

CHARLES UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
Institute of Sociological Studies (ISS)

Master's Thesis

2024

Filip Kunovski

CHARLES UNIVERSITY
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
Institute of Sociological Studies (ISS)

**Reemergence of Analogue Photographic Practice:
Affects, Intentionality and Significance**

Master's Thesis

Author of the Thesis: Filip Kunovski

Study programme: Society, Communications and Media programme (SCM)

Supervisor: prof. Andrea Průchová Hrůzová, Ph.D.

Year of the defense: 2024

Declaration

1. I hereby declare that I have compiled this thesis using the listed literature and resources only.
2. I hereby declare that my thesis has not been used to gain any other academic title.
3. I fully agree to my work being used for study and scientific purposes.
4. During the preparation of this thesis, the author used Delve Tool for qualitative research in order to conduct a thematic analysis for the purposes of the research. After using this tool/service, the author reviewed and edited the content as necessary and takes full responsibility for the content of the publication.

In Prague on
26.07.2024

Filip Kunovski

References

KUNOVSKI, Filip. *Reemergence of Analogue Photographic Practice in the Contemporary Digital Context*. Praha, 2024. 97 s. Master's thesis (Mgr). Charles University, Faculty of Social Sciences, Institute of Sociological Studies. Supervisor Andrea Průchová Hružová, Ph.D.

Length of the Thesis: 136938

Abstract

The resurgence of analogue photography in the past decade ultimately resulted in the formation of an international Analogue Photography Festivals Network (APFN). This study delves into the reasons for the re-emerging trend of analogue photographic practice within the contemporary digital context. The research explores the personal experience of photographers through a grounded theory approach utilizing in-depth phenomenological interviews while analyzing them by using a method of thematic analysis. The findings point to the need to re-frame analogue photography in the contemporary digital context. The reasons for its resurgence in the recent past are a direct result of its features, framing it as a deeply personal practice, entailing a greater sense of significance and attachment to both the process and the final product compared to its digital counterpart. Analogue photography, in the light of the digitization trends of our contemporary societies, gains another form of relevance, previously unattained.

The research contributes to the existing literature by including notions of *affects* and *affective intentionality*, which the findings suggest, form the cornerstone towards the attribution of such personal sense of significance. Nonetheless, the study underscores the importance to look at 'analogue' or 'retro' media from the standpoint of bodily experience, emotional and affective valances so as to gain deeper understanding in the dynamics of engagement some individuals undergo with it. This research concludes by emphasizing the role of digital photography in the re-emerging trend towards the analogue counterpart. Crucially, the advent of the digital had liberated the analogue from the burden of representation, effectively placing it in the sphere of the private and as a form of personal expression. Therefore, the research proposes that the analogue photographic practice should be analyzed separately, as a distinct form of media engagement, regaining its rightful place within the wider ecology of digital photography.

Abstrakt

Znovuzrození analogové fotografie v minulém desetiletí nakonec vyústil ve vytvoření mezinárodní sítě festivalů analogové fotografie (Analogue Photography Festivals Network - APFN). Tato studie se zabývá důvody opětovného nástupu analogové fotografické praxe v současném digitálním kontextu. Výzkum zkoumá osobní zkušenosti fotografů

prostřednictvím přístupu zakotvené teorie využívajícího hloubkové fenomenologické rozhovory a zároveň je analyzuje metodou tematické analýzy. Zjištění poukazují na potřebu nově formulovat analogovou fotografii v současném digitálním kontextu. Důvody jejího znovuzrození v nedávné minulosti jsou přímým důsledkem jejích vlastností, které ji rámuje jako hluboce osobní praxi, což s sebou nese větší pocit důležitosti a náklonnosti k procesu i konečnému produktu ve srovnání s jejím digitálním protějškem. Analogová fotografie tak ve světle digitalizačních trendů naší současné společnosti získává další, dříve nedosaženou formu významu. Výzkum přispívá k existující literatuře tím, že zahrnuje pojmy afektů a afektivní záměrnosti, které podle zjištění tvoří základní kámen pro přisouzení takového osobního pocitu významu. Studie nicméně zdůrazňuje, že je důležité nahlížet na „analogová“ nebo „retro“ média z hlediska tělesného prožívání, emocionálních a afektivních valencí, aby bylo možné hlouběji porozumět dynamice angažovanosti, kterou s nimi někteří jedinci podstupují. V závěru tohoto výzkumu je zdůrazněna role digitální fotografie v opětovném trendu směřujícím k analogovému protějšku. Zásadní je, že nástup digitální fotografie osvobodil analogovou fotografii od břemene reprezentace, čímž ji fakticky umístil do sféry soukromí a jako formu osobního vyjádření. Výzkum proto navrhuje, aby analogová fotografická praxe byla analyzována samostatně, jako odlišná forma mediální angažovanosti, která znovu získává své právoplatné místo v rámci širší ekologie digitální fotografie.

Keywords

Photography, analogue photography, digital photography, reemergence, affects, affective intentionality, materiality, bodily engagement, significance

Klíčová slova

Fotografie, analogová fotografie, digitální fotografie, znovuzrození, afekty, afektivní záměrnost, materialita, tělesná angažovanost, významnost

Title

Reemergence of Analogue Photographic Practice: Affects, Intentionality and Significance

Název práce

Znovuobjevení analogové fotografické praxe: afekty, záměrnost a významnost

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my mother Biljana and father Vladimir for their unwavering support during my study days and in life; my supervisor Ph.D. Andrea Průchová Hřůzová for her patient and thorough guidance in the process of writing this thesis; Sasho N. Alushevski and Mirjana Markovikj, who provided me with the necessary mentorship in conducting my field research and helped me gather my thoughts in crucial moments. Last but not least, I would like to thank my friends and life companions who gave me the necessary support, space and time to dedicate myself to this writing.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	8
2. Literature Review	10
2.1 The Return of the Analogue	10
2.2 Phenomenological aspects	14
2.3 Digitization, what got lost with it?	17
2.4 The material <i>re</i> -turn.....	21
2.5 Photographic experience	27
2.6 Affects, intentionality and the analogue photographic practice	32
2.6.1. Affective states	32
2.6.2 Affective Intentionality	34
2.7 Summary.....	35
3. Methodology.....	37
3.1 Defining the research goals	37
3.1.1 Research Questions	37
3.2 Sample:	39
3.3 Research Method	40
3.3.1 Grounded Theory	40
3.3.2 Data Collection - Phenomenological Semi-Structured Interviews	41
3.3.3 Data analysis:	42
3.4 Ethical Considerations:.....	42
4. Analysis of the findings.....	43
4.1 Technical / Circumstantial Features	45
4.2. Agential features.....	48

4.3. Material features	52
4.4 Affective States & Affective Intentionality	55
4.5 Connection and detachment.....	57
5. Discussion.....	60
5.1. Answering the main research question.....	60
5.2 Sub-question #1 – Difference in Emotional Experience	61
5.3. Sub-question #2 – Physical experience and emotional responses.....	64
5.4 Sub-questions #3 and #4 - Addressing the preference	65
5.4.1 Sub-question #3.....	66
5.4.2. Sub-question #4.....	67
5.5. Points of divergence and convergence with existing literature	68
5.6 Implications	70
6. Conclusion.....	73
6.1 Reframing analogue photography from the current historical juncture	74
6.2 Future research	75
Summary - Conclusion in Czech.....	76
List of References.....	80
List of Appendices.....	87
Appendix A - Informed written consent for participation in research and protection of personal data.....	88
Appendix B - Codebook for Thematic Analysis	89
Appendix C - Interview Example with Aleksandar.....	105

1. Introduction

With *The Revenge of the Analogue*, David Sax (2016) has in a way signaled the return of multiple different ‘analogue’ media practices in our contemporary culture. However this, not being an academically structured text, is but an illumination of a tendency. In academia, on the other hand, research of the return of *vintage*, *analogue* and *retromedia* technologies of the past has surged in recent years (Thorén et.al, 2019). Notable examples are the return of the vinyl record players (Bartmanski and Woodward, 2014), cassette tapes (Demers, 2017), VHS cameras (Egan, 2007), and the Super8 (Van der Heijden, 2015), to name but a few. Such inquiries are also made in the context of photography, where the situation is slightly more complicated as compared to the aforementioned media. This is so mainly because of the rich fields of photographic history, theory and criticism, as well as all the other fields within which the photographic medium is entangled, such as media studies, anthropology and visual sociology.

The recent literature on the return of analogue photography (Maggauda and Minniti, 2019; Minniti, 2016, 2020) represents an inquiry into popularized photographic trends. Namely, the reemergence of Lomography and the Polaroid cameras. Although certainly notable on a global market level, these are nonetheless trends that sociology and media studies seek to understand from the standpoint of their inner paradigms and principles of social research. However, another dynamic and a recent global advancement into analogue photographic practices and techniques has been marked with the foundation of *The Analog Photography Festival Network* (APFN) which “is an international union of festivals dedicated to analog photography and techniques. Bringing together representatives of nine founding member festivals from Austria, France, Finland, Germany, North Macedonia,

Mexico, Poland, Romania and Spain, APFN had its first official Meet & Mix meeting at Revela'T Festival (Spain) in September 2022.” (Zrno.mk website). This new occurrence, under the umbrella of an official organisation/network, shows that analogue photography returns in a much more dispersed way, than the market-product based case with Polaroids and Lomography that Minniti (2016, 2020) investigates.

The findings that previous scholarship (Minniti 2016, 2020; Minniti and Maggauda 2019; Margadonna, 2023) has produced, bear capacity to serve as solid guidelines upon which this thesis will try to expand and appropriate the arguments so they will be more feasible to enter photographic discourse.

As digital photography grew ever more present in the early 90s many scholars and practitioners reflecting upon this change probed the difference between the analogue and the digital. However, in light of the recent interest towards analogue photography against the backdrop of the ever-increasing digitization trends in our contemporary societies, a detailed inquiry into the difference between the analogue and digital photographic *experiences* from the current historical juncture is lacking and looms ever larger. By answering the main research question, namely **“what is the difference between the individual/personal experience with analogue and digital photographic processes accordingly?”** – The current research aims to address the issue by understanding the lived experience of the participants during the corresponding processes of creation. Furthermore, this thesis seeks to investigate why it is that analogue photography is regaining significance, and additionally, how does that differ from the position it held in the past.

The theoretical review section will delve into a thorough assessment of the current framing and literature on the re-emergence of analogue photography, which in turn, invites an overview of the practice from the perspective of photographic history and theory as well as anthropology and media studies. Furthermore, the relevance of this study lies in the

incorporation of *affective states* and the concept of *affective intentionality* which have shown to be indivisible from the photographic experience, regardless of the purpose or the practice. To clarify, it is beyond this thesis to systematically classify *affective states*, but merely to assess their intensity and role behind the deliberate choice to engage in a bodily, material, expensive and time-consuming experience with analogue photography.

As the study deals with inquiry into the personal lived experiences of participants, the research design utilises a grounded theory approach rooted in the data from the phenomenological semi-structured interviews followed by a thematic analysis. All the respondents are photographers who have notable experience in both analogue and digital photography. The thesis will conclude with a discussion and conclusion sections where the implications of the research in the current context will be observed. Additionally, an observation of the way that analogue photography is framed today will be scrutinized as to provide a new, more advanced and updated framing of the re-emergence of analogue photography within the current trends of our digitally inclined societies.

2. Literature Review

2.1 The Return of the Analogue

“Photographs are and always have been more fiction than fact”.

- David Levi Strauss (2020)

There are multiple studies that portray different aspects of the re-emergence of analogue photography. Starting from the aesthetic appropriation of digital images to acquire an analogue look (Morlot, 2013) and ranging to detailed accounts of the re-emergence of Polaroids and the Lomography culture whose insights can be valuable in the context of this

thesis (Minniti, 2016, Maggauda and Minniti, 2019, Minniti 2020, Margadonna, 2023). The literature on the re-emergence of analogue photographic practices among ‘aspiring amateurs’ (Minniti, 2016; Maggauda and Minniti, 2019; Minniti, 2020) has been well noted and media scholars have paid significant attention to this phenomena.

Such analysis and inquiries are drawing from literature in the fields of anthropology and photographic history, appropriating the concept of the “photographic object” (Edwards and Hart, 2004; Batchen 1997) from scholars to whom Minniti (2020) refers as the photo-materialists, who take as their main rationale that a photograph is an *image* as much as it is an *object*, paying equal tribute to both aspects as opposed to the photographic theory from the past 30 years (for example see Flusser, 1984; Burgin, 1982; Tagg, 1988) that has been privileging the *image* as the main referent of analysis over the *object*. Furthermore, the field of STS (Science and Technology Studies)(Kline and Pinch, 1996), shedding light on the mutual shaping of users and technology which introduces the concept of *technological resistance* allows for analysis of the analogue photographic practice as a form of resistance against the digital backdrop of our contemporary culture. Comparing it to digital photography, which is considered to be predictable, perfect and dematerialising, the authors pose the photographic object as the main pillar upon which the findings of their research are being understood and framing it ultimately as a form of *technological resistance* (Maggauda and Minniti, 2019).

What Minniti (2016) calls the *polaroidisation* and *lomographisation* as processes marking the reintroduction and re-appropriation of technologies of the past, namely analog photography both on polaroid slides and film rolls, rests on three main characteristics which were found in regards to the attitudes of photographers. Namely, the value of unpredictability over predictability, imperfections over perfection and materiality over immateriality (p.98). The first two are valuable as they hint a result of the interaction of humans and non-humans.

Seen to be mutually constitutive of the social (Latour, 2007), the analogue camera, be it Polaroid or the plastic Lomography toy camera, is seen to have equal agency in the process of production of photographs as the human actors. Within the framework of *technological resistance*, the authors place these three dichotomies as the central findings that explain the shift in the culture of the photographic medium towards its analogue version.

The findings suggest that digital images are predictable, as in, one knows much more about the picture one intends to take, before even pressing the button. At the same level of importance is the dichotomy between the ‘perfection’ that digital photography has the capacity to operate with, as opposed to the imperfections that the film-based photograph entails within it and as a byproduct of the practice. These two charge the apparatus, the film-camera, as a non-human actor, with agency. Last but not least, the material character of the analogue photograph, that is, tactile, observed against the backdrop of the digital virtual (im)materiality (Minniti, 2016).

However, notions on materiality, in such studies (Minniti, 2016, 2020; Magauida and Minniti 2019), are solely centred around the physical nature of objects whereas within photographic discourse, visual culture texts and the *Material Turn* within the field of anthropology, concepts of materiality are taken upon in a more nuanced way, paying tribute to the characteristics of digital materiality as well.

One of the aspects around which this discussion is centred is the fact that the reemergence of analogue photography takes a new and different form that it has had in the historical development of the medium (Thorén, et.al, 2019, Maggauda and Minniti, 2019). In this case, the reemergence is seen more as a re-appropriation within the contemporary digital culture. Second, the concept of *technological resistance* as the main framing of the process of re-emergence. This implies that photographers whose practice inclines towards analogue photography have almost entirely rejected digital photography. However, it is not

quite so, since what they rejected, is not the digital image per se, as revealed through the processes of digitalisation of analogue photographs that is well noted by Morlot (2013) and Minniti (2016), but rather, the characteristics that appropriate the production of digital images.

Important here is that the photographers interviewed in this study are escaping the frame of “aspirational amateurs”, rather, they indulge in a long, expensive and very attentive process of production of photographs. While the former is quite suitable for Minniti’s analysis (2016; 2020), both phenomena taken up – *polaroidisation* and *lomographisation* – are circling around a practice that is by and large accessible, fast, responsive and whose final products are visualised not long after the photographs have been taken. As he notes, “[D]ue to its capability of producing photographs that could be instantly visualised and physically exchanged, Polaroids served in festive occasions as a sort of ‘social catalyst’ with an ‘ice breaking’ capacity” (Minniti, 2016, p. 23) – to be more precise, commodities, or rather, products of the market, is what sets the ground for Minniti’s research.

This is the point of divergence between this thesis and Minniti’s inquiry. Although it well serves the purpose of establishing a position through which such trends occurring within the digital era are to be observed, what this ultimately does is present the situation within the context of media change. In order to look at the affective valencies of the process and produce a more nuanced inquiry, a more detailed look into these phenomena as well as the properties attributed to them is required. What this enables is that it allows for the findings and the dissection of the whole process to enter photographic discourse in both history and theory, and transcend the borders of a particular field, as is not the case with the literature on the analogue return thus far, which is media-centred and does not operate within the framework of photographic history and theory. What it does, effectively, is merely

explaining a trend in the tradition of media and sociological scholarship, occupying a place within these discourses.

Magaudda and Minniti (2019) acknowledge the limits of their research, as they point to the need to make an inquiry into the affective character of such practices: “We can also outline that a limit of the proposed approach is that it does not take into account some recent advancements in debates about practice based research. In this respect, we suggest future research might enrich such an approach by explicitly including in it further dimensions, including the role of affects and emotional components...” (Magaudda and Minniti, 2019, p. 689). That, they propose, can be a way forward towards a greater understanding of these phenomena and sees the *affective turn*, or rather, the inquiry into *affective states*, a suitable place to look for such illumination.

2.2 Phenomenological aspects

The case with photography is an interesting example that has the capacity to shed some light onto these phenomena because of its diverse nature and multifaceted appropriation. Ever since its invention in the 19th century, photography has been used scientifically, as a research tool, further on in the fields of journalism – as a tool for producing and contextualising documentary narratives – and as a tool for the creation of artworks, to name but a few. However, apart from technical magazines, instruction manuals and technical books, the side of photography that involves craftsmanship has been not only largely overlooked, but the advent of digital photography and the ubiquity, accessibility and affordability of photo cameras has chased the notion of *photography as a craft* on the periphery of inquiries. However, a quick detour, in order to make a slight shift of perspective is needed. Namely, a seminal text pertaining to the technological properties of the process of artistic creation and a more phenomenological account of the practice is to be found in

Arthur Gell's *The Technology of Enchantment and the Enchantment of Technology* (1992). In light of previous debates displayed here, and to appropriate Gell's argument, it seems not quite so that the issue with digital photography is solely dematerialisation, although it plays a significant role, but rather a certain form of *disenchantment* that digital photographs and their process of creation bear within. He suggests "that magical technology is the reverse side of productive technology, and that this magical technology consists of representing the technical domain in enchanted form." (p.59) However, Arthur Gell goes further that "[T]he photographer, a lowly button-presser, has no prestige, or not until the nature of his photographs is such as to make one start to have difficulties conceptualising the processes which made them achievable with the *familiar* apparatus of photography [...] the point I wish to establish is that the attitude of the spectator towards a work of art is fundamentally conditioned by his notion of the technical processes which gave rise to it, and the fact that it was created by the agency of another person, the artist." (Gell, 1992, p.50-51, emphasis added) Important to note is that 'familiar' is being the crucial point in the quote above. This reverberates with the re-introduction of analogue practices *in the context* of digitally inclined societies as they are practically rendered less familiar than the digital counterpart. Hence, one can argue that the analogue renders photography *enchanted* again.

Reverberating with the concept of *unpredictability*, one of the major characteristics that embroils agency into the analogue medium, Gell poses that "If we consider that the magical attitude is a by-product of uncertainty, we are thereby committed also to the proposition that the magical attitude is a by-product of the rational pursuit of technical objectives using technical means." (p.57). Since the material character of photographs is certainly one of the reasons ascribed to the return of the analogue photography and deeply linked with affects (Edwards, 2009), it seems even more probable that there is a certain type of enchantment that analogue photography brings forth, primarily as a practice. This

enchantment, is one of intensities, affective valencies and intense bodily engagement, that are to be found within the material production and presentation of photographs. As we shall see in the following sections, the agentic character of photographs, experienced as objects, comes as a result of the convergence of literature that abandons the primacy of vision and posits it in a wider sensorium with literature that renders phenomenological approaches in relation to the work of art and comprehension of objects (Pinnay, 2020).

Within the period of advancement of concepts and products such as *virtual reality*, *digitization*, *black-boxisation* and the *algorithmic imaginary*, the return of craftsmanship as a way of producing material artefacts sheds light upon another re-emerging phenomena. That of the evaluation and appreciation of the experience of creation. The inspection in the affective character of the process, as Minniti and Maggauda (2019) point and we shall see further on in this thesis, seems a very promising place to look for answers. In order to be able to do so, a few discussions and debates have to be attended. Firstly, a comparison of the analogue and digital photography from the current historical juncture, explaining what is it that *got lost* with the advent of the digital. Furthermore, the *Material Turn* in anthropology literature and photographic discourse (Manovich, 2001; Edwards, 2009), which will point to the different materialities within which the media operate accordingly. Secondly, the physical interactions with photography from the standpoint of sensory stimuli, along with visual culture studies' comprehension of notions such as ocularcentric traditions and the preference of thinking over feeling will be taken upon in the next sections so as to attain a better understanding of the photographic experience that this thesis is explicitly concerned with.

2.3 Digitization, what got lost with it?

Since the beginning of the 90's with the advent of digital cameras (for a detailed historical account see Galal, 2016), a larger turn arose, signaling skepticism towards the new digital trends. One of the things that many scholars saw disappearing from photography with the advent of the digital was the photograph's causal relation to the object photographed (Sutton, 2007). Also referred to as *indexicality*, this trait has entered photographic discourse only after the introduction of the term *index* by Charles S. Peirce (1955). "An index is a sign which refers to the object that it denotes by virtue of being really affected by that object" (p.102). In one of the most influential and oft-cited writings on photography, *Camera Lucida*, Roland Barthes notes that "[T]he photograph is literally an emanation of the referent. From a real body, which was there, proceed radiations which ultimately touch me, who am here." (1981, p.80). Stemming from such attitude, Sutton argues that "[D]igital photography, and especially its apparently invisible manipulability, destroyed the photograph's privileged connection to the object [photographed]." (Sutton, 2007, p.165, emphasis added). This stance towards the non-indexical characteristics of the digital image is largely made upon the backdrop of analogue photography's connection to the *real* which has been a subject both implicitly and explicitly touched upon by many scholars of photographic history and theory.

This is illuminated in a text by Matthew Biro (2012) that deals with comparative assessment of the work of photographers Hilla and Bernd Becher's series *Framework Houses of the Siegen Industrial Region* from 1971 to the work of Andreas Gursky. The analysis of the former concludes with the argument that "[T]he indexical character of the analogue photograph emerges from its material basis as a chemically sensitised surface upon which light reflected off real people and objects has been captured in a direct and unmediated way. " (Ibid, p. 354). However, it is not quite the case that digital photography is *non-indexical*,

rather, further theoretical and empirical endeavours on this topic have concluded that the digital photograph's indexical features, although different in character, are still very much present (for example see Manovich, 1996; Sepannen, 2017).

An important point is that *indexicality* as such, acquires different qualities and dimensions and its character changes in accordance with the materiality of the process – be it digital or analogue. Within the object-less digital image, the real object that was in front of the camera acquires different significance in comparison to the analogue photograph that physically *experienced* the object in front of its surface; reverberating with the aforementioned Barthes' contemplation – “[F]rom a real body, which was there, proceed radiations which ultimately touch me, who am here” (Ibid, p.80). This causal relationship with the object photographed is what allows analogue photography to become an experiential bridge between the real, the experience of the photographer, and respectively, the viewer, in a manner by and large different from that of the digital image and its indexicality in the form of a digital code. Embedded in this causal relationship with the object photographed is a particular chronoscopic sense of reality. It is never the referent itself, but its symbolic death within portrayed through this material object. “This is why photography is often described as the *memento mori* of time; it is a reminder of mortality and the irreversibility of time itself. Put differently, photography awakens the viewer's chronoscopic sense of reality. That is to say, time follows a linear trajectory...[where] time is measured not only by dates in a calendar but also by the precision of a clock that visually segments time into equidistant instances.” (Furuhata, 2009, p. 184). Observed linearly, it is through the analogue process that the object *of before* becomes the photograph *of after* with the help of the camera apparatus, and the physical object – film negative or print – that embodies both the object (photographed) itself and the hand work of the artist/technician. This causality to – and embeddedness of – the object (photographed) sheds different light upon

the problem at hand and effectively distinguishes the digital and the analogue photographic processes. Again, that is not to say that digital photographs are ultimately *non-indexical*, but rather to differentiate between the (im)material aspects that digital indexicality operates within (Eglen and Tavares, 2018), as compared to its analogue predecessor, and now, in certain occasions its successor.

Discourses on *indexicality* (see for example Manovich, 1996; Ritchin, 2009; Biro, 2012) and the tendencies that reveal the different indexical features between analogue and digital photography are also heavily reliant on notions of dematerialisation of the photograph within the realm of digital media and the Western *ocularcentric* approach within which such discourse operates (Jay, 1988; Pink, 2011; Fackler, 2019). However, the problem with the photographic theory that made such assessments of the break in the indexical link, while not paying tribute to the ocularcentric dominance, is that it has further engaged in discussions about the notion of truth. A notion that has appropriated photographic discourse since its first writings by one of the inventors of the apparatus Henry Fox Talbot *The Pencil of Nature* as early as 1844 (1969). To state the obvious, the tendency has been denoted in the very name of Talbot's text. However, it is my suspicion that the re-emerging trend towards analogue photographic practice, is not to be considered from an epistemological standpoint, that is, connection to the real in a literal way.

Within the digital era, it seems more probable that the phenomenological character of analogue photography allows for much lesser truth, a more subjective expression of sensibility and aesthetics that has the capacity to communicate in an affective manner with the audience, as much as with the author, is what stimulates photographers to engage in such practice. This points to a possible place to look for new insights regarding *indexicality*, that

is the *photographer's relationship* with the object photographed through an analogue camera.

Another aspect whose transformation with the advent of digital is worth considering is authenticity as related to reproducibility. As Joanna Sassoon suggests that “[T]he invention of digital technology represents the first revolutionary change for photographic methods since the introduction of the negative/positive process which itself transformed the photograph from being a unique item to one that was reproducible.” (1998, p. 5) With this, the question of reproducibility and its impact upon the differentiation between analogue and digital photography arises. For Walter Benjamin (1969) the technological reproduction new technologies brought forth results in the work of art ultimately losing its *aura*. Benjamin was initially referring to examples such as the film negative, where he finds the search for originality rather redundant and even impossible.

The reproduction of the digital, however, amplifies his suspicions a level further. Seen in the light of the digital photography, Sassoon re-appropriates Benjamin's argument and suggests that even though the negative is infinitely re-printable, they ultimately “cannot be assumed to be duplicates as each may contain subtle differences due to variations in printing styles and papers, be enlarged or cropped and survive in a range of contexts of equal importance” (1998, p. 9). Further examining this phenomena, Sassoon has recalled suggestions from scholars such as Roger Bruce (1994) and his contemplation that digital photographs “never acquire the burden of being originals because they do not pass through a material phase” (quoted in Sassoon, 1998, p. 5). This dynamic is particularly interesting as it shows how concepts of the past get reappropriated within the contemporary context. Similar is the case with analogue photography in the current situation, as we shall see later on in the thesis. This brings me to the next debate I would like to take upon and provide an

account between the different materialities that analogue and digital photography respectively are constitutive of.

2.4 The material *re*-turn

Considering the digital traces' immaterial character, notions of 'dematerialisation', as displayed above, widely spread across different analytical backgrounds. The notion of immaterial character of the digital image is easily comprehensible in popular language, however, when it comes to its actual status as a practice, the argument gets a bit complicated. The wider material turn, or rather, *re*-turn in visual culture studies and anthropology scholarship that is concerned with photography (Batchen, 1997; Edwards and Hart, 2004; Sassoon, 1998; Edwards, 2012; Rose and Tolia Kelly, 2012) has assessed that some of the reasons behind this are to be found within the *image/object* disjunction. To emphasise the relevance of this statement in the context of re-emergence of the analogue photographic practice, it is important to make a conceptual distinction between analogue and digital photography against the backdrop of the *image/object* dichotomy. The *Material Turn* in anthropology, with Hans Belting (2011), Elizabeth Edwards and Janice Hart (2004) and Daniel Miller (2005) on the forefront, has illuminated the theoretical tendency of the past 40 years that ultimately resulted with a disjunction of the two constitutive elements of photographs (Edwards and Hart, 2004; Edwards, 2012). Namely, the privileging of *image* at the cost of appreciation of photographs as physical material artefacts, that is, *objects*. Edwards and Hart (2004) locate the roots of such discursive practices responsible for this disjunction to be situated within the postmodern photographic criticism's view of photographs as "a set of meanings or ideologies that take the image as their pretext" (p.2). They further point that "photographs are apprehended in one visual act, absorbing image and object together, yet privileging the former", by being "detached from their physical

properties” (p.2). While acknowledging the importance of image content and the wider socio-economic and political power relations inscribed within it, the main rationale of *Photographs Objects Histories: On the Materiality of Images* (2004) is centred around “breaking the dominance of image content and look at the physical attributes of the photograph” (p.2). Such discourse is in a way a response to the post-modern thought and photographic critical theory from scholars such as John Tagg (1988), Allan Sekula (1986) and Victor Burgin (1989) who have displayed greater interest for the contents of the image, that is, what is within the frame so to point to the wider media ecologies and cultures, as well as social, political and economic power relations within which the photographic medium is inevitably entangled and transforms (Fackler, 2019). Furthermore, this tendency is notable in yet another exemplary text by a critical media theorist Vilem Flusser, *Towards a Philosophy of Photography* (1984) starting by explanation and framing of the concept of *The Image* in the following manner: “[I]mages are significant surfaces. Images signify - mainly - something ‘out there’ in space and time that they have to make comprehensible to us as abstractions (as reductions of the four dimensions of space and time to the two surface dimension)” (p.8, emphasis by the author). Considering the photograph as an *object* as much as an *image* reintroduces the notion of materiality within the medium. A notion that has shown to be one of utmost importance in the process of re-engagement with analogue photography.

To further clarify, while the digital camera has the possibility of producing a photograph, it entails a process in which first and foremost, an image is created. Once printed, it only then becomes a photograph. On the other hand, the analogue camera apparatus is one that cannot create solely an image, without creating an object on which the image is embedded. Hence, primarily creating a photograph. A photograph here is taken to be a physical artefact, an *object*, on whose surface resides an *image*. In other words, an *image*

and an *object* at once (Edwards and Hart, 2004) and all along the process of creation. This scholarship has been of crucial importance for the reintroduction of understanding photographs as material artefacts which elucidates other properties of the photograph long overlooked. And one might say, expectedly overlooked, for the analogue practice has lived through a serious decline in the past 30 years. However, with the recent trends signalling the return of such object-centred, material practice, such notions gain critical importance in understanding our contemporary visual culture.

To do justice to the balanced argumentation when assessing academic debates, I shall briefly turn to Fackler's detailed account on the materiality of digital photography, which as stated by the author 'complicates' this debate a level further (Fackler, 2019). Digital photography may be, in fact, considered a material practice, as Fackler (Ibid.) points out, but its materiality is to be found in a more abstract framework, within the larger socio-economic impact observed through the network of human-nonhuman relationship and their mutual shaping of the social, which certainly is the case with photography (for a detailed account see Zylinska, 2009), both analogue and digital. To say the least, the effects of digital materiality are hardly immediate, unmediated and certainly more global than that of analogue photography. For instance, Elisabeth Eglem and Monica Tavares's account of the form of digital materiality is as follows: "[S]ince the information can be translated and transferred to other media, the notion of *(im)materiality* should not be considered as an absence of matter, but rather as a fluid materiality that circulates through a variety of supports; therefore, less as a product and more as a transfer process. The image – when in the form of a soft copy – can circulate among various media, and it is a result of a translation between codes and languages." (Eglem and Tavares, 2018, p.2). Consequences of such a form of *(im)materiality* are ubiquitous and affect all of us as a society, but the engagement operates on a rather different sensory and tactile spectrum, as compared to the direct and

immediate engagement with the materials of the photographic practice, and throughout the whole photographic process. Furthermore, recalling physicist scholars, Fackler refers to Richard Feynman's emphasis (1985) that “from the point of view of quantum electrodynamics [...] there is no generally accepted definition of matter. On the contrary, physical reality is to be understood in terms of complex interactions between different forces and energies (electromagnetic, gravitational and magnetic) and more or less solid bodies, which may be detectable by our sensory systems” (quoted in Fackler, 2009, p. 526).

However, I do not think that Fackler is on point when further suggesting that “Yet this [referring to Feynman’s quote] does not imply that there ever existed an age in which the photographic process was *material* to the core[...]”(emphasis added, p.526), while not probing further on when was it, that the photographic process was not material to the core and assessing the type of materiality that forms the perspective from which he constructs the argument. From the standpoint of actual physical experience and as far as photographic history is concerned, it was until the advent of the digital camera apparatus that photography was a fully mechanical and material process, that is, tangible, immediate and multi-sensory all along the way. From the object in front of the camera, the film selection, the light emanated from the object, the camera work, the chemicals for developing the film, the paper on which the print was made and the process of the positive print, every instance was rather material. That is to say, the very experience is material. Apart from the intentions of the photographer, their subjective interpretation of their own reality as well as their ability to conceive of an image nothing seems immaterial, in the sense that is not anticipated by the senses.

However, the aforementioned notions of *unpredictability* and *inaccuracy* are closely related to other aspects of subjectivity, feeling, sensing and affect, to which I will turn in the next sections. Worth noting is that these are not exempted from the digital photographic

practice, but are nonetheless more abstract notions that one engages with quite differently and in a rather mediated manner through digital sensors, computer screens and smart-phones and not as tangibly as the engagement with the materials of the analogue practice. The materiality of digital photography is, to say the least, one that is not bound to the subject in a physical spatiotemporal continuum, and its immediacy is predominantly visual. Digital materiality is certainly less tangible in the sense of engagement, and it mainly considers abstract, imagined materialities connected primarily to the notion of *the image*, rather than *object*.

A substantial contribution towards the understanding of digital materiality are the *five principles of new media* outlined by Lev Manovich in his seminal book *The Language of New Media* (2001). Two of which are particularly important in the context of this text, namely, *numerical representation* and *modularity*. These explicitly deal with the materiality of new media, that is digital artefacts, and can substantially assist the understanding of materiality within which digital photography operates. The first principle, *numerical representation*, underscores that new media objects, such as digital images are constructed of digital code, from which there are two consequences; (1) that they are described by mathematical functions and (2) are subject of algorithmic manipulation (Manovich, *ibid.*). The second, that is *modularity*, explains the fractal character of new media, and implies that digital, or new media are made of small independent parts (e.g. pixels) which are a part of a greater assembly. This fractal-like nature of the digital media, where parts are an end in themselves, yet easily changeable, is what allows for the quick alteration of digital images. Another example that Manovich (*ibid.*) provides are the editing layers in Photoshop where changes are performed by simply clicking a button, probing that these actions affect primarily the pixels before changing the totality of their assemblage.

One might gauge that materiality has transformed with the advent and ubiquity of ICTs and, as Fackler rightfully suggests, digital materiality is only enriching other notions of materiality more closely bound to analogue photographic practice, and thus having the capacity to “further our understanding of analogue photography” (2019, p.520). It is the type of materiality that one needs to consider, that can provide for a more accurate assessment of the properties one aims to inspect. The problem arises when such notions are universally applied across different circumstances. That is to say, digital photography is far from immaterial, if it is to be considered without a more nuanced point of view. The materiality that analogue, that is film-based, photographs have and digital ones do not, is the one to be found not only in the presentation, but in the process of creation. The process of a more intimate engagement with the apparatus, a longer and way more thorough and immediate interaction. Process in which experiencing materials through one’s senses, the tactile work with them and the emotional responses they trigger are at the centre of the practice.

Now, after briefly presenting these two debates on materiality and indexicality, I shall turn to Sutton’s attempt at summarising a definition for photography (2007). Since all of the fields whose literature thus far have been reviewed, to set the ground for what follows, have somewhat ambiguous interpretations of photography’s definition. As illuminated in the literature reviewed thus far, one can argue that this is such a term can easily slip in an *a priori* assumption, a taken for granted definition, which, to say the least, has rarely been acknowledged as a starting point of the classical photographic texts. Namely, as Sutton (2007) rightfully suggests, “any attempt to define photography, or to explain what the photograph *is*, is *always asking for trouble*” (p.162, emphasis by the author), for the wide array of different photographic practices and theories inherit a taken for granted definition, or rather, understanding of what photography really ‘is’. Furthermore he continues, “The two ideal definitions at stake here are, firstly, the photograph as an object in itself and,

secondly, the photograph as a transparent record of something. Put another way, one might argue that a photograph *just is*, and the *real* is in the object recorded by it, whilst one might also argue that the photograph was taken for a reason, and that it is with the photograph as a representation that we have a *real* relationship.” (p.163)

If one takes a closer look at this definition, one can easily see the *image/object* duality that Edwards and Hart (2004) introduce. Namely, the *image*, in this case the transparent surface, as opposed to the *object* itself. The problem with most scholarship that strives towards theoretical conception and analysis of a photograph is the tendency to transform notions without being aware of the consequences of this unacknowledged different character of image and object, as well as within the practice of photography, ultimately leading to a creation of a rather abstract discourses. Hence, my point here is not to provide a single definition, but simply making sure one is aware of the ambiguities and contingencies regarding the distinction between the notion of *photography* and a *photograph* (see for example Azoulay, 2010) as well as the ambiguities and contingencies regarding a single definition of photography.

It is important to understand that photography as a practice is one that has the capacity to produce both photographs and images. In this thesis, the emphasis will be put on photographs, that is *images* and *objects* at once, so as to tackle the personal experience behind the reasons for engagement with analogue photography.

2.5 Photographic experience

Expanding on the *image/object* debate, as well as previous notions on materiality and object-hood of photographs, this section will deal with two oppositions. The first, is the tradition of privileging of eyesight as the main instrument at truthfully and accurately grasping, or rather mastering, the objective world around us known as *ocularcentrism* (Jay,

1988, Howes 2005), opposed by the *New Materialisms* (Coole and Frost, 2010) notions of the multi-sensory experience of the world (Rose and Tolia Kelly, 2012) and the *Sensory Turn* (Pink, 2009). The second deals with the privilege of thinking over feeling regarding photography, rooted in the discussion and different readings of Barthes' *Camera Lucida* (1981). The deconstruction of both may facilitate the task of acknowledging the experience of photography and photographic practice accordingly, which as presented thus far is one of the central tasks to this thesis.

Photography, since its very beginning, has been consistently linked with reality and truth. As I have stated in the beginning of this chapter in an epigraph by David Levi Strauss, I shall not engage in discussions on whether photography has ever been a relevant source of truth. Rather, the literature suggests that such a view is profoundly linked with the request of the Enlightenment for the demonstration of knowledge and its documentation, which explains the rise of Western *ocularcentric* tradition.

Posing the problem historically, the praise of sight over other senses is a long lasting Western way of presuming objective and truthful grasping of the material world. Concerning the roots of such tradition, Liz James (2004) suggests that it “is the traditions of Western philosophical thinking about the senses, based on Plato and Aristotle, that have placed sight and then hearing as the most significant and spiritual of the senses, relating them to the higher functions of the mind, and which have relegated smell, touch and taste to the lower functions of the body, considering them base and corporeal.” (p.525). Furthermore, Martin Jay (1988) argues that such tendency represents a direct result of Western Modernity. Some even argue that this approach is widely identifiable with a socially privileged position of white, heterosexual men (Brown and Phu, 2014; Fackler, 2019; Bal, 2003). This tendency in the context of photography is notable since some of the earliest theoretical works on photography, namely *The Pencil of Nature* from one of its inventors Henry Fox Talbot in

1844 and Oliver Wendell Homes's article *The Stereoscope and the Stereograph* (1859) where photography has been largely seen as an attempt at mastering the objective world *out there* through the prioritisation of vision over other senses for this purpose.

The criticism of such ocularcentric tradition is not as recent. Pointing to but a few examples that have indulged on such a course, one might recall on Jonathan Reè's suggestion (2000), summarised by Liz James (2004) "that sight does not stand alone, for people relate to the world through a single sense organ, the body, in which all the senses are united." (James, 2004, p.525). This argument, while made in the context of visual works displayed in Byzantine churches, find further elevation with the *re*-turn to materiality within anthropology studies in what is now known as *New Materialisms* (Rose and Tolia Kelly, 2012; Coole and Frost, 2010) and the *Sensory Turn* (for a detailed account see Pink, 2009, 2011). As is the example with Mitchell's (2005) argument that essentially, there are no purely visual media, as in "all the so-called visual media turn out to involve the other senses... and are from the standpoint of sensory modality, *mixed media*." (p. 257). Similarly, Mieke Bal's (2003) critical text countering visual essentialism within the field of visual culture, indicates that the "act of looking is profoundly impure... [L]ooking is inherently framed, framing, interpreting, affect-laden, cognitive and intellectual."(p.9). However, this tendency is also visible in the post-modern discourses on photography such as the ones mentioned in the previous section and portrays, to say the least, a rather limited understanding of the human sensory apparatus by focusing on particular *scopic* regimes (Jay, 1988). However, there is a slight twist of such notions within the postmodernists. A notable portrayal of such tendencies is to be found in yet another Western tradition, the one of division between body and mind, sensuality and rationality; Martin Jay continues that "...in the art of mere describing, we might see another reification at work, that which makes the fetish of the material surface instead of the three-dimensional depth" (Ibid, p.20). Furthermore, as Howes probes: "The

classic opposition between sense and intellect has led to the notion that the expansion of sensory awareness (except in the case of sight, the most *rational* of the senses) entails a diminution of intellectual activity.” (2005, p.6).

This interestingly enough reverberates with the reaction of postmodernist critics to the emphasis on feelings in Barthes’ *Camera Lucida*. Readings which represent a controversial example that might shed light upon this occurrence to a certain extent can be seen to have the privileging of vision over the other senses in a way analogous, or rather, consequential to the privileging of *image* over the *object* (Welch and J. Long, 2009). What Barthes does is not solely expressing his feelings and trying through them to inform the reader’s opinion, but rather, he describes an experience. There are certainly good reasons that can lead one to believe that experience, and not merely feelings, is the central element of Barthes’ *Camera Lucida*. In this light, worth mentioning is the direct response to Gell’s aforementioned text by Christopher Pinnay (2020) who proposes the term *carpothethics* with which he refers to “the sensory embrace of images, the bodily engagement that most people [...] have with artworks.” (Ibid, p. 158).

Barthes’ text has been widely read as a precedent in the same time when the postmodern discourse has been developing (Frackel, 2019, Smith 2014, Welch and J. Long, 2009). This signals not only the ocularcentric tendency, but rather opens an oppositional debate between feeling and thinking photography. While excluding feelings is somewhat a result of the modernist trends, however, even post-modernists have not escaped the pitfall of the thinking task. On the other hand, in *Feeling Photography* (2014) Elspeth Brown and Thy Phu discuss the controversy that arose from different readings of and reflections upon Roland Barthes’ *Camera Lucida*. Post-modernists have rejected Barthes’s essentially emotional account provided in *Camera Lucida*, to be as Victor Bargin’s *Thinking Photography* exemplifies, “of the personal thoughts and feelings of the critic...with the aim of persuading

the reader to share these thoughts and feelings.” (1982, p.3). This did not represent only a certain implicit denial of feelings, but also points to the neglect of what Barthes calls the *affective intentionality* that photographs bare within (Barthes, 1981, p.21). Furthermore, Neo-Marxists and structuralist approaches have likewise rejected feelings and affects, and have largely focused their scholarship on what they considered *real effects* (Tagg, 1988, p. 8). However, it is fair to do justice to Burgin and appreciate his reading of *Camera Lucida* that has acknowledged the affective and emotional vacancies that Barthes’ text points to, but only insofar as they were distanced from the “thinking” task (Brown and Phu, 2014, p.3). Brown and Phu continue to suggest that “[T]his initial provocation to think photography can also be seen as an implicit rejection of feeling photography: emotions were unthinking, problematic interlopers in the materialist project of ‘thinking’ photography ‘in relation to society as a whole,’ rather than simply the art salesroom. Instead of serving as an analytic approach for understanding photography, feeling (on the few occasions that it explicitly surfaces in photo theory) has instead been perceived as a hindrance to this critical task.” (Ibid, p.2)

Abandoning notions of ocularcentrism and thought-centrism and inviting equality of oppositions, the whole body as the sensory apparatus and feelings back into the debate, ultimately points to the role of *affective states* as a reasonable place to further explore the deeply personal experience that photographers centred around analogue photography are engaged with. Such states, dealt with in the next section, being ignorant to a specific discipline, seem a promising element to enrich the debate of re-emergence of analogue photographic practice.

2.6 Affects, intentionality and the analogue photographic practice

2.6.1. Affective states

The question of *what is affect* and *when does it arise* has resulted in an abundance of takes from different scholarship traditions and consensus is clearly lacking as to what precisely *affect* stands for. Phu and Steer (2009) suggest that “*affect* describes a concept that rests on the frontier between the mental and somatic” (p.237). Melissa Gregg and Gregory Siegwirth (2020), on the other hand, describe affect as intense feeling that “arises in the midst of *in-between-ness*: in the capacities to act and be acted upon. [...] Affect, at its most anthropomorphic, is the name we give to those forces—visceral forces beneath, alongside, or generally *other than* conscious knowing; vital forces insisting beyond emotion—that can serve to drive us toward movement, toward thought and extension...” (Ibid, p.1)

Only in the past couple of decades this discourse has entered the realm of art and arguably helps improve our understanding of personal engagement apart from rendering social phenomena graspable. In an attempt to clarify this position, I will turn to O’Sullivan’s text *Aesthetics of Affect* (2001) pointing to the ambiguity of affects, where he argues that “[A]ffects can be described as extra-discursive and extra-textual. Affects are moments of *intensity*, a reaction in/on the body at the level of matter. We might even say that affects are *immanent* to matter. They are certainly imminent to experience. Indeed, you cannot read affects, you can only experience them. Which brings us to the crux of the matter: *experience*.” (2001, p.126). Furthermore “affects are not to do with knowledge or meaning; indeed, they occur on a different, *asignifying* register” (Ibid, p. 126). When inspecting the intersection of affects and art, he goes on to say that “In fact the affect is something else entirely: precisely an event or happening” (p.127)

Nicolas Addison, inspecting affects in the processes of teaching and making of art suggests that “Affect comes on us unannounced. It enters from without (from others, the environment) and does things to us. At the same time it is a force through which we impact others: our presence, energies and actions attract attention and elicit responses, resulting in movements orientated towards or away from us” (2011, p. 365) In the context of the aforementioned *event* by O’Sullivan, Addison goes on that “[A]rt, as a work of improvisation, a dialogue between an articulate body and the environment (material resources), is a type of embodied experience, one in which the conceptual and affective fuse.” (p.365).

In regard to photography, this discourse is stemming as a result of the confluence of multiple literature strains, namely the *Sensory Turn* and its implications as described in the chapter above, as well as phenomenological accounts of the agency of images evident in the literature that explores our human relation to sacred and religious motifs. Most of the literature on affect and photography is explicitly concerned with the affect photographs convey once produced (for a detailed account of the intersection between photography and affect see Phu and Steer, 2009; Cartwright and Wolfston, 2018). For instance, Elizabeth Edwards (2012, 2009) pointing to affective registers that stem from both phenomenological anthropology, as is the case with Gell above (Ibid.), and a more grounded, *Material Turn*, widens the understanding to point to the whole human body as one sensory apparatus, similarly as Pinney indicates (2020) through the notion of *carpothetics*. That is not merely to enrich vision itself, but to diversify the whole experience of encountering a material photo-object. As Laura Levin rightfully points, it is the relationship between the photograph and “affective spectatorship” that has been thus far taken into a rather detailed account (Levin, 2009, p. 328). This particular strain of thought illuminates the place of affects in perceiving material photo-objects. However, it is my point here, to broaden this inquiry by trying to

understand the *affective intentionality* of the photographer, one that predates the final product and to try and locate the affects in the process of creation.

2.6.2 Affective Intentionality

Although the aforementioned term, *affective intentionality*, as introduced in Barthes' *Camera Lucida* (1981), suggests "an active and deliberate method of regarding a photograph" (quoted in Smith, 2014, p.30), was largely intended to describe the process of engagement with a photograph and not the process of creation. However, there are arguably a couple of ways to take advantage of such engagement in order to illuminate aspects of the production of analogue photographs. Namely, the deliberate method of regarding a photograph, is something very much present in the process of creation. Thus far, the difference between analogue and digital in the context of *affective intentionality* is hardly distinctive, for such intentionality and engagement illuminates the mere act of pressing the button, equally relevant in both mediums. However, what might differentiate the analogue from the digital in this particular point, is the length of the process and the material environment that renders this *affective* engagement crucial.

As compared to Barthes', whose affective intentionality is embodied in the spectator, another, phenomenological account of it is to be found in Jan Slaby's (2007) text *Affective Intentionality and the Feeling Body*. Slaby points to the general "underestimation of the extent to which affective intentionality is essentially bodily" (p.1). He goes on to define *affective intentionality* as the "*sui generis* type of world-directedness that most affective states – most clearly the emotions – display." (p.1) He further probes that most theories on emotions overlook the bodily experience of intentional feeling. Together with Barthes' account of the same term, one is better equipped at locating the particular places to look for such intentionality. There is another, even more interesting aspect in Slaby's argument that

shed's light on Barthes' term and is also insightful in terms of photographic practice. He posits that “[T]here are many ways to attribute significance to objects, events or situations, but only one of these ways really affects us – namely, the emotional attribution of significance. [...] Of course, we also can execute non-affective evaluations as cold-blooded as we like, but these would not count as emotions.” (Ibid, p.5)

An example that depicts such deliberative, intentional world-directedness towards photography is a text by Shawn Michelle Smith (2014) inquiring the *affective intentionality* of the photographic work of Holland Day. Smith suggests: “Rather than revealing how photographs make me feel, I’m interested in how others have forecast feeling in their propositions about and practice of photography.” (p.30). He goes on that “Barthes and Day propose a [...] theory of photography in which feelings opens the index onto other worlds, collapses disparate times, and conjoins the material and the spiritual” (p.31). Closely resembling findings in light of the return of analogue photography, namely *unpredictability* and *imperfections*, Days photographs are “[M]ade with a special, *uncorrected* lens lacking a sharp focus, and showcasing Day’s increasing expertise in platinum printing, these photographs are dense with a misty atmosphere that heightens their mythical aura” (p.31)

2.7 Summary

Where are affective states to be found within the process of conceiving of and producing a photograph is a largely untackled territory, especially on the subjective level of inquiry it investigates. Oftentimes, when considering photography theoretically, it is easy to fall into the trap of conceiving it as a coherent whole, as one act. But it is not quite so, for from the moment of capturing light, to the moment of producing a photograph there are multiple stages of the process. One regards a preconception, an idea, that tacitly affects them, then chooses and prepares the materials before pressing the button, a process which is

followed by yet another one, of developing and crafting the final outcome – a photograph. The extension of these stages are the very length I refer to when accentuating the analogue as a medium that allows for more intimate engagement. One might suspect that it is because of the length of the process that the *affective intentionality* is not a point in time, but rather a slow and dissected process that follows through every step of the way, from the pressing of the button to the final physical photograph. In O’Sullivan’s words, an event. In Slaby’s – a world-directedness. In Barthes’ – an active pre-regarding. One is tempted to assume that it is the articulation of the *affective states* that brings one to the creation of the photograph and the thorough, expensive and time-consuming dedication towards the process of production. In other words, analogue photography can be assumed to emerge as a result of the *affective intentionality*, for the photograph taken on film requires an intensive involvement and deliberate intention.

One of the things that the material, analogue process offers, in Benjamin’s terms is it reclaims the *aura* of the work, or in Gell’s context, it renders photography *enchanted* again. This characteristic invites the transference of the affects one experiences *to* the photograph. To draw a line of reference to the beginning of this chapter, one is invited to suspect that the *materiality* of the process, *unpredictability* and *imperfection* in Minniti’s (2016) terms, create the space to allow for *moments of intensities*, that is, *affects*, that emerge as a consequence of the interaction between the materials and the photographer. Therefore, the different literature strains point to a mere possibility that the analogue, material process of creation, along with its material, unpredictable and imperfect nature, has the capacity to operate in the realm of *affects*.

3. Methodology

3.1 Defining the research goals

The main goal of the current research is to explore the experience of creation, why is the analogue medium significant as a preferred medium of creation among a specific group of skilled photographers? And respectively, how does that differ from its digital counterpart? The literature suggests (Chapter 2) that this could be done by delving into the peculiarities that distinguish the personal lived-experience during the digital and analogue photographic process. Furthermore, the thesis aims to explore the relationship between the materiality (the haptic and tactile nature of the process) and the intensities of feelings and emotions arising in the production of analogue photographs. The relevance of such an inquiry stems from the need to differentiate particular aspects as well as assess their emotional impact upon the practitioner. As a result of such an exploration the research attempts at uncovering the possible differentiating aspects of the two processes that in turn should provide a perspective and possible reasons for the preference towards analogue photography in the digital context of our contemporary societies.

3.1.1 Research Questions

A single main research question defines this study: What is the difference between the individual/personal experience with analogue and digital photographic processes accordingly? In order to achieve as detailed an inquiry as possible the main research question is dissected into further four sub-questions: (1) In which part of the digital process does the emotional experience differ from that of analogue photography?; (2) How and when (if at all) do feelings/emotions occur in the process of physical (tactile and haptic) interaction with the materials for the creation of analogue photographs?; (3) What is the relationship between the haptic/tactile and emotional engagement with materials in the process of creation and the

preference for analogue over digital photography?; (4) Does the tactile/haptic engagement in the analogue photographic experience serve as a decisive factor for preferring the analogue over the digital photographic process?

The sub-questions together with the literature review (Chapter 2) helped inform and construct the semi-structured interview questions that were at the frontline of the process of data gathering.

Additionally, as stated previously in Chapter 1 and 2 of this thesis, a special importance will be assigned to the role of *affective states* and *affective intentionality* in the process of creation. Affective states have been taken up by psychologists, anthropologists, social scientists and many other scholars from different fields and all of them have respectively contributed to instrumentalizing affects for the purpose of empirical research. This, as Danilyn Rutherford (2016) has outlined shows that “[T]he study of affect, narrowly conceived, has encountered obstacles: It has proven difficult, and in some cases impossible, to capture affect ethnographically [...] but this does not mean that this trend has yielded nothing of value. It has served as a bellwether for theoretical advances in the field.” (p. 286). Since the difficulties of deliberate empirical research of *affects* are well noted (Rutherford, Ibid; Knudsen, 2016), it is safe to say that the current research does not intend on dealing with *affects* and *affective intentionality* in an epistemological way. What it does, is merely to assess their occurrence as part of the **emotional responses** behind the deliberate choice to engage in a bodily, material, expensive and time-consuming experience with analogue photography. Furthermore, it seeks to uncover their points of divergence within analogue and digital practices comparatively so as to assess their impact upon the overall photographic experience.

3.2 Sample:

This study utilizes non-random purposive convenience sampling (O’Leary, 2004). The sample consists of 8 professional photographers with a minimum of ten years of photographic experience in both analogue and digital photography. Furthermore, the sample enlists strictly participants who engage in photographic practice which is a direct result of intentional conduct. Behind this choice lies the importance of acquiring data from photographers who consistently and deliberately prefer analogue photography for their personal practice. There are two reasons for such an approach. First, in such a manner the data will be gathered from participants with considerable expertise in the process of creation of both analogue and digital photographs, which will help differentiate technical aspects between the two processes. Second, they offer a detailed account of the lived experience during the analogue process and the relationship between its features and the emotional valences it triggers. This, in turn allows for an assessment of the possible role and occurrence of *affective states* and *affective intentionality*. Although this limits the generalizability of the findings, it is a necessary stepping stone as the issue at hand has not been researched in such a manner in prior studies. In that way, it is a precondition for assessing the directions of possible future research on a more general scale. The different geographic locations, that is North Macedonia, Serbia, Slovakia and Czech Republic, are due to the convenience of the participants and the locations of their work premises. This is where the interviews have been conducted, which together with the different cultural and ethnic backgrounds of participants, will allow for an inquiry into the attributes in the process of creation unconditioned and unrelated to a particular cultural and social background.

Table 1: Participant Demographics

Pseudonyms	Age	Country	Approx. Length of Photographic Practice in years
Miro	28	Košice, Slovakia	10+
Nikola	53	Novi Sad, Serbia	20+
Maja	53	Belgrade, Serbia	30+
Jose	43	Prague, Czech Republic	15+
Marketa	39	Prague, Czech Republic	15+
Jakub	36	Tabor, Czech Republic	15+
Ana	33	Novi Sad, Serbia	10+
Aleksandar	48	Skopje, North Macedonia	25+

3.3 Research Method

As the topic at its current state has not been explicitly researched and the analysis is inductively rooted in the data – as we shall see later on in this chapter – the study seeks a grounded theory qualitative approach utilising semi-structured phenomenological interviews. Being exploratory in nature, such an approach allows the researcher (myself) to explore the occurrences constitutive of the process of conducting analogue photography and the implications of the latter for the preferred choice over digital photography.

3.3.1 Grounded Theory

Glaser and Strauss with their groundbreaking work in *Awareness of Dying* (1965) have developed a particular qualitative research methodology which came to be known as

Grounded Theory (Glaser and Strauss, 1968). This implies that the theory stemming from the research is inductively rooted in the data. The reasons for using grounded theory are particularly applicable in the current case, as the topic of this research is thus far unexplored and as Corbin and Strauss (1998) stress, it allows for a “theory that was derived from data systematically gathered and analysed through the research process” (p.12). The multifaceted nature of the phenomena – re-emergence of analogue photographic practice – may result in aspects which are unpredictable, inviting adaptation and flexibility during the research process, which grounded theory as a methodology is well equipped to address. This, as mentioned in the introduction of this chapter, will allow for exploration of *affective states* and *affective intentionality* as well as their role and frequency of occurrence.

3.3.2 Data Collection - Phenomenological Semi-Structured Interviews

The phenomenological semi-structured interviews allow for the deliberate exploration of the lived-experiences of participants through their own lens. As Kvale and Brikmann (1996) have pointed out, a phenomenological “semi-structured life world interview attempts to understand themes of the lived everyday world from the subjects’ own perspectives.” (p. 31) However, because of the theoretical basis upon which the structure of the interview is assessed this particular study follows a method to phenomenological interviewing outlined by Bevan (2014) allowing for a theoretically based approach and accurate and systematic thematisation of the lived-experiences of the participants (Ibid). One of the pillars of Bevan’s approach is that it successfully utilises a fusion of descriptive and structural questions, which have been the cornerstone of the current research instrument. This, in turn allows for a successful blend of “general qualitative interview techniques and phenomenological methods” (Ibid, p. 143) and a flexibility during the interview process. The research delves into aspects previously unattained; it resulted in a grounded theory on the

topic of re-emergence of analogue photographic practices. The duration of the interviews has taken approximately 1 - 1,5 hours per interview. The initial data gathering process was in the form of audio files, later transcribed into text. The interviews took place at the work premises of the participants, where they conduct their photographic practice, both digital and analogue.

3.3.3 Data analysis:

The data analysis method utilises thematic analysis. The reasons behind this choice of method lies in the fact that “[T]hematic analysis moves beyond counting explicit words or phrases and focuses on identifying and describing both implicit and explicit ideas within the data, that is, themes.” (Guest, MacQueen and Namey, 2012, p. 10). The flexibility embedded in thematic analysis is of crucial importance here, since it allows for a variability of datum lengths which may encapsulate relevant themes in regards to the research questions. This allows for the detailed analysis of the recurring themes within the transcripts, in a way that the segmentation is a result of combination of multiple codes concerning similar issues. This result of the analysis is explicitly showcased in the codebook (Appendix B), where the codes, classified into main categories/themes and relevant examples are displayed.

3.4 Ethical Considerations:

Prior to every interview an informed consent (Appendix A) was obtained, ensuring confidentiality and voluntary participation. Pseudonyms are used to protect the identities of participants, and adhere to the ethical guidelines throughout the whole research process.

As the researcher (myself) has the experience of interacting with both analogue and digital photography, a position of what John Lofland (et. al, 2006) refers to as “insider knowledge, skill or competence” (p.70) requires additional *bracketing*, withholding preconceived notions of the analogue and digital photographic experiences especially given

the phenomenological nature of the semi-structured interviews. For preventing the researcher's background in photography to influence the conduct of the interviews and analysis of the data, a research journal was maintained where the personal feelings and own natural attitude of the researcher was reflected upon. The journal was actively revisited during the process of iterative analysis of the data. Therefore, the researcher was fully aware of his own position in regards to the inquiry and interview questions were posed utilising the method of *deliberate naiveté*, as defined by Kvale and Brikmann (1996, p.33).

4. Analysis of the findings

The findings suggest that the main point of divergence between the analogue and digital photographic experience are the occurrence of *affective states*, *affective intentionality*, and most importantly, the sense of *connection and/or detachment* that each photographic experience is charged with. That is so because of three distinct aspects that pose the basis for such differentiation. These aspects, also referred to as *features*, can be divided into three distinct categories; that is, *technical* or *circumstantial*, *agential* and *material*. It is important to note that each aspect has had a corresponding impact upon the overall photographic experience, however, they are largely intertwined and only insofar they are observed in this manner, an accurate valuation of their impact upon the photographic experience is to be assessed.

The first category covers the *technical* or *circumstantial features* of the analogue camera, including the issue of limitations, accessibility and affordability of necessary equipment and materials for the production of analogue or digital photographs respectively. The second encapsulates the *agential* features which deal with comparisons of the agency between the analogue and digital apparatuses and materials. Here, notions of *positive*

mistakes and *imperfections* along with the amount of *control* over the process directly correspond to the lived experiences of the participants. This aspect additionally points to the ways in which the latter contribute to the photographic experience by accentuating the *unpredictability* and *uncertainty* in the analogue process. In turn, this highlights the overall feeling of emotional and mental investment into the process and contributes to its amplification. The third aspect points to the influence of the *materiality* of the process. This is distinct from the previous two which deal with some material aspects, but do not refer directly to the interaction with materials. Therefore, these findings are centred around notions of tactile and haptic engagement, craftsmanship and other sensory experiences which are observed against their corresponding aspects within digital photography.

These *features* form the starting point of differentiation between the analogue and digital photographic experience. The interviews suggest that the difference between the features characteristic of each photographic process have multiple layers of impact upon the differentiation between the lived experiences of the interviewees. As we shall see in the first three sections that deal with each feature in greater detail, they outline a differentiation between analogue and digital photography **in a direct sense**, triggering different emotional states in each practice accordingly. Furthermore, they provide a **standpoint for observation and nomination of affective states and the concept of affective intentionality** occurring within the two practices at hand. This will be the subject of analysis in the fourth section. However, it is important to understand that the *features are not an end in themselves* as the findings suggest that there are certain instances and emotional occurrences that are not solely attributed to a particular feature. That is because the emotional states, affective states and affective intentionality – although occur as a direct result from the *features* – **extend beyond them, contributing to the development of particular sense of connection and/or detachment, as well as the different attribution of significance towards the analogue**

and digital practice comparatively. Namely, this will be the subject of the fifth, and last, section of the analysis.

Before proceeding to the analysis, it is worth noting that some informants, in an attempt to express their lived experience as vividly, use poetic or metaphorical expressions, and their choice of words are not to be taken at face-value. Rather, they are but an illumination of the lived experience and highlight the sense of significance they attribute to their practice. For the purposes of diversity I will be using the photographic phrases of ‘shooting’, ‘capturing’ and ‘taking’ a photograph interchangeably when referring to the initial act of photographing.

4.1 Technical / Circumstantial Features

The technical and circumstantial features refer to practical aspects of the usage of analogue and digital cameras comparatively and the ways in which they contribute to the photographic experience. These technical features are distinct in analogue and digital apparatuses accordingly and contribute to the amplification of the *affective intentionality* as well as intimate sense of significance that the photographers are experiencing in their practice. They do so mainly by influencing the rise of emotional states of *anticipation* and *excitement*. One of the most regularly occurring features of the analogue and digital cameras comparatively that the participants have noted is the difference between ability to capture a certain amount of photographs. Within digital practice, the word 'limit' is hardly applicable, as one has the ability to repeat the process of shooting as much as they need in order to achieve the desired result, whereas in the analogue, it mainly refers to the amount of frames that the film negative allows one to capture inviting greater sense of attention and intent. One of the participants, a 48 year old photographer, explicitly referred to this differentiation.

“There was an abundance of "junk" photos. And crucially, you don't think too much while doing that, since the picture reveals itself right away. That realisation was a turning point for me. Soon after that I got back to middle-format twin-lens cameras where one has only about 12 frames. I limited myself intentionally. For example, I would go on a holiday for 10 days with only 2 rolls of film. One colour and one black and white, and at that point, there is no more messing around. If you have 12 frames, you think before you shoot.” (Aleksandar)

This, in turn amplifies the role of affective intentionality in the act of taking a photograph on an analogue camera. Here, we can see a **direct correlation between the limitations and the amount of emotional engagement put into the act**. Additionally and in relation to the affective intentionality, there is the feature of immediacy, or rather, the ability to look at the image produced with the digital apparatus right after the moment of recording it. This gives the freedom to retake the image and perform corrections in the next one. Without such ability, the analogue camera invites greater amounts of mental effort and pre-regarding of the image. However, that is not to conclude that the digital process does not have such a function, but to merely point to its amplification within its analogue counterpart. One of the participants, when asked if the analogue work differs from digital regarding the relationship that the participant establishes with their subject, they noted:

“Yes, for practical reasons, because you know you're limited. I work with 6x9 cassettes, for example, and you know you have 8 shots on one film. And you know how it goes, removing the back of the camera, setting up, focusing, then the cassette. Another kind of "dance". And then you carefully create each shot, and it feels like a little ceremony. I see it as a ceremony because I'm photographing the person, they will be reflected on this film. It will capture them there. And for all that to happen, a series of quite complex actions need to be performed,

I can't miss any, otherwise, there's no picture. I have to be completely focused. And because I'm so focused, and by the way, the key thing is that I'm not hidden behind the camera, but I'm standing next to it. And everyone I photograph, when they see me coming with that Linhof, they're all like "wow, this is something very serious." But just that limitation, that I can't click as much as I want. That serious work precedes each photograph, those are the practical aspects that make us all very focused on what we're doing. Me and the person there. It's very important to me that I'm very present in that moment, and the person I'm photographing as well. And you can see that in the photograph. And with digital photography, you know you can shoot 1000 photos. And I don't have the attitude that it's something important." (Maja)

This particular excerpt displays the sense of 'presence' as well as 'dancing' around the camera, highlighting the manual hand-work that is connected to the emotional engagement in the process of shooting. The amplification of personal relationship with the subject based on the features of the analogue apparatus points to a direct link between the two and paves the way for a better understanding of the correlation between emotional valences and technical and/or circumstantial features.

In relation to this aspect is the way in which the issue of *accessibility and affordability* has had an impact on the frequency of work and extension in the process. The latter refers to the amount of materials one *allows* themselves to use in order to conduct the practice of analogue photography. That is due to the affordability of the materials which take part in the process. Although this has shown to greatly vary due to the change of personal financial circumstances, it has been noted in every participant's interview as it contributes to the photographic experience, inevitably influencing the way they position themselves towards their practice. To some, it additionally limits the waste of materials, as in, taking greater amounts of pictures and invites additional elements of intent while taking

photographs, while to others, it causes a limit to particular materials of lesser quality. In both cases, it is an obstacle to overcome if one is to be enthusiastically engaged in analogue photography.

In the context of limitations and comparisons between technical functions of the apparatuses, remarks have been made towards the prevailing simple nature of the analogue camera, having a lesser amount of options and commands which in turn creates a sense of more intuitive engagement. Such notions are hardly suitable for a separate analysis as they contribute very little to the experience. However, these intuitions and affective states are also greatly influenced by the notion of control and (im)perfections in the context of the comparison between the apparatuses, which leads me to the next section, the agential features.

4.2. Agential features

To expand on the previous explanation, *agential* in this sense refers to particular features of the process and materials that charge the camera, as a non-human actor with a lesser or greater agency. This underlines the difference between the digital and analogue apparatuses framing the former as a machine whose feature is to thoroughly perform the desired actions of the photographer while the latter, because of the specific physical and chemical nature of the materials used, has greater impact on the final photograph, apart from the actions of the photographer. Two notions within this aspect are important, that is the **lesser control over the process and the imperfection of the analogue, as opposed to the digital camera's perceived quest for perfectionism as well as the control over the process it provides the photographer with.**

“Imperfections are very important to me, especially in the work with collodion, and that's one of the reasons I love it. It is often very unpredictable, but those unpredictabilities and imperfections often really collaborate with the idea of the photograph. If we enter the territory of the metaphysical, I would more gladly perceive myself as someone who accommodates the process, rather than creating it. It happens through me, I'm here just to accommodate it and let it happen, and not create it. What allows me to feel so is namely working with unpredictable and imperfect processes, such as collodion rather than digital photography.” (Aleksandar)

Furthermore, this agency that the analogue system is charged with is directly connected to the physical nature of the materials. Namely, the photo-sensitive chemicals that are a part of the process, being of physical nature, rather than digital numerical language, are subject to outside factors of influence, regardless whether they come consciously from the intent of the photographer, or other aspects such as time, acidity or warmth are directly affecting them. One of the participants namely pointed to this in a way to highlight the agency of the chemicals in the analogue process.

“Then I continued with digital, which is completely precise, of course, depending on how you approach things, but it's absolutely accurate. And when I returned to analog photography, I wanted to relax and not be so exact. And that's what's interesting to me about collodion. Whether the chemicals are cooler or warmer, whether they've been used more, whether they've sat for longer. You visually interrupt it, and it has some inertia. Whether it's more acidic or not. These are all things that influence, and you control them, but only to an extent. It's more interesting to me because more intuition and play come into it.” (Nikola)

These imperfections and agency of the analogue apparatus invite a certain sense of unpredictability and uncertainty whether one will be able to attain precisely what they intended to. This reflects the amount of control that the photographer has over the process. As in certain moments the photographer is not aware of the amount of influence that the materials will have on the final outcome, it is arguably inevitable that **the whole process is overladen with anticipation and excitement towards the result**. These features depict the relationship to the control over the process and the analogue camera apparatus together with the materials, such as the film negative, as displayed in the excerpt below.

“And that’s how I am, everything has to be under control, everything has to be perfect. And analog photography constantly proves to me that I can’t control it. Probably because of my ignorance and imprecision, because of my clumsiness, and because I use old films. For example, now I used films from 1984. What kind of control is that? There’s none. That’s what I love. And then I wonder how it will turn out. And again, that imagination, what will the film capture? Because the film is not the same as me. It’s like the two of us are photographing.” (Maja)

However, this particular interaction is intentional. The participant has engaged with unpredictable materials upon their own initiative, as well as because of the issue of affordability and accessibility—described in greater detail above. Furthermore, this implies that the digital and analogue experience differs in the sense that **the former has a precisely structured way to the final result, while the latter arguably does not**. However, this is just a milestone that contributes to the overall experience by creating the necessary space for deeper relationship with the apparatus and the final result. That is so, mainly because of the fact that it triggers greater intensity of *affective states* and emotions during and after the process of taking the photograph. *Affective intentionality* again plays a central role in this

occurrence, as the process requires a greater emotional investment and careful consideration of the possible ways in which the camera can contribute to the final result. Additionally, the anticipations highlight a feeling of excitement that retains the connection with the process even after it is finished and serves as the starting point from which further work in the postproduction of the photograph is directed. Therefore, **it is of great relevance for one to understand that these notions extend beyond the act of shooting and stretch throughout the process of post-production with the photographs.**

“Whereas with the digital file I would have a quite precisely structured route to the final result. And I would usually come to one result which is satisfactory, because if not, then I would go one step back and end up in that one previous position.^{[1][1]}But, with analogue I rarely make two absolutely identical prints. Especially when I use all kinds of farm reducers, some hand work in terms of dodging and burning and this type of adjustments. Also the spotting and retouching of prints. So, you hardly achieve two same images and that's the beauty of it.” (Jakub)

This highlights yet another interesting feature of the post-production process that distinguishes the analogue from the digital. Namely, the **unreproducible character of the analogue photograph**. Some aspects of it are connected to the control, unpredictability and imperfection, which are essentially the main reasons why it is impossible to achieve two identical photographs or prints; however, there is the aspect of human factor in it as well. Here it is not the affective intentionality, although certainly present in the process of post-production, but **the sense of greater emotional connection with the uniqueness of the final product as well as the emotional investment in the labour of making an analogue print** being amplified. This uniqueness, or rather, irreproducibility of the photograph is resulting from the amount of conscious effort put into the process and the rewarding **feeling of**

personal achievement. Furthermore, it involves haptic and tactile engagement with the materials which additionally contribute to such emotional states. Touching upon the post-production and manual hand-work leads me to the third and final feature the analysis suggests, namely the *material* features.

4.3. Material features

Although one could argue that each and every part of the analogue process is of physical character, this particular feature encapsulates not only materiality as in the physical nature of objects, but rather the tactile and haptic interaction with the materials, the sensory stimuli which are experienced during this interaction and the sense of craftsmanship that accompanies it. The findings suggest that **this interaction is the main contributor towards the feeling of personal connection to an analogue photograph and plays a central role in the distinction between the analogue and digital processes accordingly.** The digital is largely perceived as an immaterial process, lacking the tactile engagement. The correlation between the perceived immateriality of the digital process and the sense of personal connection is visible in the following excerpt from an interview:

“If you shoot with digital, you don't even have to get the memory card out in order to transfer images to the computer. And then you just do your thing, edit them, etc. Everything is wireless basically. Interestingly enough, you have Adobe Lightroom, which has basically copied the features of the darkroom photo lab workspace and placed them in a digital photo editor. There you can do things that you do in the darkroom by hand. To me it is important to physically touch the materials. One develops muscle memory when doing this long enough. That's how I develop the bond with the material.” (Miro)

Not only in correlation to the personal sense of significance, the haptic and tactile engagement with the materials plays a central role in assessing the influence of *affective states* in the process. This is mainly so because the preconceived idea of the ‘photograph that is to become’ emphasises the *affective intentionality* during the analogue process which, as we have seen in the previous sections is also largely connected by the practical features and the emotional valances they trigger. The findings suggest that in the stage of haptic and tactile interaction with the materials, the photographers go through a greater amount of excitement, as well as their unique way of approaching this phase, the work that they put in and the personal significance they attribute to this process. This is explicitly vivid in the following excerpt where a participant describes his inability to ‘establish a relationship’ with a photograph if he ‘edits it on a screen’. This further **exemplifies the correlation of bodily sensations and engagement in manual work with affective states and ultimately the establishment of a deeper personal connection to the work produced.**

“So I cannot establish a relationship with images when I edit them on a screen. It is easier for me when I work physically, I am excited, I hope for it, I anticipate whether it will be the way I wanted it to be or not because I often experiment with other alternative techniques which I find interesting. There is excitement, like a little kid, which I think holds an important place in my life. Call it adrenaline, or whatever. And either you have, or you don't have a good result. That process for me is crucial, because not only do you see yourself photographically, but that is a fertile ground for reflecting on one's self.” (Aleksandar)

Thereafter, on the issue of differentiating the post-production of analogue and digital photographs, important mentioning is that **the physicality of the process can also have a certain therapeutic quality, such as the act of self-reflection stemming from the engagement with the work which takes a physical, material form and in which**

photographers go through a bodily experience. Additionally the findings suggest that emotional occurrences are also related to photographic objects and not solely to the process. These physical artefacts, being the final product of the long, expensive and emotional process that one goes through when working with the analogue photography, add yet another layer of the emotional experience in relation to the **rewarding feeling of satisfaction.** What this in turn points to, that such states serve as an additional motivation to proceed with engagement with analogue photography. Put in simple terms, this feeling of gratification which accompanies the last instance of the process, namely the production of the physical photograph, is precisely what is emphasized here.

“And you know, that clock is ticking, in the dark, then the light, then I move around with my hands. For me, it’s really a dance. Then, when I put the paper in the trays, rolling it - my hands burn, I cry. Madness. Then the impatience, then you pull it out to see how far you’ve come, then wash and fix it. But when it’s all done, I’m the happiest person in the world.”
(Maja)

The material features taken upon in this section hold an especially important place and contribute to the photographic experience in a very unique manner. The affective states, intuitive decision-making and reliance on gut feeling which represent a crucial byproduct of the material features, but are nonetheless present in the other ones previously analysed, will be the subject that the next section deals with. This should additionally clarify when do such moments occur and what is their contribution to the overall distinction between the digital and analogue lived experiences.

4.4 Affective States & Affective Intentionality

It would be a false statement to pose that the digital process lacks occurrence of affective states and the involvement of affective intentionality. However, it differs in comparison to the analogue process, where these have shown to occur also after the initial act of photography, that is, the capture of the image. One of the ways in which we can understand this differentiation is by observing the phases in which such states occur. While the act of shooting is certainly affect laden, and as shown in the previous parts of the analysis—largely due to the emotional valances triggered by certain features that the analogue operates within – it is hard to deny the fact that should one be enthusiastically engaged in photography in general, some of these, probably in a lesser intensity will occur regardless of the type of the apparatus. However, **when one considers the tactile and haptic engagement post-shooting, one clearly comes to understand that the affective states and affective intentionality are also very much present in the post-production of photographs.** The digital process is shorter and requires less steps from the conception of an image to the realisation of the final photograph, which in turn points to a certain amount of work which during the analogue process is down to the photographer, but here it is being performed by the digital apparatus, both cameras and computers.

“The difference is so vast that it's almost incomparable. I don't like taking a picture and seeing it immediately. I don't carry the latent image on film; I carry it in my whole being. I dream about it, imagine it, and create various stories. And then the moment when I develop it and see the film—today I scan it, but before I went to the lab to develop it—after going through all those phases, from excitement to disappointment, to anger for not doing it right, to the thrill of doing it again, it's a whole magical world that happens there. With digital, I click, "paf"—image. Where am I in that?” (Maja)

That points to the fact the different phases of the process that the photographer goes through in order to achieve a photograph form the necessary spaces where affective states and affective intentionality can be prolonged or extended. Here the latent image plays a central role. Not the one on the film negative, but the one that the photographer has preconceived with his 'mind's eye'. While in the digital process this image is demystified in the moment right after the act of shooting, as one can immediately see it, let alone when one transfers the images to a computer where they enter the phase of post production without additional effort. This implies that the intentionality of the process operates within a much shorter period of time, whereas in the analogue system, the latent image that the photographer has preconceived and pre-regarded, extends during the work in the darkroom, in the phases of development of the negative and the positive process.

Although not to an extent worthy of a separate analysis chapter, the advancements in digital technology have been fairly noted by almost all interviewees. They have pointed to the fact that today's digital technology is so advanced that it can almost perfectly emulate the aesthetics of analogue photography. Furthermore, they are cheaper, faster, more efficient and provide access to a greater manipulability in comparison to the analogue process.

“With digital it was faster, you were thinking, like okay, I need a photograph of the dock, so you just go and get it. So what happened was that I started producing faster. At this time I would get some small jobs and of course for that purpose it was faster. My father has a nice digital camera, so I was working. In order to get clients it was a change factor. It was like "wow". This is a good tool. It is a good tool to make money. But, something was missing. Analogue was more the experience, I guess. Totally different feeling. So the difference for me is the approach, the intention behind and also the process itself.” (Jose)

What this points to, is that **the affection and undertakings in analogue photographic practice today are not relying upon the features that elevate digital photography** through all of its aforementioned traits; rather, **this amplifies the extent to which establishing a personal connection, a deeper sense of significance, as well as greater exposure to affective states, intuitions and affective intentionality overall serves as a decisive factor for the engagement in analogue practices.**

4.5 Connection and detachment

This section deals solely with the issue of connection and attribution of personal significance to the analogue and digital practices comparatively. Here, the analysis is not concerned with features of any sort; rather, it utilises the *affective states* and *intentionality* from the previous chapter, but this time, in a sense that the source of connection to the analogue is largely its implicit comparison to the overall societal dynamics characteristic of the digital era. This is important, as it points that such tacit implications are hardly conceivable without the advancements of digital photography.

“But the print that you do in the darkroom is going through phases, processes, different chemicals, requires a lot of patience, and then you look at it while it's wet, then another time when it dries off. If I see a photograph printed in a darkroom, I feel the presence of the person that printed it. That person was working hard, putting effort, and when they saw the final result, they were smiling. That's dear to me, and I value that. We could argue about the mid tones of an image and so on and so forth. But no, everyone should do what they desire to do. I am not the judge of it.” (Miro)

This statement by one of the participants **implicitly points to the digital backdrop of our contemporary societies** as it highlights the physicality of the process. It is safe to

say that **this statement is era-specific, meaning that it probably would not have occurred in an era when there was only analogue photography.** As it contributes to the deeper sense of connection to a photograph, it is important to understand that only in certain cases, **this connection derives as a direct result of the differentiation from digital processes.**

Stemming from this, there is another dimension that the findings suggest, and has to do with the **perceived intimate nature of analogue photography.** Here again, the digital nature of the photography work serves as an underlying notion upon which such accounts are put through. The difference between analogue and digital is also outlined through the notion of *indexicality* as a factor pointing to a greater intimate relationship towards analogue photographic practices.

“I use digital photography sometimes out of convenience but mostly for things I am not that passionate about in a way that I want to own part of them or keep them in my collection. So if I am doing something that is either commissioned or that I have a project where I know I need some technical images of some textures or I need to photograph a specific place that I will have printed on a specific material, then I use digital. When I am more interested in some sort of visual aspect of it, or if it's just a part of an installation, I am totally fine using the digital camera. Because I don't care about the actual thing that I will photograph. But if I shoot something that I really care about and am fascinated by, I am using analogue. It's more of a ritualistic veneration of the thing, or like getting a lock of hair from your lover, or getting a stone from a beach from the summer holiday.” (Marketa)

Although vivid throughout the analysis in different contexts and in connection to different features, the sense of connection and personal attachment is largely due to the occurrence of affective states in the process of decision-making emphasising a stronger

reliance on gut feeling and intuition. However, this is connected to one of the crucial differences between the digital and analogue workflow. Namely, the ability of the former to perform real-time corrections in each stage of the process, be it during the act of shooting – by being able to retake the photograph again and again, or during the post-production phase – where one can always return one step back and re-edit until the desired result is achieved. The latter, in turn, does not allow for such timely corrections and stimulates the photographer to actively pre-contemplate how they will be making the decisions in the process. **This is the precise moment where affective states are most frequent, that is, when greater reliance on intuitions and gut feeling mentioned earlier occurs.** In these moments, there is a greater sense of **presence** and **involvement** in the process which inevitably charges the result with greater personal significance. Although this stems from the features of the apparatus and the emotional and affective responses that they trigger, the findings suggest that there is also another aspect of convergence between the analogue photographic experience and the amplification of this sense of personal connection to the work. This aspect has very little, if not at all, to do with the features of the process; rather, it is concerned mainly with the **amount of attention and actual work, or rather, labor**, put in it.

“When you take an analog camera, especially the medium format, you somehow really connect with that technique. It's not just a cold tool to get a photo; you really use it as your instrument. I feel like a craftsman, and that's my tool to create a photograph. It's much more personal. I don't know how else to explain it. I don't feel that way with a digital camera.”

(Ana)

The intimate engagement allocates a personal sense of importance, distinguishing it from the digital practice as it implies a greater involvement into the process. One might grieve that the features and advancements of digital cameras, apart from contributing to the

phase, efficacy and affordability of conducting the act of photography, do so by replacing a great amount of the work that otherwise would have been done by the photographer. **This workload is one of the main features that distinguishes analogue photography from its digital relative.** Therefore, one is safe to say that the workload, previously mentioned as labour, is also a point of contribution towards the allocation of greater personal and subjective importance to the analogue medium.

The relation between the findings from the analysis and the research question will form the subject of the next section, where the correlations with the existing literature, as well as the implications of the process will be taken a closer look at. This in turn, should help form a theoretical framework of understanding the possible place of analogue photography today. Furthermore, the discussion section should provide one with the necessary angle of analysis which will in turn, inform a more suitable framing of analogue photographic practice against the backdrop from the current day context.

5. Discussion

5.1. Answering the main research question

In the discussion section, I will discuss the implications of the findings upon the main research question of ‘**What is the difference between the individual/personal experience with analogue and digital photographic processes accordingly?**’. This will be done so by providing a theoretically-imbued discussion revolving around my answers and following the analysis of the data gathered from the field research. The phenomenological interviews allowed the seemingly simple, yet complex nature of the main research question to be dissected into four additional sub-questions. Posing the issue at hand in such a manner

renders the comprehension of photographic experience a manageable task as it separately addresses the key attributes of the process of **both physical and emotional value**.

To begin with, one is invited to attempt a closer inspection of the photographic processes comparatively. Be it analogue or digital, the photographic process consists of three separate phases. That is, **(1)** the act of taking a photograph, as in, recording it with the help of a certain camera device; **(2)** proceeding to the post-production phase, where the photographer adjusts the photograph leading to **(3)** the act of achieving the final result, that is, printing or archiving. These processes are a given in both analogue and digital apparatuses. However, **the point of divergence is not in the three separate photographic acts, but rather their length and principle of conduct. In other words, the elements that they are composed of. The features that characterise each of the acts is charged with different physical and emotional tendencies.**

This discussion rests upon the presumption, and deals strictly with photographic practice which is a result of intentional conduct. In the following part, I will be answering each of the sub-questions that the main research question is dispersed to, which in turn should provide a detailed discussion of the findings in regards to the main research question stated in the beginning of this section.

5.2 Sub-question #1 – Difference in Emotional Experience

In this section I will address the first of the four sub-questions, namely, **in which part of the digital process does the emotional experience differ from that of analogue photography?**

The initial differentiation of the emotional experiences between the analogue and digital processes accordingly **occurs within the early stages of the process**. This is due to certain features or aspects characteristic of the digital and analogue practice respectively.

These features contribute to the rise of different emotional states that the photographers experience during the analogue and digital practice comparatively. Namely, this sub-question deals with what in the analysis section is referred to as *technical* or *circumstantial* and *agential* features. Firstly, aspects concerned with characteristics that differ in the analogue and digital technology comparatively and are largely concerned with the quantity, or the amount of images one is able to take. Furthermore, the analogue process prevents one from immediately seeing the result, whereas in the digital system, the images created are immediately displayed. One could say the difference here is one of **immediacy**. Both **the limits to the repetition of the process and the delayed encounter with the final result amplify feelings of anticipation, excitement and uncertainty**. While anticipation and excitement are also present in the digital system, their impact upon the overall lived experience is significantly under-emphasised in comparison to the analogue. In turn, this points to the frequency of affective states experienced throughout the analogue process and marks the first point of differentiation between the emotional states triggered by the two processes at hand.

The second type of features are directly linked to the materials used in the process and are hereafter referred to as *agential* features. While the digital sensor has a predetermined quality of output, this is not the case with the film-based practice. **Here, notions of unpredictability and imperfections of the analogue process are experienced against the backdrop of the digital camera's perceived quest for perfectionism**. The digital apparatus has a predetermined quality that allows the photographer to achieve a result within close proximity of the desired outcome. This is not the case with analogue practice because the materials are of physical nature and are subject to variability and outside influence. This, the findings suggest, charges the apparatus and materials with agency, that is largely perceived through the notions of imperfection and unpredictability, directly

influencing the levels of excited anticipation and ‘hoping for’ the desired result. Furthermore, a similar system of observation is applicable to the post-processing within digital and analogue practices comparatively. The analogue process consists of multiple irreversible ‘steps’ to the final result with the ever-present possibility of irreversible damage to the materials, that in turn requires active pre-regarding of the outcome and careful conduct in order for the photographer to be able to achieve it. This again prolongs the timeframe of the intentionality behind creation, rendering it affective. Reverberating with Slaby’s definition of affective intentionality mentioned in the literature review section framing it as a “*sui generis* type of world-directedness that most affective states – most clearly the emotions – display.” (2007, p.1). With the slight twist that *world-directedness* within the photographic practice is better framed as *photograph-directedness*, or rather, the photograph that the photographer’s *mind's-eye* has pre-conceived. As illuminated by Barthes (1981) and in regards to photography particularly, he posits that affective intentionality is an “active and deliberate method of regarding a photograph” (as quoted in Smith, 2014, p.30).

Considering the second of the five principles of new media (Manovich, 2001), namely, *modularity*, digital media are programmable and re-programmable, allowing for a structured route to the final result. The manipulability of the digital, especially with the recent digital advancements, is one of the pillars upon which such a sense of perfection is gained. This implies that the photographer is exposed to a greater sense of control over the final result throughout the process. On the other hand, the analogue process of achieving the final result takes place in the physical space of the darkroom where access to previous steps of the process is not permitted, rendering it irreversible. Here, the *desired result* becomes emotionally charged, as the photographers are striving to achieve it throughout all the stages of the process. Furthermore, the limitations and delayed familiarisation with the results of the work are proportionally corresponding with rise of feelings of excitement, adrenaline

and anticipation, that is, *affective states* which are experienced as a byproduct of the *affective intentionality* of the photographer, which as the literature and findings suggest, **is largely a bodily experience.**

The digital, on the other hand, although we cannot claim that is altogether stripped of *affective states*, these are found to be of lesser extent and intensity because of immediate exposure to the final result during the practice. This renders the digital experience shorter, which does not necessarily mean that it is of a lesser quality, but certainly points to the timeframe within which the affective states are experienced. Therefore, we can conclude that **it is the length of the analogue process that allows for such feelings and emotional states to last for a longer period of time and have extended impact upon the person conducting the practice and their lived experience.**

5.3. Sub-question #2 – Physical experience and emotional responses

This section addresses the question of **how and when (if at all) do feelings/emotions occur in the process of physical (tactile and haptic) interaction with the materials for the creation of analogue photographs?**

In the practice of photography, emotional responses are almost a given. That is so, because each and every step of the process requires a certain decision-making which is based on personal judgment. As Slaby points, the personal feeling of significance is strongly connected to affects, although he probes that “we also can execute non-affective evaluations as cold-blooded as we like, but these would not count as emotions” (2007, p.5). This, as described in greater detail in the analysis (Chapter 4), is not the case with analogue photography as vivid through the emotional valances that stretch throughout the whole process. Furthermore, this is particularly applicable to the tactile and haptic engagement with the materials in the process of production of one photograph. The findings point to the fact

that the **physical interaction with the materials contributes to the photographer making a stronger emotional bond with both the practice and the final outcome.** This is so, because of the stronger sense of significance attached to the practice in regards to the **emotional, mental and physical effort** put forth.

In analogue photography, the process of familiarising oneself to the photographs they have created takes the form of a physical interaction, as compared to the digital practice where this usually takes the form of interactions with screens, rendering it mediated. This is important, as it points to a particular sense of tactile engagement. **Again, as with the previous question addressed, affective states are a central part of the process.** Furthermore, the process is unpredictable and invites greater attention, because of the sensitivity of the materials where a little mistake in the workflow may permanently damage the film-negative or the final print, thus forcing a repeat of the action. However, one is not to argue that such feelings do not occur within the digital practice, but nonetheless, without such consequences.

Nevertheless, the physical engagement with the materials almost always is predated by the act of shooting, which implies that the **affective intentionality experienced during the first stages are transferred to the darkroom, that is, to the post-production of the photographs.** This amplifies the affective states that the photographer goes through during the tactile and haptic interaction with the materials.

5.4 Sub-questions #3 and #4 - Addressing the preference

In order to assess *where* does the preference towards analogue photography come from, or rather, from which part of the process, the following section will provide answers to the third and fourth sub-questions of the main research question.

5.4.1 Sub-question #3

What is the relationship between the haptic/tactile and emotional engagement with materials in the process of creation and the preference for analogue over digital photography?

The findings suggest that the photographers interviewed, because of such emotional intensity and affective states experienced during the process, allocate greater sense of significance to the final outcome towards the analogue practice. Furthermore, one could argue that this is a question of labour. The amounts of labour put into the practice directly correspond with the level of personal connection that the practice operates within, rendering it of a **more personal and intimate character, which in turn results in preference towards the analogue**. We cannot be sure that such states of personal attachment to the practice are additionally influenced by the specifics of the era that we live in, that is, one of progressing digitization and algorithmization. The significance some individuals attribute to it is somewhat posed against the backdrop of our digital culture. That is to say that **the sense of personal attachment towards the analogue practice, to a certain extent, rests upon its differentiation from the current digital workflow**. One could argue that **the existence of digital culture amplifies the attribution of personal significance to the analogue apparatus, rendering the analogue practice as a more intimate and personal way to engage in photography**.

Both the physical nature of the materials engaged in the practice as well as the emotional valences triggered by the interaction with them contribute to a feeling of deeper personal connection to analogue photography.

5.4.2. Sub-question #4

Does the tactile/haptic engagement in the analogue photographic experience serve as a decisive factor for preferring the analogue over the digital photographic process?

The tactile and haptic engagement in itself **is not the decisive** factor for the preference of analogue over digital, **but certainly forms an aspect of it**. As explained earlier, this experience has two major contributions towards the overall preference. The aspect of such engagement that differs in analogue and digital photographic practices comparatively mostly takes part in the post-production process, where findings suggest that participants interact with the materials in an **intentional** way with a preconceived notion of the final outcome, rendering that part of the process particularly affective. Although this is also applicable within the realm of the digital, the difference here is that while in the digital this interaction is mediated, within the analogue process it is of a more direct, unmediated character. Additionally, that interaction contributes to physically experiencing the photographic artifact they have created in previous phases of the process. This is amplified by the sense of craftsmanship, as media theorist and sociologist David Gauntlett defined the crucial dimension of craft as “the inherent satisfaction of making; the sense of being alive within the process; and the engagement with ideas, learning, and knowledge which come not before or after but *within* the practice of making” (2011, p. 24-25, emphasis by the author). Of course, craftsmanship is not to be considered absent from the digital process, however, as stated earlier, it takes the form of a mediated practice; mostly through computer screens where the haptic and tactile dimension is entirely different.

5.5. Points of divergence and convergence with existing literature

The notion of *technological resistance* is found to be applicable to other studies that delve into the re-emergence of analogue photography. This has served as a cornerstone of analysis that Minniti and Maggauda (2019) have established when taking a closer look at the popularisation of Polaroid and Lomography cameras. However, **this is not applicable here**, for it is not a matter of resistance that stimulates users to engage with analogue photography. The sense of personal significance stems from involvement that is different from the digital trends, which does not necessarily place the engagement with analogue photography as a form of technological resistance. To say the least, it would be unjust to analogue photography to frame it *merely* as a form of a technological resistance. Rather, it is a practice on its own that finds yet another meaning within contemporary culture. One could argue that certain feelings of connectedness and attachment to the practice are in some sense amplified when observed against the backdrop of digital photography, as we shall see later on, but it would be an unsustainable statement to attribute the reemerging interest towards analogue practices *solely* by opposition to digital photography.

Previous research (Maggauda and Minniti, 2019; Minniti, 2020) on this topic implies the oppositions of digital *perfectionism* and analogue *imperfections*, digital *predictability* to the *unpredictable* nature of the analogue process and digital perceived *immateriality* contrasted by the physical *materiality* that characterizes the analogue process. However, these notions are not an end in themselves and in the current research are not to be observed as a form of technological resistance. Rather, they are triggered by the difference in the principles of the respective technology. Furthermore, they contribute to the emotional responses and affective states that the practitioners find themselves in relation to such technological characteristics, as they are accompanied by the feelings of anticipation and excitement. This is not the case with the Polaroid cameras which are subject of previous

research on the topic, as they have the ability to produce photographs instantly. The very name of the Polaroid *Insta-matic* film depicts the ‘instantaneous’ character of such apparatuses. Within the practice which forms the subject of the current research, these prolonged states also extend the affective intentionality, experienced through the affective states with which the process is overlaid. Photographs produced as a result of the analogue practice gain relevance in regards to their physical character and represent physical objects that contribute to the greater sense of significance and personal connection.

In respect to this, one is safe to say that the current research partially **reaffirms findings of previous research on return of analogue practices that posits the aspect of immateriality, together with the unpredictability and imperfections to be reasons behind the engagement with and framing of the analogue practice** (Maggauda and Minniti, 2019). However, **it places them in a different position of significance rather than being the sole reasons for engagement.** As vividly explained in the analysis section (Chapter 4) and the answers to the research questions, notions of materiality are encapsulating **not only the physical nature of photographs, but the whole process of tactile and haptic engagement with them.** Furthermore, the research design and the phenomenological, semi-structured interviews allowed for an effective way to look into the occurrences of affects. Considering that aspect, this research extends the findings of previous ones **by framing such notions, together with anticipations and excitements, as the basis upon which *affective states* and ultimately *affective intentionality* is experienced.**

The issue of indexicality, although explicitly touched upon in very few places is tacitly present in the findings as interviewees have pointed to the sense of significance attributed to the analogue practice in regards to the objects photographed. A general finding is that when the participants are engaged photographing something of greater personal significance, they resort to the analogue practice, whereas digital cameras and photography

in general are considered to be ‘a gig thing’. This points that analogue photography today is largely also a re-turn towards the indexical character of the photograph, appropriating debates of the lacking indexicality of digital photography from the 90’s and 00’s (Sutton, 2007; Biro, 2012; Roger, 1994). This further undermines the notion of *technological resistance*, as photographers are not opposed to digital photography, but consider it of a rather impersonal character.

In the context of Joana Sasoon’s (1998) discussion on the reproducibility and authenticity of analogue prints, the findings suggest that a great sense of importance and authenticity within the photographers lived experience lies in the unreproducible character of the photographic print. The interviewees, as shown in the analysis section of this thesis, have pointed to the sense of importance they attribute to their darkroom printing practice, emphasizing their inability to create two identical prints within this process. That points to the fact that **amplified notions of authenticity are a significant factor that distinguishes digital and analogue experience, and contributes to the greater emotional weight of the latter.**

5.6 Implications

The introduction of affective states implies a relation to the photo-materialists and the Sensory Turn within anthropology and visual culture studies (Chapter 2). The analogue practice taken upon in this research, against the backdrop of the digital culture in our contemporary societies, can be seen as an **antithesis to both the postmodern and modern discourses in relation to photography.**

It does so by representing an embodiment of a practice that unites discourses opposing both postmodern privilege to the thinking task about photography and criticism towards modernist notions of ocularcentrism. In the case of the former, it defies the priming

of thinking—by emphasizing the strong emotional connection and affective intentionality within the practice—while simultaneously abandoning the primacy of *images* that digital photography and the postmodernist discourse operate within—reintroducing the unity of photographs as both *images* and *objects* (Edwards and Hart, 2004).

In the case of the latter, and in the context of the *Sensory Turn* in anthropology, analogue photography is **inviting multisensory modalities and the body as the sole organ of sensory experience**—underlining Pinney’s (2020) notion of *carpothetics*. This contrasts the ocularcentric traditions of the modernist thought and effectively charges the physical experiences in relation to the analogue practice with relevance, posing the photo-object at the centre of the practice.

Affective states and affective intentionality are present in both analogue and digital photography, as clearly mentioned earlier in this text; however, the most important distinction is when affective states are observed in the context of the features of the respective technology. The analogue process invites greater presence, quantity and quality of affective states. **This is the precise point of differentiation between the impact of affective states during the digital and analogue processes accordingly.** What this implies is that affective states have different roles, or rather, different involvement in the creation of the photographic experience in digital and analogue technology respectively.

Another relevant implication of the findings invites a thorough inspection of the current framing of analogue photography. This is due to the inevitable digital context within which it is observed. This stems from the part of the findings of the current research that points to the acknowledgement of digital photography as a more practical, cost efficient, faster and more accurate way of producing images. The role of digital photography in assessing the importance of its analogue counterpart today is not one of drawing direct comparisons/oppositions, although this is how it represents itself in the practical sense, that

is, in the lived experiences of the photographers interviewed in the current research. If taken at face-value, this can indeed lead to the tendency to frame analogue photography solely as a form of a *technological resistance*. Rather, digital photography and the digital mode of production of images, serve as the backdrop upon which analogue photography is regaining a different type of **relevance as a practice and as a craft that was previously not present**. It is effectively a reframing of analogue photography based *in* the context of digital culture. Both implicitly and explicitly integrated and revealing itself within the findings, this aspect suggests that **analogue photography today is not to be viewed from the perspective of its relevance prior to the invention of digital photography**. This implies that the significance which the practice entails is different than it once did because today it operates **alongside** digital photography.

Arguably, the position of analogue photography today, as perceived by the increasing number of its practitioners, is posed **within** the context of the digital trends. The digital in a way serves as a tool for the crystallization of the identity of analogue photographic practice. Acknowledging the role of digital photography in the framing of analogue photographic practices does not reaffirm, and should not be confused with notions of *technological resistance* previously discussed. On the contrary, it provides yet another societal dynamic, one of digitization, that contributes to analogue photography gaining a distinct meaning. One that it would not be able to attain prior to the invention of the digital camera. To summarize, analogue photography is indeed a separate practice and should be inspected as such, however, its **framing** is to be considered alongside and sometimes in the context its digital sibling, for it offers a different, material and object-centered approach, but nonetheless to a similar purpose, namely the creation of photographic images.

6. Conclusion

Signaled with the establishment of the first *Analogue Photography Festival Network* as well as the surge on recent academic research on the topic (Chapter 1 and 2), this particular study has been focused on deliberate engagement with the entirety of the practice of analogue photography. Tracing the analogue process from beginning to the final outcome, that is, an analogue photographic print while simultaneously delving into a comparative assessment to its digital counterpart. Given the lack of such an inquiry up to date, the goal of the study was to understand why is it that analogue photography is regaining significance in the contemporary context. To tackle this issue, the research started with an overview of the current state of the literature on return of analogue photographic practices concerning the Polaroid and Lomography toy cameras (Minniti and Maggauda, 2019). It proceeded with examining the theoretical endeavors that characterized the emergence of digital photography. Namely, what got lost from the practice of photography and in turn, the materialities within which each medium, that is, analogue and digital photography accordingly operates. Further on the literature review section (Chapter 2) attempted an examination of the photographic experience in regards to the *ocularcentric* tradition and the prioritising of the *thinking task* in regards to encounter with images. Scrutinizing these, together with some phenomenological accounts within the field of anthropology, *The New Materialities* and *The Sensory Turn*, so as to point to the wider sensorium ultimately posed the body as one sensory organ, non-dissectable to separate senses. In turn, the debate attended has paved the way for the introduction of *affects* and *affective intentionality* to enter this discourse ultimately pointing to the gap in academic knowledge in regards to the current state of analogue photography from the standpoint of photographic experience.

6.1 Reframing analogue photography from the current historical juncture

The findings of the research imply that analogue photography within the current stage of development is to be seen as a separate practice, based upon principles and technologies of the past, but with a different significance than its status before the invention of the digital modes of image production. That is to say, analogue photography encapsulates a manual, craft-based approach to production of photographs that is based upon emotional tendencies rendering it a deeply personal and affective practice.

This study has offered firm empirical evidence into the process of analogue and digital photographic practice as well as the comparative assessment of the experience each of them entails. This is the result from the 8 in-depth phenomenological semi-structured interviews conducted with photographers who have respectable experience with both mediums. Although not as generalizable, the findings are consistent with previous research accentuating that the notions of *materiality*, *imperfections* and *unpredictability* are defining characteristics of the practice. However, unlike previous scholarship on the topic, it claims that they are not an end in themselves. Rather, they offer but a pillar upon which the rise of different emotional states and a strong sense of attachment to the practice resides.

Today analogue photography is stripped of the quest for efficacy and accuracy in production of photographs, that is, the functionality of the photographic medium embedded since its invention in the 19th century. This is a territory where digital photography has gained the prime and, in a way, helped its analogue counterpart to enter the realm of personal preference. Hence, a certain **liberation** that analogue photography bears today due to digital photography, is ultimately inviting it to enter the realm of the private.

The findings suggest occurrence of emotions and affects in the form of anticipation, excitement and uncertainty. Furthermore, participants expressed their preference towards the haptic and tactile interaction with the materials as it imbues the analogue workflow with a

deeper personal connection to the final outcome. The irreversible nature of the analogue process, the imperfections and unpredictabilities that it entails inevitably result with a greater attention and dedication from the side of the practitioner. These, in turn are additionally charging the camera and materials with agency, which oftentimes helps participants conceive of these aspects as their companions in the process of creation. Such properties stimulate the occurrence of *affective states* and amplify the *affective intentionality*, framing them as an indivisible part of process as well as a byproduct of the practice. These, resting upon the *technical, agential* and *material features* that the analogue apparatus operates within, allow for the allocation of a **deeply personal sense of significance**, which serves as the primary motivation and a cornerstone for the engagement with analogue photographic practice. To sum up, from the standpoint of a practice, analogue photography today has the same distinct elements and characteristics prior to the advent of the digital, but now, imbued with a different meaning and role as it regains significance within the dominant ecology of digital photography.

6.2 Future research

The fact that analogue photography is also undertaken in a different way, as pointed out by the digitization of film negatives (Morlot, 2013) leads me to the limits of the current and direction for future research on the topic.

Therefore, the limits of the current research are that it does not take into account photographic practice that utilises a combination of digital and analogue techniques by conducting the act of shooting on an analogue camera while the post-production is digitally performed. In this respect, I suggest that future research, building on the findings of the current one, might enrich this perspective by explicitly dealing with such practices and the respective photographic experience they encapsulate. Such research will enrich our

understanding of the place of convergence between analogue and digital photographic practices given the emotional impact of production of images vividly displayed in this thesis.

Nonetheless, with the current work I believe to have provided a perspective of inquiry that extends beyond photography, but also a standpoint for observation of other 'analogue' or 'retro' media that includes the roles of emotions, affects and personal attachment to different practices. This, I believe, is vital to our understanding of such re-emergent practices within the context of our contemporary digital ecology.

Summary - Conclusion in Czech

Vzhledem k založení první sítě festivalů analogové fotografie a k nárůstu nedávného akademického výzkumu na toto téma (kapitola 1 a 2) se tato konkrétní studie zaměřila na záměrné zapojení do celé praxe analogové fotografie. Sledování analogového procesu od počátku až po konečný výsledek, tedy analogový fotografický otisk, a zároveň se ponoření do srovnávacího hodnocení s jeho digitálním protějškem. Vzhledem k dosavadní absenci takového zkoumání bylo cílem studie pochopit, proč právě analogová fotografie znovu nabývá na významu v současném kontextu. Pro řešení této otázky začal výzkum přehledem současného stavu literatury o návratu analogových fotografických postupů týkajících se hračkářských fotoaparátů Polaroid a Lomography (Minniti a Maggauda, 2019). Pokračoval zkoumáním teoretických pokusů, které charakterizovaly vznik digitální fotografie. Konkrétně se jednalo o to, co se z fotografické praxe ztratilo, a následně o materiálnost, v jejímž rámci jednotlivá média, tedy analogová a digitální fotografie, odpovídajícím způsobem fungují. V další části přehledu literatury (kapitola 2) byl učiněn pokus o zkoumání fotografické zkušenosti s ohledem na okulocentrickou tradici a upřednostňování úkolu myšlení v souvislosti se setkáváním s obrazy. Jejich zkoumání spolu s některými

fenomenologickými výpověďmi v rámci antropologie, *The New Materialities* a *Sensory Turn*, aby poukázaly na širší sensorium, nakonec postavily tělo jako jeden smyslový orgán, který nelze rozdělit na jednotlivé smysly. Zúčastněná debata zase připravila půdu pro vstup afektů a afektivní záměrnosti do tohoto diskurzu, který nakonec poukázal na mezeru v akademickém poznání, pokud jde o současný stav analogové fotografie z hlediska fotografické zkušenosti.

6.1 Přehodnocení analogové fotografie ze současného historického hlediska

Z výsledků výzkumu vyplývá, že analogovou fotografii v současné fázi vývoje je třeba vnímat jako samostatnou praxi, která vychází z principů a technologií minulosti, ale má jiný význam než její postavení před vynálezem digitálních způsobů tvorby obrazu. To znamená, že analogová fotografie v sobě zahrnuje manuální, řemeslný přístup k výrobě fotografií, který je založen na emocionálních tendencích, což z ní činí hluboce osobní a afektivní praxi.

Tato studie nabídla pevné empirické důkazy o procesu analogové a digitální fotografické praxe a také srovnávací hodnocení zkušeností, které každá z nich přináší. To je výsledek osmi hloubkových fenomenologických polostrukturovaných rozhovorů vedených s fotografy, kteří mají s oběma médii bohaté zkušenosti. Ačkoli výsledky nejsou tak zobecnitelné, jsou v souladu s předchozími výzkumy akcentující, že pojmy materiálnost, nedokonalost a nepředvídatelnost jsou určující charakteristikami fotografické praxe. Na rozdíl od předchozího výzkumu na toto téma však tvrdí, že nejsou cílem samy o sobě. Spíše nabízejí jen oporu, na které se zakládá vznik různých emocionálních stavů a silný pocit náklonnosti k praxi.

Analogová fotografie je dnes zbavena hledání efektivity a přesnosti při výrobě fotografií, tedy funkčnosti fotografického média zakotvené od jeho vzniku v 19. století. To

je území, kde digitální fotografie získala prvenství a svým způsobem pomohla svému analogovému protějšku vstoupit do sféry osobních preferencí. Proto také jisté osvobození, které dnes analogová fotografie nese díky digitální fotografii, ji nakonec vybízí ke vstupu do sféry soukromí.

Výsledky naznačují výskyt emocí a afektů v podobě očekávání, nadšení a nejistota. Účastníci dále vyjádřili, že dávají přednost haptické a hmatové interakci s materiálem, neboť ta propůjčuje analogovému pracovnímu postupu hlubší osobní vztah ke konečnému výsledku. Nevratná povaha analogového procesu, nedokonalosti a nepředvídatelnosti, které s sebou nese, nevyhnutelně vedou k větší pozornosti a nasazení ze strany tvůrce. Ty zase dodatečně nabíjejí fotoaparát a materiály dějem, což účastníkům často pomáhá pojímat tyto aspekty jako své společníky v procesu tvorby. Takové vlastnosti stimulují výskyt afektivních stavů a zesilují afektivní záměrnost a rámcují je jako nedělitelnou součást procesu i jako vedlejší produkt praxe. Ty, opírající se o technické, agitační a materiální vlastnosti, v jejichž rámci analogový aparát funguje, umožňují přiřazení hluboce osobního pocitu významu, který slouží jako primární motivace a základní kámen pro zapojení do analogové fotografické praxe. Shrňme-li to, z hlediska praxe má dnes analogová fotografie stejné výrazné prvky a vlastnosti jako před nástupem digitálu, ale nyní je prodchnuta jiným významem a rolí, protože znovu získává význam v rámci dominantní ekologie digitální fotografie.

6.2 Budoucí výzkum

Skutečnost, že analogová fotografie se provádí i jiným způsobem, jak na to poukazuje digitalizace filmových negativů (Morlot, 2013), vede k limitům současného a směru budoucího výzkumu tohoto tématu.

Limity současného výzkumu tedy spočívají v tom, že nezohledňuje fotografickou praxi, která využívá kombinaci digitálních a analogových technik tím, že akt fotografování provádí na analogový fotoaparát, zatímco postprodukce je prováděna digitálně. V tomto ohledu navrhuji, aby budoucí výzkum, vycházející ze zjištění toho současného, obohatil tuto perspektivu tím, že se bude explicitně zabývat takovými postupy a příslušnou fotografickou zkušeností, kterou obsahují. Takový výzkum obohatí naše chápání místa konvergence mezi analogovými a digitálními fotografickými praktikami vzhledem k emocionálnímu dopadu produkce snímků, který je v této práci názorně zobrazen.

Přesto se na základě této práce myslím, že jsem poskytl perspektivu zkoumání, která přesahuje rámec fotografie, ale také hledisko pro pozorování jiných „analogových“ nebo „retro“ médií, které zahrnuje roli emocí, afektů a osobní vazby k různým postupům. Domnívám se, že to je zásadní pro pochopení těchto znovuožívajících postupů v kontextu naší současné digitální ekologie.

List of References

- Addison, N. (2011). Moments of intensity: affect and the making and teaching of art. *the International Journal of Art & Design Education/International Journal of Art & Design Education*, 30(3), 363–378.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1476-8070.2011.01729.x>
- Azoulay, A. (2010). What is a photograph? What is photography? *Philosophy of Photography*, 1(1), 9–13. <https://doi.org/10.1386/pop.1.1.9/7>
- Bal, M. (2003). Visual essentialism and the object of visual culture. *Journal of Visual Culture*, 2(1), 5–32. <https://doi.org/10.1177/147041290300200101>
- Barthes, R. (1981). *Camera lucida: Reflections on Photography*.
- Bartmanski, D., & Woodward, I. (2014). *Vinyl: the analogue record in the digital age*. <https://openlibrary.org/books/OL29534433M/Vinyl>
- Batchen, G. (1997) *Photography's Objects* . Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Art Museum
- Belting, H. (2011). *An anthropology of images: Picture, Medium, Body*. Princeton University Press.
- Benjamin, W. (2007). The work of art in the age of mechanical reproduction. In *SAGE Publications Ltd eBooks* (pp. 25–33).
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446269534.n3> (Original work published 1969)
- Bevan, M. T. (2014). A method of phenomenological interviewing. *Qualitative Health Research*, 24(1), 136–144.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732313519710>
- Biro, M. (2012). From analogue to digital photography: Bernd and Hilla Becher and Andreas Gursky. *History of Photography*, 36(3), 353–366.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03087298.2012.686242>
- Brown, E. H., & Phu, T. (2014). *Feeling photography*. Duke University Press.
- Bruce, R. (1994). Will the digital image change curatorial practice? *Image*, 1–

2(37), 17–25.

Burgin, V. (1982). *Thinking photography*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-16716-6>

Burgin, V. (1986). *The end of art theory*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Cartwright, L., & Wolfson, E. (2018). Introduction: Affect at the limits of photography. *Journal of Visual Culture*, 17(2), 141–151. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470412918782360>

Coole, D., & Frost, S. (2010). Introducing the new materialisms. In *Duke University Press eBooks* (pp. 1–43). <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822392996-001>

Demers, J. (2017). Cassette tape revival as creative anachronism. *Twentieth-century Music*, 14(1), 109–117. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1478572217000093>

Edwards, E. (2009). Thinking photography beyond the visual? In *Routledge eBooks* (pp. 43–60). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203869031-9>

Edwards, E. (2012). Objects of Affect: photography beyond the image. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 41(1), 221–234. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-anthro-092611-145708>

Edwards, E., & Hart, J. (2004). Photographs Objects Histories: On the Materiality of Images. In *Routledge eBooks* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203506493>

Egan, K. (2007). *Trash or treasure: Censorship and the changing meanings of the video nasties*. https://openlibrary.org/books/OL28479503M/Trash_or_Treasure

Eglen, E., & Tavares, M. (2018). Between technological and social evolution: Digital photography as a framework for (im)material experiences. *Studies in Visual Arts and Communication: An International Journal*, 5(2). <https://hal.science/hal-02187436>

Fackler, K. (2019). Of Stereoscopes and Instagram: Materiality, Affect, and the

- Senses from Analog to Digital Photography. *Open Cultural Studies*, 3(1), 519–530. <https://doi.org/10.1515/culture-2019-0045>
- Feynman, R. P. (1985). *QED: The Strange Theory of Light and Matter*. Princeton Book Company Publishers.
- Flusser, V. (1984). *Towards a philosophy of photography*. Reaktion Books.
- Furuhata, Y. (2009). Indexicality as “symptom”: Photography and affect. *Semiotica*, 2009(174). <https://doi.org/10.1515/semi.2009.032>
- Galal, A. M. (2016). An analytical study on the modern history of digital photography. *International Design Journal*, 6(2), 205–217. <https://doi.org/10.12816/0036482>
- Gauntlett, D. (2011). Making is connecting: the social meaning of creativity from DIY and knitting to YouTube and Web 2.0. In *Polity Press eBooks*. <http://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BB11325325>
- Gell, A. (1992). The technology of enchantment and the enchantment of technology. In *Oxford University Press eBooks* (pp. 40–64). <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198277330.003.0003>
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1965). *Awareness of dying*. <http://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BA04523423>
- Glaser, B. G., Strauss, A. L., & Strutzel, E. (1968). The discovery of Grounded Theory; Strategies for Qualitative research. *Nursing Research*, 17(4), 364. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00006199-196807000-00014>
- Guest, G., MacQueen, K., & Namey, E. (2012). *Applied Thematic Analysis*. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483384436>
- Holmes, O. W. (1899). *The Stereoscope and The Stereograph*. (Original work published 1859)
- Howes, D. (2005). Empire of the senses : the sensual culture reader. In *Berg*

eBooks. <http://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BA71410866>

- James, L. (2004). SENSES AND SENSIBILITY IN BYZANTIUM. *Art History*, 27(4), 522–537. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0141-6790.2004.00436.x>
- Jay, M. (1988). Scopic Regimes of Modernity. *Vision and Visuality*. <http://euaem1.uaem.mx/handle/123456789/821>
- Kline, R., & Pinch, T. (1996). Users as agents of technological change: The social construction of the automobile in the rural United States. *Technology and Culture*, 37(4), 763. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3107097>
- Knudsen, B. T. (2016). *Affective methodologies: Developing Cultural Research Strategies for the Study of Affect*. Springer.
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (1996). *InterViews: Learning the craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*.
- Latour, B. (2007). *Reassembling the social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. OUP Oxford.
- Levin, L. (2009). The performative force of photography. *Photography and Culture*, 2(3), 327–336. <https://doi.org/10.2752/175145109x12532077132473>
- Lofland, J., Snow, D., Anderson, L., & Lofland, L. H. (2006). *Analyzing social settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis, Fourth Edition*. Waveland Press.
- Long, E. W. a. J. J. (2009). Introduction: A small history of photography studies. In *Routledge eBooks* (pp. 13–27). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203869031-7>
- Long, J., Noble, A., & Welch, E. (2009). *Photography: theoretical snapshots*. Routledge.
- Magaudda, P., & Minniti, S. (2019). Retromedia-in-practice: A practice theory approach for rethinking old and new media technologies. *Convergence*,

25(4), 673–693. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354856519842805>

- Manovich, L. (1996). The Paradoxes of Digital Photography. In *Photography after Photography: Memory and Representation in the Digital Age*. A+B Arts. <http://pi.lib.uchicago.edu/1001/cat/bib/2911763>
- Manovich, L. (2001). *The language of new media*. http://dss-edit.com/plu/Manovich-Lev_The_Language_of_the_New_Media.pdf
- Margadona, L. A. (2023). Understanding the new analogue photography: meanings, methodologies and aesthetics. *New Explorations*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.7202/1097584ar>
- Miller, D. (2005). *Materiality*. Duke University Press.
- Minniti, S. (2016). Polaroid 2.0. Photo-Objects and Analogue Instant photography in the digital age. *Tecnoscienza*, 7(1), 17–44. <http://www.tecnoscienza.net/index.php/tsj/article/view/251>
- Minniti, S. (2020). “Buy film not megapixels.” In *Routledge eBooks* (pp. 78–102). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003086932-5>
- Mitchell, W. J. (2005). There are no visual media. *Journal of Visual Culture*, 4(2), 257–266. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470412905054673>
- Morlot, E. (2013). *Nostalgic Consumption Behaviours among Young Generations in photography : A Comparative Approach of Instagram and Analogue photography*. [Umeå School of Business and Economics]. <http://umu.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:635911/FULLTEXT01>
- O’Leary, Z. (2004). *The essential guide to doing research*. SAGE.
- O’Sullivan, S. (2001). THE AESTHETICS OF AFFECT: Thinking art beyond representation. *Angelaki*, 6(3), 125–135. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09697250120087987>
- Phu, T., & Steer, L. (1994). Introduction. *Photography and Culture*, 2(3), 235–239.

<https://doi.org/10.2752/175145109x12532077132194>

- S. Pierce, C. (1955). Logic as Semiotic: The Theory of Signs. In J. Buchler (Ed.), *Philosophical Writings of Pierce*.
- Pink, S. (2009). *Doing sensory ethnography*.
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446249383>
- Pink, S. (2011). Sensory digital photography: re-thinking ‘moving’ and the image. *Visual Studies*, 26(1), 4–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1472586x.2011.548484>
- Pinney, C. (2020). Piercing the skin of the idol. In *Routledge eBooks* (pp. 157–179). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003084808-9>
- Rée, J. (2000). The aesthetic theory of the arts [Book]. In P. Osborne (Ed.), *From an Aesthetic Point of View. Philosophy, Art and the Senses* (pp. 57–70).
- Ritchin, F. (2009). *After photography*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Rose, G., & Tolia-Kelly, D. P. (2012). *Visuality/Materiality: images, objects and practices*. <http://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BB1037046X>
- Rutherford, D. (2016). Affect theory and the empirical. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 45(1), 285–300. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-anthro-102215-095843>
- Sassoon, J. (1998). Photographic meaning in the age of digital reproduction. *LASIE: Library Automated Systems Information Exchange*, 29(4), 5.
<https://search.informit.com.au/fullText;dn=753187057136599;res=IELHSS>
- Sax, D. (2016). *The revenge of Analog: Real Things and Why They Matter*. Hachette UK.
- Seigworth, G. J., & Gregg, M. (2020). An inventory of shimmers. In *Duke University Press eBooks* (pp. 1–26).
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9780822393047-002>
- Sekula, A., & Art, O. S. U. G. O. F. (1984). *Photography against the grain: Essays and Photo Works, 1973-1983*. Halifax, N.S. : Press of the Nova Scotia

College of Art and Design.

- Seppänen, J. (2017). Unruly Representation: Materiality, indexicality and agency of the photographic trace. *Photographies*, 10(1), 113–128.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17540763.2016.1258658>
- Slaby, J. (2007). Affective intentionality and the feeling body. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, 7(4), 429–444. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11097-007-9083-x>
- Smith, S. M. (2014). Photography between Desire and Grief: Roland Barthes and F. Holland Day. In E. H. Brown & T. Phu (Eds.), *Feeling Photography* (pp. 29–46). Duke University Press.
- Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. M. (1998). Basics of qualitative research : techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory. In *Sage eBooks* (Issue 1).
<http://lib.tums.ac.ir/site/catalogue/61151>
- Strauss, D. L. (2020). *Photography and belief*. David Zwirner Books.
- Sutton, D. (2005). Real Photography. In *The State of the Real: Aesthetics in the Digital Age*. I.B. Tauris & Co Ltd.
- Tagg, J. (1988). The burden of representation. In *Bloomsbury Publishing Plc eBooks*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-19355-4>
- Talbot, W. H. F. (1969). *The pencil of nature*. <http://phlit.org/items/show/5904>
(Original work published 1844)
- Thorén, C., Edenius, M., Lundström, J. E., & Kitzmann, A. (2017). The hipster's dilemma: What is analogue or digital in the post-digital society? *Convergence*, 25(2), 324–339. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354856517713139>
- Van Der Heijden, T. (2015). Technostalgia of the present: From technologies of memory to a memory of technologies. *NECSUS*, 4(2), 103–121.
<https://doi.org/10.5117/necsus2015.2.heij>
- ZRNO.MK (2023, July 27). *FRIENDS & SUPPORTERS - ZRNO*. ZRNO - Let the

Photons Dance! <https://grain.mk/friends-of/>

Zylinska, J. (2024). *Nonhuman photography*. MIT Press.

List of Appendices

1. Appendix A - Informed written consent for participation in research and protection of personal data (form)
2. Appendix B - Codebook from the thematic analysis (table)
3. Appendix C - Interview example with Aleksandar (text)

Appendix A - Informed written consent for participation in research and protection of personal data

Sample informed consent with participation in the research and the processing of personal information. Informed consent with participation in the research and processing of personal information.

Information on the research:

The study aims to enrich scientific knowledge regarding the phenomena of re-emergence of analogue photographic practices. Furthermore, the research is concerned with the individual photographic experience during the analogue and digital photography processes comparatively. The research is of qualitative character and will take place in the form of in-depth interviews with the participants. No potential risks nor conflicts of interest are detected.

Information on the research participant:

first name and surname: _____

date of birth: _____

delivery address: _____

e-mail: _____

Declaration

I, the undersigned, confirm that

- a) I have become acquainted with information about the objectives and course of the research described above (hereinafter, the “research”);
- b) I voluntarily agree with the participation of my person in this research;
- c) I understand that I can decide at any time not to continue participating in the research;
- d) I understand that no use and disclosure of data and outputs arising from the research establishes my entitlement to any remuneration or compensation, i.e. that I provide any rights to the use and disclosure of data and outputs arising from the research free of charge.

Simultaneously, I declare that

- a) I agree with the disclosure of anonymised data and outputs arising from the research and with their further use;

b) I agree with the processing and storage of personal and sensitive data in the scope of the data stated in this informed consent by Charles University, Faculty of Social Sciences, ID: 00216208, with registered office at Smetanovo nábřeží 6, 110 01 Prague 1, Prague, Czech Republic namely for the purposes of processing data arising from research or because of an offer to participate in similar events and for the purposes of record-keeping; this personal information can be provided to subjects authorized to perform inspection of the project within which the research is realized;

c) I am acquainted with my rights related to access to information and its protection pursuant to Sec. 12 and Sec. 21 of the Act No. 101/2000 Coll., on the Protection of Personal Information and on Amendment to Certain Acts as amended, i.e. that I can ask Charles University in Prague for information about the processing of my personal and sensitive information and I am entitled to obtain it, and that I can ask Charles University in Prague for the correction of imprecise personal information, complementation of personal information, its blocking and disposal.”

I provide the aforementioned consents and agreements voluntarily for an indefinite period of time until revoked and undertake not to revoke them without a serious reason consisting in a significant change of circumstances.

All of the aforementioned shall be governed by the laws of the Czech Republic, with the exception of so-called conflict of law rules, and will be interpreted in accordance therewith, with any potential disputes being settled by competent courts in the Czech Republic.

I confirm that I have accepted a signed counterpart of this informed consent.

On:

Signature:

Appendix B - Codebook for Thematic Analysis

	CODE	CODE DESCRIPTION	EXAMPLE 1	EXAMPLE 2	EXAMPLE 3
Contextual codes	Initial Experiences	Early beginnings with photography. Context, childhood, etc.	I was a bit tomboyish, and photography was the perfect thing for me. I felt special because I knew how to do it. I wasn't particularly technically inclined, and I'm still not, but I learned enough to do what I wanted.	My father also was into that. He was saying "You know Juan, analogue is gone, now we have to buy a new camera" - so he bought a digital camera. It was Reflex 2, it was nice. But, it changed a little bit my relationship with the camera. Of course I liked it, of course it was nice to know at least what I was doing wrong and what was I doing right, but yes, school was pushing me to follow more rules about composition, you know, lighting, it was like more serious approach about it but experience was totally different, of course.	
	Cultural Capital	Cultural Capital of the participant. Exposure to galleries, museums and other cultural institutions during the childhood phase (either through school or family)	Yes. When I was little, we visited a lot of galleries and museums. I spent my whole life doing that. If I travel, one of the most important things you can do is go to a museum and see the culture that place has. That part of the world.	Well, I can't say I am coming from, let's say, an artistic family, but maybe I could say I have a culturally alert family so I was exposed to culture and travelled with my family a lot in my teens and then I simply had to walk the path myself until I started studying in the arts.	
	Personal interpretations	This code is to be used when participants express their views on certain phenomena, cultural and sociological. Not to be confused with personal	Today, I'm quite reliant on my past experiences, what I learned along the way. I also believe that this industry has somewhat dwindled and lost its continuity, and now it's slowly coming back. I'm not sure if it's returning to the level of	This is now happening with the advent of artificial intelligence and AI-generated images. We had a forum on this topic where photographers felt some panic. I think painting became a higher art because it became more	

	practice.	reproduction it once had. It's serious science, sensitometry, what kind of grain, color reproduction, warm or cool tones, filters, reversals, corrections—there were so many things that affected it.	obsolete and was pursued by people who invested unnecessary energy. The same happened between digital and analog photography. When you start working with analog in the digital era, it's also in a way a redundant job, but it automatically gains an artistic label because it's something more complex, harder, etc. I think it just needs to be nominated. When something is nominated, there's no problem for it to be an AI-generated image or a digital image. You nominate it as AI or analog, and it's appreciated in its own way.	
Personal practice	Coded excerpts refer to the personal experiences around photography and moments when the participants refer to their wider practice.	I was on a hiking trip a couple of years ago in Poloniny. I remember I was shooting an abandoned military container in the middle of the forest. The container was black and I really liked it, surrounded with trees and bushes. So when I was taking the photo it wasn't that the scenery was too exciting. But I already had a vision in my mind of how I would approach it in the darkroom. So when I started to work with this film in the darkroom, I basically started to work with it in a way that will depict my idea of how I want it to look, and not what I necessarily shot, if you know what I mean.	I specifically choose people based on their charm, based on a soft inner feeling. It happens that I choose a theme and deal with different kinds of people, but even when I'm dealing with that theme, I look for something in the person that inspires me and simply think that every person, whether chemically or visually, is more or less interesting to someone.	

<p>Direct comparison on Digital / Analogue</p>	<p>A comparison of traits that contribute to different lived experiences when working with analogue and digital cameras and processes respectively.</p>	<p>I have to say, sometimes I am really lazy to go and set the darkroom up, dust off the enlarger, and so on. But once I do it, and I usually listen to some music, or an audiobook, or something of the sort, it is such a nice process compared to having 20 images that you need to dust off and edit in photoshop that keeps crushing or something, so it turns out to be such an annoying job that you turn out stressed and anxious at the end. However, printing images in the darkroom takes longer amount of time but its totally different type of work, which I would dare to say it is relaxing.</p>	<p>When i was using an analogue camera even during my studies, i was thinking that what is funny about it is that you cannot control the process 100 percent. I mean, there. is something that you are going to miss. You can affect the result if you meant to do it or by mistake, or it's just the simple thing that can happen by mistake. With digital it was faster, you were thinking, like okay, i need a photograph of the dock, so you just go and get it. So what happened was that I started producing faster. At this time I would get some small jobs and of course for that purpose it was faster. My father has a nice digital camera, so I was working. In order to get clients it was a change factor. It was like "wow". This is a good tool. It is a good tool to make money. But, something was missing. Analogue it was more the experience, i guess. Totally different feeling. So the difference for me is the approach, the intention behind and also the process itself.</p>	
---	---	--	--	--

<p>Anticipation</p>	<p>Stands for the expectations and anticipations connected to the process of analogue photography, especially in contrast with the immediacy of digital photography. The fact that one can look at the image right after shooting or printing it. Whereas in the analogue, this process is postponed, ultimately leading to the rise of expectations and anticipation for the upcoming result of the process.</p>	<p>The difference is so vast that it's almost incomparable. I don't like taking a picture and seeing it immediately. I don't carry the latent image on film; I carry it in my whole being. I dream about it, imagine it, create various stories. And then the moment when I develop it and see the film—today I scan it, but before I went to the lab to develop it—after going through all those phases, from excitement to disappointment, to anger for not doing it right, to the thrill of doing it again, it's a whole magical world that happens there. With digital, I click, "paf"—image. Where am I in that?</p>	<p>At the same time, with analogue cameras, and maybe this is the strongest point for me, I like that I don't see the images right away. It was more difficult when you travel to maintain the camera but there was this element of expectation, that you don't know what will come out of the image. So you can be very nicely, but also very badly surprised. And that's part of the business.</p>	
<p>Self Reflection</p>	<p>Referring to experiences of self reflection regarding the photographic process. Might be merged with "affects". This code encapsulates moments when the features of analogue photography that invite self reflection or raising the awareness of one's actions through contemplating the decisions and experience that they have gone through in</p>	<p>To me it is important to physically touch the materials. One develops muscle memory when doing this long enough. That's how I develop the bond with the material. When I work on it, I see it, I touch it. When I mess it up, then I have messed it up. It's all me and my hands and body. And even then, I analyse the mistake, how did it happen. That's the beauty of analogue work. You remain a student of the craft regardless of how much you have shot thus far. The process</p>	<p>Some sort of sadness. I feel depressed to spend so much time trying to achieve something and then just saying "next time". Starting from the beginning is very tough when I work on a project. This is something that analogue methods have taught me. Every failure is a new beginning. Each mistake. For me, getting back into analogue methods, I thought I would learn a lot about photography, but I ended up learning a lot about myself. This</p>	

	the photographic process.	that I go through when I go shooting is a ritual, I am setting my mind for what I will shoot, I think about it and it relaxes me. This forms a bond between me, the materials and the photographs that are to become.	is not a school of images or photography, this is a school of life. The character you develop, the patience, the understanding, the discipline, man. Keeping eye on small details and perseverance. All of this in one room, 2 by 2 meters. It is something that I really appreciate.	
Connecti on and detachme nt	Refers to establishing deeper connection to the work process, to the final photograph or to the subject. It encapsulates greater attention and consideration that creates the feeling of personal attachment and connection. Usually used when a participant refers to features of the process or emotional states triggered by features of the analogue or digital process that enable them to establish a sense of personal involvement and connection or the opposite.	When you take an analog camera, especially the medium format, you somehow really connect with that technique. It's not just a cold tool to get a photo; you really use it as your instrument. I feel like a craftsman, and that's my tool to make a photo. It's much more personal. I don't know how else to explain it. I don't feel that way with a digital camera.	And I use digital photography sometimes out of convenience but mostly for things I am not that passionate about in a way that I want to own part of them or keep them in my collection. So if I am doing something that is either commissioned or that I have a project where I know I need some technical images of some textures or I need to photograph a specific place that I will have printed on a specific material, then I use digital. When I am more interested in some sort of visual aspect of it, or if its just a part of an installation, I am totally fine using the digital camera. Because I don't care about the actual thing that I will photograph. But if I shoot something that I really care about and am fascinated by, I am using analogue. Its	With digital it was faster, you were thinking, like okay, i need a photograph of the dock, so you just go and get it. So what happened was that I started producing faster. At this time I would get some small jobs and of course for that purpose it was faster. My father has a nice digital camera, so I was working. In order to get clients it was a change factor. It was like "wow". This is a good tool. It is a good tool to make money. But, something was missing. Analogue it was more the experience, i guess. Totally different feeling. So the difference for me is the approach, the intention behind and also the process itself.

			more of a ritualistic veneration of the thing, or like getting a lock of hair from your lover, or getting a stone from a beach from the summer holiday.	
Affective Intentionality	Refers to a pre-regarding, a pre-contemplation, a certain will and intentionality in the process of creation of photographs. Also refers to slowing down the pace of work. It invites more space for contemplative and meditative actions that to an extent can be considered to be features characteristic to the analogue system.	When I use medium format, it's beautiful. Beautiful isn't an emotion, but it evokes beautiful emotions. I don't know how to materialize it verbally. It gives me time to think about what I'm doing. That kind of camera gives you time to think; it slows you down. You can't work fast with it. In that sense, you connect more with the camera and with the subject.	Yeah, the element of luck and chance was much more involved in the analogue system for me, and generally speaking about the difference between lets say digital and analogue post production, even though they have the same traits basically, that simply with the analogue system, as I described the work with contact prints. The whole decision-making process. It is constantly on scales that you need to make decisions for. It is the same. in the darkroom for the post production later on. Whereas with the digital file I would have a quite precisely structured route to the final result. And I would usually come to one result which is satisfactory, because if it's not, then I would go one step back and end up in that one previous position.	So, nothing is sure, you don't see the result, you have to make a decision on how you process it, how to handle the negative, and make the contact print. That brings new decisions to be made all of the time. Then you need to decide what to present, which includes several analyses or readings of the contact sheet, then you have work prints, then slightly larger prints, that show you more, and slowly you build the way to the final print. Which so to say, is the cherry on the top of this long process.

<p style="text-align: center;">Digital Features</p>	<p>Digital advancements</p>	<p>Solely commenting on advancements in digital technology, especially cameras and printing machines and their impact on the photographic process. These repeat as parts of other codes, but here are most explicitly expressed by the participants.</p>	<p>And I think now we live in a time where all this editing softwares and the way lenses and digital cameras are built, they can emulate the optics and look of analogue photography. Whereas in the early stages, even the professional digital cameras came out, they had a distinct look, the way the colours were displayed. I felt like there was something a bit unattractive for me.</p>	<p>Digital photography appeared quite specifically, I remember, brought by people who had photo labs and shops. They attended those Photo-Kino events and were the first to bring digital photography. It was interesting because it was digital, a new technology, but it was still far from a level that could be included in something serious. But it progressed quickly.</p>	<p>And I could say, regarding prints, I like modern technology. I like it because I can basically get the same quality, the same thing, and I like that there are a lot of materials. And I experimented with materials, I printed black and white photos on 9-gram paper, and it looks totally crazy. You couldn't do that in a lab. I actually, because I spent a lot of time in printing, because of the magazine I mentioned earlier, sometimes for 24 hours, I met a lot of top-notch printing professionals, understood machines, processes, and everything else. And it all becomes normal. I tried various materials as technology constantly advances. And now you can print on metal, glass, paper. I really experiment as much as conditions allow. And I get fantastic results. So I'd say I made a big breakthrough in digital work, but through printing, not through shooting.</p>

<p>Accessibility & Affordability Practicality</p>	<p>Referring to the ease or hardship of acquiring any resources for the purpose of photographic work.</p>	<p>I found that when I took that trial digital camera and offered it for the next job, except for something requiring high artistic quality for museums or calendars, every time because of the cost, they chose digital. For that moment, it was just a solid quality.</p>	<p>I had to do it digitally because I needed to do it quickly. I collected some points for a professor's re-election, didn't have time due to my two kids, and was overwhelmed. I urgently made a project I really wanted to make. The project and concept were planned and desired, but I didn't have time to do it the way I wanted, and it required a lot of work and photos. It was very expensive, and I couldn't afford it. So, I did it digitally. I took over 1000 photos and selected 25, but I was never satisfied with that project. Even though I tried to make it look analog by converting to black-and-white, adding grain, it never looked right.</p>	
<p>Immateriality</p>	<p>Referring to the absence of physical materiality within the digital process.</p>	<p>First, we have to acknowledge that digital is a computational language. That is basically something that can be read from another machine. So in order to see an image created by a digital device, we need another machine in order for it to be displayed. So, of course you can get excited, but without another machine, this image does not exist. So I would like to go into a post-</p>	<p>If you shoot with digital, you don't even have to get the memory card out in order to transfer images to the computer. And then you just do your thing, edit them, etc. Everything is wireless basically. Interestingly enough, you have Adobe Lightroom, which has basically copied the features of the darkroom photo lab workspace and placed them in a digital photo editor. You can do there</p>	

			<p>apocalyptic scenario where the machine disappears and all the photos are gone, but its basically that. If there is an electricity issue for a few hours, your photos are gone. They don't really exist at that time. I think one of the aims of the photographer, in the era of mass production of images, is to think about how to bring this computational language into the physical world. And for that i think analogue helps a lot.</p>	<p>things that you do in the darkroom by hand.</p>	
Analogue Features	(Im)perfections Control 	<p>Features that are considered benefits of analogue photography, comparisons between the digital quest for perfection and analogue imperfections. The sense of control that is linked to mistakes (imperfections)</p>	<p>I sometimes see that some part of the photo is not exposed properly, so I am figuring out how to correct it. And then it comes down to a compromise, what one can or cannot get out of a particular negative. I see some details, and the assess the possibilities of where I can get. But I don't want to break the film, as in, going beyond what it is capable of providing me with. So I try to take advantage of the mistake in the film, and I work with it.</p>	<p>What I like about the analogue is that it is a way I can express myself because I also need to get into methods or techniques that I cannot really control 100 percent. But if I want to go towards something more precise, an accurate quality for something specific, for a job, then digital is good. But what made me grow as a photographer better was the analogue.</p>	<p>And that's how I am, everything has to be under control, everything has to be perfect. And analog photography constantly proves to me that I can't control it. Probably because of my ignorance and imprecision, because of my clumsiness, and because I use old films. For example, now I used films from 1984. What kind of control is that? There's none. That's what I love. And then I wonder how it will turn out. And again, that imagination, what will the film capture. Because the film is not the same as me. It's like the two of us are photographing. It's</p>

				my life companion.
Limitations	Referring to limitations within digital or analogue photography. In analogue, these are usually the amount of frames/shots that the film roll has, so it invites careful consideration and contemplation.	I wasn't thinking that way; it was more about the excitement of having a film roll, with only 36 shots, so I couldn't take as many pictures as I wanted and had to use those 36 frames wisely; to really think about what I wanted to shoot.	I realized how much snaps I produced. So I somehow remembered that maybe I should consider more carefully what I photograph, which the digital does not allow for. You can always snap another one, then see it on the display, then go back to shooting, etc. There was an abundance of "junk" photos. And crucially, you don't think too much while doing that, since the picture reveals itself right away. That realization was a turning point for me. Soon after that I got back to middle-format twin-lens cameras where one has only about 12 frames. I limited myself intentionally. For example, I would go on a holiday for 10 days with only 2 rolls of film. One color and one black and white, and at that point, there is no more messing around. If you have 12 frames, you think before you shoot.	
Reproducibility	Comments on the topic of the irreproducibility of analogue photographs, their uniqueness as opposed to the reproducible character of the digital image.	Digital is a computational language. So the 1s and 0s are fixed and standardized. You can just produce the same image, with almost every printer you want. Then you	But, with analogue I rarely make two absolutely identical prints. Especially when I use all kinds of farm reducers, some hand work in terms of dodging and burning and this type of	

		<p>need to be an expert, to know if the Cyan or Magenta are not accurate. If you really standardize, you are going to get an infinite number of copies, as much as you can. But in analogue, you wont get two similar prints. Most of the time it would happen that you see a corner that can be brighter or darker. And you do the process again and again. You can always make an analogue print even better. There is always something (imperfection). It is the visual language that will help you understand what you want to do with the same film. Give me the same negative, and even if we are doing the same process, something will be different. But give me the digital image, and you can print exactly as I do.</p>	<p>adjustments. Also the spotting and retouching of prints. So, you hardly achieve two same images and that's the beauty of it. Sometimes you can do something that might seemingly be considered a mistake, but it opens a door to some further possibilities and development, which is something which is possible in the digital system but not so available, because you can always go one step back.</p>	
<p>Simplicity</p>	<p>The amount of features that are present on the analogue and digital cameras and processes comparatively.</p>	<p>Now thinking also from a perspective of a teacher, when we use digital cameras to teach those students who don't know anything about photography, or how to photograph, I think analogue cameras are very simple because you pretty much have one button for setting the shutter speed and on the lens you have the aperture, so you don't</p>	<p>Well, I always liked simplicity, so I always preferred to work with manual cameras, and I admit it's harder to work with that, you really have to know the machine and the metering and simply with the digital camera the technology is very advanced now. You can do very special operations, but you can also use it in a very simple manner. The camera does</p>	

			<p>mix up the various wheels that are currently on digital cameras on different places. So even setting up these really basic things is quite complicated to remember on digital cameras. Whereas it is quite natural that you see "yeah, this is the lens" - that's where the aperture is set, that's where you find it, and on the body is the shutter speed button and the film has an already set ISO. So I think for learning photography the analogue is a lot more straightforward.</p>	<p>most of the things for you. But very often, the digital cameras that were used were big and not as discreet as I would need them to be. Which is not the case with all digital cameras. But they also have a lot of options, a lot of buttons and this is something I would need and was very helpful when I would do some technical work with the National Gallery or something like that. But, for my own practice I prefer to have as few buttons as possible and the camera is sort of an extension of my body.</p>	
Materiality	Craftsmanship Workflow	<p>Marks statements and excerpts that purely refer to craftsmanship and workflow of the participants. This is not to be confused with haptics & tactility code which refers to the actual manual hand work in more detail.</p>	<p>Because in analogue photography any material can be good if you really understand how it behaves under certain circumstances. When you understand this, you can do a lot with any film, paper or chemical. That is to say, even if you have a fancy Kodak film, but you don't know how to use it so you get the best out of it, you will not get a better quality than FOMA, for example. But this is a tough question.</p>	<p>Of course you can scan it but if we are talking about really going to the darkroom and printing it, it's a different thing. This I think is the main difference. I don't want to go for composition and the other technicalities which are important, equally in the digital realm as much as in the analogue, but the printing, when one has the chance to go and print their images in the darkroom, one puts an image in the physical world. It's like giving birth. When one is photographing, it is almost like one is creating life, from the camera, then</p>	

			developing the film, then printing.	
photo-objects	Referring to the physical experience with printing or printed photographs. Also referring to the things connected to the photo-objects.	And with analogue photography, I am a firm believer in this indexicality of the print, you know. The material was there, at the same moment in time, if anything, with the real thing. The same light reflected from the object and touched the material. So it is kind of a fetishistic approach to take away with you something that touched the original thing. Same as taking a cast of something or getting a signature from someone. There is this physical relationship with the object and the thing it represents. That's something that the digital photograph does not have.	I am a combination of a visual and a tactile type of person. To me that's quite an important thing and probably it underscores how and why I work with photography. To me, a final photograph is not the one displayed on a screen, but one that has a material, physical form. Be it printed on paper or some other material on which the image resides.	
sensory experience	Any sensory experience apart from tactile and haptic engagement. Be it smell,	If we're talking about black and white prints, because I've worked a lot with that, baryta paper is baryta paper. And again, it comes down to the fact that I know I did it with my body, and I went through the lab and all that.	For a long period of time I thought I was selfish, egotistical, thinking that if you read me a date in the newspaper I cannot understand it, but if you give it to me, so I hold it in my hands, I can consume the contents of it more thoroughly. If you read it to me, little amount makes it to my understanding. Being a psychologist by education, I can't believe how long it took me to understand that I am a very tactile person.	

	Haptics and Tactility	<p>Talking generally or explaining the experience of tactile and haptic engagement for the purpose of creation and connection. Physical interaction/engagement (tactile and haptic) with physical materials during the analogue or digital process. Physical work with analogue photography in the darkroom.</p>	<p>When I work with medium format and then scan it and make digital prints, it feels as if it is not finished properly. I feel like the work isn't complete. If I did everything analog and then gave it to a print shop to run through a plotter, I feel like something was taken away from me. Or that I didn't give enough. But if I develop all those films by hand and enlarge them in the darkroom, I know I have those prints. That's the whole story, everything is complete.</p>	<p>I have to say, sometimes I am really lazy to go and set the darkroom up, dust off the enlarger, and so on. But once I do it, and I usually listen to some music, or an audiobook, or something of the sort, it is such a nice process compared to having 20 images that you need to dust off and edit in photoshop that keeps crashing or something, so it turns out to be such an annoying job that you turn out stressed and anxious at the end. However, printing images in the darkroom takes longer amount of time but its totally different type of work, which I would dare to say it is relaxing.</p>	<p>Oh, definitely! I have a somewhat religious relationship with films and my cameras, even though I don't think technique is important. I don't have many cameras; they are all old and rickety, but I love them as they are. It's very important to me when I work with film: develop it, hold it, cut it, and look at it. When I scan it, I notice its thickness, how it bends, its specific base, whether it's yellow or has more magenta. All that is part of the process, and it's very important to me, the manual handling and using my hands. That's why I don't like computers or Photoshop, but life has forced me to sit at the computer and scan films.</p>
Affects	Intuitions Gut feelings Decision-making Affects Emotions	<p>Intuitive experiences. When respondents talk about certain intuitive decision-making. Irrational decisions and expressing the feeling of doing the "right thing". Whenever</p>	<p>Yes, I do experience emotions. For me, the analog process is an eternal enigma, and I think it's something you never fully master. And that's the charm that keeps you engaged. You have a desire and need, ultimately, to control and play with the process. But on some metaphysical or Kabbalistic level,</p>	<p>All the time. It's fast. I don't think a lot when this happens. Just feel. Digital cameras taught me that you have to be fast in order to take a shot. So overthinking is not an option. For me it works that way. I just sense it, and take a shot, i am not complicating it with additional rationalizations. I</p>	<p>Before I started working the way I do now, everything was very intuitive. I carried my camera, taking photos of things that interested me. It was all very intuitive. Then I realized that when guided solely by intuition, I get too many impressions from the outside</p>

		<p>referring to gut feeling. Many definitions, but generally referring to moments of pre-conscious, inexplicable nature, that the respondents have hard time choosing words to describe but refer to the process of creating a photograph or acting under the influence of intuition. Feelings or emotions or intensities which occur in the process of active creation. Does not exclusively refer to analogue photographic practice, as affects are moments of intensity, pre-conscious decision-making and following the gut-feeling. So they can be equally represented in both analogue and digital practices.</p>	<p>there's always some interplay and relationship with the chemistry. It's as if it has a life of its own, which is probably my own fiction. But I have a certain relationship with it, influenced by my mood and focus—how well you take care of the temperature, the purity of the chemicals. You can always go a step further or forgive yourself at some point and say, "Well, it doesn't have to be perfect, but it's good enough."</p>	<p>cannot imagine working in a different way. When I am doing the composition of a photograph, moving slightly to the left or the right side, just to get something inside the frame is mostly a matter of intuition. Its not something mathematical that guarantees that I will get a good photo. It's just to follow that little voice and do what it says. It will be fine.</p>	<p>world that don't give me anything. Everything is just beautiful and interesting.</p>
--	--	---	--	--	---

Appendix C - Interview Example with Aleksandar

Aleksandar

- Age: 48
- Gender: Male
- Education: Bachelor's Degree in Psychology
- Nationality: Macedonian
- Place of residence: Skopje, Republic of North Macedonia
- Work: Freelancer in numerous fields such as education, photography, production of art events and festivals
- Length of practice: around 25-26 years

Filip:

Welcome, my name is Filip Kunovski and I appreciate your participation in this study. The purpose of the interview is to delve into aspects of your personal photographic practice and experience that you live-through while producing photographs. Your insights are of crucial importance. Your input is confidential and none of your personal details will be disclosed in any publication. Your identity will remain anonymous.

Your participation is voluntary, if you have any questions or decide to withdraw, feel free to do so at any point. We will have a semi-structured conversation, ensuring that we cover key topics naturally and there are no right or wrong answers. The interview should last 1-1.5 hour.

Before we start do you have any questions?

Aleksandar: No.

Filip: During the time of your education, or through family circles, did you have any exposure to galleries, museums and other cultural institutions?

Aleksandar: Yes, the first thing that crosses my mind is that our high school literature teacher used to take us for the premier shows of the local theater which back then was at its prime. So yes, I would definitely say that such experience had a formative impact on me and my future relationship with cultural activities. Of course, we were also going to exhibitions, again mostly in high school. In my primary school years we were also visiting galleries but nothing that I clearly remember, whereas in faculty days, no formal or organized visits happen.

Filip: I would like to proceed with our main topic, namely how and when did you start with photography?

Aleksandar: My father had a middle-format ADOX Gold that was always accessible and at fingertips. He had, mainly as a result of the 80s, a sort of a social-realist relationship towards that object. He had a certain type of respect towards it. My brother, who is older for about 11 and a half years, being a journalist, had his own photo-equipment that he acquired in the typical, for that time, thing, that Yugoslavians were going to Russia, and for a "pack of bubble-gum" could buy whatever they wanted. So that way, I got my first personal camera, Kiev Vega, which was a 16mm spy war camera. I shot many rolls of film on it.

My brother taught me how to develop the film and I, being curious enough, have constructed an enlarger myself, which was basically one paper carton box with an optical device in it. That's where I was making my first photographs, loading the cassettes myself, since we were buying a 100m roll and then cutting it into the smaller lengths suitable for the Kiev. It didn't hold my interest for a long time. But when I see it now, it seems as if there are a few photographs of respectable quality.

As I went to high school, I kinda forgot about that. Even before high school I was really interested in painting. But I have lost interest in that as well. During the high school years I was more dedicated to the Rock'n'Roll culture, and during my university days, I got back to photography for good. Which, worth mentioning, was still analogue at that time. That's 98' and 99'.

I remember we got a very pricey offer for our student board almanac, so I proposed that I take their pictures on a color film. The idea was that they get 3 photos each, paying, in today's currency, approximately 1 euro per person, and we have all the pictures scattered on the board to make it authentic and messy. So we had the first nonchalant/crazy student board in Skopje. And this is where I got back to photography big time. Soon after that I bought my first digital camera - Sony Mavica. I don't remember the precise model, but one of the very first ones to record images on floppy discs. So I was also, probably one of the first ten people to have a digital camera in the country.

Filip: When you compare the experiences that you had with analogue and digital photography respectively, how would you differentiate them?

Aleksandar: At that time, I took a solid grip of photography quite easily. Especially because at that time I started learning Photoshop. The first Photoshop I legally purchased

was Photoshop 5.5 with an accompanying book and all the other accessories. I was fascinated by the features of digital photography. I shot so many brochures and zines with the Sony camera during my university days, and it only had a native resolution of 640x480ppi, but that enhances one's editing skills. At that time I was solely a digital photographer. After the Sony one, I owned an Olympus. I can not remember the name of the model, then Sony 828 which I used for a very long time. All those cameras had small sensors. And still at that time, maybe even now, I considered myself a hobbyist, who just shoots randomly without any greater ambitions. It was fascinating how fast you could acquire the image after shooting. No waiting for someone to develop it, no anticipation on how they will do it, whether there will be a mistake or not. Nor whether you shot the image well or not. You knew everything immediately. All those possibilities of the digital camera were indigenous to me. At one moment, I went back to my hometown Bitola, I took the analogue Praktika, had some macro-photography adapter and I know I loaded a Konica color film roll. I haven't managed to get what I was looking for and already the film was done. I realized how much snaps I produced. So I somehow remembered that maybe I should consider more carefully what I photograph, which the digital does not allow for. You can always snap another one, then see it on the display, then go back to shooting, etc. There was an abundance of "junk" photos. And crucially, you don't think too much while doing that, since the picture reveals itself right away. That realization was a turning point for me. Soon after that I got back to middle-format twin-lens cameras where one has only about 12 frames. I limited myself intentionally. For example, I would go on a holiday for 10 days with only 2 rolls of film. One colour and one black and white, and at that point, there is no more messing around. If you have 12 frames, so you have to think before you shoot. So that would be maybe a first-hand difference between the analogue and digital photographic experience, seen chronologically as it occurred in my life.

Filip: So how did it happen that analogue photography became your preferred choice?

Aleksandar: It is not only now, since that turning point I just continued to shoot on analogue, but given I did not have my own darkroom, I was giving the films for developing to my friends. But they were doing a bad job, as one does when doing a favor. Then I started to send them to the local museum's lab technician Sanko, who charged me way too much, especially for the E6 process and slides.

When I developed my first film at home, I was fascinated by how perfect it was. It had no scratches, no dust, no bullshit. And because no one used it for anything else, I turned the small toilet into my little improvised darkroom. One thing I forgot to mention earlier is that digital photography, back in the day as I was working with seminars, lectures and workshops, allowed me to document something which would be hard to do on analogue. It was great, I could take it to parties, drunk or sober, taking a shitload of snaps which later on remained as a memory. I don't know if that's good or bad, it just meant a lot to me as a characteristic of the digital era.

I came back to analogue photography because I wanted to make one particular project, which made me realise that digital photography could not accommodate my idea. There were numerous layers within it. One thing is that there were certain "mistakes" that happen during the analogue process, which in my view were to contribute to the visual narrative and what I wanted to express. So I started to play with both colour and black&white film rolls and the cameras, which as I mentioned earlier, have always been a part of my surroundings. Quick enough I realised that 35mm will not do it, so I thought that maybe middle-format can be the suitable technology. Not long after I came to a realisation that not even that can help, so I put the idea on hold.

And it was on hold until I discovered Collodion. And yes, the Collodion process is definitely a method most suitable for the conceptualisation of the project. So it took me years until I got my hands onto a large-format camera, the chemicals and then the knowledge, of course, in order to start working with it. Thank god that happen and now I am working with that. And I still haven't started that project, of course. So thats the story, I came back to it because I thought that the analogue aesthetics are can serve and accommodate my idea in a way that I found most suitable.

Filip: You mentioned a lot of different materials, the different film formats, cameras, etc. How do you choose which materials to work with?

Aleksandar: Depending on what I want to achieve, how I want to express myself. I don't think that analogue photography covers all purposes and needs. Neither can digital accommodate all of them. So I choose according to the idea in my head, according to a certain sensibility. This, for instance (pointing to the photograph on the desk) is a cyanotype, and I found this particular technique to be most suitable for that particular photograph. For others, according to my sense of how the photographs should look, feel and what I want it to represent, the Collodion techniques seem more suitable. So it really depends on what you want to achieve.

Filip: I would like to know a bit more about the process itself. The physical work with the materials and photographs. How do you feel during that process, does it trigger emotions or physical sensations?

Aleksandar: Namely, you mentioned a very important thing. For a long period of time I thought I was selfish, egotistical, thinking that if you read me a date in the newspaper I cannot understand it, but if you give it to me, so I hold it in my hands, I can consume the contents of it more thoroughly. If you read it to me, little amount makes it to my understanding. Being a psychologist by education, I can't believe how long it took me to understand that I am a very tactile person. People have different channels of perception. Some are more of a visual type, some auditive, some tactile. I am a combination of a visual and a tactile type of person. To me that's quite an important thing and probably underscores how and why I work with photography. To me, a final photograph is not the one displayed on a screen, but one that has a material, physical form. Be it printed on paper or some other material on which the image resides. That's on the one hand.

On the other, the process is important, namely something that photography has been for a long time deemed for. The pictorialists, for instance, have emerged as a response to the accusations that photography is not an art form because it is created by a machine. A mechanism created by someone else, on an emulsion which is also made by someone else. One puts the emulsion in the machine and basically makes a photocopy of reality, to put it simply. So the question that arises is "where is your authorship then?". Having gone through such accusations, pictorialists have started with authorial interventions on the photograph. The process is crucial for authorship. I would want, neither I dare to label what I am doing as art, but rather craftsmanship or a creation. Presence holds the key to this. Digital photography similarly reverberates with the accusations I mentioned earlier about the machination of picture making. So I cannot establish a relationship with images when I edit them on a screen. It is easier for me when I work physically, I am excited, I hope for, I anticipate whether it will be the way I wanted it to be or not because I often experiment with other alternative techniques which I find interesting. There is excitement,

like a little kid, which I think holds an important place in my life. Call it adrenaline, or whatever. And either you have, or you don't have a good result. That process for me is crucial, because not only do you see yourself photographically, but that is a fertile ground for reflecting on one's self.

For instance, if I want to tone a cyanotype photograph that took me days of experiments to perfectly expose, but am lazy enough to wait for the toners to cool down and then the photograph is bleached by the warmth, than that tells me something about myself. Its maybe a stupid example but you get my point. During the physical process, the key is that you get insights about yourself.

Filip: So how does the process of producing a photograph look like for you?

Aleksandar: Depending what type of a photograph. Imperfections are very important to me, especially in the work with collodion, and that's one of the reasons I love it. It is often very unpredictable, but those unpredictabilities and imperfections often really collaborate with the idea of the photograph. If we enter the territory of the metaphysical, I would more gladly perceive myself as someone who accommodates the process, rather than creating it. It happens through me, I'm here just to accommodate it and let it happen, and not create it. What allows me to feel so is working with unpredictable and imperfect processes, such as collodion rather than digital photography.

Filip: How do you know when you have achieved a good photograph?

Aleksandar: It is a gut feeling. That's what I always say to my students. You may learn all the rules, and you should learn all you can, but at the end of the day it is down to a feeling

that you can't put to words. It's a particular kind of a feeling. Sometimes it is very clear what it is, other times it's just a hint. The decision whether to follow that feeling is yours to make. It also depends upon the momentary mood or the phase in life you go through. But in time, one learns how to listen to it, and that is also a challenge in its own way. That challenge to me is much more important than making an exhibition to which everyone will applaud and tap me on the shoulder. Again, I am getting to the process, where you create something through which you understand something about yourself. It is more important than being likable.

Filip: What is the difference between an analogue and a digital print for you?

Aleksandar: The digital is 1s and 0s. That's of a linear character. Life is not linear. Here, again the distinction is metaphysical. If you mix silver-nitrate with gelatine in order to make an emulsion, depending on how you mix it, you either get a smaller or a bigger grain in the photograph. But none of those silver crystals you make, cannot be done with an algorithm, even a seriously good one. You cannot categorize those crystals on the basis of how they are produced. That's that non-linearity. The digital, being 1s and 0s is quite limiting for me. That in-between area that the analogue operates within is what resonates with my idea of life, the world, the universe, or however you want to put it.

Filip: I understand, but in context of the connection with the subject, how does analogue and digital photography respectively influence your relationship to the subject?

Aleksandar: I would not say that that has a great importance, except for the collodion. I would say that people behave differently when being in front of such a big camera for the

first time in their lives. To them, it seems magical, they experience weird smells, they don't know whether you are a vampire, or an alchemist or a friend, since they never saw me in such light before. When I place them in front of the camera, flood them with intense lighting and rest their head upon a tripod to make sure they stay fixed because of the long exposure time, then some other aspects of their character come forth. An aspect oftentimes unfamiliar to them as well. Or they don't perceive it. In addition, the collodion, for instance, is sensitive to another part of the light spectrum, so often times it happens that the photographs I make are of a self-reflexive character to the subjects as well. Also, because of the length of the process, I have certain safety procedures and that gives me time to talk to them and introduce them to the techniques. This would not be possible with digital photography, or maybe even 35mm film. Both are quick. If I have only one roll of film I might be more cautious, but otherwise it won't make such a big difference in the process of shooting.

Filip: As you mentioned, you limit yourself quite a bit. How do you choose your subject?

Aleksandar: I don't choose carefully. I choose what I shoot by gut feeling only.

Filip: And how does that feeling feel physically? What do you feel at those moments?

Aleksandar: Aaah... You can't put that into words. If I could, I probably wouldn't do what I am doing. It's something that I don't even feel comfortable putting into words, to be honest. The more one talks about it, the more one devalues it. But it's a hint, let's say.

Filip: The photographic process, especially the analogue, from its beginning to its end requires a lot of decision-making. How do you make your decisions?

Aleksandar: The same that I have said above is applicable here. That is, often when I am crazy enough and I counter what would be rationally expected, in terms of light, time of exposure, etc. In other words, when I do something opposite of what I have rationally preconceived and calculated is when an excellent photograph emerges. For instance, if I photograph something that is not within a standardised distance, with non-standardised parameters, according to the calculation I should fire the flash for, let say, 3 times, but at some point, I decide to fire it for 7 times. But that's when I am attuned enough to be able to hear that little voice within me. So yes, you can call them decisions, but I would say that those are rather just following the flow of things. Not my decisions. If I make the decision, I will mess it up, but if I am attuned to that "voice" than things happen in their own pace.

Filip: And how often does it happen that you are able to listen to that "voice"?

Aleksandar: Frequently enough for me to get something out of it. More and more frequently, I would say.

Filip: Is there anything else that I did not ask you but you would like to add?

Aleksandar: Not really.