though there is much truth in the facial expressions of instantaneous photographs.’

(Scharf, A., 1974. Penguin.)

**Truth in instantaneous photographs.**

How would his grudging acceptance of some value of the medium be seen in the adoption of the medium in art in the coming century? Not least in my work that puts discreet smart phone photography at the forefront of drawn and printed artworks, to reflect more than ‘just likeness’ and perhaps aspire to the ‘truth’ to which Ruskin refers, and do justice to the subject while investing something of myself through the artistic process. My research will explore the complexity and intricacy of these questions of photography and drawing.

**Summary**

This submission is a summary of my academic written research and indicate the methodology I am applying. They do not include my extensive practice research methodology, which are captured in my ‘Developing as a researcher’ contribution. Practice, selection and sharing of portraiture subjects are forming a valuable intersection of theory and practice, in my research. This will form a part of my next stage forward plan and will contribute to the fulfillment of my thesis question.

**Plan of study**

I will build upon initial research by researching the post 19th Century introduction of photography and the implications to portraiture drawing in the 21st Century. I will further situate the research by investigating the interpretation of justice of artist’s and photographer’s portraiture in contemporary digital and analogue contexts. Immediate investigations include two identified areas of research focus:

**1. POST WAR Photography, portraiture, drawing and the self.**

Photography, portraiture and analysis of the self in art matured from the inception of photography and its popularity in the first half of the 20th Century. In post second world war art America artists embraced modernity and many expressed themselves through Abstract Expressionism. However, a number of artists reacted against abstraction and engaged with figuration through movements including Pop Art. By studying the approaches to drawing, copying, likeness and use of photography by post war artists in their art making I will explore **The Drawn Portrait in Contemporary Printmaking**.

**2. Digital is hot or cool?**

I will investigate whether Digital is hot or cool? In the 21st Century ‘digital’ has moved photography, image capture and artistic making forward exponentially. Some might say this is of great benefit and has been incorporated in the making of important artworks reflecting society and our place as human beings within in it.

However, others might say this is to the detriment of art and as analogue and traditional techniques disappear, due to technological progress, the desire to revive and maintain such practices paves the way for pockets of artistic practice and learning where continued access is ensured. Examples of this include independent printing presses worldwide, UK Art Schools and innovation hubs.

The dichotomy, if it is one, between digital and analogue surfaces in Deanna Petherbridge’s analysis and criticism of contemporary drawing where she condemns digital as: ‘cool, too fast and violent. In a digital age, the newly generated image has no more status than any other image in the chain of simulcra; all are equally susceptible to decomposition, multiplication and dehistoricisation …….. In the conflation of public and private, which the high tech media of mass communication have spawned, authorship is only a flash’. Petheridge argues that: “hand drawing becomes the signifier of the autographic self in contrast to the fragmentation of the rest of the artist's practice.’

Although I agree that drawing can be a signifier of the autographic self I do not agree that artist’s use of multi media work has no personality or trace of the artist. Through their making they imbue the work with something of themselves. In the digital world where artists make use, adopt, develop and apply digital techniques to make their work they also leave traces of themselves. If they choose to mix digital and analogue techniques then so be it and the viewer will decide if they get something ‘right’ and they can see the artist in the work.

**Impact**

Impact will be twofold: Academic study in the form of written and illustrated papers/ journal articles and in through practice-based outcomes, the exhibiting and sharing of printed art works in both physical and digital environments. The audiences for both approaches will be measured against impact data relating to engagement and critique with academic scholars and their networks in the fields of portraiture, drawing, digital photography, ethics and the philosophy of art. An example of how my research will be submitted to academic calls is a recent abstract for *Portraiture: an Interdisciplinary Conference.* Durham University.

**Soul Theft:** Digital and Analogue Portraiture

It is understood within anthropological research and early photographic portraiture that subjects across countries and communities have felt something of themselves being ‘taken’ when a photographic portrait of them has been made. Taking this notion of ‘Soul theft’ this paper will unpack ethical and cultural questions in the context of the early adoption of the camera. Through my interdisciplinary investigations I will present my research into contemporary portraiture through interdependent genres of mobile phone, drawn and printmaking. This paper will further explore the ethical nature of smartphone portraiture questioning the potential for ‘soul theft’ within contemporary society. Central to this dialogue is the idea of identity loss through image capture:

‘*The camera is clumsy and crude. It meddles insolently within other people’s affairs. The lens scatters a crowd like the barrel of a gun*.’

S Barker. 2010. p207.

Barker’s quote is a powerful one whereby the camera, in search of a subject, becomes the gun, but what of the marksman? This paper will delve into the ubiquitous prevalence of smartphone cameras that invade society affecting understanding and perceptions of contemporary portraiture.

Whilst acknowledging the historical significance of the techniques and traditions of portraiture the paper will conclude with a presentation of how the smartphone portrait can be reinterpreted within the analogue environment of drawing and printmaking.

By exploring the unique qualities of a hand-drawn printed portrait, in stark contrast to the ‘taken’ photographic image, this paper will question whether the soul of the subject can be embodied within the printed outcome?

Phillips, S. ed., 2010. *Exposed: Voyeurism, Surveillance, and the Camera*. Tate Pub 2010 Chapter Up Periscope. Photography and the surreptitious image. Simon Barker. -P207

The second impact approach will be through the inclusion of the practice outputs in multidisciplinary fields of art, portraiture, drawing, photography and printmaking. Such sites include art galleries, printmaking exhibitions, conferences, biennales, social and digital media including regular blog posts.

**Ethical considerations**

I have read the University research ethics policy. I have responded to the policy questions in relation to my research through a comprehensive ethics statement. This Ethics Statement has been submitted and accepted by my second supervisor Dr Lawrence Green, the head of ADM Research. **Doctoral researcher and future professional development.**

I have actively participated and contributed to a University and doctoral programmes. I participate in lectures, debates, exhibitions and social media exchanges to learn and develop my research capabilities. I will seek professional development through writing workshops including thesis development; journal /article/paper writing, structuring and submission processes. Practice research : pursue advanced artistic and printmaking development through visits and attendance at visual arts labs, Biennales, Gallery Exhibitions, Print and fine art presses. I will pursue artistic, literary and research collaborations with artists and researchers that will lead to enhanced learning outcomes.

**Forward Plan**

I have submitted a gantt chart outlining my research plans.

**Literature Review**

I have submitted my literature review.
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1. This question is couched in 19thC drawing term, rather than those of contemporary drawing. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. . Artistic photographers and champions of the medium as it matured over the coming century will have rightly claimed similarly that the mind is at work in their image making. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)