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Synopsis

The process of documentary making which is the subject of analysis here was conducted through the low budget video and online productions of *Using Fort Scratchley* and *Fort Scratchley a Living History* (www.fortscratchley.org). The new contribution to knowledge generated through this self-reflective research considers my creative documentary experience against a number of creativity theories, models and processes. This practice-led research took a reflective empirical approach, using the Practitioner Based Enquiry methodology (Murray & Lawrence, 2000). The analytical scope of the research is comprised of practitioner ‘data’ collected across four production years; including a reflective journal detailing the making of the cross-platform documentaries, the documentary production paperwork and the documentaries themselves. *Using Fort Scratchley*, commissioned by Newcastle City Council, runs 53-minutes in length and employs oral history interviews that capture the military, maritime, coal mining and Awabakal usages of the Fort Scratchley site situated at the mouth of the Hunter River in Newcastle, Australia. The oral history interviews and additional archival material were re-worked, extended and prepared for delivery through an online data-based called *Fort Scratchley a Living History*. The online documentary permits minimal interactivity as the media has been presented through five pre-set tours: Awabakal, Coal Mining, Military, Maritime, and Theatre.

The production of these two Fort Scratchley documentaries provided a research environment that interrogated the effectiveness and appropriateness of a particular confluence model of creativity, the Systems Model of Creativity (Csikszentmihalyi, 1999), a Group Creativity Model (Nijstad & Paulus, 2003) and three staged creative process theories (Bastick, 1982; Csikszentmihalyi, 1996; Wallas, 1976). In employing these models and theories, which can be seen as complementary, the research investigates the assumption that they could be readily applied to documentary production practice. The analysis of data reveals the layers of complexity within these theories; layers that account for collaborative practices as well as explaining a practitioner’s intuition and embodied knowledge. In particular, this exegesis discusses and analyses how these creativity theories can be used to demystify creative documentary practice by deconstructing how I mediated external contexts, knowledges and skills, and drew on internalised and previously embodied knowledge throughout the production processes. In conclusion the exegesis argues that it is necessary to revise the System’s Model of Creativity in order to more clearly situate creative practice inside a system.
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Figure 1 - Fort Scratchley after restoration, June 2008, Photographer: Roger Hanley, Copyright: Federal Government of Australia
Chapter One: Introduction

Presented for examination are this exegesis and two documentary creative works Using Fort Scratchley and Fort Scratchley a Living History (www.fortscratchley.org). The University of Newcastle’s (UoN) degree rules state that there is no stipulated weighting for either component submitted for examination (UoN, 2008: online).

The research contained in this exegesis, provides a very lengthy answer to a very simple question: ‘What is creativity?’ Six years ago I was asked by my principal supervisor to describe creativity. At that time I found it difficult to comprehensively answer the question. What I tacitly knew then, and have been able to confirm through this research is that creativity is extremely complex. This exegesis and the documentaries explain my current understanding of this systemic phenomena.

An examination of my creative documentary practice has been possible through the Fort Scratchley project. This research also explores how creative documentary practice is changed overlayed or complicated by the imperative to represent the facts and tell the truth in an historical documentary. The representation of truth and how that relates to creativity is an important question for documentary because scholars define documentary as the ‘creative treatment of actuality’ (Grierson, 1933:8). The meaning of Grierson’s statement is explored in theoretical detail, and practical examples from the Fort Scratchley case study illustrate my experiences of what it means to treat actuality creatively. Though this research is specifically contextualized in the Fort Scratchley documentary production context, this type of creative practice research could have been undertaken using any documentary subject matter. Therefore, the findings present a generically applicable explanation of creative documentary practice that should hold true across multiple documentary forms, and with further research may even transfer into other unrelated creative arts endeavours.

The documentary Using Fort Scratchley explains how multiple communities used the site where the Fort now stands by historically tracking Awabakal, coal mining, military, maritime and local theatrical communities site usages. The low-budget documentary has been packaged on a DVD titled Using Fort Scratchley – Re-deployed, which also contains thirty-three minutes of DVD extras (see Figure 2, page 2). The DVD was made primarily for Fort Scratchley site visitors including school children. To date 253 DVD’s have been sold between June 2008 and September 2010. All DVD sale profits are returned to the Fort and contribute to its maintenance and upkeep. The online documentary, Fort Scratchley a Living History, provides interactive access to a 200-year timeline of
significant historical facts. Similar to the linear documentary the website presents five pre-set tours about the communities that have been caretakers of the site. Each pre-set tour is presented by date and event via a Flash data-base that allows online users to access a range of multi-media including historical photographs, convict and colonial artwork, archival newspaper articles, military documents, video interviews and animations of the history of the Fort Scratchley site. The website has been well supported by online Fort Scratchley enthusiasts (Appendix K - Website Statistics from 2007-2010). Both the video and the website documentaries were made publicly available at Fort Scratchley’s official re-opening ceremony in June 2008 (see Appendix I – Fort Scratchley Community Preview).

Figure 2 - Promotional images for DVD, Using Fort Scratchley – Re-deployed and the website Fort Scratchley a Living History

Constructed in 1882, Fort Scratchley is an historical military installation. Situated at the mouth of the Hunter River in New South Wales, the Fort was built to protect the profitable coal exporting port of Newcastle from enemy attack. Fort Scratchley is celebrated as the only military installation in Australia to have fired on an enemy vessel during war. This incident occurred on the night of June 8th, 1942, when a Japanese submarine shelled Newcastle, and Fort Scratchley’s six-inch guns returned fire. The Australian military ceased formal operations in 1972. Since 1978, the site had been operating as a military and maritime museum for the Newcastle region. However, the upkeep on the heritage listed structures and military installations was overwhelming for the volunteers who ran the on-site museum and in 2004 the Australian government pledged $5.5 million (AUD) to restore the fortification’s buildings and tunnels. Unfortunately the scope of the restoration works was greater than the funds available and a further $4 million (AUD) was granted by the Australian government which allowed restoration works to begin in June 2007.
It should be noted that my research was part of a larger research project, ‘The Living History of Fort Scratchley’, set up in 2004 as a collaborative industry and academic research project, jointly funded by UoN and Newcastle City Council (NCC). UoN History academics approached me to join the research team. Their brief required two short documentaries on Fort Scratchley to be produced as part of the project. The documentary aspect of the project was attractive for a number of reasons; it had the potential to develop into a larger nationally-funded research project, it would give me the opportunity to undertake practice-led research into creative documentary practice as a producer, writer and director while also extending my own professional practice. Finally, the visual documentation of the history of Fort Scratchley and the restoration of this historic landmark would contribute to the local communities’ understanding and appreciation of the site.

The research project commenced with a video budget of $13,500 (AUD). These funds were acquired through a collaborative seeding grant between UoN and NCC, and were intended to cover initial setup cost of video equipment and some production costs for one of the short form documentaries. The funding limitations were to become one of the main structural constraints of the project. Two attempts to secure Australian Research Council Linkage Grant funding to undertake historical research and expand the documentaries productions were unsuccessful. The alternative was to fund the documentary project through a number of UoN small research grants and direct support from the NCC.

Table 1 - Research Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Susan Kerrigan's Creative Work PhD</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UoN Collaborative Grant with NCC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Using Fort Scratchley’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; video production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 and a half years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration shoot &amp; re-edit video</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration of Fort Scratchley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UoN Teaching Relief Scheme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6 months)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity Research Fellowship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6 months)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Fort Scratchley a Living History’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website Production (8 months)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exegesis Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2 years part-time)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final cash budget for the two creative works was $39,000 (AUD). Table 1 provides a brief explanation of the project’s timeline and shows the effect the other main structural

---

2 Previously I had been employed with the Australian Broadcasting Corporation as a Television Producer/Director.
constraint, the successful restoration of Fort Scratchley, had on the documentary’s completion.

My research investigation of creative documentary practice rested on the foundational concept espoused by one of the first documentary filmmakers, John Grierson, who defined documentary as ‘the creative treatment of actuality’ (1933: 8 - my emphasis). The literature review in Chapter 2 contains discussion about the way documentary theorists and practitioners interpret his definition and considers how their understandings of Grierson’s concept may inform creative documentary practice generally. Additionally reviewed are ‘text book’ approaches to documentary and video practice, academic writing on documentary genre and practice, and historical accounts of Fort Scratchley. The literature review then leads to a more theoretical consideration of how a notion of ‘creativity’ has come to imply manipulation of documentary truth. Bruzzi summarises this argument:

the fundamental preoccupation is with ‘creativity’ being ascribed to ‘documentary’, but only because creativity is taken, very rigidly, to denote anything that detracts from the document, the truth, the evidence at the heart of the non-fiction film. (2006: 76)

Since the purpose of this practitioner focused research was to explore psychological and social/cultural research definitions of creativity, creative process, and group creativity within the context of documentary production, the discussion of methodology in Chapter 4 defends the Practitioner Based Enquiry approach. Included in this chapter is an explanation of how ‘data’ collected through reflective journal entries, documentary production paperwork and the making of the productions themselves, has informed my creative Fort Scratchley documentary practice.

Analysis in Chapter 5 provides an examination of the self-reflective data through the lens of the three elements of Csikszentmihalyi’s ‘Systems Model of Creativity’ (1999) that is the Domain, the Individual and the Field (see Figure 3, page 11). This model is explored in Chapter 2 and has been chosen as the primary theory for this research because it provides a relatively generic and simplified theoretical framework of a creative system in operation and it shows clearly how the cultural, social and individual aspects of creativity interrelate. The section on the Domain provides an analysis of my past experience and the knowledge that I needed to acquire through the ‘field of works’ (Bourdieu, 1993) to create the Fort Scratchley documentaries. The section on the Individual examines how I mediated and applied my internalised and newly acquired domain knowledge and field opinions through my documentary practice, and the final section on the Field identifies the influences and feedback that social validation (Csikszentmihalyi, 1999: 321) had on my selection processes in regard to documentary narrative construction.
The conclusion in Chapter 6 presents a series of findings confirming that my documentary practitioner experiences resulted from the self-generating contextualisation of documentary practice which was only possible because of my immersion in the content of the domain and field of Fort Scratchley and my mastery of the skills, practices and processes of the domain and field of the documentary discipline. This confirmed that creative documentary practice is a systematic process and to reflect this an adjustment to Csikszentmihalyi’s Systems Model of Creativity called *Revised Systems Model of Creativity incorporating Creative Practice* (Figure 31, page 150) has been created from this practitioner-led research. This adjustment more clearly accommodates creative practice within the system by identifying creative practice in direct relation to the *intersection* between Domain, Field and Individual.
Chapter Two: Theoretical and Historical Context – The Literature

2.1 Documentary and Creativity

Documentary scholarship identifies, quantifies and defines documentary products, processes and practices in a number of ways. But scholars have approached the subject in different ways. Nichols approaches documentaries from ‘four different angles: intuitions, practitioners, texts (films and videos), and audience’ (2001: 22). Alternatively, Renov explains documentary through four ‘modalities of desire’ (1993: 21) these include – to record, reveal, or preserve; to persuade or promote; to analyse or interrogate; to express (1993: 21). Furthermore, Corner examines documentaries through three different dimensions, ‘the technological, the social and the aesthetic’ (1986: viii - original emphasis) whereas Ellis and McLane distinguishes the documentary form from other film forms, through six categories ‘(1) subjects; (2) purposes, viewpoints or approaches; (3) forms; (4) production methods and techniques; [and] (5) the sort of experience they offer audiences’ (2005: 2).

While each theoretical approach has its differences they also share commonalities that unite them especially in terms of activities involving selection and inclusion. Therefore, for the analysis of documentary products, processes and practices it should also be possible to add recently developed theories on creativity to expand existing approaches. This addition would result in a re-conceptualisation of creative documentary practice (Kerrigan & McIntyre; 2010). Rethinking these ideas requires starting with an examination of documentary and creativity literature that explores existing understandings of ‘creativity’ for documentary theory. The discussion that follows includes theoretical insights about the nature of documentary from those who first worked in the field (Grierson, 1933, 1946; Montagu, 1964; Wright, 1972), from those who have defined documentary forms (Corner, 1986, Nichols, 2001; Renov, 1993) and from those who theorize about documentary products and their consumption and production (Austin & de Jong, 2008; Bruzzi, 2006). The discussion also reviews texts that have contributed to debates about the changes in documentary products, audiences and practices which have occurred as a consequence of social, cultural, technological and aesthetic constraints (Chapman, 2006; Cohen, Salazar & Barkat, 2009; Corner, 1986, 1996, 2000; Rosenthal, 1988; Wayne, 1997).

The term ‘creativity’ has rarely been defined in relation to documentary product or process which is surprising given that the seminal definition of a documentary is recognised as ‘the creative treatment of actuality’ (Grierson, 1933: 7-9). Whilst this axiom has become the
standard definition of documentary it is rarely attributed and has become so entrenched in
documentary discourse that the origins of the quote have become immaterial.3 Indeed, it
was originally intended to describe the desirable qualities of a documentary producer,
‘Documentary, or the creative treatment of actuality, is a new art with no such background
in the story and the stage as the studio product so glibly possesses’ (Grierson, 1933: 8).

Moreover, Grierson never actually explained the meaning of his phrase and this omission
has led to significant discussion within the field of documentary studies (see Austin & de
Jong, 2008: 284; Barsam, 1992: 89; Beattie, 2003: 53; Braddeley, 1970: 250; Corner,
Rabiger, 1998: 3; Rosen, 1993: 76; Winston, 1995). But, scholarly explanation of the
terms ‘treatment’ and ‘actuality’ seem to be more easily achieved within documentary
discourse (Winston, 1995: 10), than are explanations and interpretations of the word
‘creative’ which continues to be problematic (Kerrigan & McIntyre, 2010).

Common misunderstandings of the notion of ‘creativity’ and its artistic connotations are
prevalent within documentary and filmmaking communities. Documentary literature
continues to draw on the writings of Grierson and his disciples all of whom situate the
documentary product as ‘art’, thus suggesting that the person making the documentary is
an ‘artist’. One of the key arguments presented by Winston is that there is an obvious
contradiction with the axiom because ‘the supposition that any ‘actuality’ left after ‘creative
treatment’ can now be seen as being at best naïve and at worst a mark of duplicity’ (1995:
11). Winston takes an extreme position that suggests all ‘creative’ acts of documentary
are synonymous with works of fiction which undermines documentary truth claims.
Consequently Winston has been critiqued on this very point. For example Bruzzi asserts
creativity in regards to documentary has been too rigidly interpreted (2006: 76). Whereas
Corner argues that Winston is inclined to make assumptions about how “ ‘creative
treatment’ necessarily collapses the documentary project into ‘fiction’” (1996: 18). Winston
himself arrives at this interpretation of creativity by drawing on literature that subtly
interprets creativity and art from the romantic and mystical perspective, by perpetuating
the ideas and tensions between ‘film as art’ and ‘film as mechanical reproduction’ (1995:
18). The assumption here is that art and creativity are equivalent when in fact recent
research into creativity shows that this conflation may be too simplistic and misleading.

3 As a technical aside another definitive phrase exists ‘the creative interpretation of actuality’, this bastard
sibling is also quoted without attributes in documentary texts (Corner, 1996: 13; 1986: x; Ross, 1950: 19-20;
Wayne, 1997: 206; Wright, 1972: 40), but it is difficult to find this exact quote in Grierson’s writings (Higson,
1995: 191). Given that the phrase is sufficiently embedded in the documentary discourse, I am happy to
accommodate it in this exegesis without dispute.
The terms ‘Art’ and ‘Creativity’, as commonly used within Romantically inflected discourses, appear problematic especially since Margaret Boden asserts that, ‘romanticism provides no understanding of creativity’ (Boden, 2004: 15). From this perspective Romantic understandings of ‘Art’ perpetuate a belief that artists, those who make ‘Art’, are creative and the way they produce creative work is through mysterious processes. This perception allows the artist to be viewed as a ‘divinely inspired creator’ (Zolberg, 1990: 116) or alternatively, as a ‘quasi-neurotic artist who sees their own creative activity as fundamentally self-expressive’ (McIntyre, 2008b: 1). One of the key problems with using the romantic ideal is that ‘art objects are perceived in terms of the mind of their ‘creator’ rather than material objects in their own right’ (Petrie, 1991: 4). Those who have empirically researched creativity and theorised about what constitutes this phenomenon, argue extensively that there is a distinction to be made between a practitioner’s creative process and the product, which is the end result of creative practice (see for examples Bailin, 1988: 61-86; Csikszentmihalyi, 1995, 1999; McIntyre, 2003: 2008a, 2008b, 2009; Pope, 2005; Sawyer, 2006, 2007). Romanticism commonly fails to distinguish between a creative art product and an individual’s creative process. It also fails to perceive creativity as a rationally accessible phenomena instead perpetuating the myth that creativity is a trait that is only found in individual artists. Sociologists, in contrast, reject romantic notions of Art and argue that rather than being the product of gifted individuals in touch with their muse art is, in fact, a social product. This idea is clearly expressed by Becker who argues:

[all artistic work, like all human activity, involves the joint activity of a number, often a large number, of people ... The forms of cooperation may be ephemeral, but often become more or less routine, producing patterns of collective activity we can call an art world. The existence of art worlds, as well as the way their existence affects both the production and consumption of art works, suggest a sociological approach to the arts. (1982: 1)]

By accepting the sociological premise that collective activities create worlds that produce and consume art, it becomes necessary to leave behind research activities that focus solely on attempts to define creativity through investigations focused on individual artistic genius. Studies of gifted and talented geniuses have been unable to provide acceptable explanations of individual acts of creativity (Albert & Runco, 1999; Weisberg, 1993). Work also exists which debunks the romantic and mystical approaches to creativity (Boden, 1990, 2004; Sternberg, 1988, 1994; Wolff, 1981; Zolberg, 1990). Common sense assumptions about creativity supported by Plato’s notion of the muse ‘have probably made it harder for scientific psychologists to be heard’ (Sternberg, 1999: 5).
Creativity has also been investigated using a variety of methodological approaches; psychometric, experimental, biographical, biological, computational and contextual research approaches (Mayer, 1999: 449-460). Some creativity scholars argue that creativity research needs to situate the practitioner within their social and cultural environment (for examples see Pope, 2005: 38; Sternberg, 1999: 339 & 458):

> Creativity occurs when someone creates an original and useful product. However there is a lack of consensus on such basic clarifying issues as whether creativity refers to a product, process, or person; whether creativity is personal or social; whether creativity is common or rare; whether creativity is domain-general or domain-specific; and whether creativity is quantitative or qualitative. (Mayer, 1999: 451)

A review of documentary practitioner texts shows distinctions which confirm documentary practitioners are using the term ‘creative’ to describe specific elements of the processes of production and consumption. Some texts use ‘creativity’ as an umbrella term situating documentary practice as being creative (Ayers, Mollison, Stocks & Tumeth, 1992; Chapman, 2006; Millerson, 1992; Mollison, 2003; Proferes, 2005; Rosenthal, 2002). Other publications use the term ‘creative’ as an adjective to qualify or describe the attributes of production personnel, which is probably derivative of the commonly used industry term ‘creatives’ (Collie, 2007: xii; Dancyger, 2002: xxii; Field, 1982: 15; Kindem & Musburger, 2005: 16).4 There are also resources that use ‘creativity’ or ‘creatively’ in chapter headings (Chapman, 2006: 1-23; Rabiger, 1998: 37-43), to encourage beginner documentary filmmakers to identify their documentary making motivations.

Interestingly, screenwriting texts provide more comprehensive explanations of the writer’s creative process. Aronson (2000) explains De Bono’s approach to lateral and vertical thinking, while McKee explores creative processes (1999: 117-118) and the significance of creative limitations. He suggests, ‘limitation is vital… The constraint that setting imposes on story design doesn’t inhibit creativity: it inspires it’ (1999: 71). Well known screenwriting author, Syd Field, explains creative decision making in a different way, when he states ‘[c]hoice and responsibility… Every creative decision must be made by choice not necessity’ (1982: 15, original emphasis). What is important to note here is that, even though Aronson, McKee and Field are well known feature film screen writers, they are not explaining creativity in relation to fictitious worlds and imagination. They are talking about a screenwriter’s ability to creatively work within the rules and conventions of storytelling thus acknowledging a practitioner’s ability to demonstrate their creativity

---

4 The most overt use of the term was found in Kindem and Musburger’s text who used ‘Creative Staff’, to describe all non-technical members of the crew, ‘producer, director, assistant director, scriptwriter, designers, and the talent or performers’ (2005: 16).
through their understanding of the codes and conventions of screenwriting. These ideas should also be applicable to the codes and conventions of documentary practice.

At this point it should be emphasized that this exegesis is not contesting the validity of the majority of the information presented in the texts reviewed. It is proposed, however, that the assumptions about the term ‘creativity’ that are implicit in these texts inadvertently misrepresents the scope of the term ‘creativity’. What becomes apparent from this situation is that it is imperative for documentary theory, and more broadly some video and filmmaking texts, to depart from what is essentially a poorly theorised understanding of creativity in relation to documentary products, practices and processes.

Indeed some comprehensive explanations of documentary practice do exist in the literature and can be aligned with rational approaches to creativity. Kilborn and Izod argue that there are two counter posed tendencies in documentary that are ‘creative’ and ‘actuality’:

…(the actuality component) the documentarist is claiming our attention on the strength of her or his ability to reproduce or represent events which have occurred in the external world; with the other (the creative component) a whole series of structuring and narrativising ploys have been brought to bear in order to heighten the impact of the film or programme on an audience. (Kilborn & Izod, 1997: 12-13)

This description identifies key distinctions in creative documentary practice which could be aligned with current research-based on bio-psycho-socio-cultural theoretical perspectives on creativity, also known as confluence approaches to creativity.

Confluence approaches to creativity developed out of the need to demonstrate how the convergence of multiple components and factors can explain the phenomena of creativity (Sternberg, 1999: 10-11). Notable creativity researcher Teresa Amabile describes creativity as ‘the confluence of intrinsic motivation, domain-relevant knowledge and abilities, and creativity-relevant skills’ (Amabile cited in Sternberg and Lubart, 1999: 10). Additionally, the investment theory, developed by Sternberg and Lubart, explains that:

creativity requires a confluence of six distinct but interrelated resources: intellectual abilities, knowledge, styles of thinking, personality motivation, and environment. (Sternberg and Lubart, 1999: 11)

Similarly, Dacey and Lennon’s creative process model explains the bio-psycho-social-cultural sources of the creative process by identifying six components that influence the individual: biological, cognitive, personality, micro-societal (dynamics of family, friendships and living arrangements), macro-societal (environmental influences like neighbourhood, work, education, religion, ethics, legal, economic and political) and time (1998: 225).
The confluence approach developed in Csikszentmihalyi’s ‘Systems Model of Creativity’ (1988, 1999) is illuminating (Figure 3). His model represents the interactions of three forces, Domain, Individual and Field, whereby a culture transmits information to an individual, a society stimulates an individual’s novelty and a social group is then able to select the novelty offered by the individual via the community. Csikszentmihalyi argues:

For creativity to occur, a set of rules and practices must be transmitted from the domain to the individual. The individual must then produce a novel variation in the content of the domain, the variation then must be selected by the field for inclusion in the domain. (1999: 315)

While this is a macro view of the creative system at work it is imperative for creative practitioners, like the one explored in this research, to comprehend that ‘creative individuals are those who are able to internalise this system’ (Csikszentmihalyi, 1995: online). So, while the model can be applied externally to documentary production contexts, it should also be able to be applied simultaneously to the individual’s internalised creative processing. That is:

To function well within the creative system, one must internalise the rules of the domain and the opinions of the field, so that one can choose the most promising ideas to work on, and do so in a way that will be acceptable to one’s peers. (Csikszentmihalyi, 1999:332)

By way of accommodating the external and internal components of the Creative Systems Model, Phillip McIntyre has defined creativity as ‘an activity where some process or product, one that is considered to be unique and valuable, comes about from a set of antecedent conditions through the conditioned agency of someone’ (2006: 2)

Using this definition, the purpose of my research is to explore the notion of conditioned agency, by applying and testing out the validity of the Systems Model of Creativity through examining both my internalised creative documentary processing as it was occurring, and investigating how at the same time I was also negotiating the external social and cultural
environments during the production process. It is to the literature concerned with the social and cultural context of documentary making that the discussion now turns.
2.2 Documentary as Cultural Production

Cultural and film studies approaches analyse documentary texts and practitioners and refer to documentaries as cultural commodities which renew themselves ‘as the temporary ‘property’ of varied, production workers and publics, and the perennial ‘property’ of businesspeople’ (Miller in Simpson, Murawska & Lambert 2009: 12). While a number of the explorations of cultural and social relationships between documentary audiences, subjects and practitioners provide insights into the consumption of culture, these intertextual explorations also include some examinations of the production of culture by looking directly at documentary practitioners. For example, cultural theorist Susie Khamis argues that Australian documentary filmmaker Tom Zubrycki’s claim that he is absent from his films, is contestable (2009:148). She describes Zubrycki’s presence in his films Temple of Dreams (2007) and Billal (1996) as being discreet but:

… far from invisible or inconsequential. There are several ways that Zubrycki cues these narratives. Both films feature voiceover commentary, interviews, inter-titles, soundtrack, archival material and numerous instances where Zubrycki is acknowledged and involved by the subject as a familiar and trusted friend. These inclusions orient the audience to certain reference points, and structure the narrative within specific parameters … These films therefore prove a powerful counterpoint to a wider cultural tendency: to see Australian Lebanese Muslims through a narrow and detrimental prism. (Khamis 2009: 148-149).

While this discussion acknowledges some of the relative production choices faced by Zubrycki, it does not provide a substantial account of past production practices and current production methods that have permitted Zubrycki’s style of filmmaking to be labelled ‘narrative vérité’. In order to be useful to other documentary practitioners, than documentary audiences, analysis of the work of documentary practitioners’ has to be seen from more pragmatic positions. Simply inferring these concepts through social and cultural readings of cinematic content does not provide an accurate account of the complex cultural and social influences which are faced by a documentary practitioner. While it may be possible to see ‘the self-inscription of the film-maker within the film’s text’ (Simpson et.al 2009: 16) there may be other ways of providing useful insights into the constraints and benefits of production practice faced by filmmakers in order to help documentary practitioners themselves better understand what cultural and social forces are at work throughout production.

As a further example of this approach Haltof examines the modes of production of documentary practitioner Paul Cox and argues that ‘Cox fully controls every stage of the cinematic process, which he shares with a small company of actors and production crew’ (Haltof, 2009: 131). Haltof is thus defining Cox as a modern day auteur because his
filmmaking satisfies the characteristics of an auteur by using similar approaches for each film and interacting with the same people during production. However, it is difficult to support Haltof’s argument, given that the main weakness with auteur theory is that the logistics of the filmmaking process ‘render it impossible for a sole individual to make a film’ (Petrie, 1991: 23). Furthermore, arguments based on notions of the documentary maker as an ‘auteur’ quite quickly collapse when placed alongside more recent creative collaboration arguments about fiction or factual filmmaking.

From this latter perspective documentary theorists argue that documentaries are created when actuality or the raw materials are experienced and consciously transformed using labour, technology and aesthetic laws through the ‘creative artists [or group]’ (Montagu, 1964: 281, [in original]). Additionally, Silverstone argues that the documentary filmmaker is ‘in a constant, both conscious and unconscious dialogue with the rules of film and television’ (1985: 168). Kilborn and Izod take the relationship between filmmaker and audience a step further and argue that:

> It amounts to the existence of a kind of contractual agreement between filmmaker and audience whereby the raw material for the documentary will be gathered from the socio-historical world and the resultant production will therefore not emanate primarily from the creative imagination of an authoring agent. (1997: 5)

Cultural production research conducted from a sociological perspective provides more prudent insights into documentary practitioners’ negotiation of their production processes. De Jong qualitative study of the production company that made Deep Water claims ‘a separate space for documentary production practice’ (de Jong, 2008: 147) by revealing how the actions and choices of the field of documentary practitioners, in this case a small independent production company, influenced the production process and the shape of the documentary film. The significance of de Jong’s research is that it reveals the subtle relationships of power which ‘influence both the production process and the film text’ (de Jong, 2008: 135).

Two other research studies that add more pragmatic understandings of the influences that documentary practitioners are exposed to and which specifically investigated the social and cultural factors that impacted on documentary production practices, are those of Silverstone (1985) and MacGreagor and Simpson (2000). Silverstone conducted a two-year ethnographic study of a BBC science documentary, employing a participant observation methodology Silverstone accompanied producer, Martin Feeth through the production of ‘A New Green Revolution’. Whereas MacGregor conducted auto ethnographic research into his own low-budget documentary practices which looked at a number of issues, one being the changes in technology and the potential capacity or
output of a single person crew (MacGregor & Simpson, 2000: 185). What is important about these academically researched understandings of documentary production practice is that they situate the documentary practitioner in a complete environment where their actions are shaped by social, political, technological or cultural forces, which in turn further shapes their actions. What emerges in this case is an exemplification of the duality of structure, whereby ‘social actions create structures, and it is through social actions that structures are produced and re-produced’ (Haralambos & Holbern 1995: 904). Sociologist Anthony Giddens calls this process of interaction between agency and structure, ‘structuration’ (Giddens, 1979, 1984). Agency in this case is the ability to make choice while structures are those things that determine or delineate choices. By seeing agency and structure in an interactive relationship this view focuses the study of any creative activity, including documentary practice, towards investigations of the actions of the documentary practitioner within specific contextual structures. In this case a documentary practitioner’s ability to regenerate and improve practice allows them not only to be personally creative (or small ‘c’ creative), but in some cases, may also enable their practices to acquire cultural creative recognition (or large C creativity) (Csikszentmihalyi, 1995: online). Research into the differences between personal and cultural creativity confirms that investigations of socially successful artefacts and their artists does not reveal any great insights into the fostering of individual creative talents (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996). However, this thesis does confirm that the creative potential of any practitioner, including a documentary practitioner, is enhanced when that practitioner can demonstrate through their practice a comprehensive understanding of the social processes of selection, construction and distribution specific to their chosen medium.

For example documentary practitioners create documentaries using film, video or digital/electronic mediums which are then distributed through theatrical cinematic release, television, online or commercial release via DVD. Each screen medium presents variations in technical practices that, in turn, effect selection, construction and distribution processes and practices. Armes argues that many unspoken ‘rules’ of production practice originated as a response to technological changes (1988: 116-153). Some documentary theorists have also argued that it might be important to evaluate the ‘specific effects of video rather than film practices’ (Renov, 1993: 36). While detailed research like this would account for the effect of technical production structures on documentary practices, the usefulness of this sort of research is limited as technological advances that change and update equipment and therefore practices could make these research insights redundant quite quickly. However, Petrie presents an alternative argument that is built on a similar foundation:
Technology represents the ‘tools of the trade’ which enable film-makers to creatively intervene at each stage of the process. Consequently, the whole question of technology as a resource deserves to be examined in depth going far beyond the simple consideration of the utilization of technology. (1991, 27)

Taking this argument further it can be claimed that documentary practitioners, either as film-makers, video-makers or digital content creators (Manovich, 2002), are not only using the enabling aspects of their technological medium but are also working within an existing antecedent aesthetic that is shaped by known documentary production codes and conventions. As evidence of this position Beattie’s research into the construction of an online documentary explains that the world of new media relies on established cinematic language, allowing users to mediate digital databases through web-pages so that a web-page becomes:

… the basic unit of data organisation, and in that we have a convergence of text, of still images, of discrete audio, of moving images and animation, and the challenge for the content creator is to use all of these tools in presenting a ‘documentary experience’. (Beattie, 2003: 73)

Consequently, the technologically grounded documentary production process should be viewed as being both enabling and constraining because it provides documentary practitioners with opportunities to intervene and manipulate the editorial, visual and aural narrative as it is being processed through the screen based technologies. Since it also argued that technological processes are part of the social and cultural production of documentary films (Bruzzi, 2006; Corner, 1996: 22; Nichols, 2001: 26; Wayne, 1997) these arguments support the statement that filmmaking and documentary practices are both constrained and enabled by technological, social and editorial practices. No documentary maker can work outside these factors. By drawing these arguments together a confluence approach to documentary practice would look at these three key areas of social, editorial and technical documentary practices. Inside each of these three areas it is possible to identify additional layers of structural variables that a documentary practitioner has to negotiate and manage in order to create a documentary:

Once these structured processes become intuitive to a practitioner the ideas and actions that spring from them will follow. These necessary structures can be embraced more fully, with obvious caution, once it is realised that structures not only inhibit and constrain creativity but they, at one and the same time, just as readily encourage and enable it. (McIntyre, 2009: 167).

This argument confirms the entwined nature of agency and structure and how it may be possible to apply these ideas to creative documentary practice. In order to do this, theories that accommodate individual agency and theories of practice need to be considered (Bourdieu, 1977).
Sociologist Pierre Bourdieu’s definition of Habitus can be used to explain the self generating actions of a documentary practitioner. From Bourdieu’s perspective habitus is more than experience. It is a conscious embodiment (Noble & Watkins, 2003) which Bourdieu explains as being:

[A] ‘feel for the game’, a ‘practical sense’ [sens pratique] that inclines agents to act and react in specific situations in a manner that is not always calculated and that is not simply a question of conscious obedience to rules. Rather it is a set of dispositions which generates practices and perceptions. (1993: 5).

Habitus in this sense is one component of a more complex theoretical explanation of cultural production which clarifies how agents negotiate cultural structures. The other two structural components set out by Bourdieu that help to explain how cultural exchanges occur are Cultural Fields and Cultural Capital (Bourdieu, 1977). Cultural Capital is '[a]n internalised code of a cognitive acquisition which equips the social agent with empathy towards, appreciation for or competence in deciphering cultural relations and cultural artefacts' (Bourdieu, 1993: 5-7).

Whereas Bourdieu’s concept of Cultural Fields describes them as:

…structured configurations or spaces of objective relations between both positions and position-takings [which include]…formal jobs and tasks and roles. Position-takings are the stances, practices and expressions of agents, including artistic expressions. (Lipstadt, 2003: 394, original emphasis)

Working together, these key cultural production elements can be crudely aligned with Csikszentmihalyi’s three elements of the Systems Model (McIntyre, P. 2006: 2; 2009). Thus, the Domain from the Systems Model can be aligned with the notion of Cultural Capital. The Field from the Systems Model can be aligned with Bourdieu's use of the term Cultural Field and part of the Individual's action can be explained by the concept of Habitus. This simplified comparison confirms that it is possible to identify similarities between the theories of creativity presented from a psychological perspective and the ideas of cultural production considered by sociologists. These identifiable similarities permit researchers to draw on both theoretical explanations to better explain both cultural production and creativity and will be used in this study to focus on how, as a documentary practitioner, I have been able to negotiate these cultural and social structures. The next section of this theoretical and historical overview drills further down into a documentary practitioner's production processes by aligning staged creative process theories with the documentary production process.
2.3 Documentary Production Process and its Relationship to Collaboration

The documentary production process as laid out in various texts represents sets of cultural codes and structural conventions that help documentary practitioners describe the phases of production: project development, pre-production, production, post-production and distribution (Ayers et al., 1992: 5; Cohen et al. 2009: 95). What these works suggest is that each production phase may be discretely experienced, with phases occurring in a linear order. However, in practice it is more common with documentary productions for these production phases to occur in a non-linear fashion and overlap. For example, with time sensitive projects the filming of critical events may need to be organised before the documentary concept is properly funded. As a further example, for online documentaries the process can have a more graphic/design front end where the documentary producer draws up a brief to present to a web designer and producer, who in turn create a concept, sample graphics and/or animatics and a budget for producer approval. Once approved the project moves into the pre-production, production and site testing phases (Cohen et al, 2009: 97). During the production of the online documentary, *The Wrong Crowd* (Beattie, 2002), Beattie noted that there were three key issues:

... the often competing needs of organising the database and constructing the narrative, the filmmaker’s tool of temporal montage versus the web designer’s comfortableness with spatial montage and the unknown nature of the audience’s reception of a product via online delivery as opposed to broadcast delivery. (2003: 88)

In order to produce creative documentaries across different distribution platforms a documentary practitioner has to demonstrate mastery over the documentary form, content and production process. Mastery is not easily achieved as it can take years of consistent practice. In this regard research reveals that a practitioner’s learning process can be seen as a continuum (Bond & Spurritt, 1999: 193) which begins with the unskilled practitioner, who in order to learn and develop skills moves through four phases of learning. These phases are Cognitive, Closed, Open and Automatic. This final automatic phase is described as one where ‘skills are performed intuitively’ (Bond & Spurritt,1999: 193). Bond and Spurritt argue that this learning process sees the practitioner move from ‘practical skill to artistic skill’ (Bond & Spurritt, 1999: 195), though they do not elaborate on what they mean by artistic skill. A further tangible explanation of how the learning of skills can become artistic, tacit and automatic, is provided by Bailin (1988). She carefully points out that ‘skills are not mere habits but involve critical judgement[s] applied in a variety of changing circumstances’ (Bailin, 1988: 97). Similarly, as Cowan argues the Kobl learning cycle, which is used to explain how individuals learn, describes how the learning
processes rotate through experience, reflection, generalization and testing (1998: 34-45) Further to this, Bastick asserts that learning is central to the development of creativity and intuition (1982: 5) and points out how the ordinary aspects of learning processes are connected to intuition; thus, taking intuition from being perceived as a mystical and largely inexplicable process to it being an ordinary everyday process of learning and the acquisition of skills, knowledges, rules and processes of practice.

There are however, different types of learning that can mean different things in relation to a practitioner’s creativity. For instance, an individual learning the documentary process for the first time could be described as being small ‘c’ creative. Whereas an experienced documentary practitioner who may be learning a new process, either technical or editorial, which could be considered at the cutting edge of industry production, could be regarded as small ‘c’ creative as well as large ‘C’ or culturally creative (Csikszentmihalyi, 1995). Margaret Boden uses different terms to explain these same ideas. She argues that ‘P’ or psychological creativity is an individual process:

The psychological sense concerns ideas (whether in science, needlework, music, painting, literature…) that are fundamentally novel with respect to the individual mind who had the idea. (1990: 32, original emphasis)

In contrast ‘H’ or historical creativity contains ‘ideas that are fundamentally novel with respect to the whole of human history’ (Boden, 1990: 32), but, as she argues, one cannot be ‘H’ creative without being first ‘P’ creative. These are important definitions in regard to explaining the difference between creative individuals and socially recognised creativity because they point to a critical connection between individual skill and knowledge acquisition and the social verification of creative products. In this sense it is possible for one person to be recognised as being both ‘P’ and ‘H’ creative, simultaneously. For example, if a documentary practitioner is using a new technique to tell stories, then that makes them ‘P’ creative, and if that practitioner is well situated in their creative field, then it is more likely that their creative processes will be of interest to others and will be documented in the creative domain as being ‘H’ creative. In this sense, social validation produces ‘H’ creativity or in other terms, large ‘C’ creativity. For an independent production that is less likely to be recognised by the industry, it may be ‘P’ creative work, but it may fail to be deemed ‘H’ creative simply because of its lack of overall social recognition. However, given the existence of the idea of ‘P’ creativity such a situation should not be seen as a complete creative failure, for as Bailin points out, ‘it might be more beneficial for a person’s creativity to create an inferior product’ (1988: 84). Furthermore, in exploring an individual’s ‘P’ creative activities, theorists have identified
staged creative processes which could in themselves provide a useful framework to focus on the creative process.

The theories of Wallas (1976), Bastick, (1982), and Csikszentmihalyi (1996) demonstrate a logical progression whereby a practitioner follows a predictable staged process that emphasises the learning of skills and knowledge so that action or practice can be achieved. In this regard, these staged creative process theories can be aligned with the documentary production process.

Csikszentmihalyi, who has developed the most comprehensive approach, argues that the creative process is made up of five stages: preparation, incubation, insight, evaluation and elaboration. These stages can be described in the following way: the preparation stage involves an analysis of the problem and involves ‘conscious work and draws on one’s education, analytical skills and problem relevant knowledge’ (Lubart, 2001: 296). The incubation phase is where the mind is working on the problem supposedly below the threshold of consciousness (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996: 79). The third phase is insight, where the ‘Aha!’ moment occurs, that is, when a sudden flash of enlightenment clarifies the best way to proceed with the problem at hand. The fourth phase is evaluation is where ‘the person must decide whether the insight is valuable and worth pursuing’ (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996; 80). While the final phase of the process is elaboration which is likely to take up the most time as this is where conscious, and sometimes physical activity occurs through the evaluation, refining, and development of an idea, product or process. Wallas’ staged creative process is similar to Csikszentmihalyi’s, but has one less stage; preparation, incubation, illumination and verification (1976). Bastick on the other-hand presents a two-staged creative process theory which includes intuition and verification. He asserts that ‘intuition’ results when Wallas’ first three stages of preparation, incubation and illumination are collapsed into one phase (1982: 310-311). Collapsing three phases into one intuitive phase acknowledges the antecedent nature of creative practice and an agent’s ability to draw on past experiences through non-conscious processing of practice. This is important as Bastick defines intuition as ‘non-linear parallel processing of global multi-categorised information’ (1982: 215). Essentially, it can be argued that Bastick’s stage of ‘intuition’ is similar to the operation of a zip file where an experienced documentary filmmaker is able to negotiate a complex filming task instantaneously, as if by ‘second nature’, drawing on their past experiences and knowledge, enabling them to complete said task with seemingly very little effort.

Filmmakers will choose almost instinctively to shoot in eye-catching places; they will study the available light for the best position, think and look around the action, and consider shooting higher or lower, using
shots involving windows, door, reflections or mirrors for instance. (Chapman, 2006: 87)

This ability to judge filmic scenarios is analogous to the internalised and intuitive processing that a highly skilled documentary filmmaker engages in when faced with filming a sequence that will help to tell the story. A deep level of immersion in the flow experience, where a documentary practitioner is ‘in the moment’, may prevent that practitioner from being able to accurately explain what they did and why, or they may say something to the effect of, ‘it felt like the right place for the camera to be at that time’. The body and mind’s ability to work together to intuitively process and respond to the context in which the filmmaker finds himself/herself can also, as discussed be described as ‘Habitus’ (Bourdieu, 1993). This filmmaker/practitioner embodiment of the documentary process can be further explained as ‘conditioned agency’.

To deepen the theoretical explanation of staged creative processing, Csikszentmihalyi argues that these stages are non-linear and that they ‘overlap and recur several times before the process is completed’ (1996: 83). This makes the creative process iterative and recursive. Similar arguments about the non-linear repetitive nature of the documentary production process exist (see Rabiger, 1998: 42). This similarity suggests that theoretically it is possible to overlay the five staged screen-based production process with the five-staged creative process. Further to this, each of the five documentary production stages can be broken down into their own staged creative processes. Thus, either the documentary production process or staged creative processes can be used as a structural framework through which documentary practitioners can organise their work. However, given that many documentary practitioners work in groups it becomes necessary to assess how these individual staged creative processes become collaborative.

The collaborative aspects of documentary production are readily acknowledged within the literature (see Buscombe, 1981: 32; Chapman, 2006; Kilborn, 1997: 191). Basil Wright, who worked alongside John Grierson wrote:

…..a film is created both by the single inspiration of the director and by the collective activity and enthusiasm of a diverse group of experts who pool their skill to the agreed purpose. (Wright, 1972: 20)

So, too, creativity theorists argue that it is difficult to identify the one person who works within a group as being solely responsible. Moreover, it is a ‘fruitless and impossible search because there is no single creator for many of these modern creative products’ (Sawyer, 2006: 134). From a rational and practical perspective the socio-cultural argument is straightforward; ‘in the information age it has simply become impossible for single individuals to possess all the relevant information, knowledge and expertise’ (Nijstad & Paulus, 2003: 339).
While digital technologies have enabled documentary filmmakers to multi-skill and multi-task production crew roles, the multitude of skills needed to make competent films can sometimes be lost if an individual insists on taking this literally. Paul Watson for instance uses a digital video (DV) camera to film his own documentaries and states ‘if I have to sacrifice something in picture or sound quality, so be it’ (Baker, 2006: 63). Irrespective of the potential reduction in quality of the recorded materials at the point of production, Watson acknowledges the need for the collaborative contributions of a film editor (Baker, 2006: 61), but what is missing from this example is the support of the commissioning institutions and distribution platforms. Documentary research shows that concept development, funding, post-production and distribution phases cannot be successfully undertaken by a sole filmmaker (de Jong, 2008). Therefore, creativity theories that situate multiple individuals within collaborative group processing become a necessity.

Group creativity research is drawn from ‘diverse traditions of cognition, groups, creativity, information systems, and organisational psychology’ (Paulus & Nijstad, 2003: 5). Paulus and Nijstad have drawn together group creativity research and identified aspects of group functioning, which has allowed a Generic Model for Group Creativity to be developed (Figure 4, page 23).

The Group Creativity Model begins (Arrow 1) by illustrating how the individual’s external acquisition of information is processed before it is presented to the group for collaborative assessment, evaluation and verification (Arrow 2). Once the knowledge or artefact is presented to the group a decision is made to either accept the work or re-cycle it back through the individual for further modifications (Arrow 3). When the individual’s contribution is accepted by the group, as indicated by (Arrow 4) it is then prepared and shared collaboratively. Eventually each group member’s ideas need to be accepted by the group in order for them to produce ideas, plans, or more artefacts that are then verified outside the creative group; that is audience evaluation (Arrow 5).

In effect the Group Creativity Model organises group members, group processes and group context in a linear way because the model has a definitive starting and ending point, even though the diagram accommodates an iterative cycle. This is contrary to Csikszentmihalyi, who argues that creativity can begin at any point in the Systems Model. One reason for this difference could be because there is an assumption that a creative group is assembled specifically for the purpose of completing a task within a specific time frame as opposed to the Systems Model which does not advocate a specific starting point, nor does it explain the specifics of task completion.
Instead, the Systems Model explains how creative ideas manifest through individual, social and cultural interactions. Despite these apparent differences, it is argued here that these models can all be effectively used in conjunction with each other to explain creative documentary production practice. While the Nijstad and Paulus model ‘appears superficially to be quite different to the Systems Model of Creativity, it can be seen that the movement of ideas, knowledge sharing and critical feedback on processes and products is comparable to the Systems Model in that it also identifies individual, field and domain interactions necessary to produce artefacts’ (Kerrigan & McIntyre, 2010: 125). In this way the Creative Systems Model and the staged creative process theories both help explain how a documentary practitioner moves from one documentary project to the next, and how this movement allows their experiences or their intuition to accumulate, which in turn enables the individual to approach their practice in a creative way. The Group Creativity Model, on the other hand, identifies the individual’s accumulation of knowledge and how they then use that knowledge through practice to collaboratively create an artefact. In effect these creativity theories provide complementary frameworks to analyse the
processes employed by documentary practitioners to facilitate and organise their practice. With these ideas on board the next section explores in more detail theories about individuals and practice, and how these ideas can be positioned within a creative documentary context.
2.4 Documentary Creative Practice at the Individual Level

Research into creative practices exists for poetry & literature (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996; McIntyre, E., 2006; Paton, 2008; Pope, 2005), performance (Pope, 2005; Sawyer, 2006), music (McIntyre, 2003; 2008a; Negus & Pickering, 2004; Sawyer, 2006) fine arts (Becker, 1982; Csikszentmihalyi, 1996; Wolff, 1981) and theatre (Bailin, 1988, Sawyer & DeZutter, 2009). Despite this work it remains difficult for creativity psychologists to provide a conclusive set of determinants that describe the qualities of a creative individual (Nickerson, 1999: 392-430). Nickerson attempts to identify a set of characteristics, competencies, traits and attitudes that a creative individual could, should or may possess. He believe that in addition to general intelligence, an individual's creativity may be enhanced by:

... purpose and intention, basic skills, domain-specific knowledge, curiosity and inquisitiveness, motivation, self-confidence and a willingness to take risks, mastery orientation and self-competition, beliefs, choice and the opportunity to discover, self-management skills and specific creativity-aiding techniques. (Nickerson, 1999: 419)

But, even with Nickerson's carefully worded qualification, his extensive list, fails to provide clarity in relation to these individual creative attributes. Weisberg offers another possible lead with his 'tension view' of creativity (1999: 226-250) and asks researchers to examine the relationship between creativity and knowledge. He asserts 'the relationship between knowledge and creativity is assumed, therefore, to be shaped like an inverted U, with maximal creativity occurring with some middle range of knowledge' (Weisberg, 1999: 226).

In opposition to this tension view is the foundation view which supports a more positive relationship between creativity and knowledge, whereby 'rather than breaking out of the old to produce the new, creative thinking builds on knowledge' (Weisberg, 1999: 226). In arriving at this conclusion some key phrases were coined to support the connection between knowledge and creativity including 'the 10 year rule' (Howe, 1999: 5) which suggests that it takes 10 years to master skill and task performance, and 'practice, practice, practice'. Both phrases emphasise creative recognition as benefiting from deliberate practice that leads to the acquisition of master level skills. Weisberg's conclusion is that 'one will never find an individual who has made a significant contribution to a creative discipline without first having deep initial immersion in that discipline' (1999: 242). Other theorists also support the position that learning skills in order to acquire knowledge to a point where the knowledge is embodied, and can be reproduced spontaneously without conscious thought, is fundamental to creative practice (Bailin, 1988: 97; Bastick, 1982: 4; Wayne, 1997: 14). 

Explanations of Bourdieu’s cultural
production theories expand on this very point by asserting that cultural production occurs through:

the interplay between a *field of works* which presents possibilities of action to an individual who possesses the necessary *habitus*, partially composed of personal levels of *social, cultural, symbolic and economic capital* that then inclines them to act and react within particular structured and dynamic spaces called *fields*. (McIntyre, 2009: 161, original emphasis)

Making the same argument but using different language is Csikszentmihalyi when he claims:

…one must internalise the rules of the domain and the opinions of the field, so that one can choose the most promising ideas to work on, and do so in a way that will be acceptable to one’s peers. (1999: 332)

So how does a creative documentary practitioner internalise the rules and conventions of documentary practice? The simple answer is that they gather as much knowledge as they can about documentary making while also engaging in ‘documentary practice’. The text, *Documentary in Practice: Filmmakers and Production Choices* (Chapman, 2006) provides an approach to documentary practice that addresses six core themes across the documentary production cycle; objectivity/subjectivity, representation, reflexivity, responsibility to audience, authorial voice and ethics (2006: xiv). While Wayne argues that documentary filmmaking involves engagement with value-laden contexts and people, begging the question of the documentary filmmaker’s own evaluative responses to these people and the political and ethical conditions of intervention into these contexts. (2008: 83)

The above arguments identify the significance of the contextual environment in which a documentary practitioner works and demonstrate that theorists who have researched practice and learning have created various theoretical frameworks that are useful when observing, understanding and improving practice. These generic theories of practice are applicable to many professional and non-professional areas. The ones that have relevance for this study are those based on the Reflective Practitioner (Schön, 1987), Tacit Knowledge (Polanyi, 1962 1967) and Autotelic experience, also known as Flow (Csikszentmihalyi & Csikszentmihalyi, 1992). These theories about practice are useful in that they help to explain the generic phenomena of practice and how individuals move from positions of unskilled to skilled ‘conditioned agents’.

Flow or ‘optimal experience requires a balance between the challenges perceived in a given situation and the skills a person brings to it’ (Csikszentmihalyi & Csikszentmihalyi, 1992: 30). Flow theory explains how individuals are intrinsically motivated to engage in practice by connecting the skill development process with a range of emotional states including anxiety, boredom, joy and fulfilment (see Appendix H – Flow Chart). Whereas
Tacit Knowledge provides a rational explanation of the process of skill and knowledge embodiment and our inability to articulate our own understandings of what we have learnt to do during practice. As Polanyi argues ‘[t]here are things that we know but cannot tell. This is strikingly true for our knowledge of skills’ (1962: 601). Polanyi extends this idea by stipulating that there are two types of Tacit Knowing, the practical and the intellectual which ‘are always found combined to some extent and are sometimes found combined equally’ (Polanyi, 1962: 604). The notion of the Reflective Practitioner as exemplified by Donald Schön (1987), draw on the concept of tacit knowledge by pointing out that the practitioner knows what to do because the ‘knowing is in the action’ (Schön, 1987: 25, original emphasis). An individual’s ability to observe how they embody and reproduce these skills and knowledges is described as reflection-in-action (Schön, 1987: 26). Practitioners reflect in action during action, and doing so enables them to remain immersed in the moment while also adjusting what they are doing in order to improve their performance. After the moment of action has passed, the practitioner reflects-on-action. By looking back over the outcomes of practice the practitioner can learn from their experiences through analysis and summation. Schön’s reflective practice moments are essential to practitioner led research because they are based on the researcher’s ability to identify transferrable skills and formulate generalisations or theories from experiences, which may be transferred and/or may shape future actions (Schön, 1987: 31). Following Schön’s work, researcher John Cowan coined the term reflection-for-action (1998: 37) to describe the anticipatory reflection which a practitioner engages in when preparing for action. It is argued here that this reflective cycle comprised of reflection-in-action, reflection-on-action and reflection-for-action, can be effectively used if employed during the learning of practical skills.

Sharon Bailin makes the connection between practical skills and imagination by defining imagination as a higher order skill that should not be viewed as mysterious, as this would presuppose ‘a very limited sense of the notion of skill’ (1988: 113). She argues that:

\[\text{[t]he skills of the art, then, are not something totally separate from the imagination embodied in a vision which is in place before the skills come into play. Rather, there is imagination manifested in the execution of skill, and also skill involved in the development of the imaginative vision. (1988: 115)}\]

An individual’s imagination is, therefore, founded on their understanding of rules, skills, knowledge and critical judgements and these are indispensable to an individual’s creative achievements because ‘in them is embodied the practice of the discipline at a specific moment and mastery of them is vital to the advancement of the tradition’ (Bailin, 1988: 106). It is suggested here that each of these theories of practice describe particular
moments that a practitioner experiences when learning the rules of practice and subsequently uses when demonstrating their creative understanding of those rules of practice. According to Bailin the 'one difference between creative and uncreative performances relates to having a real understanding of the discipline in which one is engaged' (1988: 106). With this distinction in mind it can be asserted that these theories clearly affirm that in order to achieve mastery as a creative practitioner, in any domain, but for this project in the domain of documentary practice, an individual must learn the traditional processes and rules of their chosen domain. For documentary production a practitioner should therefore critically reflect before, during, and after practice in order to generate creative documentary practice. Thus, a documentary practitioner’s immersion in, and implicit understanding of, the discipline of practice is essential if they are going to be socially recognised as being creative.

Mastery over the documentary medium therefore includes a mastery of structuring editorial content, discussed above in relation to authorship.

Authorial voice is firstly about original intent. The original concept will dictate the documentary material that is chosen, structured, fashioned and packaged for presentation. The filmmaker selects a technique or number of different techniques that will act as a vehicle for authorial voice. (Chapman, 2006: 12)

Interestingly, the documentary literature reveals a relationship between notions of auteur theory, authorial voice and authorship that are concerning. As Wayne indicates ‘authorship has such a high status in western cultures. It is seen as a mark of value in cultural artefacts if an author can be clearly discerned (1997: 17). Bruzzi acknowledges that the idea of a documentary auteur has in the past been problematic for documentary scholarship because it ‘disrupts the non-fiction film’s supposed allegiance to transparency and truthfulness’ (2006: 163). However, in acknowledging this, Bruzzi presents a more refreshing and holistic argument which rests on a simple premise, ‘that documentary, like fiction is authored’ (2006: 163). This viewpoint does not deny the idea that the notion of an auteur is highly problematic. What it does do is recognise as Janet Wolff argues, that ‘despite the fact that creative genius is more often myth than reality, it cannot be said that art works give birth to themselves by some parthenogenetic process’ (1990:114). From this position it is relatively easy to move forward and to accept that the documentary practitioner, who is truthfully representing reality, is indeed intervening in reality through the very act of filming events or interviews. Regardless of whether the documentary filmmaker for example, is in the film, making a cinema verite style film, or, as in the case of this project, shaping an expository and historical style of documentary, it is important to accept that the documentary practitioner is inextricably involved in the social construction
of the documentary from its inception through to its completion. Acknowledgement of the documentary practitioner’s participation in the construction of reality brings a whole new meaning to the phrase ‘the creative treatment of actuality’. From this perspective, when a documentary practitioner possesses an understanding of their practice one that acknowledges the graduation from learning of skills to embodiment of skills, and then further movement to the selection, construction and manipulation of documentary material, it is at this point of development that mastery level skill should be close to being achieved.

In conclusion it is reasonable to suggest that it is possible to reconceptualise creative documentary practice without jeopardising or undermining claims to documentary truth if one aligns the notion of creativity with a research-based understanding of the term. Coupling this assertion with ideas from the literature on documentary practice, and focusing this on production processes, cultural production and the individual’s systemic understandings of creativity, allows the employment of an evidence-based research process using a Practitioner Based Enquiry methodology. However, before I turn to a methodological discussion of the methodological approach, a brief explanation of the Fort Scratchley project and how I came to use this documentary content, follows.
Chapter Three: Fort Scratchley Creative Project Brief

‘The Living History of Fort Scratchley’ project was set up originally as a collaborative research project between historians at the UoN and Newcastle City Council (NCC) with initial seed funding of $20,000 (AUD). The UoN Historian’s saw this project as an opportunity for a PhD candidate to document the history of Fort Scratchley. NCC agreed with this academic outcome and included the production of two fifteen-minute videos. Their video brief outlined that one of the videos was to draw on the History PhD research while the other video was to document the impending restoration of Fort Scratchley. As the historians had no video production skills an invitation was extended to UoN Communication Academics to join the research project. At first, I rejected the initial offer to collaborate on the project because the content of the videos and the short documentary form were not appealing. I was also wary of the DIY approach that would be inevitable given the small budget that had been proposed. However, UoN Historian Dr Erik Eklund persuaded me to take a closer look at the documentary value that could be extracted from the histories of Fort Scratchley. I reconsidered the offer primarily because Eklund’s ‘Living History’ methodological approach had the potential to marry well with the aesthetics and ethics of documentary production.

The ‘Living History’ approach is founded on:

… a concept that recognises history is both a disciplined study of the past, and an opportunity, through various techniques, to engage and interest those in the present. From the 1980s emphasis was placed on ‘tangible’, ‘interactive’ or ‘hands on’ history (Eklund, Kerrigan & McIntyre, 2004: 26).

This approach enhances the historical documentary content by connecting actual locations and artefacts with significant events from Fort Scratchley’s history; an appealing characteristic which cemented my decision to join the research team. The projected timeline for the research is displayed in Table 2 (page 31), which indicates I should have worked on the project as part of my enrolment in a Masters in Creative Arts from June 2004 to June 2008. During this time I was to complete the two short form documentaries and a website (indicated in yellow). This was an ambitious and complex research plan and it needed two factors which to proceed required two key elements. Firstly, the proposed twelve month restoration of Fort Scratchley had to begin in June 2004, and secondly, funding through an Australian Research Council Linkage Grant, which would also fund the PhD candidate for the historical research, needed to commence in June 2005. The ARC
proposal did not win funding and the restoration of the site did not get underway for another three years. Despite these disappointment the project had already commenced in April 2004 using the original seed funding. From the original funds the allocated video budget was $13,500 (AUD), the remainder being used by the historians on the production of a 5000-word booklet on the history of Fort Scratchley.

Table 2 - The Living History of Fort Scratchley projected timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected timeline</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerrigan MCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4 years part-time)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UoN Collaborative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant with NCC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1 year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation of Fort Scratchley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12 months)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research / production of 1st video</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14 months)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application for ARC Linkage Grant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC Linkage Grant (3 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/production 2nd video</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18 months)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Scratchley Multimedia Production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12 months)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD History Candidature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historian’s Production of FS booklet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12 months)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC Outcome – Study of FS History Media Production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NCC was considered to be an industry partner because they supplied half of the funding. However, I understood their role as being more akin to a client who presents a project brief. At the first meeting with NCC’s Business Manager Grant Halverson, it was clarified that the Council:

…wanted these videos to be displayed on the site, probably somewhere near the entrance. I suggested that based on that, that I could make two videos that would act as triggers, encouraging the visitors of the site to want to go off and explore the site in more detail. Grant showed enthusiasm for my ideas. (Kerrigan, Journal: 7 May 2004)

So it was agreed that the first video was to visually document the $5.5 million, Australian Government funded restoration of Fort Scratchley, while the second video was to outline
Fort Scratchley’s historical, cultural and community significance. The target audience was identified as site visitors. Demographics statistics from a 2003 survey confirmed that about 70,000 families, tourists and school children had visited the Fort that year. 

In April 2004 my work on the project began through two professional dimensions. As a producer I immediately calculated what was possible with the allocated funds. As a director, I began preliminary content research and immersed myself in the language of the domains of Fort Scratchley and identified where the Fort’s extant histories were archived. As a researcher I started employing the reflective practitioner approach will be explained in detail through the following methodological justification.

---

5 NCC was anticipating that once refurbished, visitor numbers might increase to 120,000 per annum.
Chapter Four: Methodological Approach – Practitioner Based Enquiry

Methodological debates on practice-led research have occurred within the academy through symposiums, workshops and journals (Art & Design, 2000; ASPERA, 2004; AVPhD, 2005; ISEA, 1990; Lebow, 2008; SPIN, 2006). Scholars primarily struggle with the fundamental issue as posed by Flynn-Jones and Sharma as to, where ‘the research [is] constituted – within the work or the supporting documentation?’ (2008: 272). But some scholars like Desmond Bell, clearly articulate the purpose of a practice-led PhD:

...every candidate accepted onto a PhD by practice mode should expect to produce both a body of critical writing contextualising their work and a body of documented practice. (sic) (2008: 177)

In line with Bell’s explanation a creative practice PhD from the University of Newcastle will produce two outcomes, a product that exemplifies the practice and an exegesis, a contextualised written account of that experience (University of Newcastle, 2008: online).

Various exegetical approaches have also been debated in academia. Milech and Schilo outline three models for an exegesis; a Commentary model, a Context model and a Research Question model (2004). Examination of the Commentary and Context models show them to be limited because they ‘entail an unwanted separation of the creative production and the written document’ (Milech & Schilo, 2004: online). The Research Question model, in contrast, provides a more concrete link between creative work and written component:

Both the written and the creative component of the thesis are conceptualised as independent answers to the same research question – independent because each component of the thesis is conducted through the ‘language’ of a particular discourse, related because each ‘answers’ a single research question. (Milech & Schilo, 2004: 6)

The Research Question approach was adopted in this study as it suited my line of theoretical inquiry in parallel with the practical execution of that inquiry. The original research topic, conceived in 2005 was ‘Investigating the creative process, for the role of a producer/writer/director on a documentary video production’ (Kerrigan, 2006b: 2). This statement was underpinned by a key research questions: ‘What is the creative process of a documentary maker?’ Even though the documentary project expanded to include the production of the online documentary this research questions still had a general conceptual relevance. While Milech and Schilo argue that adjustments to the research context and consequently the research question are an accepted practice for those using the research/topic question mode of investigation (2004: 7). My understanding of the
theories of creativity and creative process developed and the research began to incorporate several key models, including Csikszentmihalyi’s Systems Model of Creativity. With this more developed theoretical framework for the research included I arrived at a more refined research problematic: Can the current theory on creativity be applied to the creative process of a documentary maker where documentaries are regarded as the creative treatment of actuality? In essence this research question was designed to reveal my antecedent conditioning as a television producer/director while also documenting, through a creative theoretical framework, my development as a conditioned agent in the creative process.

In regard to this approach several academics have characterised the types of candidates who choose to use the PhD as a vehicle for practice-based research (Bell, 2004, 2008; Burgin, 2006). Bell outlines four different candidate types, the following being the one with which I identified:

Those with a background in the cultural industries and achievement as creative professionals who wish to advance their understanding of their professional field via an innovative mix of making work and documenting and reflecting upon their studio practice in a sustained critical engagement. This might seek to interrogate craft practices and professional conventions to arrive at a reconfigured art activity. (2008: 176)

This description accommodates my professional history, having previously been employed as a television producer/director with the Australian Broadcasting Corporation, and more recently as someone who teaches students filmmaking through a creative process approach. Therefore my aim has been to use this research to gain insight into my creative process through an account of the tacit and intuitive assumptions that I bring to documentary practice. In The Foundations of Social Research: Meaning and Perspective in the Research Process, Crotty argues that ‘to ask about these assumptions is to ask about our theoretical perspectives’ (1998: 2). He explains that a researcher’s theoretical perspective is ‘the philosophical stance informing the methodology and thus providing a context for the process and grounding its logic and criteria’ (1998: 3). Following this line of reasoning, the theoretical perspective of creativity will inform how I examine my intuitive assumptions and newly acquired documentary knowledge during my Fort Scratchley documentary practice.

In this regard Crotty offers one explanation of a research framework that sets out terms and corresponding definitions, which in turn determine how robust a researcher’s chosen methods are. This research framework is represented graphically in Figure 5, (page 35), the flowchart on the left sets out the relationship between the four essential elements of
the research process. On the right the same flowchart shows specific terminology used in the context of my practitioner-as-researcher process.

![Flowchart Image]

Figure 5 - Social Research Process applied to my study

The reflective approach taken with this creative practice research framework is supported through a constructionist epistemology (McIntyre, P. 2006: 4). Constructionism, along with objectivism and subjectivism, is one of three basic rationalist epistemologies (Crotty, 1998: 5). Constructionism is the view that:

…all knowledge, and therefore all meaningful reality as such, is contingent upon human practices, being constructed in and out of interaction between human beings and their world, and developed and transmitted within an essentially social context (Crotty, 1998: 42).

An alternative epistemological approach like objectivism, embedded within areas of positivist scientific research, is founded on the belief that it is possible to discover the objective truth of all things. Thus, objects exist with their own embedded meanings, which are waiting to be understood. An objectivist epistemology 'holds that meaning, and therefore meaningful reality, exists as such apart from the operation of any consciousness' (Crotty, 1998: 8). Thus, within an objectivist epistemology it is possible to validate and replicate research findings because the objective truth is waiting to be uncovered, and can be reliably confirmed through multiple experiments. No matter what methodological approach the researcher takes, the fundamental belief is that the same objective truth will be confirmed through scientific discovery. This objectivist notion of
absolute ‘truth’ regardless of subjective interactions is problematic in terms of constructionism which asserts that '[t]ruth, or meaning, comes into existence in and out of our engagement with the realities in our world. There is no meaning without a mind. Meaning is not discovered but constructed’ (Crotty, 1998: 8-9).

Constructionism rejects the idea of objective truth and more importantly dismisses the notion that humans can discover the absolute truth of a matter. Thus, self-observational styles of research, like Practitioner Based Enquiry (PBE), can be defended because they correlate well with investigation into how individuals may construct meaning.

In this regard PBE provides a mechanism that allows the subjective voice of the practitioner-as-researcher to expose the constraining and enabling affects of contextual, structural or agency related conditions, which affect the quality of the research and its accompanying creative works. According to Murray and Lawrence the benefits of a researcher undertaking PBE research include the practitioner moving ‘towards the acquisition of intellectual autonomy, improved judgement making and enhanced technical competence’ (2000: 10).

Criticisms of self-investigatory, self-directed, self-observational, self-reflective and self analytical, research design such as PBE can, however, be strong (Lynch, 2000). Sometimes criticism is so harsh that the premise and validity of constructionist research findings are rejected outright (Ashmore, 1989). Understandably, such criticism originates from epistemological and ontological positions that are in opposition to constructionism. Criticism from the objectivist paradigm typically attacks the reliability and reproducibility of research generated from a subjective research position. It is claimed that research findings generated from ‘one-off’ artistic contexts may appear as being difficult to validate, in that the findings are not able to be easily replicated. However, criticism such as this is perpetuated through misunderstanding about what is being researched and ignores the differing epistemological foundation of constructionism, which provides the keystone for practitioner-led research investigations like this.

It has also been argued that no matter how sophisticated are the research techniques, nor the precision of the research language itself; self-investigatory research produces limited empirical outcomes (McIntyre, P. 2006: 9). As Sternberg argues:

Even those who value self-observations as a tool for empirical study disagree regarding when to obtain observational data. Some contend that if observations are obtained during the performance of a task, the very act of observing the task performance changes it. Others argue that inaccurate (or at least imperfect) recall interferes with self-observations obtained after the task performance has ended. (1994: 50)
Problematic areas of data collection include the researcher distorting their results through the act of observing and studying themselves through the over-zealous documentation of experiences. Contrary to this, is the underreporting of production processes and experiences because it is tedious and boring, sometimes taking longer to write about them than to engage in them. The practitioner's ability to identify patterns that recur throughout the production processes, despite the emotional effects that the stage of production might be having on the practitioner-as-researcher, though significant, can be difficult to discern. To be defendable practice-led research studies need to clearly define ‘...the influence of the subject researcher’s own cognitive nets on pattern-seeing; and the study’s ability to definitively establish the grounds for causal links between daily activity and creative output (Zuzanek cited in McIntyre, P. 2006: 8)

An examination of the robustness of the PBE methodology should ratify the links between it and the daily activities that might be under investigation by a documentary filmmaker. PBE permits a relatively subjective and self-reflective approach to research because it allows professionals to ‘enquire into their own practices to produce assessable reports and artefacts’ (Murray & Lawrence, 2000: 10). PBE has a similar methodological approach to action research, participant observation and auto-ethnography and has successfully been applied to practitioner-led research environments in teaching (Burton & Bartlett, 2005) and nursing (Johns, 2006). For my study, PBE provided a suitable methodology for revealing the insider’s perspective on creative documentary filmmaking activities.

Twenty-five years ago Silverstone completed an anthropological research study into documentary filmmaking practice using a sociological framework with an ethnographic methodology (Silverstone, 1985). In that study, Silverstone argued that it was difficult for research participants, that is the filmmakers, to take on both roles as practitioner and researcher. The post-script to Silverstone’s book, that ethnographically recorded the production of a one hour BBC documentary, discusses the methodological limitations of the research:

At the heart of it is an attempt to get inside and unravel another’s world, to make sense of it, to challenge its taken-for-grantedness, to observe and comment and maybe enlighten. And at the heart of it too is a question that participants on the whole don’t or cannot ask. The question is ‘What’s going on here?’ (Silverstone, 1985: 203)

Methodological approaches now argue that it is possible to attempt to get inside the world of another using auto-ethnography methodologies like PBE because PBE should be seen as complementing these previous research findings because it literally does provide an insider’s perspective on creative practice (McIntyre, P. 2006: 1). Rather than standing in
opposition to the ethnographic approach, insider knowledge gained from PBE has to be seen as adding to the body of knowledge available, making it possible to better understand ‘what is going on’ for a filmmaker during filmmaking activity.

It has also been argued that the data-obtained by filmmakers researching their own filmmaking practice may be too similar to existing industry and/or professional practice experiences. Bell (2004, 2008) therefore questions the reasons why a filmmaker would choose to make a film as part of a research project, when they could have the same experience within the industry. As an example, a practice-led research project that is investigating the development of documentary content, may be seen as being close to identical to industry practice and therefore its contribution to ‘new knowledge’, according to Bell, would be difficult to discern. Therefore he argues that practitioner-researchers should design research-based projects specifically focusing on gathering unique knowledge to contribute to the domain of knowledge about their research areas. For example, Beattie undertook a self-reflective filmmaking research project that focused on the cutting edge production of an online interactive documentary *The Wrong Crowd* (2002). This practice-based research presented its unique contribution to new knowledge because it documented one of the first experiences of documentary construction in an online form (Beattie, 2003). Similarly Morgan’s research of the scripting and production of the docu-drama ‘Hunt Angles’ (2006) has to also be considered to be generating new, original documentary knowledge too, as he argues:

> Other digital medias, such as the Internet, are providing researchers and writers with an access to a visual past which may have once been denied them. These technologies hold the potential to deliver up untapped source materials for the re-telling of history in a multi-media age, and thereby, evoke the historical imagination and stimulate an interest in the past. (Morgan, 2006: 8)

These research examples demonstrate the value of practitioner-led research for documentary making practice. Accordingly, this research, therefore follows in the wake of past practitioner-researcher accounts of documentary making by identifying its own unique contribution to knowledge about documentary filmmaking activities. That is to provide new knowledge to the documentary domain by applying recent creativity theory to a low-budget documentary context. Methodologically this research approach is intended to reveal the uniqueness of my creative documentary practice and allow it to be theoretically its generalisable to other documentary practice research.

In this case the duality of the researcher-as-practitioner, and vice versa, is then seen as crucial to providing insight into how humans construct the world around them. This construction includes worlds of meaning making which can be assessed from an insider’s
perspective. Consequently, the types of data collected, to be later used to examine the practitioner's context, become important. If Crotty is correct in identifying the general research framework then those data gathering methods must relate to the epistemological stance taken by the researcher.

As laid out in Figure 5 (page 35) the last green box on the right identifies four data gathering methods used for this research. As proponents of PBE methodology state, it is beneficial to use more than one data gathering technique in order ‘to check comparatively the stability of the phenomenon under study’ (Murray & Lawrence, 2000: 31). This approach to qualitative data collection, called triangulation, evolved out of anthropological field-work protocols. Examining data that has been collected using multiple methods is believed to have the advantage of ‘constructing a more encompassing perspective on specific analyses’ (Jankowski & Webster in Jensen, 1991: 45). Triangulation is a useful technique to employ with auto-ethnographic self-reflective, research such as mine because it produces ‘rich descriptions of subcultures’ (Murray & Lawrence, 2000: 31). These rich descriptions are important because they give a depth of information that also helps self-reflective practitioners-as-researchers learn from their practical experiences (Cowan, 1998: 37; Schön, 1987: 26). It gives a chance, as Schön (1987) suggests, to both reflect-in-action and reflect-on-action. From a creative perspective, Csikszentmihalyi argues that it is important for an individual to be able to detach themselves from their work. He states:

Another dialectic is that between attachment and detachment. It is very important to care tremendously about what one does, so as to completely forget everything else, so as to be immersed in what one is doing. Then one should be able to pull back and ask, ‘Is this good or not?’ If one doesn't have the ability to be detached, then one will be all over the place and probably not know if and when one has something good, (1995: online)

During my self-investigation I found the passing of time became important in helping me to detach from the emotional response that can occasionally cloud one’s judgement when examining one’s own practice. Table 3 shows four types of data collected in this research and how the reflective stages were employed in parallel with documentary practice.

To that end, in addition to a substantial period of time lapsing between the practice and this research analysis of that practice, I identified methods for collecting data to reveal each of the three reflective stages of, in, on and for action from within the documentary production context. During very active production times, when I was so immersed in the documentary making process that it would have been inappropriate to stop and document the process, I employed the reflection-in-action technique through making a mental note from an observation of something significant that occurred.
Table 3 - Reflective Data Collection Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection Method</th>
<th>Reflective Practice Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practice of documentary video production</td>
<td>Reflection-in, on and for-action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Notes documented as Reflective Journal entries,</td>
<td>Reflection-on and for-action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emails and all other electronic correspondences.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video production paperwork</td>
<td>Reflection-on and for-action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artefacts, completed video documentaries and all</td>
<td>Reflection-on and for-action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>footage and edited sequences which do not appear in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the final product</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This mental note was later reflected upon at a more appropriate time and documented in a reflective journal, the purpose of which is to chart personal and reflective critical accounts of understandings and experiences (Bolton, 2001).

My reflective journal spanned four and a half years, with a total of 149 typed pages. It recorded and accounted for my learning, decisions, outcomes of field trips, as well as plans to be considered for future tasks. As a journal that reflected on my learning and observations of process it was used as ‘a literary device through which the problematic nature of...enquiry [was] rendered intelligible, first to self, and subsequently to significant others’ (Murray & Lawrence, 2000: 14-15).

Indeed during analysis of the journal I realised there were times when I had forgotten what I had done and thus, like ethnographic researchers, I relied on it as an accurate record of the diarised reflections of my documentary practice. However, this highlights the issue of mediation, which can be problematic since the act of observing can alter the type of data gathered. I found this to be the case for aspects of this research. There were times when I wrote emails about certain occurrences or issues, the emails demonstrating the significance of particular matters, but I had failed to note these occurrences of issues in my journal. One of the key reasons for not recording these events in the journal was that at those times I was so deeply immersed in the completion of the production task that a written journal reflection was overlooked. But, there are also examples in the journal of my detachment as a practitioner that amount to critical reflections observed as a researcher and providing researcher insights into what those observations mean in terms of the creativity theories being applied to my practice. Thus, the journal became an ethnographic

---

6 The first entry was on May 7th, 2004, and the last entry was 31st December, 2008.
text; ‘a version of reality created or concocted by the anthropologist in collaboration with informants’ (Cohen, 1993: 124) and cultural contexts. For this reason the journal is used in conjunction with other data collected during the timeframe of the practice-based study in order to triangulate, and confirm, the ordering of events as I experienced them.

Other data used as part of the reflection-for-action and reflection-on-action process included production paperwork; logging sheets, transcripts of interviews, archival lists of documents, photographs and films, documentary scripts, documentary planning files, personal emails and website information architecture. The creation of these documents became an essential component of the mapping of my documentary production process. While production documents may be cast off as by-products of practice, for the purpose of research they were valued and archived as evidence of the accurate mapping of my documentary practice and creative processes.

So, too, the media ‘left on the cutting room floor’ was indicative of the creative choices made by myself allowing me to analyse why I rejected certain footage and included other footage in the final film/website. By distinguishing the processes where practitioners evidence their own practice it becomes possible to also identify the areas where reflective data can be harvested to demonstrate the creative cycles of documentary practice. Since, as Inglis points out, ‘pattern seeing must be a consequence of knowing what you are looking for’ (cited in Lull, 1990: 143) my understanding of documentary practice both prior to this project and throughout it, enabled observational processes not usually accessible to others.

In conclusion, this PBE methodology, despite its limitations, provided obvious advantages in setting out a self-reflective and self-reflexive research framework that helped me to identify my intuitive, tacit and cogitative processing which was consciously and sub-consciously employed throughout my documentary practice. It is to an analysis of this self-reflective data that I now turn as I explore my cultural, social and individual understandings of documentary and documentary practice structured around the three major components of the Systems Model of Creativity, these being the Domain, the Individual and the Field.
Chapter Five: Documentary Practitioner’s Creative System Case Study

5.1 - The Domain

To be recognised as being creative within a particular domain individuals have to be able to internalise knowledges and skills from that domain (Bailin, 1988; Hennessey & Amabile, 2010). As domains develop over long periods of time, so, too, an individual’s access to domain relevant knowledges and skills must develop across their lifetime. This development includes the establishment of ‘factual knowledge, technical skills and special talents in the domain in question’ (Amabile, 1983: 362).

Csikszentmihalyi has argued that the centrality of the domain within a culture and the clarity of the domain’s structure affects the individual’s acquisition of domain knowledge and skill (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996: 38) while also affecting their ability to internalise domain knowledges. Internalised domain knowledges form the basis of an individual’s intuition, which is also described by Bastick as being the non-linear and parallel processing of an individual’s multiple categorised information, and has some parallels with an individual’s habitus. In this sense it is central to decision making in the creative process. The knowledge acquired for this production came from two domains. The first domain was centred on Fort Scratchley as an historical artefact and formed the content of the documentary, whereas the second domain was documentary practice itself, as that is the domain of knowledge that specifies the form used to organise the content. Teresa Amabile argues that creative individuals need to demonstrate generic competencies of domain knowledges for them to be recognised as being creative. These skills and competencies include ‘familiarity with factual knowledge of the domain in question; facts, principles, opinions about various questions in the domain, knowledge of paradigms, performance ‘scripts’ [Schank & Abelson, 1977] for solving problems in the domain and aesthetic criteria’ (Amabile, 1983: 363).

The two domains relevant to this study identified above have been broken down further into sub-domains in order to demonstrate the breadth of domain knowledge, and the interconnected nature of domains and knowledge. These domains and sub-domains follow:

- **Documentary Production Knowledge and Practice**
  - Television production practice
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- Low-budget documentary production
- Website and online production knowledge

Fort Scratchley History

- Historical development of Newcastle
- Australian Military History
- Australian Maritime History
- Australian Coal Mining History
- Awabakal History
- History of Newcastle’s outdoor theatre productions

With this list in mind, the discussion below analyses my internalised domain knowledges acquired through my lifetime of experiences and past leisure and professional practice. The second section 5.1.2 Acquiring Domain Knowledge will discuss my acquisition of domain knowledge from the domain of low-budget documentary production. While the third section 5.1.3 Acquiring Field Opinions, will discuss the gathering of field opinion acquired as part of the documentary content research from the domain of Fort Scratchley history.

5.1.1 - Identifying my Internalised Domain Knowledges

Social-psychologists argue that motivational factors are important for creative individuals (Hennessey & Amabile, 2010: 581). My decision to commit to the Fort Scratchley project was informed by my past television practice and my understanding that the historians on this project shared a passion for the living history approach to social story construction. My intuition about the project was informed by my experience as a television practitioner and the first few reflective journal entries that illustrate my implicit concerns about assessing production requirements (Kerrigan, Journal: 7 & 16 May 2004). As part of making these assessments I was figuring out the minimum production facilities and personnel required to complete the two video documentaries. My practitioner’s intuition informed the initial direction that was needed to begin work on the project. Intuition in this case is seen as an almost automatic or global method of accessing individual’s accumulated body of knowledge, which exists as compressed information from previous learning and experiences. When the creative individual is faced with decisions about practice they rapidly and intuitively processes this knowledge and use it to make decisions about practice.
The opportunity to make these documentaries was only possible because I was willing to compromise on aesthetic quality given that the budget could not accommodate skilled crew, or the hire of expensive equipment (see Appendix A – April 2004 Video Budget). In the first journal entry I itemised the multiple roles that I would need to undertake as a single person crew:

The key creative roles that I will be performing are Writer, Producer, Director, Editor, the menial supporting roles that I would be performing are Transcribing I/V, Researching Content, Photographic and document Archival research. (Kerrigan, Journal: 16 May 2004)

Also I was aware of the aesthetic compromises I faced, resulting from my having to learn to use camera, lights and editing software. I felt that such an aesthetic production compromise could be managed throughout the project, and therefore may not significantly impact on the final quality of the documentaries.

My optimism was fuelled by the successes of my past practical experiences working in robustly structured television production systems, and collaborating with highly experienced crews. Thus, I anticipated that some of the skills that I already possessed might intuitively transfer and assist me in learning new technical and editorial skills; skills necessary to meet the low-budget constraints of the Fort Scratchley project. An analysis of the development of my life-long learning can expose my intuition; intuition that has developed as cultural capital by acquiring and internalising domain knowledge:

Bourdieu defines cultural capital as a form of knowledge, an internalized code or a cognitive acquisition which equips the social agent with empathy towards, appreciation for or competence in deciphering cultural relations and cultural artefacts. (Johnson in Bourdieu, 1993: 7)

Practitioners' levels of cultural capital or internalised domain knowledge vary according to their formal and informal education (Csikszentmihalyi, 1999: 328; McIntyre, 2003). Bourdieu argues that:

...cultural capital, is accumulated through a long process of acquisition or inculcation which includes the pedagogical action of the family or group members, (family education), educated members of the social formation (diffuse education) and social institutions (institutionalized education). (Johnson, 1993: 7)

The analysis of my life-long learning appears in the ‘Domain Acquisition for Susan Kerrigan’ table (see Appendix B), which includes informal education through social education and family learning as well as formal and institutional education. The column headings in the table represent four general categories, which explicate internalised domain knowledge, while the rows account for seven categories where my domain knowledge acquisition occurred. These include: professional practice, amateur practice, formal tertiary and secondary education, exposure to popular culture and family
influences. The information in this table is important for explaining my creative capacity as an individual because, as argued by Amabile ‘domain relevant skills can be considered the basis from which any performance must proceed’ (1983: 362). Given this, the last row of the table accounts for knowledge acquired through this project. In essence, the subject of much of the last row is presented through this exegesis.

My internalised domain knowledge has amassed across my lifetime, and has become part of my uniquely individual cultural capital and the basis of my own tacit knowledge. Influences are traced from my personal background, interests and preferences which led to me choosing to do Communication studies through a Bachelor of Arts degree at the tertiary level. This qualification put me in a situation to seek employment with the Television section of the Australian Broadcasting Corporation (ABC). During my thirteen years there my skills and knowledge of the television production process expanded. I worked on many television programs, sometimes changing programs after only six months. During this period I was acquiring new production skills and editorial skills. These skills related to the construction and selection of content and manipulation of form and they were to become part of the collection of skills I acquired in this process. I simultaneously acquired and tacitly drew on these skills throughout my professional practice. I learnt that the details of corporate production practices are not always written down usually the specifics are passed on from one practitioner to another through on-the-job training of production management and production practice. In line with this idea Bill Ryan describes how corporations control stages of creative production through their policies:

> Some aspects of policy are written down – albeit in fragments – in job and task specifications, memos, reports and manuals, while others exist discursively in the culture of the organizations – the everyday understandings and values of workers and management. These refer to the particular types of raw materials, technologies and forms of labour invested in by the organizations, the purpose of the organization and the character of its output. In the daily organization of work, as Clegg (1975: 77) points out, these policies are invoked ‘iconically’, as an idea (1), a standard measure of activity. (1991: 148)

Ryan’s argument explains how individual agents are co-ordinated through production activities, which are controlled by the rules of the governing body that enables production processing. Reflected in those individual and group practices are the corporation’s policies. My production knowledge was nurtured in the ABC’s corporate environment.

More formally, I acquired highly specialised skills through training courses that could take up to eight weeks. I undertook intensive on-the-job training, and then more informal learning of production process through continued practice on-the-job. The first eight years
of my professional practice I worked as a Director and Producers’ Assistant, which was akin to a Producer/Director’s apprenticeship. Subsequently, I learnt how to use narrative structures, production methods and program formats to create content and meaning. The production practices that I have experienced include film and video on single and multiple camera field productions and multi-camera studios with ‘live’ and pre-recorded formats. While I had worked on many different types of programs at the ABC, I had no experience working in a low-budget documentary environment. I had worked in the factual department for twelve months on two magazine programs, ‘Quantum’ and ‘Question of Survival’ as a Producers’ Assistant, where I assisted ten Segment Producers and was also responsible for the program compile. As a Producers’ Assistant I worked on the production phase of a documentary special on solar cars. During this time my cultural capital expanded as I acquired foundational knowledge, codes and conventions of practice relating to program content for News, Science, Documentary, Comedy and Drama.

When I transferred from factual programming to non-fiction, and drama production, I learnt how to maintain continuity in the role of ‘Continuity’ on fast turn-around drama productions. All this accumulated production knowledge was intuitively and tacitly used in my role as Producer/Director of Children’s Television programs ‘Play School’ and a puppet show called ‘Mixy’. While my career demonstrates my strengths in production and working across many different television programming styles and contents, I did not experience the role of documentary director/producer whilst at the ABC.

Throughout my employment at the ABC I was oblivious to the amount of practical knowledge I was acquiring through direct and indirect learning. By examining my life-long learning and the accumulation of my domain relevant skills and knowledge, I am arguing that it is possible to demonstrate that this prior knowledge accumulation directly contributed to my creative capabilities and potential. It is important to note that while my knowledge, skills and practice are unique to me, in that they brought me to a particular place and time in academia to work on a PhD, my personal narrative is not dissimilar to other academics who also have had a film and television production career. In this sense personal narratives, which illustrate the development of domain knowledge are common. This should not weaken the uniqueness of individual experiences and the creative understandings that result. Instead, understandings of individual skill and knowledge development need to be seen as being processed through similar structures but still remaining uniquely specific to each individual. Furthermore, these experiences contribute to each individual:

7 During conferences of the Australian Screen Production, Education and Research Association, I have met a number of colleagues who have similar backgrounds.
... achieving the ‘second nature’ sensation, as a practitioner demonstrates an implicit level of understanding in regards to the creative activity and it is comparable to Bastick’s notion of intuition, defined as ‘global processing of multi-categorised information’ (McIntyre, 2003: 42).

These intuitive responses, which manifest as tacit reactions to practical tasks can also be explained through theories on tacit knowledge that provide explanations about individuals accomplished uses of tools.

For the purpose of the Fort Scratchley project the production and technical ‘tools’ that I needed to acquire competence in were video cameras, lighting, sound equipment and editing equipment. Polanyi describes the process of learning to use a tool, and how the experience develops into a tacit use of that tool:

Anyone using a probe for the first time will feel its impact against his fingers and palm. But as we learn to use a probe, or to use a stick for feeling our way, our awareness, of its impact on our hand is transformed into a sense of its point touching the objects we are exploring. This is how an interpretative effort transposes meaningless feelings into meaningful ones. (1967: 12-13)

My lack of tacit knowledge in relation to camera skills became obvious during my first Fort Scratchley filming experience in August 2004. I had taken a student, Simon Farrell along with two University video cameras, lighting, sound equipment and editing equipment. Simon had used one of the cameras previously, I had used neither. At the end of the day I asked Simon to execute a reasonably complex shot that would demonstrate Fort Scratchley’s relationship to another military post, Shepherd’s Hill Battery, which could be seen from Fort Scratchley’s parade ground. Simon was asked to execute the following shot; begin on a full frame of Shepherd’s Hill Observation Post, zoom out, pull focus, pan right, and tilt the frame to end on Fort Scratchley's Observation Post, no more than 10 metres away from the camera. Simon was unable to complete this shot. The pull focus, pan and tilt sequence was a very complicated technical move as it required implicit technique in camera operation. As a field director I would have expected a professional camera operator to execute this shot without any trouble but Simon was unable to successfully complete the shot, despite trying six times. My journal entry is illuminating:

I remembered being surprised that Simon was unable to execute the shot, so I tried to do it, and I was unable to do it either, so I modified the shot, made it go in reverse. I found it amazing that I was physically unable to get the camera and my hands and actions co-ordinated enough to execute the [original] shot. (Kerrigan, Journal: 1 September 2005)8

---

8 Unfortunately, this shot did not make the final edit of the documentary.
The realisation that the type of visual storytelling that had become ‘second nature’ to me might not be possible when relying on my own camera operating skills and those of my students was demoralising. Furthermore, since I had become aware that it was increasingly common practice for documentary practitioners to multi-skill production crew roles (Baker, 2006) I anticipated that, in order to keep production costs to a minimum, I would have to develop my own technical and editorial skills to a proficient level to enable multi-skilling and multi-tasking to be successfully achieved. The outcome then, from this disappointing shoot, confirmed camera purchase as a priority so that it would be possible to acquire the knowledge that would eventually become tacit through repeated use.

As the documentary’s Producer I secured $9000 through a UoN Early Career Researcher Grant to purchase a suitable prosumer video camera. The Cannon XL2 video camera was collected in December 2004 (Kerrigan, Journal: 21 December 2004). The laptop that was to be the editing suite was acquired in January 2005, from Fort Scratchley project funds, while the editing software was supplied through the University. Having now unrestricted access to the production equipment ensured that I could learn to use the technology and develop ‘muscle memory’ and the automatic processing required for proficient operation. I completed more than thirty hours of filming family events, weddings and my children’s dance concerts in order to develop my own intuitive muscle memory and reflexes while operating the Cannon XL2. The time spent acquiring these basic skills was necessary as it increased my confidence and trust in my technical skills which I realised were crucial for the successful completion of this project.

A journal entry, from October 2005, shows my continuing difficulty in my single-handed attempts to film an interview. The interviewee, on this occasion, was a nervous elderly woman who had, the day before, bruised her cheekbone by falling out of bed and she was reluctant to appear on camera but as we had both travelled a long way for this interview to be recorded we decided to proceed. This journal entry explains the compounding circumstances, in that using the technology by myself, operating camera and recording audio was overwhelming enough and I was also becoming aware of the need to calm the nerves of a hesitant interviewee, so that she would relax on camera:

The most difficult thing was to re-frame the camera at the same time as I was trying to keep my attention focused on the interviewee. I was very aware of maintaining my attention on what she was saying in an attempt to make her feel more comfortable. I don’t think that I was successful. If I was working with a camera operator, it might have been more possible for me to engage with her, and reduce her nerves … I really felt that I was mentally working so hard, that it was impossible for me to give any more attention to the situation at hand, as there was no more attention to give.
We had to stop recording to kill three blow flies, which were buzzing around the room. I found that the interviewee was unable to feel really herself in front of the camera, she told the best stories off camera, and I didn’t try and get her to re-tell them on camera because, I felt at that stage, it would be unsuccessful. (Kerrigan, Journal: 3 October, 2005)

This example shows my practitioner intuition or tacit knowledge at work in regard to the interview process itself. I was aware of reaching the point of no return and could see that my directorial efforts, to settle the interviewee for the recording camera were not working. For me this represents an intellectual skill where the knowing is in the moment. Schön describes this practitioner skill as ‘knowing in action’ whereas Polanyi describes the same scenario as distal knowing. Rather than the tacit knowing being physically or practically oriented it is an intellectual understanding of the moment (Polanyi, 1967: 34) where a practitioner possesses intellectual skills that help them recognise and assess certain characteristics of a situation. As Polanyi suggests ‘we do not attend to these features and their pattern in themselves, but rely on our awareness of them for attending to the physiognomy to which they jointly contribute’ (1962: 604).

Similar arguments about the self sustaining nature of practice exist in theories about cultural production, specifically those concerned with habitus and praxis:

Practices are produced by Habitus and these routines go on to reproduce themselves. They create evolving patterns of behavior that reproduce themselves … practices cannot be discovered by looking at the context of the situation, but they tacitly exist as social practices. Habitus has social and cultural agency, but that agency does not exist in any one individual. It exists in tradition, practice and other forms of tacit knowledge. (St. Clair, Rodriguez & Nelson, 2005: 149-150).

It is the knowledge that tacitly resides inside an individual which forms their cultural capital. While this knowledge is derived from social structures it is specific to that individual and has the potential to make an individual’s practice self-referential and self-generating. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that multiple theories of practice identify the self-referential nature of practice which is manifest both physically and conceptually. In this sense, my intuition can be seen as following Tony Bastick’s (1982) definition of the term ‘intuition’, where my mind and body’s ability to globally process my embodied and internalised domain knowledge, and my lack of embodied technical skills in one area compromised the outcome of the recorded interview.

Since my embodied store of domain knowledge is my cultural capital, it informs the decisions I make in regard to screen production practice. It also accounts for much of the automatic mental processing that allowed me to intuitively respond to and undertake many documentary tasks that I encountered on this project. For those documentary tasks that I was unable to complete, I either had to engage others to assist, or the quality of the
work would be compromised. In the video documentary there are two interviews with Fort Scratchley residents which I recorded by myself (see DVD - Using Fort Scratchley; 2008, minutes 21.48 & 24.11). In these interviews it is possible to see through poor lighting and bad framing how constrained I was when relying on my own skills. It is too simplistic to say that I was only constrained by my skills, as in fact I was simultaneously enabled by them, in that I was able to conduct and also record the interviews in the first place. My personal background determined the starting point for my Fort Scratchley documentary practice while also providing a store of intuitive knowledge that informed my practice.

It can be said, therefore, that intuition is useful, in that it is not only embodied in the individual and helps them to more successfully negotiate practice, but it also automatically identifies gaps in the individual’s past personal background that need to be filled in order for successful engagement in the creative activity to occur. My intuitive ability to identify my lack of knowledge and my need to acquire knowledge and skills from the domains relevant to the project, were continually at work in a tacit way and they implicitly and automatically drove my creative decision making processes.

5.1.2 - Acquiring Domain Knowledges

The analysis of my internalised domain knowledge confirms my experience and exposure to film and television production practice across a number of genres and program formats while also exposing some of my technical weaknesses. There are numerous journal entries detailing my camera operating experiences, and this concentration of journal entries demonstrates my deep immersion in the preliminary stages of screen craft skill acquisition. For example, the following is an account of the development of camera operation skills during a day of oral history interviewing.

The first day interviewing I used the camera in auto focus, but I got annoyed with it dropping focus as I zoomed in, so on the second day I felt brave enough to trust my own judgment and set the focus to manual. This allowed me to zoom in, get focus, then zoom out. Everything within that range is then in focus, and the focus from this point on was perfect. I shot the three interviewees with a R-L eyeline, and 3 interviewees with a L-R eyeline. I hope that this will provide a balanced visual aesthetic, should these interviewees be cut together. (Kerrigan, Journal: 12 July 2005)

While my reflection shows a certain level of competency, the actual interview footage from that day shows a number of camera operator errors that could not be edited out of the documentary. There is one shot in particular that makes me cringe, as it exists as proof of my poorly developed skill and limited critical judgment as a camera operator at that time. The interview in question was with World War Two veteran, Jim Cannon.
Jim Cannon was in charge of one of the 6-inch guns which fired on the Japanese submarine that attacked Fort Scratchley in 1942. His account of those events was crucial to the documentary as he was the only living person to provide the eyewitness account from that night’s events. Unfortunately, there are re-framing errors that appear in Jim’s edited interview (Using Fort Scratchley, 2008; minutes 12.18). On reflection I believe I was trying to re-frame the shot to assist the editor but in fact re-framing the shot exactly when I did only caused problems in the edit – there was no way of masking or hiding the camera operation error that exists in this footage. This type of operator error is embarrassing and is the sort of mistake that is only made once. In terms of a practitioner’s understanding of creativity however, it can be argued that the creation of inferior products is more beneficial to a practitioner’s understanding of creativity (Bailin, 1988: 84). Certainly an individual’s failure to live up to expectations, set by themselves or others, can motivate that individual to do better next time. As a consequence all the subsequent interviews were framed as fixed medium close-ups (Using Fort Scratchley, 2008; minutes 8.50, 9.11, 14.59, 17.46, 22.41).

There are a number of aesthetic errors that occur in the documentary; poor camera work (Using Fort Scratchley, 2008; minutes 37.00), lighting (Using Fort Scratchley, 2008; minutes 15.00 & 22.41) and audio recordings (Using Fort Scratchley, 2008; minutes 17.28) that exists as proof of my learning and skill acquisition. Consequently, these aesthetic compromises exist as evidence of the constraining production context that I had accepted and was working in. So while my lack of technical skill was constraining, the following editorial and logistical skills I possessed from past professional practices were enabling. This learning journal entry explains that:

On the whole I feel like my tacit knowledge of the production process is quite advanced, and I feel less inclined to make journal entries about the preparation stages of production because they are not problematic. My tacit knowledge on editorial construction of narrative is not as well developed. This may be due to the documentary form or the content itself. (Kerrigan, Journal: 3 July 2005)

At the time of the entry my awareness of my own lack of experience and knowledge in pulling together a linear documentary narrative was becoming evident. Development of these editorial skills became a priority as I immersed myself in the Field and Domain. As Keith Sawyer’s research into creativity confirms, creative content producers need to have comprehensive access to all domain knowledge:

Evaluation can’t be done effectively without a deep understanding of the domain - the conventions and language of a creative domain, and the history that resulted in the body of existing works that is known and is shared knowledge among creators in the area. (2006: 106)
My need to develop a deeper understanding of documentary narrative structures had become obvious. This understanding was eventually achieved by immersing myself in the codes and conventions of the documentary domain, reading about documentary scriptwriting techniques, and watching documentaries to see how other documentary practitioners structured their narratives.

One example of this immersion is an analysis I performed on Revealing Gallipoli (Fimeri, 2005) a documentary which re-tells the World War 1 Gallipoli conflict from Australian, Turkish and Welsh soldiers' points of view. Directed by Wain Fimeri, the film used three international presenters, who explained the political perspective, military strategies and battle conditions related to both sides of the campaign. The conflict was personalised using soldiers’ letters and photographs to show experiences from each side of the battlefield. I examined the documentary in detail, timing the length of segments and looking at the precise structure of the narrative by examining the voiceovers, use of archival images, use of presenters and editing techniques and made notes about these aspects in my journal:

…. my mind wandered to my story and how some of these techniques might be incorporated in the doco that I am making. The main thing for ‘Getting Behind Fort Scratchley’ [working title] is to turn the Fort into a character. In effect telling its life story. (Kerrigan, Journal: 26 April 2006)

Becoming a cinephile is one way to keep up with contemporary filmmaking techniques but there is only so much filmmaking that can be learned through watching and examining the structure of existing documentaries. While my understandings of general techniques of documentary storytelling and production increased by watching a range of documentaries, this knowledge had to be used in conjunction with the knowledge that I was acquiring about the Domain and the Field of Fort Scratchley.

5.1.3 - Acquiring Field Opinions

Domain knowledge resides in the written form, language, symbols, notations and conventions of a particular field. Domain knowledge is located in all previous products that have been created and accepted by the field, and this permits others wanting to understand the origins and history of a domain to do so by accessing that knowledge through libraries, publications and books. Initially, I accessed Fort Scratchley’s history
through these traditional archival avenues. Accounts of the development of the Fort (Mackay, 1969) and documents detailing the conservation and preservation of the site (Australian Survey Office, 1975; Currey, 1975) were accessed through local libraries and the archive at Fort Scratchley’s Historical Society [FSHS]. However, individuals wanting to acquire domain knowledge that resides outside the written word, in cultural practices and social behaviours, need to have access to the field that is conversant with that domain. For this project that entailed me interacting as a documentary filmmaker with members of the Fort Scratchley field who had stored domain knowledge in terms of their opinions and social behaviours. Internalisation of field opinions is necessary for documentary practitioners because they draw on that knowledge, through practice, and use it to judge the product they are creating.

My documentary practitioner immersion and internalisation of Fort Scratchley domain knowledge through interactions with the field is represented through the systems model as:

…every new bit of information added to the domain will become the input for the next generation of persons. Thus, the [systems] model represents a cycle in the process of cultural evolution. (Csikszentmihalyi, 1999: 333)

At a foundational level, the Systems Model as it is usually graphically represented (see Figure 3, page 11) demonstrates through each of the three sets of parallel arrows the cyclical and causal progressions of the acquisition of knowledge. By applying this model to myself as documentary practitioner, it becomes possible to explain the social and cultural acquisition of facts, opinions and rules from archival sources and field members. In this case, I as a documentary practitioner had to embody, internalise, and reproduce certain domain knowledges and field opinions before the field, which includes those who directly mediate the product but also various audiences who engage with the product, is able to recognise me as being a creative individual.

Keith Sawyer, author of Explaining Creativity: The Science of Human Innovation (2006), has categorised audiences through four social groupings (see Figure 6, page 54). This is a useful model as it also assists in defining the social groups of the field according to their level of knowledge. Sawyer ranks these groups from the least knowledgeable group of ‘public’ to ‘amateurs’ followed by ‘connoisseurs’ and ending with the most knowledgeable field experts, located at the centre of the sphere and generically named ‘intermediaries’ (2006: 97). Understanding these social groupings and how they interact socially has been important to me as a documentary practitioner on this project as I was continuously interacting with these various levels of field experts, who were at times providing various and conflicting opinions about the Fort’s roles in Australian history.
For example, direct contact with Fort Scratchley’s field experts occurred through sixteen different institutions. Some were central to the social fabric of the Fort like the Fort Scratchley Historical Society, while others were only vaguely aware of the Fort’s role in military and maritime history, for example the Australian War Memorial.

According to Keith Sawyer the amount of cultural capital that exists within various social groups is based ‘on their level of expertise and how connected they are to the creators who work in the field’ (2006: 127). The institutions accessed are listed below and range from professional bodies operating in a local, national or international capacity as well as voluntary bodies operating at the community level:

Australian War Memorial, Australian Artillery Association,
Fort Scratchley Historical Society, Coal River Working Party,
Historic Houses Trust, National Library of Australia,
Newcastle Region Art Gallery, Newcastle Region Library,
Newcastle Regional Museum, Newcastle Maritime Museum,
Screen Sound Archive, State Library of New South Wales,
State Records of NSW, Powerhouse Museum Sydney,
University of Newcastle, Auchmuty Library and Cultural Collection,

Using Sawyer’s categories to place these organisations against their level of cultural and social capital helped me to understand the types of field opinions that I was exposed to during conversations with members of those institutions. For example, the Fort Scratchley
Historical Society would be classed as connoisseurs as there are several reasons for this. The first is the society’s structure, established in 1982 the non-profit society is run by a volunteer Management Committee. This gives FSHS a strong military focus and many of its members served at the Fort as part of the 113 Field Battery, Royal Australian Artillery (Fort Scratchley Historical Society, 2006: online). Secondly, while FSHS has a real job to do in maintaining the Fort, its members claim to enjoy the social aspects of the society because it provides them with a space to share their military service memories and Fort experiences. Thirdly, most FSHS members have gathered their historical knowledge through first hand experiences at the Fort and through second-hand accounts of military history. Thus FSHS members can be regarded as connoisseurs, a group of active and enthusiastic field members. However, I had to be careful to verify all historical accounts passed on to me as fact from FSHS members because stories could sometimes be inadvertently altered or modified by enthusiastic connoisseurs, hence perpetuating inaccuracies. Therefore, to avoid these inaccuracies being repeated in the documentary I had to observe a strict historical methodology that triangulated historical fact.

Immersing myself in the social structure of Fort Scratchley’s field of experts helped increase my knowledge of the domain of Fort Scratchley. The gathering of information from archives and from opinion, enabled me to access and assess the cultural, social and economic capital held by these institutions, their employers and/or representatives, in turn helping me to understand each community’s regard for Fort Scratchley. What slowly became apparent to me in this process was that making a documentary that incorporates many layers of historical knowledges and field opinions was going to be challenging. As the documentary’s Director I was:

> [a]t the micro level chasing strange details that needed to be confirmed in text, and also gathering human stories that were required to put these significant historical events into context. (Kerrigan, Journal: August 8, 2005)

While so-called factual knowledge from FSHS members had to carefully checked I was nevertheless able to access valuable human stories through some filmed interviews.

My first interaction with FSHS was through a tour of the historical buildings, tunnels and military artefacts of the site. Mr Len Young, a volunteer tour guide explained the extensive tunnel system underneath the parade ground (Figure 7), which was built to store explosive ammunition underground and away from firing guns (Kerrigan, Journal: 23 July 2004). After a tour of the Fort’s tunnels, buildings and artefacts I realised that the Fort itself contained domain specific information that was not transmitted through traditional archival resources.
Figure 7 - Map of Fort Scratchley’s Tunnels circa 1911

Extensive domain knowledge exists in the physical fabric of the Fort, its sandstone buildings, connecting tunnels, numerous guns and cannons and other military artefacts. For me this meant that a site visitor could learn a great deal about the Fort by just walking around the site. My own site tour made me aware of the pressure of creating a documentary that would somehow need to compete with the actual experience of the site (Kerrigan, Journal: 23 July 2004).

FSHS also had a well catalogued photographic archive compiled by Dick Mort, a founding member of the society. This photographic collection showed the development of the Fort’s buildings and tunnels and revealed how they had been structurally altered over the years. Between 1888 to 1929 there were three major modifications made to the Fort as a direct result of changes to military defence technologies, tactics and armaments (Figure 8).
From FSHS’ viewpoint, every cannon or gun installed and used at the Fort had its own story to tell about the social, political and technological climate of its time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>BUILDING</th>
<th>ARMAMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>Approval given by Sir Peter Scratchley for construction of the fort.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>Construction begins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>Fort completed</td>
<td>4 80-pounder R.M.L. guns 3 9-inch R.M.L. guns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>Barracks construction begins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>Barracks completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Remodelling begun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Remodelling completed Trench Wall built</td>
<td>3 6-B.L. Disappearing guns 1 8-inch B.L. Disappearing gun 1 80-pounder R.M.L. gun 3 1½-inch Nordenfeldt Machine Guns 2 5-barrel machine guns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Last major structural changes</td>
<td>2 6-inch Mk. VII B.L. guns 2 1½-inch Nordenfeldt guns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Minor changes only</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>6-inch guns taken out of commission</td>
<td>40-m.m. Mk XII Boforkanti-aircraft guns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>6-inch guns removed to Obelisk Hill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Site vacated by the Army, which moved to Adamstown</td>
<td>Field Battery at Adamstown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For instance, the disappearing gun was singled out in the video and online documentary as one example of this concept because its firing action was so mechanically interesting and easily translatable to 3D animation (Using Fort Scratchley, 2008; minutes 4.02-4.20; Fort Scratchley a Living History, 2008; date 20/6/1888)

My interactions with FSHS volunteers made me realise that they, as military ‘buffs’, assumed that site visitors would be keenly interested in all things military and more specifically the reasons behind each armament upgrade (Kerrigan, Journal: 6 June 2005). Similarly, the Newcastle Region Maritime Museum, also located at Fort Scratchley from 1977 to 2004, demonstrated analogous biases about the Fort’s role in maritime history. Maritime Museum volunteers made equivalent assumptions, based around site visitors’ interests in maritime artefacts. In some cases these maritime artefacts had been relocated and displayed at the Fort even though some of them had no connection to the Fort’s history. By recognising these community biases I also began to realise the need for the documentary to explain the Fort’s role in multiple community histories.
So, as a documentary practitioner I actively sought out historical examples, which could bring together the Fort’s role in both military and maritime communities. Interestingly, the archival documents showed that the military and maritime communities continually argued over site access and ‘ownership’. While the military claimed ownership of the site from first settlement. Letters from 1804 written by the settlement’s first commander Lieutenant Menzies identified the site as the best place to locate a few guns ‘from a commanding height above the town’ (Fort Scratchley a Living History, 2008: date 30/03/1084) in order to deter convicts from escaping. But evidence confirmed that the maritime community had extensive use of the site throughout the early years of the settlement. For example, Westmacott’s painting circa 1840 (Figure 9) shows a coal-fired beacon that continuously burnt to show mariners the entrance to Newcastle Harbour.

Figure 9 - Newcastle the Coal Mines of NSW by Robert Marsh Westmacott, National Library Australia, circa 1840

The pagoda provided a shelter for maritime personnel watching the harbour entrance and the flagpole provided a safety signal for vessels wishing to enter the harbour. Furthermore, the maritime community claimed that before the Fort was constructed the Newcastle Harbour Master, Captain Allan, lived in a cottage on top of what was then known as Captain Allan’s Hill (Harrison, 2006; Fort Scratchley a Living History; 2008: date 16/05/1855). The Harbour Master’s residence had to be removed for the construction of the Fort in 1882. It became obvious that both maritime and military communities were able to historically and legitimately trace their community’s use of the site back to Newcastle’s first settlement. I was mindful that if I was persuaded by either side that their claim to the site was more legitimate than the other, then the documentary may continue to fuel an irresolvable ownership claim to this geographical location. Moreover, I realised that there was no benefit to be had in perpetuating these obsolete claims of site ownership.

Of more importance, Australian history does not begin with white habitation. Discussion of the transformation of the site and the communities who used the site occurred during my trip to the Sydney Power House Museum (Kerrigan, Journal: 26 July 2006). These
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discussions helped me to understand how important it was to represent site use by the
original owners of the land - the local indigenous tribes called Awabakal. The Awabakal,
tribe originally inhabited the Newcastle area and information about the tribe was accessed
through the University of Newcastle’s Awaba website which provided a detailed academic
account of the habitation of the area and the customs of the Awabakal tribe (Carey,
Grieves, Maynard & Roberts, 2003). Also found on the Awaba website were portrayals of
the Awabakal community engaging in various activities from their daily life as painted by
convict artist Joseph Lycett in 1818 (Using Fort Scratchley, 2008; dates 15.07-15.31 &
15.47-15.59; Fort Scratchley a Living History, 2008: date 1818). An exhibition,
‘Joseph Lycett: Convict Artist’ was held at Newcastle Regional Art Gallery in August 2006,
which included his most famous painting ‘Corroboree at Newcastle’. This painting depicts
eight different Awabakal ceremonies with what would become Nobbys and Fort Scratchley
headland seen in the distance (Fort Scratchley a Living History, 2008; date Pre-1770).

Pictorial evidence illustrating the changing shape of the site was revealed through
research of local, state and national libraries and online art galleries. This research was
made easier by the University of Newcastle’s Coal River Working Party image archive
which housed a substantial amount of maps, etchings, paintings and photographs of the
landscape where the Hunter River meets the Pacific Ocean (Di Gravio, 2006: online).
With the assistance of the Coal River Working Party Chair, Gionni Di Gravio, project funds
were used to purchase an electronic copy of the first European map of the area, hand
drawn by John Shortland in 1797 (Using Fort Scratchley, 2008; minutes 2.03; Fort
Scratchley a Living History, 2008: date 10/10/1797). In addition, photographic images
appear in the documentaries acquired from the FSHS photographic archive and the
Newcastle Regional Art Gallery’s, Hunter Photo bank (Using Fort Scratchley, 2008;
minutes 2.14-2.45 & 14.35-.14.58). Copyright was negotiated on all images, photographs,
film and video used in the documentary. Surprisingly the larger institutions were very
generous when it came to negotiating rights. All copyright holders are credited at the end
of the documentary (see Appendix C – Using Fort Scratchley Credit List), while images
displayed in the website have the copyright owners listed in text. Some documentary
participants were able to supply images from their personal archives that precisely
illustrated their personal histories (Using Fort Scratchley, 2008; minutes 20.11, 21.15,
21.48 & 22.40; Fort Scratchley a Living History, 2008; dates 30/10/1932, 1/10/1942)

In addition to gathering domain knowledge as visual representations of site changes, I
located moving images, film and video footage that could be used to visually depict the
changes of the site over time. Some 16 mm film footage of the Fort during military training
was found in the FSHS archive. Stored in the bottom drawer of a filing cabinet the colour
footage was filmed during firing practice at a military training camp in the 1960’s. This footage was transferred to videotape and appears in the documentary (Using Fort Scratchley, 2008; from minutes 26.08; Fort Scratchley a Living History, 2008; dates 17/04/1960). A search of Australia’s National Film Archive at Screen Sound, confirmed that there were no documentaries, either short or long forms made about Fort Scratchley.

Searching multiple online archives, though time consuming, helped me to gain a better understanding of the changes that humans imposed on the site since white colonisation. For example, one montage was constructed to illustrate the multiple communities that have used the site over its 200-year history (Using Fort Scratchley; 2008; minutes 14.34-14.54). By displaying archival images of the site coupled with site names from the same era it became possible to illustrate the multiple communities’ uses of the site and the physical changes that the site endured. The name Fort Scratchley was first used on September 9, 1887 in the *Newcastle Morning Herald*. Previously Fort Scratchley had other aliases, which included ‘Collier’s Point’ and ‘Coal Head’, names attributed to the site because of the seaward-facing coal seam which became the first Australian Convict Coal mine. Within the maritime community the headland was known as ‘Beacon Hill’ or ‘Signal Hill’ and ‘Allan's Hill’ or ‘Captain Allan’s Hill’ (Mort & Carey, 1986: 7). With the later erection of a Flagstaff it became known as ‘Flagstaff Hill’.

My reflective journal also shows the development of my understanding and use of language and conventions from more general domains such as Australian Military History. Firstly, the Nation’s military history was accessed through historical texts (Austin, 1979; Horner, 1995; Stanley, 1988). This knowledge was further developed through contact with the Historical Research Assistant, Julie McIntyre, who had been employed to research, write and update an historically accurate booklet on the Fort. Reflective journal entries show our limited understanding of military language and we agree that a naïve approach could be used as a storytelling technique:

> We looked up the definitions of the words Artillery, Battery and Armament, and we both suddenly understood why there were 4 guns installed at Scratchley from 1878, because a Battery was normally made up of a 4-gun artillery. (Kerrigan, Journal: 6 June 2005)

Besides clarifying factual information about the Fort’s development the ‘Living History’ approach used by UoN Historians, meant we were uncovering original research by collecting personal stories from people who used the Fort. Some personal stories were already laid out in a forty-page booklet titled *Fort Scratchley, Newcastle, New South Wales* (Mort & Carey, 1986), specifically in Chapter 3, ‘The Fort in Action’, and Chapter 4, ‘Tales from the Fort’. These different sources of information contributed to some initial reflections on how they could be used to structure the documentary narrative. My idea
was to use a parallel narrative form that would see segments from one narrative explaining the original 1880 construction of the Fort intercut with a second narrative that shows the 2008 refurbishment of the site. The underlying idea was that the Fort would become the protagonist and the historical changes that the site had undergone over the last 200 years would provide the conflict:

Somehow I’d like to parallel the narrative of the Fort being built with the narrative of the refurbishment. If the Fort is the protagonist then the antagonist could be identified in the military, and its use and abuse of the site. It makes sense to identify the Fort as the protagonist, as it is such a picturesque spot, and it’s easy to like the Fort. Its current state of disrepair is sad. In this sense the first act would be its current plight. I’d need to identify a central question. The second act would need to break up into two parallel stories; one to show refurbishment, the other to show how the fort developed originally. The third act of course needs to offer hope of what the refurbishment will bring and what it will mean for Novocastrians and Australians for a successful refurbishment. At this stage expositional stories could be developed around Scratchley - the man who designed the fort and the Russian invasion. The coming and goings of the guns need to be used to advantage. Obviously the climax to the Fort’s story would have to be the exchange of fire with the Japanese. But for the Fort it would be good to identify an ending to the story that would see the Fort rejuvenated. (Kerrigan, Journal: 30 April 2005)

This reflective journal entry explains my attempts to combine dramatic screenwriting techniques normally used to develop character and use them instead to emphasise the changes to this geographical location. By making the site the documentary protagonist I could use its historical development to show the resilience of the geographical location entwined with community usages of the site. As a documentary practitioner, my ability to mediate community stories was a developing skill necessary because I had to be able to filter community biases in order to critically judge the most significant stories to be re-told within the documentary.

It was ironic that on the whole the FSHS was genuinely concerned about the accurate re-telling of specific events, while at the same time it was some of their members who had perpetuated these inaccuracies. For example, on June 8th, 1942 a Japanese submarine attacked Newcastle. While there was an official record of the attack there were also some unsubstantiated stories or rumours from the night of the Japanese attack that were perpetuated by FSHS members. One of these stories suggested that one of the six-inch guns had jammed while firing on the submarine, rendering it inoperable. Confirming the accuracy of this rumour took some time and required a thorough research methodology.

As noted above the history methodology used in this project was the ‘living history’ approach, which required oral history researchers to corroborate verbal stories with the
facts as explained through official records or documents. So, in order to locate the most accurate version of the night’s events I referenced the Official War Diary held at the Australian War Memorial in Canberra:

Fire opened up by Battery at enemy vessel, not visible in any beam, but located first time by gun flashes at bearing 067° and approx. 5000X Four round fired from Battery. During this action rounds were observed to fall left of Battery into harbour – others appeared to pass overhead. After the fourth round from the Battery there was no answering fire from the enemy. (Australian Army, 1942)

In addition to this official account (see Appendix D - Australian War Diary June, 8 1942) an oral history interview with Gunner Jim Cannon, who witnessed the attack, was conducted. Jim was on duty the night the Japanese submarine attacked. Jim was the Number 1 Gunner in charge of the Number 2, 6-inch gun and he confirmed the official versions of that night’s events. Jim spoke about the four shells that were fired by Fort Scratchley’s two guns, as well as clarifying the rumour about one of the guns jamming during the attack. Jim confirmed that the six-inch gun he was in charge of did not jam. During the interview Jim was asked, ‘Tell me about one of the guns which jammed?’ to which he replied:

No it didn’t jam… No I had an Aboriginal number 4 [gun crew member] on number two gun, and you’ve got a rammer bucket at the back and his job was to ram the shell when it was put in, assisted by the number one. And he was a black fella; he would have been one of the whitest men that I have even seen in my life on the night of the action. Because he was that keyed up that he pulled the rammer bucket a little bit too close on the second round and when the gun recoiled the lever breach mechanism, hit the edge of the top of the rammer and slightly bent the lever breech mechanism, so I called the observation post and told them that number two gun had had an accident and put it out of action. We didn’t need it any more thank goodness, that night. (Video camera tape 15: 18:15 minutes)

Jim’s version confirms that his gun, the number 2 gun, was made inoperable, and Jim’s clarification of that evening’s events demonstrates the language a gunner would use to explain an occurrence that would render the gun inoperable. A jam occurs when a shell gets stuck in the breach of a gun’s barrel making it difficult to dislodged, necessitating a raft of safety procedures to effectively remove the jammed shell, which has the potential to explode at any moment. For this case the original story of the gun jamming is technically not true, but it has to be acknowledged that a non-military person may unknowingly change some words of a story and hence inadvertently change the meaning of the story. What became apparent to me through Jim’s answer was that military language and meaning is precise. The difficulty for oral history research is that these sorts of ‘chinese
whispers’ can quickly turn into the ‘truth’ and even irrefutable ‘fact’ within a volunteer organisation like FSHS.

After being able to verify the same version of events from two sources, one the Official War Diary and the other from an eyewitness, I felt satisfied. Then I located a third source, revealing where some of these inaccuracies may have originated. A locally made radio documentary called ‘War on our Doorstep’ recorded in 1972, interviewed a number of men some thirty years after the Japanese Submarine attack on Newcastle. Bombardier Ted Pritchard’s interview reveals him explaining his controversial version of that night’s events and his claim that the Fort Scratchley guns fired five times that night:

When we got the order to fire the first shell that was fired out of Number Two gun, which was the first gun to open fire was a practice shell. Now that was always kept in the bore of the gun to stop any boat getting in or out without a clearance. Now that was the first shell that was fired. The second shell that went out of Number Two gun was an armour piercing shell the same as what Number One gun was firing. Now Number Two gun fired three and Number One gun fired two. Now this is a bit, eh… controversy to what records show. They maintain that there was only 4 shells fired that morning, there were, four live rounds but one practice round went as well, and that was fired by Number Two gun. (Ladlow, 1972: Track 2 at 19.54 minutes)

Unfortunately no one could corroborate Pritchard’s detail about the firing of five shells from Fort Scratchley’s guns whereas the firing of four rounds was corroborated from three sources. Firstly, the Official War Diary content (see Appendix E - War Diary Store Order); secondly, Jim Cannon’s interview and; thirdly, through an Ammunition Store Order that was passed on to me by the son of Lieutenant M. Laffy, District Officer. Lieutenant Laffy wrote at the very top of the page "I certify that the under mentioned Ammunition was expended during action against the enemy on the morning of the 8/6/42" (Fort Scratchley a Living History, 2008; date 8/6/1942 - Japanese Retreat).

Working through the military document archives, published material and broadcast radio material helped me to understand the concerns held by some FSHS members about accurately re-telling the facts and not perpetuating implausible inaccuracies held by other members of the FSHS. As a documentary maker I experienced my own struggle in assessing the official reporting of an incident and the contradictory information that comes through oral history interviews. Determining if there was any truth to these personal stories was difficult. My struggle as a documentary practitioner revolved around whether I should filter out the inaccuracies that contradicted the official factual recordings of the events or if I should include these personal accounts even though they deviated from the recorded ‘truth’. The question that I had to answer was, ‘was Bombardier Ted Pritchard’s account plausible?’ Earlier in the interview Pritchard explained that a practice round was
always kept in the barrel of the six-inch guns to fire as a warning shot over the bow of vessels attempting to enter or leave Newcastle Harbour without clearance (Ladlow, 1972). If I believed Pritchard’s version to be plausible would this undermine the notion of ‘truth’, and in this case the factual accounts of Australian Military History?

As a documentary practitioner I could not dismiss uncorroborated stories without due consideration but trying to corroborate those stories became impossible. By questioning the plausibility of these stories I was also questioning the integrity of the soldiers who had shared those memories with their families and with the radio reporters and historical writers. When clarifying one particular point during an interview with the son of a soldier who was on duty on the night of the Japanese attack, I became aware that I was relying on the memories of a man who was recalling his father’s account of events of a night that had occurred 64 years previous. What right did I have as a documentary filmmaker to insinuate that the memories being recounted to me were inaccurate? These memories had lived as the ‘truth’ for that family for the last 64 years. Consequently, I was faced with the notion of the relationship between ‘truth’ and ‘memory’, and the fragility of those two connections.

My eventual conclusion was that Pritchard’s story was plausible but because of duration restrictions for the linear documentary it was not possible to explain it in any detail. So the expenditure of four shells is presented as fact in the DVD. However, as there was more space in the online documentary I was able to present Pritchard’s story and, by providing a digital copy of Laffy’s signed Ammunition Store Order, I hoped that a website user could draw their own conclusions about the truth of the matter. Here is the explanation that has been provided in the text window from the online documentary:

> This official record confirms that Fort Scratchley’s guns fired four shells against the enemy. Jim Cannon who was in charge of number 2 gun confirms that his gun fired 2 of those 4 rounds.

> However, oral history interviews with other Army personnel disagree on the number of shells fired from each gun. One account claims that one gun fired 3 shells. Another account claims the first shell fired from the guns did not contain a full charge as it was a practice round. (Fort Scratchley a Living History, 2008; date 8/6/1942 – Japanese Retreat)

Other uncorroborated details which have turned into myths within the FSHS community, existed around the Japanese perspective of the attack. Three accounts from the night of the attack were published in naval books and they were all similar, in that the attack lasted for thirteen minutes in which time thirty-four rounds were fired from the Japanese Submarine the I-21. Eight of these rounds were star shells which were used to illuminate the sky and help the Japanese gunners locate their targets (Horner, 1995: 309; Jenkins,
The conflicting account was from the Royal Australian Navy which stated that:

At 2.15 a.m. shells were fired from position 7,000 yards N.E. by E. of Fort Scratchley, and during the next 20 minutes some 24 fell in the vicinity of the power station and Customs House. A number failed to explode. Some damage was caused, though there were no casualties. The bombardment ceased when Fort Scratchley fired four rounds in reply. The bombarding vessel in this instance was I-21. (Hermon Gill, 1968: 78)

There was one published account from the Japanese perspective which confirmed that the attacking submarine was the I-21 but it does not confirm the number of shells fired by the Japanese during the attack (Hashimoto, 1954: 58). Drawing on these accounts is an illustration showing where the shells landed in Newcastle. Drawn by Monty Webb, the map shows precisely where all the shells landed, including which shells exploded and which did not. This hand drawn illustration was published in the *Newcastle Herald* at that time, which meant it had been socially verified as being an accurate and creditable account of the shelling of Newcastle. Unfortunately, copyright restrictions on the illustration prevented it from being included in either the linear or the online documentary but Fairfax did permit the illustration to be published in the Fort Scratchley booklet, authored by my co-researchers Julie McIntyre and Erik Eklund (2008: 33).

This example demonstrates the ‘oral history’ rigour that I employed as a documentary researcher, to acquire accurate local, national and international knowledge of Fort Scratchley’s recorded engagement in military history. To determine the Australian War Memorial (AWM) understanding of Fort Scratchley as a significant military location, I undertook a research trip to Canberra in August 2006.

The AWM is recognised as the authority on Australian Military history. In terms of Sawyer’s categories, the AWM Historians are identified as field ‘intermediaries’ or ‘gatekeeper’s’ who include ‘the patrons who provide emotional and financial support; experts like authorities and critics; and transmission agents who disseminate the work to the public’ (Sawyer, 2006: 124). In comparison to the members of the FSHS, AWM historians have significant amounts of social and cultural capital within the domain of military history. Therefore, they have the power to determine what information is acceptable for disseminating within Australian Military museums and they also have the power to determine what is trivial – as such these operate as gatekeepers of the domain of Australian Military knowledge.

Therefore it was no surprise that historians working at the AWM had quite strong views on the Fort Scratchley’s insignificant role in protecting the Australian shoreline during World War II.
War 2. Whilst at the AWM, I met with its leading historian Associate Professor Peter Stanley. This turned out to be a very confronting meeting, as my learning journal describes:

Assoc Prof Peter Stanley said that I was thoroughly “…under prepared for an archival research trip…”. He felt that my lack of historical methodology was extremely obvious, and that I should have had some training in historical methodology in order to research this topic. I have to say that I felt quite gutted by Peter Stanley’s comments that I was under prepared for an archival research trip.

When I look back on my conversation with Peter Stanley, I realise that I was trying to find out exactly how important he felt Fort Scratchley is to Australian Military History. Though he didn’t answer this question directly, he did leave me with an impression that Fort Scratchley was and remains insignificant. Though he did say that he had visited the site, and also spoke of how close the Fort was and is to the “community”. When I said that it had been dedicated to all serving military personal he virtually rolled his eyes. (Kerrigan, Journal: 14 August, 2006)

The following day I went to speak with John Perryman, an historian from the Australian Navy Seapower Centre in Fyshwick, Canberra.

John initially spoke to me about the Imperial Japanese submarine campaign, and his comments were similar to Peter Stanley’s comments in that this attack on Newcastle was specifically designed to raise the level of fear within Australian communities. The Imperial Japanese submarines were able to achieve this because they were unseen, and had an unknown and unquantifiable presence below the surface of the water. The arbitrary nature of the attack on Newcastle combined with so many shells not exploding provides sufficient evidence that the attacks were designed to put fear into the Australian communities. (Kerrigan, Journal: 15 August, 2006)

On reflection, the latter of the two meetings helped me to put into perspective the national significance of the Japanese submarine attack on Newcastle. There were no fatalities as a result of the Newcastle attack but coastal blackouts were enforced in Newcastle and Sydney from that time. Fort Scratchley’s guns were manned twenty-four hours a day. The Japanese therefore achieved their aim, which as suggested by Perryman was to put fear into the hearts and minds of Australians. What was important for me to understand was that an event that is regarded as so significant to Newcastle’s history and key to the mythology of its wartime effort, is in fact, seen as trivial by the gatekeepers of national military history.

Understanding the attitudes held by Stanley and Perryman helped me to put into perspective the enthusiastic attitudes that I had been exposed to through interactions with the members of the FSHS. Though it took some time for me to fully understand the reservations of the expert authority figures, the main outcome was that I felt the documentary would be stronger if it took a more community oriented approach, instead of
one that solely concentrated on the military legacy generated from the night the Fort responded to the attack by the Japanese submarine.

As part of my research, I also visited Sydney’s Powerhouse Museum to find out how field experts create audio/visual (A/V) oral history exhibitions and installations. The Museum hosted my 3-day visit and Assistant Curator, Anni Turnbull who is an oral history installation specialist, prepared a schedule that gave me a deeper insight into the practices of A/V museum curators.

I had prepared a three-page brief to present to the curators at the Powerhouse of my ideas on how to package Fort Scratchley’s oral histories at the site (see Appendix F - AV Installation Plan Fort Scratchley). The brief included notes on the oral history content and an aerial photograph of the site illustrating where it may be possible to display DVDs and the content of each segment. There are no journal entries detailing their feedback from this three page DVD installation proposal. However, I remember being embarrassed about it after I had viewed the installations situated at the Powerhouse Museum.

The key word used at the Powerhouse was ‘interpretation’ which was so well used that it often was shortened to ‘interp’ by the Museum’s curators and designers. Each exhibition used multiple techniques specifically designed to get individuals to interact with cultural artefacts. It was the curator’s and designer’s interpretation and layout of these artefacts, which was unique. Artefacts included photographs, paintings, caption cards, graphic/visual displays and edited oral history interviews. Basically, any exhibition device was used to engage the museum visitors in the interpreted content. Of particular interest to me was the way the Powerhouse practitioners packaged their oral history interviews. All the interviews followed a similar format edited into 3-7 minute segments where the interview questions were cut out and replaced with text on screen, and most importantly, they were free of a narrator:

I’m starting to really see how the different media, and distribution methods and audiences affect the way the story is told. Oral History exhibitions are extremely against using narrators, as they feel that it is a restricting and enforcing voice. And maybe for oral history installations that may be the case but for a documentary I feel that it is really important for someone to be leading the viewer in and out of the story. To not have a narrator on a 50 minute doco which is about the transformation of site would be extremely difficult. (Kerrigan, Journal: 26 July 2006)

By way of showing the quality of the content from Fort Scratchley’s oral histories, I had prepared some short oral history interviews to show at a work in progress session. These clips were very roughly prepared and I made a few embarrassing mistakes when
screening the clips for the Powerhouse staff. Primarily, I did not clearly explain the context of the interviews. Here are my reflections from that day:

The first two people I spoke with were A/V people, and I was quite keen to show off my oral history content that I jumped right in there without setting up the material. One of the Powerhouse staff got very cranky because she had no idea what context the interview was coming from. Unfortunately this meant that we stopped Jim Cannon’s story, and they didn’t get to hear it. This was totally my fault. I knew that I had to set up his story, and I didn’t do that. So what resulted was a lot of criticism about how to locate the viewer first. These things I already know, so I felt that I made a very bad impression of my knowledge base. (Kerrigan, Journal: 25 July 2006)

What I realised from this experience was that each field expert has different criteria that they use when critiquing or judging work:

…the level of unacceptability varies from person to person. It is as if there is a ‘technically correct’ way to deliver content and if the content is not delivered to these perceived ‘technically correct’ specifications it is immediately judged as unworthy. This judgment appears to prevent the field expert from actually assessing the value of the content in any way whereas a more general audience is technically naive, or ignorant and does not possess the knowledge or skills to technically judge the material they are looking at. Therefore if they can see it and hear it, they are not frustrated with the material and will immediately move into their [audience mode of] field expert [and begin to] judge the content. (Kerrigan, Journal: 25 July 2006)

This journal entry shows my developing awareness of field criteria as a researcher/practitioner and the importance, when working as a practitioner, to be able to pitch ideas correctly. The opportunity to present my ideas more appropriately to four of the Museum’s curators did eventuate and their particular insights from different areas of expertise and interests were beneficial:

The curators’ feedback motivated me to make changes to the initial concept and design of my creative works, in order to exploit my own creative skills as a documentary producer/writer/director… [and also] affirmed the richness of the Fort Scratchley content that I was working with. (Kerrigan, Journal: 26 February 2007)

The Powerhouse visit encouraged me to consider a whole range of forms used to package oral histories as screen-based stories:

My mind keeps coming back to the format versatility embedded in this project. This excites me greatly. At this stage there is a potential documentary (25 minutes), A/V installations at the site, 2 alternative Podcast tours of the site (one military, one cultural), an online interactive website containing the oral history A/Vs and the podcast tours of the site, + photos and text/documents of the site. There is so much material here. It is huge. How to best shape this material into a project that works best for the stories is what is driving me, and finding the money to deliver the
media in the highest quality is essential. This project is getting out of hand!!!! (Kerrigan, Journal: 28 July, 2006)

Oral history curator, Anni Turnbull, showed me how she had given her oral history installations a second life through the web. This seemed like a workable idea for my project for the specific reasons that I’ve documented here in my journal:

The online component was conceived to increase the accessibility and audience range of the oral history interviews, photos and animation that has been created and are contained in Using Fort Scratchley. (Kerrigan, Journal: 27 February 2007)

There were two main options to consider. Previously, I had realised that the Fort Scratchley site contained a lot of knowledge that could be easily interpreted by site visitors walking around the site, so my real challenge with creating an AV installation at the Fort was to find a way to package the videos onsite to maximise the connection between these precise locations where the history unfolded and the re-telling of the historical event through video screened in situ. While this was an attractive idea, which cemented the ‘living history’ research methodology it was difficult to entertain the eventuality of this idea without first considering the increase in production costs incurred by permanently mounting an audio visual installation at Fort Scratchley. At this stage in the project, 2006, it was anticipated that a successful ARC Linkage grant could supply the appropriate funding for a permanent A/V installation. Furthermore, NCC had suggested in their initial brief that the completed videos may be shown on site. Accommodating the onsite screening of small sections of video would require precise storytelling that could locate the video and the viewers in those precise locations. Whereas the delivery of an online website had other benefits; it would not require the documentary to accommodate specific places of screening, so a more generic documentary narrative would work. The website could be used as a pre-site or post-site tool to explain the complexity of the site’s history. Therefore, the generic ‘screening locations’ embedded in both a video documentary and components of that broken down for online viewing, from a production point of view would be easier to construct.

While the Powerhouse visit should have solidified the benefits of preparing on-site A/V installation, it had done the opposite. It confirmed the amount of work and additional cost of housing an installation at Fort Scratchley. The benefits of re-working the video documentary’s rich media and video material for a website thus became my preference.

Over the first twenty-one months of the project I had immersed myself in the domain of Fort Scratchley and low budget documentary production. The development of my technical skills meant I was now competent with operating equipment and multi-skilling, multi-tasking multiple crew roles. The acquisition of historical knowledge that placed Fort
Scratchley's history within the broader development of Australian military history meant I was now able to draw my own conclusions about what information should be included in the documentary. Finally, by immersing myself in museum exhibition culture I was able to consider expanding the delivery platforms of the Fort Scratchley content. Overall, the knowledge I had gained during this period informed the next stage of creative practice; shaping the history of Fort Scratchley into two cross-platform documentary narratives.

The domain acquisition stage, also known as the preparatory stage of my creative documentary process, changed as I began to incubate the domain knowledge I had acquired. The phase where I actively gathered a wide range of perspectives from the historical, military and documentary domains was coming to an end, as I began to consider the best way to organise this knowledge into the documentary form. At this point I started to evaluate ideas and implement them using ‘convergent thinking techniques’:

 Whereas divergent thinking promotes the generation and sharing of as many different ideas and options as possible, convergent thinking allow groups to select among the available options and to put these ideas into practice (Milliken, 2003: 35).

The incubation of all this knowledge, that is the newly acquired knowledge that was becoming internalised by me led to the next creative process phase of illumination, as discussed in relation to the ideas of Wallas (1976) in Chapter 2. It is important to note however, that this overall preparatory phase of domain acquisition did not sit in exclusive isolation from the subsequent phases of documentary production as, from time to time, and as my practice dictated, more domain knowledge was acquired. This process of knowledge mediation will be examined in the following section through an analysis that supports the self-generating nature of my creative documentary practice.
5.2 - The Individual

The analysis below utilizes observations of my own documentary experience by drawing on the idea that a practitioner’s creative work is simultaneously undertaken from an internal intuitive level and also from an external collaborative level. The documentary practitioner's role in shaping and interpreting the documentary narrative is at the heart of documentary creativity. In this respect, Corner argues that ‘[d]ocumentary is authorial in that it is about creativity and transformation based on vision’ (1996: 14), while Kilborn and Izod assert that the two components of documentary production are actuality and creativity:

It is the relationship between the selection and filming/recording of actuality material and its transformation into a skillfully crafted artifact that lies at the heart of the whole documentary enterprise. (Kilborn & Izod, 1997: 12-13)

With these ideas in mind this section will discuss the decisions made in regard to the structuring and shaping of the video documentary, which primarily occurred during a 6-month study leave period from June to December 2006. This was followed by another 6-month block of study leave from January to June 2007. Table 4 shows the identifiable outcomes from both periods of study leave, with the first row showing the anticipated completion of a short documentary by December 2006, and the scripting for the online/website documentary also scheduled to occur in that month. The production of the online documentary was anticipated to commence in January 2007, and be completed by June of that year.

Table 4 - Equity Research Fellowship Timeline, 10 August 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PhD Creative Work (20 minutes)</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Production Phase</th>
<th>Completion dates</th>
<th>RHD program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short Documentary</td>
<td>A linear narrative for International Documentary Film Festivals</td>
<td>Script, Filming &amp; Editing</td>
<td>Dec-06</td>
<td>Ospro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Documentary</td>
<td>An interactive online narrative presented in themed sections</td>
<td>Draft Script</td>
<td>Dec-06</td>
<td>Ospro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exegesis (approx 30 000 words)</td>
<td>Practitioner Based Enquiry data analysis of my creative process</td>
<td>Draft Exegesis of Reflective Learning Journal and analysis of media products</td>
<td>June - 07</td>
<td>Equity Research Grant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though these deadlines were more realistic than those projected through ‘The Living History of Fort Scratchley projected timeline’ (see Table 2, page 31), some obstacles prevented me from meeting these precise timeframes. The details of each of these
obstacles will be examined below using creativity theories to explain the impact of creative practice on the production’s progress.

For the purposes of this analysis this discussion is broken into two. The first section analyses my individual documentary practice from the perspective of a documentary writer/director, including an analysis of the conceptualisation and shaping of Fort Scratchley history into a factual narrative. The second section looks at the interactions and collaborative practices, how these conceptual ideas were filtered through the production process and eventually realised in collaboration with the documentary crew. Both sections consider the details of my own documentary practice by highlighting my concerns, deliberations, decisions and achievements as I have documented them in the learning journal. In order to achieve this aim, it is important to examine more general understandings of practice to see how they align with the theories of tacit knowledge and reflective practice discussed in the literature from Chapter 2.

The noun practice is defined as follows:

1. habitual or customary performance: normal business practice; 2. a habit or custom, 3. repeated performance of systematic exercise for the purpose of acquiring skill or proficiency: practice makes perfect, 4. skills gained by experience or exercise. (Macquarie Dictionary, 2006: 951)

This definition describes discrete moments of human repetition where established methods or processes can be discerned. As previously explained through an outline of the work of Polanyi, repeated practice can be explained through two forms. These include the practical and the intellectual which ‘are always found combined to some extent and are sometimes found combined equally’ (Polanyi, 1962: 604). The action of practicing describes the moment an individual is engaged in practice, also explained by Schön as ‘knowing in action’, where a practitioner is able to use their existing skills knowingly as they engage in repeated practice. The adjectives, self-generating and generative (Csikszentmihalyi 1988) have been used as part of the headers for this analysis. Self-generating will be used to describe the self-perpetuating nature of practice where the term ‘generative’, which is defined as ‘relating to the production of offspring’ (Macquarie Dictionary, 2006: 494), will be used in conjunction with output of a group of individuals.

While the analysis of Domain details examples of how I went about acquiring and internalizing the domain knowledge necessary to make these documentaries, the purpose of the forthcoming discussion is to identify how that knowledge was generatively used to shape and interpret the Fort Scratchley documentary narrative during my creative practice.
5.2.1 - Self Generating Creative Documentary Practice

The notion of *self generating creative documentary practice* is intended to emphasis the depth of practice that was engaged in by me and my ability to anticipate action, thereby explaining the documentary practitioner’s proactive calculations, which instantaneously occur during moments of iterative and recursive documentary production practice.

Identifying the narrative concept of the video documentary took about two years. While it may now seem inevitable that I would produce a military-themed documentary, I was consciously striving to broaden the understanding of Fort Scratchley’s history by drawing on multiple communal histories. It took three years for me to draft a short synopsis of the video documentary narrative. Though quite wordy and still maintaining a military focus this synopsis highlighted some of the communities who had used the site:

**Documentary Synopsis:**

Fort Scratchley, a Newcastle Military installation was closed in 1972. The Newcastle Harbour and Industry, which was the target of a WW2, Japanese shelling campaign, no longer required the sort of labour intensive protection that Fort Scratchley offered. Military defence tactics used to shield the Australian Coastline had changed rapidly through the 20th Century, and the missile arms race re-directed Australia’s military energies, and resulted in the closure of unsustainable installations like Fort Scratchley.

The highlight of Fort Scratchley’s military career occurred on the 8th of June 1942, when its two six inch guns returned fire on the I-21, a Japanese Submarine. The enemy fired 25 rounds on Newcastle. Interviews with soldiers who served at the Fort from 1942 through to 1972, provide engaging and colourful stories of military and family life at the Fort. They reveal that it was more than a military establishment; it was a place to be proud of.

Though this prime piece of inner city Newcastle real estate has been virtually empty since 1972, the federal government is now funding a $5.5 million dollar refurbishment of the site. This documentary intertwines oral history stories and historical research into the site usages; Aboriginal, convict, coalmining, maritime and artistic communities, in order to illustrate the cultural significance of the place and what it means to the individuals and communities who have become sentimentally attached to Fort Scratchley. (Kerrigan, Journal: 15 September 2007)

As evidenced in this synopsis, ideas on the significance of place, meaning of place and community worth were beginning to emerge as sustainable themes which would eventually provide the documentary with its subtle argument. Running in parallel with my struggle to confirm a sustainable narrative approach to the documentary was my inability to commit to a fixed duration for the documentaries. This above synopsis, drafted in 2007, was for one, forty-five minute film (Kerrigan, Journal: 15 September 2007). But in 2004 I was creating two fifteen minute films. In 2005, I had extended these films to twenty
minutes in length in order to comply with Australian Academic Research Publication Criteria (Kerrigan, 2006b: 10)\textsuperscript{11}.

Needless to say one of the documentary ‘Executive Producers’ had become concerned at what appeared to be my apparent disregard for duration. Having tried to raise their concerns about how the changing film length was an indication that I did not really understand where I was going with the documentary, the Executive Producer asked:

… once again asked about the duration of the doco, and what my target duration would be. I was vague, because I don’t want to be pinned down on this, at the moment. [The Executive Producer] is really concerned that I don’t know where I’m going, but I’m not. Duration is something that I’ve paid attention to constantly. When I know where the program is going, then I’ll know how long it will be and a cracking 20 minuter will be far better than a slow 45 minute. And as I realised after my conversation with [an industry documentary gatekeeper], I don’t need to be constrained by anyone’s format except the story itself. That will let me know how long it needs to be, and I have implicit trust in my tacit ability to judge that when the time is right. (Kerrigan, Journal: 20 September 2006)

These comments reflect what turned out to be my misguided confidence in my intuitive understanding of program duration and my ability to manage program duration. Perhaps too much prior experience calculating program durations for television production had made me over confident in regard to duration. In previous professional production roles it had been my responsibility to calculate the estimated running duration of a drama program which was partially shot and unedited. Consequently, I believed that my skills for estimating, monitoring and manipulating a program’s duration were reliably ‘second nature’ and that I could trust that honed intuition. Eventually I realised that avoiding being pinned down on documentary length actually highlighted my underlying lack of skill at constructing a factual narrative and I was indeed struggling to find the most appropriate way to tell Fort Scratchley’s stories.

Three years of planning afforded me time to consider many different narrative approaches. However, in order to keep the project within the brief I had identified a list of essential criteria that the funding body, which was also the client, was expecting to see in the final documentaries:

1. Oral history interviews were to provide the main source of material for the documentary.

2. Provide an historical explanation of the significance of the Fort Scratchley site.

\textsuperscript{11} According to Australian Research Council Classifications called DEST, a work of at least 20 minutes duration can be classified as a ‘A Major Recorded Original Creative Work that is publicly and commercially distributed (University of Newcastle, 2002: online).
3. Visually document the restoration of the site.

Another factor that continued to affect the narrative was the possibility that segments of the documentary might be displayed on site. My concern was that a poorly structured segment would not hold a site visitor’s attention and would be worthless. A research study looking at museum videos and visitor time spent watching them confirmed about a third of museum visitors are attracted to videos, and that their videos may hold their attention for up to two minutes and twenty seconds (Serrell, 2002: 50-64). Serrell’s research confirmed for me that an on-site video is a useful device, like a pamphlet or signage and when used appropriately and in moderation can be effective. Influenced by this research I decided to try and restrict the length of video segments to two minutes.

The challenge for me will be to keep conceptual or historical information packaged within two minutes to allow viewers to engage with the material while not overburdening them with information and facts. (Kerrigan, 2006b: 10)

The underlying reason for this decision was that should the funding come through to pay for screens to be installed on-site, then it would be easier to break down the documentary into sections for site installation. I also realised that I may be able to use the restoration process as a way of achieving site interaction.

For example, a segment may show pre-restoration footage, which emphasised the state of disrepair of some areas of the site, followed by some footage showing the construction work undertaken on that area:

Presenting the site visitor with only one or two thirds of the narrative would potentially motivate them to investigate the site and discover what had been completed during the refurbishment process. In theoretical terms, the resolution of the documentary video narrative would be part of the interactive experience of the site visitor. (Kerrigan, 2006b: 11)

By juxtaposing these two visuals I hoped that a visitor would be motivated to go and find that space and see how the restoration had turned out. In effect the third act would not exist in the video but in the visitor’s experience of site exploration. Unfortunately, because of issues with the funding of the restoration it was not possible to film any site restoration activities until 2008, so this idea was shelved while I continued filming FSHS site maintenance activities and oral history interviews.

The recording of eight oral history interviews was carried out across two sessions in June and December 2005. The interviewees were a mixture of males and females who recounted personal stories from their Fort Scratchley experiences. Half of these interviews were with former Army personnel who had served at the Fort during World War 2 while the four other interviews were with FSHS members who had served at the Fort as Army Volunteers during the 1950’s through to the Fort’s military shut down in 1972. These
interviews were recorded with two cameras, and given the technical errors that had occurred in the camera work during these recordings were difficult to use. Previously I had conducted the interviews but this time an ex-TV journalist and historical research assistant on the project, Julie McIntyre conducted them:

The first day, the interviews were more superficial, but the second day I felt that we captured some really personal feelings from these men. Jimmy James’ interview would have to be a highlight. Jim Cannon was able to give us his version of events on the night of 8th of June. Overall I feel that I will be able to develop a complex story with human depth, and emotion. Some of the tales were told a number of times, the tale of ‘fluffy the sheep’ being one of them. (Kerrigan, Journal: 1 July 2005)

The second block of recorded interviews were with two women who were stationed at Fort Scratchley during World War 2, Marie Kildney and Ildyce Pike. They had richly detailed stories to tell about being housed at Fort Scratchley, stationed on Nobby’s Head Search Light post and undertaking rifle training on Nobby’s Beach (Kerrigan, Journal: 2 December 2005).

These richly detailed oral histories again reinforced the military dominant history of the site with the most dramatic stories focusing on World War 2. I was anticipating that these interviews would provide specific stories that could be connected to existing Fort Scratchley buildings and structures. However, at the same time I was also becoming aware of the need to balance the benefit of connecting personal military histories with landmarks, in the sense that too many military stories would demonstrate a bias for military site histories. My journal entries show that I was considering the best way to lay out a narrative that took a non-military approach:

I want the site to be the [main] character and I want to tell a story about its development. I was wondering if I could get the site’s timeline to resemble the three-act structure. (Kerrigan, Journal: 31 July 2006)

The narrative elements I was considering were laid out in an Excel file (Kerrigan, Journal: 13 September 2006) where these historical stories were broken into three crude dramatic-acts (Figure 10, page 77). My main concern was that the scope was too narrow in that these historical segments and oral histories represented less than one hundred years of the Fort’s military history. Broadening the scope of the documentary was therefore necessary. I considered taking a critical approach to the politics of historical site maintenance, so the section titled ‘Community Fights Back’ would detail the struggle that volunteer groups and the NCC had in maintaining the Fort’s buildings from 1972 up until its restoration. Unfortunately, this argument was not sustainable given that the Federal Government had already given $5.5 million to refurbish the Fort and would eventually supply another $4 million to completely refurbish the site.
Another option under consideration was to find a ‘character’ and use this person to tell the story of Fort Scratchley. FSHS President Bill Hopkins was considered because he presented very well on camera and was well supported by the society. My concern, however, was expressed as follows:

I don’t think that I’ll have enough intimate footage with Bill, and what I would need to see would be some greater crisis emerge with the failure of the restoration project, before Bill’s story could provide a narrative with high hopes, aspirations and bitter disappointment.

The other option is to carve out a narrative which illustrates why these men love their guns. The main overriding theme here is about “guns”. Given our society’s current obsession with guns, I think that this angle would work very well, but I don’t want a man to present the story. I’d like a female, as I want the main question to be, why are men so passionate about guns? (Kerrigan, Journal: 22 August 2006)

During 2006 I became consumed with which conceptual approach to take and whether or not the documentary should have a presenter or a narrator. These options were discussed with one of the Executive Producers:

I am contemplating. 1. Female presenter, who is also the narrator, acts in the rifle re-enactment training on the beach. 2. Two presenters, male & female, starting with Japanese attack. 3. No presenters, but using a website interface to navigate through the various themed sections. 4. No presenters but a narrator guiding us through the FS narrative. (Kerrigan, Journal: 28 August 2006)

In addition to making a decision about either a presenter or a narrator, I had to find a non-didactic way to include the Australian government’s recognition of the cultural significance...
of the site. In the Fort Scratchley booklet written in parallel with the documentary production, the historical and heritage value of the Fort was noted on the first page of text:

The site is on the Commonwealth Heritage List, included on the State Heritage Register as part of the Coal River precinct, and was dedicated to all past and current service personnel by the Prime Minister, Mr John Howard, in June 2002. (McIntyre & Eklund, 2008: 4)

Formally listing the government’s recognition of the site, I felt would interfere with the personalised tone that I hoped the documentary would embody. So I decided to avoid mentioning the site’s heritage listing given that it was included in the booklet. Instead, I focused on the narrative capturing the meaning of place by showing the faces and hearing the voices of those who respected and understood the site. Theoretically, the oral history stories should be powerful enough to reflect the cultural and heritage status of the Fort. I was certain that the military oral histories would be sufficient but how could I use the same technique to tell the story of the Awabakal? One option was to use Awabakal narration\(^\text{12}\) as a storytelling device to begin the documentary; ‘… if this land could speak it would sound like these words and the stories it could tell would be these….’(Kerrigan, Journal: 26 July 2006). While it was considered, this narration was never used. I was concerned that it may be tokenistic to begin a story about a Fort with an indigenous emphasis. Instead I interviewed Professor John Maynard from the UoN. He explained the Awabakal usage of the site with the dignity and respect that the content required (Using Fort Scratchley, 2008; from minutes 14.54; Fort Scratchley a Living History, 2008: date 1818).

From 2004 to 2007 I considered many narrative devices for possible use in the linear documentary. This demonstrated that I was deeply immersed in incubating relevant domain knowledge that would eventually contribute to my creative documentary decision making process. However, at times it felt like I was going round in circles and moving in slow motion. From the projects inception it was ‘in-production’ and I felt like I had not had enough time to work out the ‘key message’ of the documentary. Perhaps my inexperience with the documentary form was beginning to be exposed or the parallel tasks of conceptual development colliding with filming and editing hindered my ability to make decisions. In this regard documentary theorists argue that the approach to scripting a documentary depends on the nature of the film:

> [w]hatever the strategy factual content requires thorough research, for this underwrites form in all cases. Here, there should be no short cuts; the filmmaker needs to conquer the relevant information, whatever the style of film. (Chapman, 2006: 53)

\(^{12}\) Though the Awabakal language was lost decades ago, anthropological records from 1834 created by Reverend Threlkeld have been used to re-introduce the language to Aboriginal school children in Newcastle.
Certainly, I was keeping my options open and this uncertainty made me anxious and my moods fluctuated. My way of dealing with anxiety was to make a ‘to-do list’. List-making had become part of my process and the act of writing the list or discussing options with others helped me to make decisions and to refocus my anxiety so that a concrete outcome, even a small one, could be achieved and my progress could be marked:

Whenever I feel anxious I make a list. Somehow the making of a list reassures me that I haven’t forgotten anything. And it makes me feel like I’ve got all that I need and then I can methodologically go through and gather together all the things on the list. The gathering of the material is generally quite mundane but it is the methodical collection of that material that is reassuring and its predictability represents a safe place to be, a safe task to undertake that generally isn’t overwhelming and demanding. But that does depend on what the task is and how skilled you are in achieving the outcomes. (Kerrigan, Journal: 18 September 2006)

Items on the list included work on small achievable tasks like transcribing oral history interviews. Interview transcription, though laborious, was extremely valuable in my experience because it triggered thoughts about how each oral history story could fit into the overall narrative. As my learning journal details, periods of interview transcription were followed by work on the narrative structure:

So yesterday I spent some time transcribing Carl’s interview. I finished Jimmy’s interview. Then I looked at the narrative structure, and drafted that again. It’s up to its third draft, so in about 15 hours I’ve moved through a few drafts. I’m saving each iteration so that I can track my progression which should demonstrate the iterative nature of the process and how working on small sections, and returning to fix up the problem areas, helps to build the project as a whole. (Kerrigan, Journal: 5 September 2006)

The building of the linear documentary narrative occurred through my working and reworking the editorial content including the recording interviews, transcribing interviews, interactions with field experts and visits to the site itself, drafting of the sub-story paper edits and reviewing and feeding back my opinion on rough vision edits with the documentary editor, an Honours student who had been engaged in that task. All these tasks were simultaneously occurring while the narrative plan was being drafted and constantly updated. This demonstrates the multi-skilling and multi-tasking roles that I was engaged in as documentary writer/producer/director, camera operator, audio recordist, and production manager.

As there was only myself undertaking multiple crew roles, critical discussion of documentary content that would have taken place had there been multiple individuals in those roles actually manifested itself as personal critical thought processes that were
instead evidenced through the learning journal entries and the multiple drafting of production documents.

While a complete script was never written for the documentary, editing scripts for the oral histories and narration scripts were written in the post-production stage (see Appendix G - Example Documentary edit script). The overall narrative structure was managed through an Excel document which laid out documentary segments, oral history dramatisations, archival footage and photographs (Figures 11 & 12). These Excel spreadsheets worked as a planning document and provided a way of keeping track of what had been edited. The pale blue rectangles identify which of the sub-stories had been rough cut by the editor. Five drafts of the paper narrative were produced and each draft increased the level of detail and number of segmented items. My reliance on the 3-act structure is also significant in that it provided a framework to sort the sub-stories into acts so that the acts could be developed into logical sections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative Draft 4b</th>
<th>October 19, 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Histories</td>
<td>Dramatisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Fires on Sub</td>
<td>JAPANESE ATTACK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PACKAGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson’s story,</td>
<td>NARRATOR TO V/O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risby’s story,</td>
<td>SCRATCHLEY &amp; JERVOIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura’s story,</td>
<td>Feared an Attack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beubri Story</td>
<td>(Russian,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>French, anyone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPANESE SUMMARINE</td>
<td>1870 Red Coats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPAGINE</td>
<td>Leave, Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Militia Protect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the land &amp; the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration hopes</td>
<td>Closing ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic: June 2005, 10 months later</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Restoration hopes</td>
<td>Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic: Anzac Day, 2006, another 10 months later.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>Bill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close the fort and Ownership</td>
<td>Carl &amp; Newspaper articles about site’s future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic: Peace Time Gun Training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramming Shells 2, Dummy loader, training, segue to WWII</td>
<td>Carl/Jimmy ends with Jim Cannon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic: World War 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11 - 'Narrative Draft 4b' worksheet from 'Narrative Structure 19 October 2006' excel file
This intensely introspective and reflective work demonstrates how I creatively intervened throughout the stages of production which, in turn, enabled me to reflectively internalise the narrative I was constructing. The consuming nature of this documentary practice was
exacerbated by my multiple crew roles. As I was experiencing the effects of collapsing multiple technical and editorial crew roles I was also experiencing the collapsing of the staged creative process where preparation, incubation and illumination phases began to collapse into the one intuitive phase. The condensing and embodiment of my skills across a number of crew roles, both technical and editorial, confirms for me Bastick’s understanding of intuition which argues that intuition occurs through the collapsing of the first three stages of Wallas’ four phased creative process (1982: 310-311). By identifying the collapsing of these three stages into one stage, I realised I was experiencing my own single intuitive stage of creative documentary practice.

As a screen practitioner I recognised the recurrence of predictable and familiar screen production patterns. Recognition of these structured processes was in itself reassuring and enabled me to continue to explore the options of documentary construction and selection. This familiar, repetitious cycling of the screen production process is an example, for me, of the description of the ‘second nature’ sensations identified through Bourdieu’s habitus (McIntyre, 2003: 42). Irrespective of the reassurances gained via the experiences that had become ‘second nature’ to me, feelings of anxiety were still recorded in the learning journal particularly in regard to the shaping of the narrative. Even though there is evidence to suggest that the narrative construction was progressing well I did not have confidence in my processes at this stage and, consequently, my anxiety levels continued to rise:

Did a lot of work yesterday on the narrative. Unfortunately it just made me more anxious about how slowly the narrative is developing, and how difficult it is becoming to find a through line. (Kerrigan, Journal: 3 October 2006)

These feelings of uncertainty and anxiety continued from time to time, right through to the delivery of the video master edit. The various emotional states that occur with fluctuating practitioner skill levels is associated with the concept of ‘Flow’ (Csikszentmihalyi & Csikszentmihalyi, 1992). When an individual is acquiring skills it is possible that they may be working below the level of the challenge causing their levels of anxiety to rise in regards to task completion (see Figure 13, page 83). As Csikszentmihalyi argues, flow or ‘optimal experience requires a balance between the challenges perceived in a given situation and the skills a person brings to it’ (Csikszentmihalyi & Csikszentmihalyi, 1992: 30). If the individual’s skill meets the level of challenge, a flow state may result, where the individual ‘will produce a sense of exhilaration, energy, and fulfilment that is more enjoyable than what people feel in the normal course of life’ (Csikszentmihalyi & Csikszentmihalyi, 1992: 29).
Other emotions have been identified as part of the flow experience (see Appendix H – Flow Chart). Furthermore, Nakamura and Csikszentmihalyi argue that

\[\text{I}\text{[s]taying in flow requires that attention be held by this limited stimulus field. Apathy, boredom and anxiety, like flow, are largely functions of how attention is being structured at a given time. (2002: 92, original emphasis)\]}

Therefore as indicated in Figure 13, the ‘flow channel’ represented in the diagram is the ‘sweet spot’ where an individual’s level of skill meets the level of challenge. However, it is also possible for an individual to experience anxiety when the level of challenge exceeds their level of skill.

\[\text{I}[n\text{ anxiety, perceived challenges exceed capacities. Particularly in context of extrinsic motivation, attention shifts to the self and its shortcoming, creating a self-consciousness that impedes engagement of the challenges (Nakamura & Csikszentmihalyi, 2002: 92).\]

My fluctuating states of anxiety appear to be well documented in my journal. These anxious moments contributed to a lack of confidence in my documentary skills and abilities. However, my reflective journal also provides evidence of the improvement of my skills as I documented the predictable, repetitious and cyclical documentary process that was engaged in as I gathered the site histories from five communities. Sometime I found these processes to be enjoyable and effortless while other times I found the processes difficult to accomplish resulting in a range of negative emotions, apathy, boredom and anxiety. After two years work on the project I noted a recognisable change in my anxiety levels:
... the anxiety had dissipated, and I felt confident that I knew where I needed to head next and the velocity which I need [to maintain] in order to complete the project before Christmas ... you gather oral history stories, and you look at them, and you try and work out what the story thread is that can be used to present this story through a screen based medium. Then as the project progresses, you begin to seek out interviews that satisfy a part of the story that needs to be explained. So the interviews become more specific and more selective. (Kerrigan, Journal: 10 November 2006)

Continued work on gathering the details required to complete production tasks, I found, helped to reduce my anxiety. When the anxiety reduced I found that my confidence in my process and abilities increased even when I was unsure of the actual outcomes of those production tasks that were still waiting to be completed. What this experience highlights is that the familiar and predictable staged production processing actually renewed my confidence in my documentary production abilities and therefore the experiencing of a range of emotions has to be seen as a normal part of a creative experience. This analysis of my fluctuating emotional levels, therefore, provides a useful insight into this aspect of my creative practice, particularly when mapped holistically against the development of my skills across the entire project.

In line with these observations, flow theory suggests that in order to continue experiencing flow the individual must ‘identify and engage [with] progressively more complex challenges’ (Nakamura & Csikszentmihalyi, 2002:92), this in turn resulting in the extension of existing skills and leads to ‘a more complex set of capacities for action’ (Nakamura & Csikszentmihalyi, 2002:92). Therefore the two Flow diagrams (Figure 13 & Appendix H) are useful for practitioners as they provide conceptual maps that illustrate the range of emotional responses that may arise during the execution of skills relative to the challenge they face. These observations of my relative skill, challenge and emotional experiences confirm that improvement of my skills was relative to those challenges and, looked at optimistically, moments of anxiety confirmed that necessary skills were being mastered and these skill would later help me to meet the increasing challenges of current and future productions.

In addition, my experiences of these stages of documentary processing became more and more iterative and recursive as the project progressed. Consequently my developing familiarity of these documentary processes in turn increased the predictability of them. The number of times that an element of the narrative had to cycle through its own revision, edit and review process is relative to my own practitioner’s immersion in content and skills at executing the media process. In effect, when one undertakes these cycles of screen processing individually, as was done in this instance, it makes the total experience of selection, construction and manipulation of the video material appear as one
interrelated and self-perpetuating stage of practice. This can give an appearance of a complete and fluid documentary screen practice which occurred because of the multi-skilling and multi-tasking aspects of current production methods used in this study. Furthermore, this situation contributes to a perception that the screen processes themselves create their own momentum. Indeed they do, but that momentum is only recognised by the agency of the practitioner’s engagement in the task. What I experienced as a practitioner was a self-generating context of documentary screen practice that was only possible because of my immersion in the content of the domain and field of Fort Scratchley and the skills, practices and process of the domain and field of the documentary discipline.

Therefore, it can be argued that my individual experiences in my Fort Scratchley documentary practice have identified the existence of structuration, that is, the intimate relationship between agency and structure set out by Giddens. Moments where structuration occurs are identified in my documentary practice when the documentary structures and the choices of action available to me are contextualised by that moment and, in turn, generated further actions on my part. These moments of structuration will now be referred to as the generative nature of practice. In support of this idea this section has evidenced how my internalised decision-making processes were applied to my documentary practice. By analysing these observations of my own practice, the importance of completing somewhat menial and boring tasks, like transcribing interviews, as providing foundational information that contributed to the selection and construction of the documentary narrative, has been exposed. Further analysis will connect the construction of the linear narrative to the effortless construction of the online narrative. These observations allowed me to identify the self-sustaining and self-generating aspects exhibited by myself, through practice-specific engagement and behavior, therefore demonstrating my creative documentary process by exposing my intellectual and physical engagement in a self-perpetuating and self-generating practice. The section below documents the experiences and accomplishments of the documentary field members who worked on this documentary project.

5.2.2 - Generative Collaborative Documentary Practice

The discussion below provides some insights into my collaborative experiences through shooting, editing and animation production phases of the Fort Scratchley project. My growing awareness of the diversity of skills that had been informally assembled for this project were recorded in a journal entry from 2006, where I identified three groups of specialists who brought their own knowledge of content and form to the project.
1. Content Specialists – Historians, Military experts, Historical Society
2. Technical Specialists – University employed Technical Officers
3. Practitioner – me
4. Distribution Experts – ABC, Film Festivals, Grant and funding bodies


The identification of these research influenced practitioner defined ‘fields’, reflect some of the domains and sub-domains previously noted as being important to this study. These grouping also highlight attempts to convince myself that it would be possible to complete the project without having to bring in more specialised expertise.

Scholars investigating Group Creativity identify three main aspects of group functioning: group members, group processes, and group context (Nijstad & Paulus, 2003: 332). The functioning of the Fort Scratchley documentary crew will be analysed according to these three aspects, prefaced by an explanation of how the twenty-member crew for the video production came to be assembled.

Descriptions of crew members' skill levels, observations of the implementation of the production plan, and the success with which various crew members dealt with obstacles that impeded production progress will be explored using my journal observations and first-hand accounts from some crew member experiences, i.e. email correspondences, and in one instance an Honours exegesis written by the documentary’s editor Kathryn Freeman. Sourcing primary and secondary data in this way will verify the constraining and enabling factors of the generative collaborative Fort Scratchley documentary production context.

The research imperative of this project meant that the documentary production context was connected to the University of Newcastle’s educational environment. Fortunately, this also meant that the University provided office and editing facilities as well as some video equipment resources. Furthermore, many of the documentary crew were recruited from the University’s pool of students, tutors, technical staff and academics while other skills were secured through my own industry contacts. Table 5, (page 87) lists the twenty people who worked across a number of crew roles and positions and who provided various editorial and production skills on the video component of the documentary.

Thirteen of these people had never worked on a documentary before. Therefore, the time taken to increase group member's resources, that is screen craft skills and collaborative documentary practices, was an obstacle that needed to be overcome for the group to reach its productive potential. In this regard group creativity theorists Bernard Nijstad, and Paul Paulus argue that ‘[g]roup members bring knowledge skills and abilities to the group, without which the group tasks cannot be accomplished and group creativity would not be possible’ (2003: 326-327).
It is important to also note that individual skills have been described as being creative when a unique or valuable product or process is recognised as coming from ‘a set of antecedent conditions through the conditioned agency of someone’ (McIntyre, P. 2006: 2). Though Nijstad and Paulus use different language they are in fact arguing along similar lines to McIntyre when they highlight the creative contributions that individuals can make to group work.

The first to ‘join’ the documentary crew were my two doctoral supervisors. Their contributions to the Fort Scratchley project will be used as an example to illustrate the diverse make-up of the production crew. Certainly there are benefits to the performance of a group when group members bring diverse sets of skills to a project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production Role</th>
<th>Team Member</th>
<th>Skill level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Producer/Writer/ Director &amp; Editing Assistant</td>
<td>Susan Kerrigan</td>
<td>Academic and ex-ABC Television Producer/Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>Kathy Freeman</td>
<td>Communication Honours Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>Vicki Kerrigan</td>
<td>ABC Radio Broadcaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Producers</td>
<td>Dr Phillip McIntyre</td>
<td>Record Producer, Sound Engineer and Academic Journalist, Novelist and Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr Judy Wells</td>
<td>Radio Producer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vicki Kerrigan</td>
<td>Freelance- Goodeyedeer Production Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gavin Banks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History Consultant</td>
<td>Dr Erik Eklund</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Director &amp; Sound Mix</td>
<td>Mark Tinson</td>
<td>Record Producer &amp; Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animation Supervisor</td>
<td>Roger Quinn</td>
<td>Professional Designer, Animator &amp; Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Animator</td>
<td>Geoffrey Hookham</td>
<td>Bachelor of IT undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animators</td>
<td>Bill Farmakis</td>
<td>Bachelor of IT undergraduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matt Brown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gavin Scott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musical Composer</td>
<td>Mark Tinson</td>
<td>Professional Musician and Musical Producer, Engineer and TAFE Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP – Tunnels and Singing</td>
<td>Anthony Davidson</td>
<td>Freelance 16/35 mm DP/Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera Operators</td>
<td>Susan Kerrigan</td>
<td>Freelance 16/35 mm DP/Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anthony Davison</td>
<td>Freelance Film Technician – Camera/Key Grip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Washbourne</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isaac Turier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simon Farrell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kathy Freeman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steadi-Cam</td>
<td>David Washbourne</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location Audio</td>
<td>Susan Kerrigan</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phillip McIntyre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Anthony Davison</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isaac Turier</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Susan Kerrigan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Support Personnel</td>
<td>Daniel Conway</td>
<td>Computer Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew Evans</td>
<td>Video &amp; Audio Technical Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to also note that individual skills have been described as being creative when a unique or valuable product or process is recognised as coming from ‘a set of antecedent conditions through the conditioned agency of someone’ (McIntyre, P. 2006: 2). Though Nijstad and Paulus use different language they are in fact arguing along similar lines to McIntyre when they highlight the creative contributions that individuals can make to group work.

The first to ‘join’ the documentary crew were my two doctoral supervisors. Their contributions to the Fort Scratchley project will be used as an example to illustrate the diverse make-up of the production crew. Certainly there are benefits to the performance of a group when group members bring diverse sets of skills to a project:
...diversity is one of the most important factors in group creativity....
Evidence suggests that functional, informational, or cognitive diversity is
associated with higher levels of group creativity and innovation. (Nijstad
& Paulus, 2003: 328)
My supervisors were experienced academics with production credits in their own fields of
practice which included music songwriting, music engineering, radio production and
journalism. Both also had previous experience working with/on radio documentaries,
though neither of them had worked professionally on screen-based documentary
productions. Furthermore, as supervisors of the research they should not automatically
become executive producers of the documentary, but this is what transpired.
Consequently, there were some misunderstandings because of the combined
inexperience with the documentary medium and processes and my expectations and
assumptions about their abilities. However, my final understanding of the arrangement
brings me to a point where I have to acknowledge that my supervisors’ research
experiences were more important for the success of the research project rather than their
combined lack of documentary production experience. This is a revealing finding because
it identifies my priorities for the project in that I put access to research knowledge ahead of
access to documentary production knowledge. This situation also reveals the level of
confidence that I had in my own skills as a screen-based practitioner. Obviously I felt that I
could manage most aspects of documentary production without requiring specific support
from my supervisors and therefore I knowingly understood the knowledge trade that I was
agreeing to when selecting supervisors for this research/practice-based project. In one
sense I was anticipating that the project would benefit from a diverse knowledge base
provided through the higher degree project supervision mechanism.
Another characteristic that can be identified through the tertiary context was the nurturing
of learning. In this case, the selection of crew from the student body was in some
instances inevitable and often done on purpose because the cost to hire in skilled
practitioners was prohibitive. So, overt explanations of documentary processes and
production techniques were embedded in the project and for some crew members,
particularly the students, the learning process continued throughout the life of the project.
Explanations of crew roles, responsibilities and production processes impacted on the
group’s creative output as the necessary instruction required to bring the crew up to a
somewhat professional level inadvertently became the responsibility of the skilled team
members which, in turn, diverted attention from their own tasks as they became occupied
with explaining foundational skills to students. In terms of this process Paulus and Nijstad,
explain that groups struggle to live up to their potential because of obstacles that prevent
the realisation of group creativity. The Generic Model of Group Creativity (included again as Figure 14) provides an explanation that situates individual production processes against larger group functioning. This is a ‘meta model, mainly suited to organising results and deriving questions for future research’ (Nijstad & Paulus, 2003: 338) and illustrates the iterative nature of group work and how individual processing occurs in a group context. Arrow 1 of the model highlights the moment of knowledge transfer, when a group identifies a task and agrees and deploys individuals to work on that task. The individual’s process is highlighted in the model by the greyed section. When the task is completed the individual’s output is offered to the group for assessment through Arrow 2. If the group is not satisfied with the work then it is returned to the individual, via Arrow 3, and more work is completed. The model doesn’t stipulate how many times the work can cycle between the individual and the group but it does indicate that work, assessment and rejection of the work can continue to cycle around until the group is satisfied with the work. The group then does more collaborative work on the product, process or idea shown thorough Arrow 4, whereas Arrow 5 represents the final knowledge transfer stage where the collaborative product is delivered.

Figure 14 - Generic Model of Group Creativity (Nijstad & Paulus, 2003: 334)

Nijstad and Paulus warn that researchers need to draw on additional theorising if the Generic Model of Group Creativity is to be used to derive specific predictions about the benefits or limitations that may result from group work:
First, under some circumstances, groups have creative potential and can achieve high levels of creativity .... Second, this potential often will not be fully realised because of process loss. Third, adequate procedures are required to minimize process loss and come close to the group’s optimal performance. In some cases productive gains may never be achieved. (2003: 328)

Following their suggestion, the Group Creativity Model will be applied here, in conjunction with an adaptation of Steiner’s group productivity formula (discussed below) and Stasser and Birchmeier’s research into group processing. Ivan Steiner’s seminal work on group productivity has also been adapted to the group creativity context through the following formula: ‘Actual Group Creativity = Potential Group Creativity – Process Loss’ (Nijstad & Paulus, 2003: 328)

For the Fort Scratchley documentary project ‘Actual Group Creativity’ can be identified through the collaborative processes which contributed to the successful completion of both documentaries and the Fort Scratchley field’s acceptance of them, whereas some of the ‘Process Loss’ factors are identified through the varying skills of the crew:

If the resources possessed by group members are sufficient for adequate task performance, potential productivity is high. If the group does not possess the necessary resources, potential productivity is low and the group will be unable to perform well. (Nijstad & Paulus, 2003: 328)

By way of explanation, I refer back to the greyed section from the Group Creativity Model (Figure 14, page 89) which represents an individual’s creative process. Each Fort Scratchley documentary crew member had their own, discrete yet inter-related creative processes that were determined by their crew role, the stage of documentary production and the task given to them to complete. The seven experienced practitioners were able to draw on their resources, habitus and store of documentary practice and successfully complete tasks in an efficient and timely fashion. This was not the case for the thirteen inexperienced practitioners. Achieving adequate task performance for the inexperienced crew members was difficult, it was not only their inexperience in video and documentary practices but a general lack of life experience which meant that their potential contributions to the group through ‘diversity’ were negated. Furthermore, my observations of the progress of their work revealed that these unskilled crew members required various levels of assistance to complete their assigned tasks and to then begin to work autonomously. Therefore, it has to be noted that explanations of crew roles and responsibilities hampered progress on the documentary, in that the unskilled crew unintentionally contributed to process loss.

Furthermore, as Nijstad and Paulus argue, process loss is caused through two factors; motivational loss or co-ordination loss. Motivational loss occurs when group members are
unmotivated to contribute to the group product, and co-ordination loss occurs when communication between group members may be sub-optimal (Nijstad & Paulus, 2003: 328). In this project motivational loss has to be ruled out as a contributing factor to process loss because everyone on the Fort Scratchley production crew volunteered their services and their time. While some were paid a meagre incentive for their contributions, other student crew members, like Kathy Freeman participated as part of their studies. Each student’s motivation was driven by their desire to learn new processes and practices and up-skill themselves in software or production methods which could then be used as part of their study program. Consequently, I would argue that, lack of motivation was not the main contributor to process loss in this instance. Instead lack of domain knowledge and understanding of craft specific practices and processes was identified as the main process loss contributor. In other words, it was their lack of antecedent conditioning which affected their creative input and process. Indeed, the inexperience or lack of antecedent conditioning of the majority of the documentary crew affected the group’s potential to function effectively and to keep to scheduled deadlines.

One key example of process loss involves Kathy Freeman, the documentary editor who agreed to work on the project as part of her Honours project. As my journal demonstrates I was dubious about letting ‘someone else come and work with me’ (Kerrigan, Journal: 4 March 2006). However, I was concerned that I could not manage to successfully complete all of the necessary tasks by myself. Kathy’s preliminary task was to roughly assemble the scripted oral history interviews into the editing software, Final Cut Pro. Once the vision was assembled I was to critique the edit and provide feedback for improvement. But after two months of working together I became aware that I had to repeatedly explain the editing process to her, in order to improve not only the quality of her work but the quantity of her output. After viewing a number of these completed rough cuts I realised Kathy was unable to interpret the instructions that were embedded in the documentary split scripts of the oral history interviews that she had been given. Table 6 (page 92) provides an extract of the split script layout that was being used and a journal entry explains my frustration:

[Kathy] didn’t make the connection that the purpose of the two columned script was to indicate, as precisely as possible, the linear presentation of the vision and audio.

I’m still completely amazed that Kathy should begin work on this script, without really understanding what she was doing … Her expertise and understanding of working practices in video is extremely limited. (Kerrigan, Journal: 7 September 2006)

Kathy’s lack of knowledge about the documentary editing process also accounted for her fixation with removing ‘gaps’ in the Final Cut Pro timeline. Her preoccupation with getting
things ‘technically correct’ meant that Kathy fiddled with vision in the timeline but would not play back the sequence to see how her adjustments affected the meaning of the edit. It took a number of conversations to get her to realise that a director cared about the placement of the timeline footage only because it affected the meaning of the edit when played back in real time.

Table 6 - Example Documentary Split Script

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VISION</th>
<th>AUDIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8th June 1942, + clock face showing 2.17 am</td>
<td>SFX BOOMING NOISES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 15 @ approx 8.33</td>
<td>Jim Cannon: We heard the booming and thought it was the BHP. SFX MORE BOOMING NOISES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, Kathy accepted that ‘gaps’ in the timeline were the visual representation of the pace and timing of the edit and the editor would not be judged on the presentation of the timeline. Kathy’s own description of this experience is discussed in her Honours exegesis where she explains:

Due to the editor’s lack of experience at the start of the production phase she was editing by form…. The editor was determined that the timeline presentation had to be “technically correct before I can think about the narrative and how to improve it” (10/01/07). (Freeman, 2007: 30)

While Kathy’s misunderstandings and subsequent learning about the role of a documentary editor can be identified as an obstacle that slowed down production output I have to also accept some responsibility. I naively expected Kathy to work as an experienced documentary editor would, even though I knew she had no experience as such. Closer supervision of her work was required and the benefits of realizing this saw six rough oral history edits completed in a much shorter period of time (Kerrigan, Journal: 20 September 2006). While progress was eventually made in the edit suite the time taken to address and teach editing processes and practices became an obstacle, or process loss contributor, because it slowed down production output which impinged on the overall potential output of the crew. Unfortunately Kathy’s lack of knowledge about the role of a documentary editor was to compound and it became obvious that she was unable to editorially contribute to the shaping of the smaller edited sequences that were specifically created to be compiled into a larger sequence (Kerrigan, Journal: 14 September 2006).

Kathy’s exegesis reveals her developing awareness of her editing skills, particularly a better understanding about narrative compilation:
Th[e] compiled sequence told one story even though it was constructed from a number of military oral history interviews. The editor suddenly understood why each sequence was two to three minutes in length, as these were designed to slot together into larger sections. This process of narrative construction helped the editor to understand why some of her previous edits had not ‘worked’. Therefore it was only after the editor had experienced the compilation of one of these larger sequences that she was able to grasp the concept and narrative structure of the documentary. (Freeman, 2007: 30)

Kathy’s observations of the development of her creative process as an editor combined with my observations and experiences of the same occurrences demonstrate some of the human resourcing constraints that were embedded in the project’s creative group potential. Kathy’s exegetical conclusion summarises her learning in the role of the editor:

... the actual role is to create meaning from the vision and audio by understanding the genre (documentary and its associated expectations), conventions (the format of documentary editing) and traditions (what has already been done). (Freeman, 2007: 39)

Clearly, both Kathy and I were aware of, and motivated to address, the process loss issue caused by her lack of domain knowledge. Both our learning journals openly documented our communication processes and confirmed that adequate steps were taken to rectify the lack of domain knowledge thus ruling out ‘coordination loss’ as a contributing factor to this instance of process loss. So, too, ‘motivational loss’ has to be ruled out as Kathy was emotionally committed to the project because it had become her Honour’s project. While Kathy did her very best to address her lack of documentary editing domain knowledge throughout the project, the significant gap in knowledge that was evident from her first contributions to the project was prohibitive and was an identifiable obstacle for the creative realisation of the documentary. However, what neither of us fully comprehended at that time was that the compounding effect of the lack of domain knowledge would increase across the post-production timeline and would continue to contribute to process loss. Our accumulated lack of understanding of how to effectively address the lack of domain knowledge did eventually negatively impact on the editing schedule. It took ten extra weeks to complete the edit. I had anticipated that the edit could be finalised by December 2006 (see Table 4, page 74), but this target was not met, and I was required to fine cut the documentary during my 2006 Christmas holidays/summer break in order to meet the Film Festival deadline of mid-February, 2007. Using this example I can state conclusively that one of the main constraints of working within the tertiary environment was finding practitioners who had foundational levels of screen craft practice.

13 The Film Festival was the Dendy Short Film awards, which runs as part of the Sydney Film Festival.
Regardless, the tertiary environment did provide a nurturing climate that fostered learning and hence it became possible to address and overcome most individuals’ lack of knowledge about practice and process by using the project to teach/learn documentary specific processes and practices. The nurturing of my own skills as a documentary producer/director needs to be included in these findings as this project enabled me to extend my producer/director skills and add the documentary genre to my production skill base. The support and tolerance of learning was, therefore a major enabling factor of the creative group environment of the Fort Scratchley project and the following example provides another illustration of the enabling characteristics of the tertiary environment.

Between October and November 2006 a crew was employed to film footage of Fort Scratchley. As producer I organised two shoots and used a portion of the research project funds to employ some professional crewmembers. During the contracting processes I realised that some of the funds, if not spent by December 2006, could be withdrawn, as this was standard operating procedure for budgetary matters at the University. The total funds available to the project in 2006 were $13,278 and these funds were split across two University research accounts. The first account was referred to by UoN staff as the “University account” which held $7,452, the second account was referred to as the “NCC account” and it held $5,826 (Kerrigan, Journal: 15 September 2006). The money in the NCC account would be there until it was all spent as these funds were acquired external to the UoN, whereas the funds in the University account were provided through the Research Office and if not spent in accordance with the UoN policy they would be withdrawn at the end of December 2006. After a number of conversations with various University administrators I discovered a way to extend the life of the funding which was to transfer the balance from the University account into the NCC account before the deadline. This, I was assured, would extend the funding life of the project beyond the December 2006 deadline. The transfer of funds was executed in December 2006 and the remaining $3000 was used to employ an experienced colour grader in May 2008. The juggling of these funds, though initially identified as a constraining characteristic, can in actuality be seen as an enabling characteristic that was unique to the UoN tertiary educational environment as it extended the financial viability of the project beyond what was originally intended.

Other enabling characteristics, seen as being more universal to documentary production practice, were the multi-skilling and multi-tasking of crew roles. I regularly undertook multiple crew roles and production tasks in parallel (i.e. directing, producing, production managing, assistant editor, technical setting up for a shoot) which had the unintended effect of making some of my journal entries chaotic:
Kathy, the editor is getting behind, and I am really getting concerned about us meeting our target of vision lock off.

Just emailed Mark Tinson about my latest thoughts on the music, I really love the big band number, and I like track 2 the best. Have suggested that I’d like to hear this track as a faster tempo and also with some other instruments to represent different time periods.

Just emailed Nic, re the journal transfer that has to occur to pay for the $426.90 worth of film cleaning and video transfers, also she will transfer the $2000.00 to pay Mark Tinson’s invoice.

Andrew is doing a dub of the Mini-DV footage called “Shooting at Fort Scratchley”, so that will be interesting to watch later today.

What else do I need to do today? I think that I’m going to go and set up the data projector. (Kerrigan, Journal: 26 October 2006)

The data projector was to be used as a rear projection device for a re-enactment shoot in the University’s television studio (Using Fort Scratchley, 2008; from minutes 24.22). Even though I was employing a Director of Photography to light the studio I had to work out how to achieve the desired rear projection look myself for the following day’s shoot with the Italian folksingers. The two Italian singers were father and son, Victor and Gionni Di Gravio. The son Gionni also assisted me on the project through his position as chair of the Coal River Working Party. I had three crew for the shoot day; DP, Tony Davidson and my principal supervisor who recorded the vocals. My husband David Washbourne, who is a film technician, assisted with the set up of the data projection unit:

David came and helped me set up in the morning. I felt incredibly nervous about this technical set-up. This was because I felt that I hadn’t adequately gone through the technical set-up with the appropriate film technicians. At the ABC there was always a process of discussion and approval, from editorial practitioners through to technical craftspeople. When preparing for a shoot, verification of the plan of action was always received through either a script meeting or a production meeting and location recce, or even through both. However I realised that though I had done a technical discussion with Tony (DP), I had not had the opportunity to really verify how the elements for the photo projection would come together. (Kerrigan, Journal: 31 October 2006)

While I was well aware of my technical limitations, the preparation that I had done paid off, as my experience of the shoot was rewarding:

The studio was excellent, and I distinctly remember a moment, listening to them, and seeing the beautiful lighting, and hearing their tenor voices, that I thought, this is why I do it. However, it’s been too long since I had that feeling…. I don’t really do this for the final product or for the audience. I do this for me. For that wonderful feeling of gratification, when the plan is being well executed and all the complex elements come together, and when everyone involved enjoys that moment. Or as Csikszentmihalyi says when the level of challenge meets the level of skill, that is when flow occurs. (Kerrigan, Journal: 31 October 2006)
The above journal entry demonstrates the satisfying experiences of elation or flow that came from the successful completion of the shoot. Previously states of flow have been identified in relation to negative emotions but here the accounts are positive. Throughout my journal there is evidence of flow being achieved through the completion of small achievement, and other times, as identified above, as part of the reflective observations of a plan successfully completed. From a practitioner-based researcher perspective these individual accounts of anxiety or elation indicate that I was deeply engaged in documentary practice even though the experience may not have been pleasurable all of the time. From an analytical perspective the states of flow that occurred through the staged collaborative production processes connects moments of dissatisfaction or satisfaction with collaborative documentary practice.

Using another example to illustrate this point, I had organised another shoot to gather more visual overlay. This time the location was the Fort Scratchley tunnel complex. I hired a crew of five including the same Director of Photography, Tony Davidson, with David Washbourne operating a steadi-cam. The planning of these steadi-cam shots is laid out in Figure 15 (page 96).
Four steadi-cam choreographed shots had been designed to show the multi-layered tunnel complex by walking along the same route that a shell would be carried, from the ammunition store to the guns situated above ground. Five and a half minutes screen time was filmed through six steadi-cam set-ups which were edited into one long tunnel sequence. The edited version of this tunnel walk through is in the DVD extras, with a superimposed tunnel map showing the exact position of the camera as it progresses along the tunnels (Using Fort Scratchley, 2008; DVD Extras menu ‘Tunnel Complex’, minutes 5.26, Fort Scratchley a Living History, 2008: date 18/10/1880 & 2/04/1882). By way of adding atmosphere to the tunnels members of the FSHS re-created the original lighting conditions of 1880 by allowing us to film them lighting the recently refurbished oil lamps and walking the camera through the darkened tunnels lit only by the flame from the burning oil (Using Fort Scratchley, 2008: DVD Extras menu ‘80 Pounder/Tunnel Lights).

The shooting day was structured by the crew’s production methods – setting lights, rehearsing and then shooting, which contributed to a pleasant and productive on-set atmosphere that I reflected on in my journal entry:

It took some time to set up the first shot, getting the gear in place. The crew needed to organise who was doing what, as Tony had two lighting assistants, Tom Hancock and Isaac Turier. Also the camera set-ups took some time to organise and I couldn’t get the camera’s user bits to work properly. Anyway it took an hour to light and shoot the first shot, and then it took another half hour to work out and get the first shot right.

That was to become the rhythm of the day, taking about an hour to light each shot, and then about 15 minutes to execute the shots. (Kerrigan, Journal: 30 October 2006)

There was not much time to dwell on the success of the tunnel shoot, however, as the following journal entry indicates:

Now that those two shoots have been completed I’ve been able to immediately turn my attention to chasing up other storytelling angles. I’ve made contact with both an Awabakal spokesperson and someone from the Theatrical community. (Kerrigan, Journal: 5 November 2006)

My by now intuitive understanding of the process kept my attention focused on progressing the project. By mid-November I was working to a specific list that specified most of the interviewees but I was still having trouble finding someone to interview about the Fort’s maritime history:

So last Sunday I wrote a list of who I needed to speak with that week.

1. Person from Hunter Valley Theatre Company.
2. Footlice Theatre – Michael Meaney Done Thursday 9th
3. Pat Wilson from Parnell Place Done: Friday 10th
4. Adele De Glorian from Parnell Place Done: Wednesday 8th
5. Maritime Museum – Story about Captain Allan, who was the harbour master and lived on Signal Hill
After a lot of searching I found a local maritime author and historian, Pamela Harrison (2006), who was willing to speak on camera about the Fort’s maritime history, specifically in relation to her relative Captain Henry Newtown who was Newcastle’s Harbour Master in the 1800’s (Using Fort Scratchely, 2008: 17.25-20.10; Fort Scratchely a Living History, 2008: 1855, 1900).

Feeling more satisfied with the direction of the narrative, the next hurdle to overcome was the realisation that the dramatic re-enactment of historical events to be shot at the Fort had to be abandoned. The main obstacle to filming the re-enactments was securing permission to film on site at Fort Scratchley. While NCC had commissioned the documentary they did not actually own the site and therefore could not grant me permission to film at the fort. All site access requests had to be made to the Australian Federal Government, who owned the site. My email requests to the Federal Government for permission to film at Fort Scratchley were denied. I also tried to secure permission to film on site through the construction company who won the tender for site restorations. While they were supportive of the documentaries they were not in a position to grant me access to the site either. From a documentary perspective, the key element that could make these re-enactments authentic was filming them on the exact location where the historical incident occurred. At the time I felt that these re-enactments were not only important to the integrity and authenticity of the documentary content but the creation of them was one of the primary reasons I had committed to the project. It was also a common point of interest between myself and the history academics. However, as the documentary project moved on I become increasingly disconnected from the historians and our shared commitment to these re-enactments. Moreover, the lengthy delay with the restoration works, which was at that point in time two and a half years behind schedule provided another disincentive. These circumstantial pragmatics made me realise that it was going to be impossible to re-enact or dramatise key moments in the Fort’s history where they had occurred. Below is the journal entry that illustrates historian Dr Erik Eklund’s reaction to my decision not to film the re-enactments:

Today I had a meeting with Erik Eklund and I realised that he didn’t know that I’d pretty much dropped the dramatisation angle because I haven’t been able to get access to the site. He seemed almost disappointed about this and of course I felt that I should have kept him more informed about the project. But without site access it’s very difficult to dramatise oral histories that are so connected with the site. (Kerrigan, Journal: 14 November, 2006)
While Eklund was disappointed by my decision I had long since moved on from my own disappointment. Again a meeting with the Executive Producers validated my decision to drop the re-enactments because they

... thought that I was justified in my decision to abandon them, particularly when I listed why:

1. Access to the site was integral to the dramatisations being believable.
2. The failure of two ARC Linkage grants meant that extra money to complete the dramatisations was not available.
3. In order to meet the project deadline, and the collaborative grant deadline, I had to complete a documentary, and the style of the documentary had to be sustainable for my skills. (Kerrigan, Journal: 22 November, 2006)

The plan was to replace the re-enactments with some computer generated imagery (CGI). The documentary editor and myself looked over some CGI files, which had previously been prepared by 3rd year IT students as part of an animation course. There was one file that provided a recognizable geographical match to Newcastle Harbour. It was created by Matt Brown using the Cinema 4D software. This CGI file was a gift because Brown had been able to, through his personal contacts, access Newcastle’s geometric data, after importing the topographical information into Cinema 4D. The exciting thing to realise was that the software was able to create an animated version of Newcastle Harbour (Kerrigan, Journal: 29 November, 2006). Unfortunately neither the editor nor myself could use Cinema 4D. So I approached a colleague who recommended another student, Geoffrey Hookham, to work with me on refining Brown’s CGI animations. Hookham’s friend, Bill Farmakis, also joined the animation team. Though Hookham and Farmakis both had limited working knowledge of Cinema 4D software their enthusiasm for this opportunity to learn Cinema 4D and their blinding confidence in their abilities to complete the task allayed my concerns regarding their abilities to alter the existing animations. Though I still felt quite worried that they would not be able to create completely new animation sequences that I thought could really bring some of the other oral history stories to life.

Theoretically, the context that brought these animators to the project is a result of the constraining and enabling aspects of the Fort Scratchley project’s context. This account of the strategies used to assemble the animation group reveal evidence of the social and collaborative nature of the creative documentary process and how important it is for a practitioner to be open to opportunities that are provided through group diversity and group environments. From a creative process perspective Hookham and Farmakis were working through their own extended version of the staged creative process laid out by Wallas and identified by the greyed section in the Group Creativity Model (see Figure 14, page 89). Similarly, as animation director, I was working through my own extended staged
creative process as I had not directed any CGI before. But as I had some directorial skills I was able to benefit from these when scripting the oral history accounts for animation. Needless to say the three of us were working through our own discrete yet inter-related creative processes that would contribute to the CGI production.

The animated Cinema 4D files were passed from the student animators, represented by Arrow 2 in the group creativity model, to me and the documentary editor for feedback on the timing of each animated action, to ensure that it fitted perfectly with the oral history interview grabs. The checking of the timing on these animated files was repeated a number of times, represented by Arrow 3 in the group creativity model. At this point the files were ready for full quality rendering represented in the model by Arrow 4. During the rendering of the full quality version of the ‘Japanese Submarine Attack’ another obstacle was identified. The twenty-seven seat computer lab that was used as the render farm exported all but two animated frames. Later, this error was traced back to some technical key framing parameters which occurred because of the light diffractions used in the underwater explosions. However, at that time these two un-rendered frames prevented the 1567 framed sequence from being exported, effectively sending the group back to the individual problem-solving level indicated by Arrow 3. At that point another individual had to be brought onto the team to help solve this technical problem and they contributed to the group decision making process.

Stasser and Birchmeier (1993) have identified two major processes for group decision-making the first is preference-driven processes and the second is information-driven processes. Preference-driven group processes rely on the group discovery of common or popular beliefs followed by a decision to support the majority rule (Stasser & Birchmeier, 2003: 87) whereas information driven group processes are ‘important when making decisions that are complex and information-rich and can be evaluated by objective criteria’ (Stasser & Birchmeier, 2003: 87). In this instance the objective criteria can be identified as the completion of the render. The CGI production group had effectively adopted an information-driven process whereby the processing of complex software information was evaluated against the delivery of the final animation. A Design colleague, Roger Quinn, had the necessary skill and knowledge of Cinema 4D to identify the file problem and provide a solution. In terms of the creative group process this could also be seen as the process phase of illumination, that is, a moment where a breakthrough occurs. My journal entry during this time reflected this:

Roger thought that the network render would tile the final frames, but it didn’t in this case. So when Roger got in about 3.30pm he suggested that we duplicate the frame before the frames that were still being
rendered, and save them in the list of rendered frames. (Kerrigan, journal; 13 December, 2006)

Roger’s suggestion worked. By duplicating the two troublesome frames, renumbering them and reinserting them into the list of rendered frames Cinema 4D Net Render was tricked into thinking that all the frames required for the sequence were now complete, hence permitting it to create the final export file. Roger felt that his moment of illumination, which solved the rendering problem, highlights one of the key lessons learned from the CGI process; that is, to only be concerned with what the viewer will see, not what the virtual world contains. Creative verification of the animation was achieved after a five day render for a fifty second sequence (Using Fort Scratchley, 2008; minutes 0.01-0.51; Fort Scratchley a Living History, 2008; date 8/6/1942).

The successful completion of the first animated sequence helped us to develop group trust and intuition and enabled us to go on to complete three more animation sequences without further incidence of process loss (Using Fort Scratchley, 2008: minutes 7.43-7.53 & 10.04-1026; Fort Scratchley a Living History, 2008: date 6/08/1942 – Japanese Retreat). My knowledge and enjoyment of working within CGI worlds also increased as I realised that complex camera moves, that would normally cost significant dollars to execute on a location based set, could easily be created in a 3 dimensional world. The sorts of complex camera moves are demonstrated in the online documentary entry from 8 June 1942, that shows where each searchlight was positioned on the Newcastle coastline (Using Fort Scratchley, 2008; minutes 7.31: Fort Scratchley a Living History, 2008; date 8/6/1942).

The mapping of the animation process against the Paulus and Nijstad Generic Group Creativity Model confirmed that discrete individual yet collective staged creative process cycles, illustrating the iterative and recursive nature of individual and group processing, were operative for the CGI production team. Furthermore, group creativity theory was able to explain that during the render-farm error the group was using an information-driven interaction which is more ‘conducive to the discovery and adoption of creative decisions’ (Stasser & Birchmeier, 2003: 87). Collins and Guetzkow also refer to this potential as an assembly bonus which ‘depends on members having different subsets of relevant information’ (cited in Stasser & Birchmeier, 2003: 88). It can be argued that in the CGI example the production group experienced an ‘assembly bonus’ through the successful identification of necessary pieces of information and knowledge which were then combined and executed to deliver the completed animation.

Running in parallel to the animation productions, the editor and I were still trying to complete the compiling of sequences, to form larger segments that should have enabled us to complete the documentary to the point of ‘vision lock-off’.

101
Compiled a 20 [minute] 49 second sequence today of the oral histories section. It's too long and needs to be reduced by about 4 to 5 minutes. (Kerrigan, Journal: 13 December 2006)

As noted above, I had anticipated that by December 2006 the video documentary would be completed. Unfortunately, the process loss issue discussed earlier in this section was one of the main contributing factors that prevented us from achieving this deadline.

However, while I knew that there was much work to be done to complete the video documentary, I was also intuitively focused on other production priorities:

I've noticed that when one task is completed, I move swiftly onto the next task that is waiting for attention. Like today when the animation was completed, I immediately asked Phillip about dates for the audio mix. I was so surprised that I did it, that I even mentioned it out loud. It's as if my mind can only handle a certain number of tasks and when a task is completed, I quite quickly turn my attention to the next task on the list. Sometimes the (next task on my intuitive) … list may not follow any logical progression. (Kerrigan, Journal: 13 December 2006)

By way of contradiction, a subsequent journal entry a few days later describes my inability to remember the details of the edit, file pathways and sequence names:

Last Friday, I told Kathy (the editor) that she was responsible for all the editing files, because I no longer understood what was where, due to the complexity of the nested sequences. (Kerrigan, Journal: 17 December 2006)

This observation identifies that my trust in the editor’s abilities to assist with the edit had increased to a point where I was relying on her knowledge of the file structure to locate sequences that we were working on in the Final Cut Pro (FCP) timeline. Technically, Final Cut Pro permitted us to ‘nest sequences’, allowing small edited sequences to be pasted, or compiled, into another FCP project file without losing a generation of video. This non-linear editing technique meant that we had to keep track of the originating sequences, and the FCP file names, which became increasingly difficult for me to do. I have always been able to rely on my ability to remember details and particularly file names, pathways, tape numbers and so on as this was part of the work that I performed at the ABC. Therefore, it was quite a new experience to forget where the project files were physically located because I was concentrating on the editorial components of the story.

Other factors that threatened the progress of the edit at this time were some software rendering difficulties and the university’s Christmas shutdown, which was fast approaching:

The rendering difficulties that were encountered last week did have an impact on my progress. I admit that I was a bit behind before the render complications. What I am looking for is a short cut to get me to the next stage. I hope that a short cut is just around the corner. (Kerrigan, Journal: 17 December 2006)
A compromise was negotiated and I was permitted to take the computer, an Apple G5, home for the duration of the Christmas shutdown. This was a significant compromise because not only was I working without Kathy and her meticulous ‘local’ knowledge of our Final Cut Pro files but from a personal perspective I was trying to rough cut a documentary during my much needed Christmas holidays. However, I felt I had no choice because the Film Festival deadline was drawing near.

Before leaving the University, Kathy and I compiled all the segments into a single, one hour and eleven minute sequence (Kerrigan, Journal: 19 December 2006). The time spent over the Christmas break saw the duration drop by a total of twenty-four minutes to 46 minutes and 58 seconds (Kerrigan, Journal: 10 January 2007). This drop in duration was accomplished through consistent analysis and review of the edited footage. The creative decision-making that occurs in the edit suite where the raw actuality footage is shaped into the narrative is acknowledged as being similar to the scripting process (Chapman, 2006: 53). During my first at-home editing session I cut ten minutes from the timeline but I also realised that there were elements of the story that were missing from the timeline ‘I suppose that I’ve got at least another 6 minutes to add’ (Kerrigan, Journal: 22 December 2006). These missing elements were added which increased the duration by seven minutes. Working at home meant that my working patterns changed radically and I had to work mostly at night with headphones so that my family would not be disturbed by the constant and repetitive noise of an edit (Kerrigan, Journal: 21 December 2006).

As it was Christmas, I made the most of my family connections and enlisted my sister who is an ABC Radio Presenter/Producer, Vicki Kerrigan, to help me reduce the duration further. Below is an edited version of our list of things to do:

- Need to emphasise the significance of the Japanese attack.
- Cut Jap attack stuff-reduce radio doco by half.
- Cut some of Jimmy James stuff by half – cut first bit – rebuilding the guns and cut ramming shells and Mount Vesuvius- done.
- Intro of tunnels to explain who Peter Scratchley was.
- Maritime museum – cut end of relocation & develop opening intro.
- Some of the AWAS stuff can be reduced – done.
- Theatre stuff – cut shark stuff – done.
- Cut Rod Ansell – done.
- Zeal Theatre graphics fix aspect ratio – done.
- Michael cut – footlice theatre’s charter – done.
- Put Mikey Robins stuff at head…- done.
- Reduce the explanation of how they prepare the firing post pack- Vicki wants to keep this bit.
- Cut the bit about Len saying he wants to show us what the gun firing was like.
- Cut the projects that FSHS have done. (Kerrigan, Journal: 27 December 2006)
Christmas came and went and I continued work on the project. On Boxing Day I met with the Music Director Mark Tinson, a noted record producer in the music industry, to discuss about the musical style for the documentary (see Appendix I - Musical Composition Brief) I also spoke to an audio expert, Don Bartley, about removing music from behind some archival radio documentary interviews. This intense work on this aspect of the project affected my editorial judgement:

It’s quite interesting how I have lost the ability to judge some sections of the documentary. Even though I know that this has occurred, I am powerless to adjust or rectify it. It’s as if once I am immersed in the subject matter, and know it intimately, it’s extremely difficult to regain an objective perspective on what is important to the storytelling and what is not. This is where I have found that the technical or structural approach to storytelling assists me in determining why pieces of information need to be in certain places. The three-act structure is so simple yet can be easily applied to all stories and is extremely useful in helping me to regain my perspective on a story. (Kerrigan, Journal: 27 December 2006)

Decisions on the fine cut continued to be made and Vicki and I watched a newly revised version through, which was now running 44 minutes and 41 seconds:

It has been an extremely enjoyable day. Watching the doco through again with Vicki tonight brought closure of her contribution to my project. I’m really pleased that she has had this time to understand it, and I’ve had the time to work on something really substantial with her. Her editorial skills are extremely strong. (Kerrigan, Journal: 29 December 2006)

I gave Vicki an Executive Producer credit as a way of thanking her for assisting me on the project and then I took three days off to celebrate the New Year. I resumed work on the edit a few days later and found Final Cut Pro was struggling to render changes that were being made in the timeline. The problem was due to the ‘nested sequences’ technique which should be an effective way to layer smaller edited timelines into one larger sequence. The benefit of using the nested sequence technique is that the FCP software is supposed to automatically update all sequences that reference the sequence that is being altered. The FCP error I observed was that the computer’s processing unit was having difficulty referencing and rendering the original sequence which meant that any changes made to the larger timeline had to be manually done in the original file first then copied back into the larger sequence:

Though this may have become a very time-consuming process, it eventuated because our editing projects and sequences have become so complicated. I fear that I may make some change that will get lost in the various projects. (Kerrigan, Journal: 4 January 2007)
Kathy the editor had been in touch and wanted to come and work on the project but I had lost confidence with her commitment to the project for a number of reasons:

Teaching someone to technically edit as well as working alongside them has at times been trying as I am unable to really impress upon her the importance of completing stuff. Many times she had turned up to an editing session and not completed the Photoshop stuff or the Flash stuff that she said she would do. Something always got in the way. I know that I have stopped expecting her to put in the extra effort required to make this project special, hence I don’t want her to come here and do any editing. (Kerrigan, Journal: 4 January 2007)

I continued to work alone at a productive pace and managed to bring the project back in line with my revised production schedule which was to deliver a copy of the completed documentary to the Film Festival, which had a deadline of February 19th, 2007. While working at home was productive having the computer setup in the ‘formal’ lounge room was not ideal for my family:

What happened to Saturday? Is it that late again that the date has changed and this entry falls under the next day. I have spent too many late nights working on this doco. Alice [8 years] is getting very fretful, and Rose [5 years] is indifferent to me. On a brighter note I have, I believe, completed the rough cut stage. That is a big statement for me to make but I do believe that it’s true. And it dawned on me tonight while taking a loo break that finally I have a rough cut to show people and the next stage is to get feedback and to do the fine cut. … Tomorrow I’ll burn a DVD and will look forward to watching it away from the computer. (Kerrigan, Journal: 7 January 2007)

Finally I had reached the point in the project where I could reflect on the edit as a whole:

I really felt like the Doco was completed and I commented on that in that entry and then remembered that I had made arrangements to shoot some extra stuff with the Lord Mayor and the Aboriginal community. And now I just feel that that stuff is extraneous. (Kerrigan, Journal: 10 January 2007)

The documentary fine cut had reached a point where members of the creative field could assess it. Receiving feedback from producers and executive producers is standard professional practice but it is more likely to occur once vision is locked in place and the audio is completed. Using Fort Scratchley was not up to this stage yet, however, I felt that my solitary editing process necessitated critical review of the edit from my PhD supervisors and the historian Dr Erik Eklund, in order to confirm that the approach that I had taken so far was acceptable. Also, I was anticipating negative feedback that may require time to consider changes and implement them and still be able to meet the film festival deadline.

Before moving on to analyse of the third dimension of Csikszentmihalyi’s Systems Model, it would be useful to give a summary of the preceding discussion. This discussion here
has analysed a number of aspects of group functioning to determine the generative collaborative nature of the Fort Scratchley production and post-production crew. Specifically, accounts of individual group members and their understandings of documentary or animation working practices identified some process loss issues which affected the scheduled progress of the edit. Though process loss issues were identified they should not be seen as exclusively having a negative impact as I, too, admitted to benefiting from the generosity of the production crew in tolerating my cycles of learning as a documentary producer/director. It was noted that when individual skill development had occurred, particularly in the case of the documentary editor, I came to rely upon the editor’s skills, specifically her ‘local knowledge’ of file management. Therefore, the ability of the group to withstand process loss issues, identified through short periods of domain knowledge acquisition, should not be seen as solely constraining but also as factors that, in many senses enabled the output of the group.

Examining the animators working practices against Nijstad and Paulus’ Generic Model of Group Creativity confirmed that the group processes, though initially affected by lack of domain knowledge, did indeed improve and increase output over time, so much so that an acceptable level of creative group functioning was achieved. It can, therefore, be claimed that even though lack of domain knowledge was identified as a contributor to process loss it did not have a detrimental effect on the group’s output because the knowledge acquisition process was well managed by both parties who were also motivated to improve their skills. What was then observed was that with the development of individual knowledge and processes, so, too, the productivity of the group improved, thus moving away from the individual learning environments. In essence, the group began to function more effectively as a group and make decisions about production output together. From time to time however the contribution of skilled practitioners, like Cinema 4D expert Roger Quinn and ABC Radio Producer Vicki Kerrigan, was required, as their unique understanding about specific practices and processes was lacking within the existing skill set of group members.

The final component of group functioning is group context and this self-reflective analysis of my interactions with group members and observations of group processes supplies evidence that demonstrates the effects of group context on creative group output. For example, the analysis confirms that the changing work environments and working practices did not inhibit the completion of the documentary, they actually facilitated it. Also, the values of the tertiary learning environment that obligated crew to simultaneously nurture learning as well as to provide teaching instruction initially, on the one hand impeded progress. On the other hand, once individual learning was no longer as critical
the newly acquired skills, learnt specifically for the Fort Scratchley documentary production context, facilitated collaborative group functioning and, in turn, output. Therefore, analysis of the three aspects of creative group functioning – group members, group processes and group contexts – demonstrates the interrelated nature of those functions and the causal relationships which simultaneously enabled and constrained output. Furthermore, it is the enabling and constraining aspects of collaborative documentary practice which confirm the generative nature of group practice of the type that was experienced on the Fort Scratchley productions.

Having now examined the individual and the individual's experience of group creativity, the effects of the field on my creative process are explored in the discussion below.
5.3 - The Field

The Systems Model (see Figure 3, page 11) diagrammatically explains the relationships between the domain, individual and field, where the field has the power to select novelty introduced by the individual which is then archived in their domain. This interactive system highlights the field’s acceptance as being important for creativity because ‘[f]ields are made up of individuals who practice a given domain and have the power to change it’ (Csikszentmihalyi, 1999: 321). This conceptual explanation of the power of the field is central to this creative practitioner research and the following analysis will examine how I, in the first instance, interacted with Fort Scratchley and documentary field members. Observations of these interactions will support my social inclusion as a member of the Fort Scratchley field and also the documentary field’s initial rejection of my documentary works.

Field’s are powerful agencies and they ‘will differ in the stringency of their selective mechanisms, the sensitivity of their gatekeepers, and the dynamics of their inner organizations’ (Csikszentmihalyi, 1988: 331).

The term ‘gatekeeper’ has been used by Csikszentmihalyi to describe field experts who have acquired enough social and cultural capital to have their social standing in the field recognised. In this conception, ‘gatekeepers’ have acquired the power to legitimise certain works as being creative and to deny that status to other works (Sawyer, 2006: 123). The term ‘cultural intermediaries’, originally defined by Bourdieu, is sometimes used in place of the term ‘gatekeepers’. It has, however, at times been misread and misunderstood by many cultural theorists. Usefully Hesmondhalgh (2006) lays out Bourdieu’s intended meaning of cultural intermediaries by identifying the old definition of the term and its newer uses:

... the ‘old’ cultural intermediaries were those who acted as critics and as experts on serious, legitimate culture in the pre-mass media age. Both new and old cultural intermediaries, we must assume, are thus named because they ‘mediate’ between producers and consumers. (Hesmondhalgh, 2006: 226)

Hesmondhalgh then argues that there is a need for a ‘better specification of the division of labour involved in mediating production and consumption in culture-making organisations’ (Hesmondhalgh, 2006: 227). I agree with him in principle but Hesmondhalgh’s approach tends to emphasise a theoretical argument which focuses on a general separation between agency and structure. Hesmondhalgh creates a theoretical distinction between primary creative workers who appear to be working within the constraints imposed on them by the technical and managerial creative workers, and fails to accommodate an interactive and systemic process, a process typical of low budget, multi-skilling and multi-
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tasking media environments that have proliferated as a direct result of the technological digital media advances of the last decade. In addition, and most importantly, Hesmondhalgh’s analysis tends to downplay the enabling aspects of the technical and managerial frameworks that give primary creative workers a positive production imperative. A separation between agency and structure may be useful for critical theorists trying to understand the mediating affects of the production and consumption processes in order to better understand the distribution of creative labour. But a general separation of agency from structure ignores the fundamentally creative capacity of the individual who has the potential to work within the rules of a tradition, either individually or as part of a social grouping, to observe or break those rules, to innovate and advance those traditions (Bailin, 1988). Instead, the adoption of Sawyer’s ‘nested audiences’ (see Figure 6, page 54) approach which uses the term ‘intermediaries’ in a slightly more modified way, will be once again applied as it more usefully explains the structuring of the field through social groupings which confirm the importance of various levels of social knowledge and acceptance for creative recognition. Intermediaries are located at the centre of the circle as the most knowledgeable group and the model works outwards through three more groups labelled as connoisseurs, amateurs and the public. This nested sequence model also accommodates the argument supporting ‘structuration’ which is developing as a finding for this practitioner-centred research. Therefore, an examination of how I began to assume an intermediary’s position, as an autonomous documentary agent creatively managing both the technical, managerial and editorial components of the Fort Scratchley documentaries, will be explained. In assuming that position, observations of how the field’s acceptance of this stature will explain the benefits that ensued for both the Fort Scratchley documentary products and my life-long creative process.

5.3.1 - Capitalising on Field Opinions for Documentary Practice

Referring back to the Group Creativity Model (see Figure 14, page 89), the part of the process that is being discussed here is represented by Arrow 4, where a combination of contributions, discussion, information sharing, collaborative reasoning, voting and so on is combined to form a group response. In January 2007 it had become time for the incomplete documentary edit to receive critical feedback from the field, these people were also the video documentary’s intended audience. A series of discrete test screenings were held, some of which I was present at, others I was not, where the viewers were asked to provide detailed feedback. These multiple screenings occurred because of time constraints, it being difficult for me to get everyone in the one place at the one time, but also because I thought that it would help me to reflect on the feedback and take on board
suggestions that might improve the clarity of the edit. The execution of my screening approach was definitely crude, and consequently I found that even though it was explained that the video was incomplete, not everyone was able to judge the documentary as a work in progress.

Intuitively, I was applying a preference-driven process for group collaboration, previously explained as a way of making decisions that draws on understandings of popular belief and identifying the dominant or majority position of the group (Stasser and Birchmeier, 2003: 87). Though not explored in the creative literature, most filmmakers would use a preference-driven process, whereby the test screening of a near complete film with sample audience ensures that the film either does or does not satisfy a socially shared set of cultural codes and conventions. Test screening feedback helps the filmmaker(s) to make adjustments to the authored narrative as well as confirming the clarity of the social meaning embedded in the film’s narrative.

A seminal research study into social influence conducted by Festinger in 1954 found that ‘people seek confirmation of their opinions from others in the absence of objective criteria for judging correctness’ (cited in Stasser and Birchmeier, 2003: 90). In the case of my film I was hoping that the test screening feedback would provide a consensus of opinion about the historical clarity and logic of the documentary.

While I viewed the film with Kathy, the editor, who gave mostly technical feedback and said that she ‘liked it’ (Kerrigan, Journal: 11 January 2007). Next to view the film in my presence were three members of the FSHS Executive Committee, Bill Hopkins, President, Carl Caulfield Vice-President, Len Young. I carefully observed their reactions to each section carefully, watching for signs of disinterest such as verbal or visceral responses to elements of the film. In my journal I noted:

They all seemed to like it, or were they being polite? Carl said that I’d used one photo incorrectly; Bill wanted to know where the Aboriginal land usage story was. And they wanted me to use some footage of the RSL Pipe Band that was filmed at Fort Scratchley, they seemed very keen for me to include it in the doco, but as I said, I couldn’t really see the connection with FS. (Kerrigan, Journal: 15 January 2007)

Bill also commented that this version did not clearly explain the Fort’s historical links with the convict coal-mines. This feedback made me reconsider the vision and the voiceover that I used to tell that part of the story.

The Executive Producers were given the documentary to view in their homes. Feedback from them confirmed the need to add more voiceover in order to clearly spell out why there were so many different community stories being told. Also one of the Executive Producer’s put forth a preference about the types of stories being told and questioned my
desires to use the Film Festival as the completion date for the documentary. My reflections of this conservation were detailed in my journal:

[The Executive Producer] felt that the stories being told about the refurbishment were not essential to the film and will date the film and give it a short shelf life. This is something that I fully understand. Also [the EP] felt that the film festival is confusing the issue and it is forcing me to make the documentary into something else.

Basically I feel that the comments on the need to add more voiceover and reduce the tunnels section were valid. But the other comments were too general and too confusing. Unfortunately [the EP] wasn’t able to be specific enough with the comments to more accurately explain or articulate how to fix the problems that had been identified with the doco. (Kerrigan, Journal: 16 January 2007)

As the journal entry explains these comments confused me, as I was trying to make sense of the criticisms that had been put to me, which somehow seemed to be personal. In this regard, research that documents how the contributions of group members effect individual level cognition, motivation and emotion have been documented. Nijstad and Paulus argue that ‘if others respond in an emotional way to differences of opinion, the benefits of controversy for creativity will not materialize’ (2003: 336). Reflections of the Executive Producer’s feedback were foremost in my thoughts, particularly my motivations for wanting to enter the documentary into the Film Festival, so much so that I was now considering not entering the film in the Festival. ‘On Tuesday, after the conversation with [the EP] I felt like the doco was a mess and the direction that the whole project was going in was wrong, (Kerrigan, Journal: 17 January 2007).

The main cause of my anxiety was, I believe, a common misunderstanding about creative motivation, that is, extrinsic or external deadlines may actually negate creativity. This notion has been thoroughly researched by Teresa Amabile (1983, 1993, 1994) and has been heavily contested in the literature (see Eisenberger & Shanock, 2003) which confirms that extrinsic factors, like the Film Festival deadline, are just as important to creative production as intrinsic motivators are:

On reflection it would appear that [the EP] does not understand the importance of motivation for the production of a creative work which is why the Film Festival is seen as a hindrance to creative production instead of it assisting with creative production. The anxiety I was suffering from left me. I felt satisfied that things were coming together well. I felt happy, with our progress, and I felt…that I would be able to pull this off to a suitable standard that would satisfy me. (Kerrigan, Journal: 17 January 2007)

A few days later I realised that the misunderstanding may also have been caused because of a lack of understanding of the quality of the documentary that was given out for a screen test (Kerrigan, Journal: 30 January 2007). This insight is similar to the insight
that I had at the Powerhouse Museum, where I had prepared something for screening to the Powerhouse staff, but had not adequately set up the form that the content appeared in prior to showing it. As previously discussed with the Powerhouse Museum incident, individual field experts critically judge material based on their own assumptions about the content and the form it’s packaged in. The reaction of the Executive Producer reinforced this point and made me realise that I cannot make assumptions about the criteria against which field members judge a work, because when I do, unnecessary misunderstandings occur that prevent the work being judged in a way that would be useful to me. In hindsight I should have insisted that everyone view the rough cut of the documentary in my company. Had I done this I could have clearly managed expectations about the quality of the film that was to be viewed.

Once I had taken on board what I believed was a more rational and objective understanding of the interactions between myself and my Executive Producers I was able to return my attention to completing the documentary in time for the Film Festival deadline.

Around this time I screened the documentary rough cut for Dr Erik Eklund. He knew most about the history of the Fort Scratchley site and he confirmed that the documentary’s narrative structure worked. However, he recommended that it needed a clearer set-up, using some voiceover to clarify what the story was about. In addition to this note, I wrote:

> Erik also felt that the maritime history wasn’t clearly explained and he felt that a package could more clearly explain the coal/convict mines and the busy harbour from the beginning of the 1800’s through to the turn of the century. (Kerrigan, Journal: 23 January 2007)

These suggestions (Using Fort Scratchley, 2008; minutes 2-14-4.21) were undertaken back in the editing suite at the University, where I was again joined by editor Kathy Freeman. Work began editing the audio with the Music Director, Mark Tinson. Under Mark’s supervision Kathy set correct audio levels, equalised the audio and added music. This work on the audio made me realise that, at last, the project was near completion:

> It was interesting to see what he was doing and the realisation for me that laying in this music and fixing the levels, really set the placement of vision in concrete. (Kerrigan, Journal: 28 January 2007)

In addition to making these changes I had shot and edited two more key interviews, one with Professor John Maynard, about the Awabakal use of the site and the other with Newcastle Lord Mayor John Tate, which discussed Newcastle City Council’s response to ongoing site vandalism and some issues with the stalled site restoration. After editing Tate’s interview I still felt there were some issues with the end of the documentary:
The ending is still not quite there, it doesn’t feel like it works ending on Tate saying that he hopes to seek more funding. Tomorrow I’m interviewing Bill and I hope that he will give me something else. I’m worried that he will give me too much emotion where the Lord Mayor, hardly showed any. It’s a funny process, to be this close to the end of the doco and not actually know how it’s going to end. (Kerrigan, Journal: 30 January 2007)

The Film Festival version of the documentary ended on a comment from FSHS President Bill Hopkins, stating that they would continue to lobby the Federal Government for more funds to complete the restoration of the Fort. With the filming finally completed I was able to finalise many of the loose ends over the next two weeks. Copyright on the archival photos was secured, a DVD cover was created (Figure 16), the credit list was checked and re-checked, a DVD was burnt and tested to make sure that all the buttons worked.

Figure 16 - DVD Cover for 1st version of Using Fort Scratchley

By Monday the 19th of February the completed documentary was ready for submission to the Film Festival. I drove the DVD’s to Sydney, and without any fanfare passed a package over the counter. Submitting the completed DVD to the Film Festival marked the end of the video documentary part of the project (see Table 4, page 71). Though I was ten weeks behind schedule, I had, in seven and a half months, achieved my outcome of completing the video documentary. Unfortunately, the extended schedule meant I was now ten weeks behind on the website production.
The website satisfied a number of contextual components of this project. Firstly, it offered an achievable way to deliver content that did not require funding, installation and maintenance of DVD players and monitors in Fort Scratchley’s tunnels. Secondly, the website would satisfy one of the aims requested by NCC, which was to promote the history of the Fort to potential local, national and international visitors. Thirdly, the website was able to promote a location without being directly attached to that location.

Funds to create the website were secured through a UoN internal fellowship scheme the ‘Equity Research Fellowship’. The 6 month funding began in January 2007, and additional support of $10,000 to fund website production was also granted. These funds were to cover the employment cost of a Research Assistant (R.A.) to work collaboratively with me. The learning that had come out of the video documentary collaborations helped me to identify some conditions for the R.A.’s employment. The R.A. had to be an experienced website producer, be extremely proficient in all website production software and be willing to work both autonomously and collaboratively (Kerrigan, 2006a).

Through a colleague I found an ex-graduate from UoN’s Visual Communication program, Shannon Murdoch. My reflections on our first meeting are below:

It didn’t take long before the pitch was over, and they [Shannon and his colleague] were examining the brief I wrote. Towards the end of the meeting I said, well it sounds like we are going to work together but I hadn’t even seen … any examples of their work. (Kerrigan, Journal: 7 March 2007)
Though Shannon had brought along a colleague to our first meeting that person did not work on the website. Instead Flash Web Designer James Bennett worked with Shannon who led the project as Web Producer. The website production was managed through Dreamscape Media, which was a company owned by Murdoch (Dreamscape Media, 2010).

At the second meeting I met James and the aesthetic style of the website and the inclusion of an historical timeline that had some interactivity was discussed. I also requested that the text component be easily accessed for editing and correction purposes and the whole website be open-ended so that new content might be added at a later point in time. Shannon suggested that the media be structured around a database. I rejected this idea as I had a concept of databases as being clunky and pedestrian. However, I reconsidered and after further discussions I asked Shannon and James; ‘Can you make a database look sexy?’, and they did. Figure 17 (page 114) shows an initial sketch of the database idea including Shannon’s initial layout of the content through customised tours. I then generated a more detailed layout of the Fort Scratchley content (Figure 18, below) categorising the content into five social groupings, containing both discrete and shared timeline events. The hot pink sections indicate events that would be grouped into a highlights tour:

![Figure 18 - Timeline Website Brief: 19 March 2007](image)

James was also supplied with quality photographs of Fort Scratchley’s communities and guns so that preliminary work on the interface designs could begin (see Figure 19, page...
The overall aesthetic design incorporated the interactivity component through a media selector window indicated by the small grey boxes situated bottom left of screens.

While James liaised with Shannon on the interface, I developed Fort Scratchley’s historic content (Figure 20, below). An Excel spreadsheet, used horizontally laid out the timeline content. This quickly became unworkable as the volume of historical data that I had accumulated was difficult to manage using the horizontal layout.

The material was re-worked into a vertical timeline (Figure 21, page 117), making it easier to see exactly the quantity of material that was being considered for the website. I found it easier to organise the historically significant dates by colour coding them into the Fort Scratchley community grouping to determine how many timeline entries would be
appropriate. This working document became the plan for the website in the same way the Excel document used for the video narrative helped me structure that narrative. My lack of web-production experience made me ignorant of acceptable website methods used to organise content, but I was comfortable designing my own layout as it was intended only for me and did not have to be deciphered by anyone else. Figure 21 shows an example of one entry from the date 1885, which has been separated across three community tours of Maritime, Coal Mining and Military.

Figure 21 - Fort Scratchley’s Webpage Content Draft

After seven weeks the Fort Scratchley timeline content had been organised into community tour groupings with each date having up to three photos/images, three videos and three written documents. Shannon worked in a very collaborative and inclusive way. He was also very patient and organised. For example, he specified how the media needed to be physically assembled for website assembly:

Each image/news article/video must have copy written for it, or an indication of what copy should be used beside it in the website.

Have one folder per event, named ‘YYYYMMDD - Event Name’ (this allows us to work chronologically as it’s compatible with the MacOS filename sorting algorithm). Each event folder would contain three
folders - VIDEO, NEWS ARTICLES, IMAGES. Beside each media file would be a text file (with the same filename) containing the associated copy for that media file. (Murdoch, email: 16 April 2007)

Working at this level of detail meant it was important to manage my files well and keep track of file names. Figure 22 (below) shows the simple folder structure that we employed to physically organise the media for each date/timeline event.

Figure 22 - Website file pathways

Murdoch’s specific instructions not only provided the process that I had to follow but reassured me that all the work I was doing would make his job of website assembly easier:

Working on the content today for the website. I’ve got 10 folders to make up with the content. I feel like I’m making good progress, as the process of narrative construction is now extremely clear to me. Each timeline event is centered around a date, that has a photo, document or newspaper article and a video segment, each piece of media was chosen for ability to either visually or editorially progress the user’s understanding of the timeline event. (Kerrigan, Journal: 30 May 2007)

Through the construction of the website, Shannon identified two priorities that he was working on:

1. To develop a non-database driven method of storing the data of the website and;
2. To develop and refine the visual transitions for the website keeping in line with Jame’s rustic interfaces.

To address the first priority I’ve looked into storing the website’s content in XML files – these are becoming increasingly used for the storage and communication of data across many electronic devices on the market...For instance, when your mobile phone synchronises its contacts with your computer, it will transfer an XML file for your computer to read in. It is basically a structured way of storing information that does not rely
on any advanced technology and can be modified in a simple text editor. This will allow you to make simple text and content changes to the website without needing to open Flash. It also means the site should be able to be run off a CD-ROM or very primitive website hosting. This evening I’ve developed the structure (or ‘schema’) of the XML files that will describe which events fall under each tour, and also the schema of the events themselves – one that accounts for a varying number of video clips, images and articles...I’m sure this all sounds like gobbledygook, but I thought it might add to your research paper. (Murdoch, email: 31 May 2007)

In my opinion Murdoch’s explanation does add to this research but not for the technical reason that he has implied. Instead it was Murdoch’s collaborative approach to the technical construction of the website that satisfied my desires to work collaboratively with skilled producers for the website production. The technical production of the work, categorised into dated folders and restricted to three items for each version of media, was not constraining, as it enabled me to select and organise the Fort Scratchley media very early on in the web production preparation.

It took four more weeks to completely prepare all the media using the file structure that Shannon had requested. Being able to organise the Fort Scratchley content into this XML file structure specifically demonstrated how deeply immersed I was, in both the technical production of the media and the editorial selection and manipulation of the media. The advantage of this immersion was that I was able to logically order the material and imagine how website users may want to access the media. The first draft of the website content contained:

… 66 timeline events, made up of 151 photos and paintings, and 62 video clips and 83 newspaper articles and documents.

I feel relieved that I’m through and now all I have to do is Photoshop some files and edit the video clips. It should take me about another week to complete the files. I even wrote the opening intro page. (Kerrigan, Journal: 31 March 2007)

A prototype of the website was emailed through, allowing me to see exactly how the website could be navigated and how each piece of media would be displayed. I wrote ‘it’s just the most beautiful thing that I have seen.’ (Kerrigan, Journal: 21 June 2007). Arranging the historical content to suite web-delivery was effortless because, I had internalised Fort Scratchley’s historical stories, and I had formed my own opinions about how it should be presented for web-delivery. These feelings of joy and satisfaction demonstrate my ‘flow’ experience, where the level of challenge was met in this case with a similar level of skill.

However, it could also be argued that ‘group flow’ was also experienced through the website production. In the book ‘Group Genius: the Creative Power of Collaboration’,...
Sawyer discusses group flow which he describes as ‘a peak experience, a group performing at its top level of ability’ (2007: 43). The benefits of working with two highly skilled and intuitive professionals made the website production process relatively easy and so much more streamlined than the previous Fort Scratchley documentary process. Murdoch and I communicated primarily via phone, text and email and because of this we only had five face-to-face meetings. Sawyer argues that ‘[t]he key question facing groups that have to innovate is finding just the right amount of structure to support improvisation, but not so much structure that it smothers creativity’ (Sawyer, 2007: 56). The balance described by Sawyer, where creative innovation is nurtured because of the tensions between the structural form, skill of crew members and execution of the task at hand, was demonstrated in the Fort Scratchley website production experience. The collaboration of each of the three crew members: myself, Shannon Murdoch and James Bennett, demonstrated that as a group we were able to successfully manage the balance between media structure and individual and collaborative group actions making it possible to achieve group flow.

Scholars describing the successful effects of group work label this experience convergent group thinking:

Through convergent thinking work groups funnel down a set of ideas or opportunities into a manageable decision from which to proceed to implementation [...] implementation is crucial; ideas must be not only novel but practical as well. (Milliken, 2003: 35)

From my observations the main reasons for the smoothness of the online production were because each team member was professionally skilled in their area of production and there were no process loss issues identified as was the case with aspects of the documentary video production. Additionally, my Fort Scratchley domain knowledge was of great benefit particularly with the selection and planning of the web-content. Very little mental effort was required to sort and re-organise the material that had been accumulated for the video production and was now being re-purposed for web-delivery. This was due to my previous level of immersion in the Fort Scratchley content domain that afforded me an implicit understanding of how best to tell the histories of Fort Scratchley online.

This analysis of field interactions shows how as an intermediary I was able to capitalise on field opinion for both the video and the web production phases. Again, lack of domain knowledge was identified as a constraint that affected the critical judgement of one of the field members who had provided video documentary feedback. Overall, I was able to capitalise on collective field feedback of the video documentary and using a preference-driven process method, identify weaknesses in the video’s narrative structure and addressed them. Rearranging some narrative components, adding material and making
the voice-over more explicit contributed to making the multiple historical stories easier to comprehend. While this field feedback directly contributed to the successful completion of the video narrative it was also indirectly useful for the structuring of the web content. Experiencing a critique of the video content prior to working on the website helped me to expand my understanding of field opinions and expectations in regard to the ordering of the Fort Scratchley material. These insights made it easier for me to select and layout the website content which was, in fact, never subject to the same critiquing and feedback process that the video had been subject to. Possibly, I felt that the level of critique of the web-authored content was not required. However, the decision to omit one of the stages of field peer review for the website must have been unconscious as no website audience testing was documented in my journal. These reflections demonstrate how I internalised technical, editorial and managerial aspects of the field’s opinions, in parallel with the video and web productions, confirming the notion that:

To function well within the creative system, one must internalise the rules of the domain and the opinions of the field, so that one can choose the most promising ideas to work on, and do so in a way that will be acceptable to one’s peers. (Csikszentmihalyi, 1999:332)

Finally, this analysis demonstrates how I internalised the rules of the domain and the opinions of the field and in doing this, my own critical judgement of my work expanded. By absorbing the structures of documentary making, in fact being conditioned by them, my own agency as a decision-maker was enhanced.

Having made these realisations, it was time to take the final products into the wider world. The following section analyses the field’s feedback on the now completed video and online documentaries. The analysis below has to be seen as different from the above in that once the documentary products were essentially complete it was going to be more onerous, and in sometime instances impossible, to return to production in order to incorporate or address content issues raised by other field members.

5.3.2 - Field Feedback on Documentary Practice
The knowledge acquired through field interactions during production and audience test screenings was informative and useful. However, I was concerned that because of my relationship with the field I would receive insightful feedback and given the products had been finalised, I would not be able to incorporate that feedback into the documentaries. My concern or fear of the project being criticised by the Fort Scratchley or documentary field can be balanced by Sawyer’s argument about the complex layering of the audiences, and as I have already identified myself as an intermediary of the Fort Scratchley
documentary field then I should have already been acting under the conditioning of these social field groupings who do ‘influence ... the creative process, even if the creator is alone in a room in the woods’ (Sawyer 2006: 128). What follows are examinations of my observations of the field’s reactions to the completed documentaries.

By March 2007 the Film Festival version of the documentary was completed. It was time to show NCC representatives how the documentary explained the failed restoration of the Fort. The scope of the restoration works planned for the Fort exceeded the funds allocated which meant that the restoration work had been stalled for three years. The ending of the film festival version of the documentary reflected FSHS’s president’s frustration with the stalled restoration work and the repeated vandal attacks that the site had suffered from because of the lack of human activity at the Fort.

Newcastle City Council representatives Bruce Carpenter and Grant Halverson attended a private screening with me. Halverson was the manager who first pitched the project idea to me and Carpenter was the liaison between NCC, FSHS and the Government’s Finance Department in Canberra. My reflections on the screening were documented in my journal:

> It went well, and the strangest thing about things going well is that there is no resistance. People move from praise quite quickly to how they may use the work. For example the NCC guys asked specific questions about what sort of access they can have to the doco. I said that the copyright resides with me but they are welcome to show the doco to whomever they want.

> We discussed the possibility of [NCC] giving us more funding to complete the booklet and to complete Kathy’s DVD for sale at FS\(^\text{14}\)\(^\text{,}\) and to pay for the copyright on the website material and finally the purchase of equipment to display the DVD at Fort Scratchley. (Kerrigan, Journal: 12 March 2007)

While Carpenter requested a copy of the documentary to send to the Government’s Finance Department (Kerrigan, Journal: 14 March 2007), he did express some concerns about the political nature of the documentary ending as it was being critical of the stalled restoration of the Fort Scratchley site. These critical comments, though removed from the second version of the documentary can be viewed on the website (Fort Scratchley a Living History, 2008, dates 17/11/2005 & 24/5/2006). While I distinctly remember Carpenter being uncomfortable about the ending of the documentary I have not documented this conversation in my journal. I should have expected that he would be more sensitive to the issues with the Fort’s restoration because he was responsible for

\(^{14}\) As part of Kathy’s Honours project she had packaged all the content into a DVD, while here I am referring to this as Kathy’s DVD, it was in fact the culmination of work done throughout the production.
managing NCC’s involvement in the project through the Government’s Finance Department.

More field feedback was obtained through a screening with my academic colleagues:

It was such a pleasure to know that my narrative was captivating a room of people for 50 minutes. They laughed out loud a few times (end of Fluffy story @ 30.50 Modess pad story @ 21.26 and fire on the grasslands story @ 29.33). There was total silence during Laffey’s tunnel memory segment, and the end credit ‘PhD production’ got a laugh too.

John Sutton [public affairs lecturer and former Newcastle City Councillor] said that it was an advocacy documentary and asked how I created the narrative. I said that I kept trying to work to the strengths of the content by constantly assessing where the project was up to and adjusting the narrative to suite my timeframe. (Kerrigan, Journal: 23 March 2007)

The positive feedback that was coming from the documentary screenings was thoroughly enjoyable:

The last few days have been really energizing. I’ve had lots of conversations about Fort Scratchley, both the documentary project and its imminent public release and also other spin off projects that have resulted (booklet and website). (Kerrigan, Journal: 29 March 2007)

In March 2007, I also contacted ABC Television’s documentary department to see if they were interested in broadcasting the documentary. Here is what I wrote about their response:

The ABC requested a copy of the DVD today for assessment re: programming. So I posted one off this afternoon. They said that they don’t normally screen such programs but it could be suitable for the Anzac Day schedule. A screening on the ABC may jeopardise the Film Festival entry. This afternoon I felt confused about what to do but after some thought I’ve decided that I made the doco in order to point out the historical significance of the site and it needs to be shown to the widest audience possible and the best way to achieve this would be through an ABC screening. (Kerrigan, Journal: 22 March 2007)

In the lead up to Anzac Day (25 April), there was no word from ABC Television about broadcasting the documentary. Regardless of this situation I was preparing to launch the documentary to the local community with the help of the University’s PR team:

I’ve been organising the cast and crew screening for the doco to coincide with the Media launch. The University Media and PR department will write the press release and pitch the story to Newcastle Morning Herald (Print) and NBN and Southern Cross (Regional TV stations).

15 Film Festival’s like to have National or International Premier screening rights therefore, a television broadcast may have compromised the potential exclusivity of a Film Festival release.
Andrew [Technical Officer] set up the TV studio as a theatrette for 75 people. I’ve organised a sponge cream and jam cake, with army green camouflage icing on it, to have afterwards. (Kerrigan, Journal: 20 April 2007)

About fifty of the documentary participants turned up for the screening (see Figure 23, page 124). While I knew that the documentary had its faults I put them aside and really enjoyed the atmosphere of the screening. I was deliriously happy to receive positive feedback on the finished form particularly from this audience who predominantly had a military bias:

I was elated at their response to the work. Everyone is so enthusiastic about it. Given that this audience really enjoyed the work it’s odd that the ABC haven’t gotten back to me about screening it. Everyone loved it and it’s hard to describe how happy I felt, that I had their blessing. (Kerrigan, Journal: 22 April 2007)

There were two documentary participants who expressed their concerns about the content. Jimmy James, an active FSHS member who served in World War 2 and joined the Fort Scratchley battery after the war commented: ‘I don’t like all that other stuff you’ve got in there, the plays and stuff, the military stuff is good.’ While I had recounted Jimmy’s comment a number of times all I could find in my journal is a reference to our meeting but there was no reflection about his comment (Kerrigan, Journal: 1 August 2007).

Another documentary participant approached me at this cast and crew screening to discuss her reservations about one of the stories I had included in the documentary. Marie
Kildney had served at the Fort during World War 2 and she had told a story about learning to fire rifles on Nobbys Beach. The recoil of the rifle was so powerful that it bruised the women’s shoulders so the women strapped ‘modess’ pads to their shoulders to protect them (Using Fort Scratchley, 2008; minutes 21.26-21.47). After viewing the documentary Marie expressed her embarrassment about this story being in the documentary. She felt that on the recording day she was just telling the story to the four women who were in the room and did not think it would be in the documentary. I responded compassionately while also trying to explain that her story was so valuable to the documentary because it is one of the few female military experiences portrayed and it always receives a giggle from female audience members. Marie, however, was still embarrassed, but after conversations with her daughter she became convinced of the merits of her story and agreed that it could remain in the documentary. However, her story does not appear in the website. This example highlights the ethical nature of both research and documentary making activities.

By strange coincidence the day after the screening there was an announcement, made by the Australian Prime Minister, John Howard, which was to have consequences for the documentary that I thought was complete:

Mum’s phone call woke me up this morning. She told me that she’d heard on the radio that John Howard, Australia’s Prime Minister, had just announced another 4 million dollars for the restoration of the Fort. This announcement set the agenda for my day as University’s P.R. officer Kate Reid arranged to have the Uni’s press release sent out to local media. I raced into work. (Kerrigan, Journal: 23 April, 2007)

Local media for TV, print and radio all covered the Prime Minister’s additional funding announcement and included in each story was a promotion for the documentary Using Fort Scratchley. Below is a breakdown of the eight regional media interviews that I did during that week. For most of these interviews I was also asked to provide impressions of the announcement about the extra restoration funding, I felt very strongly that it was not my position to make official comment and directed the journalists to FSHS President, Bill Hopkins. Here is a list of the interviews on that day:

1. NBN did a news story, 3rd item, they used a grab from me that related to the spending of the extra 4 million (off air recorded).
2. Newcastle Herald did a paragraph on the doco with the article they ran about the extra funding. (Article scanned)
3. ABC Radio, did an 11 minute interview with me, broadcast at 4.30pm. Interviewer was Craig Hamilton. (copy received)
4. ABC Radio News ran an item.
5. 2HD Radio News ran an item. (Copy recorded)

16 ‘Modess’ is the brand name for a feminine hygiene/sanitary napkin.
6.2 NURFM did an interview, about 10 minutes at 11.30am on Felicity Biggins’ show.
7. ABC Central Coast, interviewed me at 1.40 pm, Scott Levi. After the interview he asked if he could turn the interview into an ipod download. So I emailed him two photos to go with it.

Fort Scratchley’s moment of newsworthiness subsequently reinforced the local cultural worth of the Fort and the community interest in its refurbishment. Unfortunately the cultural intermediaries from the film festivals and broadcasting agencies showed no interest in screening *Using Fort Scratchley*. The documentary was also offered to and rejected by the NSW Premier’s History Prize, the History Channel, SBS and Network Australia. My reflections of these rejections are below:

It appears that it is going to be very difficult to get this film screened, outside of Fort Scratchley. Got an email from ABC TV today, confirming that they will ‘pass’ on my documentary. I feel so disappointed about this. She said that two assessors...after consideration and lengthy discussion were unable to find a spot in their schedule for the film. I emailed her back saying that I was relieved that there was lengthy discussion about the film and that that was all that I could ask for. However, I remain extremely disappointed, because even with due consideration, the film is not worthy of broadcast on the ABC.

After it being so well received by those who have seen it, it would appear that the rules of the field are extremely rigid and inflexible. The content, though presented in an entertaining way, obviously isn’t considered to be broad enough for a mass audience. (Kerrigan, Journal: 22 May 2007)

Despite the research focus of my own work it was difficult to take on board in a rational way the news from the ABC:

I know that one of the points of this research is to see how the Field receives this piece and from pure research terms I can see that penetrating the Field is difficult and this is something that personally affects me. And it’s hard to find the motivation to continue. (Kerrigan, Journal: 27 May 2007)

Further reflections as to why the documentary was not attractive to Australian television broadcasting Field has brought me to the understanding that Fort Scratchley does not have enough of a national profile while it does have a regional one. The lack of a national profile may be one of the reasons why the documentary was not considered worthy of national broadcast. However, as the creator of the work I feel that the low-budget quality of the documentary was unattractive to broadcasters. Unfortunately these reflections come from my speculation and conjecture because once these cultural intermediaries
rejected the documentary film no further communication or feedback from them is possible. 17

From a creative research perspective, this discussion has explored the effect of Field feedback that occurred after what I initially thought was the completion of the product. The feedback from the broadcasters and Film Festivals provided information that suggested that the documentary video product was not acceptable to the Field members or cultural intermediaries who managed the distribution of products for the national sphere. On the other hand, the feedback from the regional media outlets suggested that the documentary would be acceptable to those Field members because they are selecting works against regional criteria which would be distributed to audiences that include the social grouping of both amateurs and connoisseurs. The Systems Model (see Figure 3, page 11) is able to accommodate both differing outcomes identified through the Field’s social groupings as the parallel arrows that run between Field and Domain, which are labelled to emphasise the positive outcome, ‘selects novelty’, imply the capacity for inclusion or exclusion from relative Domains. The complexity of an integrated open creative system that accommodates various social orderings of the Field and its capacity to simultaneously accept or reject creative process, product or idea is difficult to accurately represent in a diagram. While the Systems Model diagram identifies the occurrence of these Field interactions it does not clearly explain the complex social groupings that occur within multiple Fields and Domains.

These theoretical implications can be seen as contributing to my P-creativity as the knowledge gained from my experience of these products being simultaneously selected and rejected will, of course, benefit my future Field interactions. The discussion below continues to explore the dynamics of the Field and the privileges that come with Field approval.

5.3.3 - Fort Scratchley Field Approval
During the making of the documentary I had doubts as to whether I was a fully accepted member of the Fort Scratchley Field. But after the documentary was completed, I experienced a significant change to the way the Field treated me. From my perspective I had completed the documentary and even through the Fort’s restoration was about to commence I was not intending to alter the documentaries to include the restoration. I felt I had fulfilled the original brief to the best of my abilities in light of the stalled restoration.

17 The Television stations, however, did supply a rejection email telling me that they had ‘passed’ on the documentary whereas the film festival did not contact entrants.
Moreover, by producing the website I had delivered more than the brief required even through neither documentary was able to track the Fort’s restoration process. While the timing of the restoration was completely out of my control, there was still an expectation from both NCC and FSHS that I would video the restoration of the Fort at some undetermined point in the future. However, as there were no funds left from the original research grant and the initial timeframe for that grant had expired in 2005, and it was now 2007, I felt I was no longer obligated to video the restoration of the Fort. My own priority for the project was to undertake a creative work for a PhD and the production of the online and video documentary satisfied this ‘research’ imperative. However, the Fort Scratchley Field persuaded me to change my mind about filming the restoration of the Fort. The most persuasive factor was the obvious change in the Fort Scratchley Field members’ attitudes towards me.

I began to notice a change, a sense of acceptance, when interacting with NCC employees and the construction workers who had begun preparations for the Fort’s restoration. With this acceptance came some privileges, or increased social capital (Bourdieu, 1993) which had previously been denied. Firstly, I was invited to film the announcement of the beginning of construction works at Fort Scratchley by Australian Senator Richard Colbec on the June 4, 2007. Previously, I had not been included on the guest list of these official functions, and back in 2004, when I requested access to film restoration works at the Fort, I had been refused.

I attended the event with my video camera and filmed Senator Colbec’s announcement with the explicit intention of putting the footage on the website which had not yet been finalised. Attending this announcement were all the main restoration stakeholders; the Australian Department of Finance, the construction company and sub-contractors running the restoration, NCC and FSHS members. I was introduced to a number of key people, whom previously I had only had email correspondence with:

While holding my video camera I also met the Federal Government Finance official [Owen Hammond] who had refused to permit me to film on site and yet there I was preparing to film in front of him. And of course I said, ‘Oh Owen Hammond, I know you, you refused to allow me to film at Fort Scratchley’. He denied that he was the person who refused me permission to film on site. He even appeared embarrassed, standing back and dropping his head. Owen then went on to tell me that he did have a copy of the doco, yet he hadn’t watched it yet.

Finally I met the contractor who will be overseeing work on the site, [John Ryan] and I promised to send him a copy of the doco for viewing, along with my requests to film certain works at the site. (Kerrigan, Journal: 4 June 2007)
At the announcement event, I also engaged Bruce Carpenter from NCC in conversation and confirmed that the Council would pay for the printing of the booklet and the DVD duplications (Kerrigan, Journal: 4 June 2007). These observations clearly demonstrate that access to the field makes the production of a documentary much easier. The *quid pro quo* of these interactions resulted in a request to supply a photo of Senator Colbec firing the six-inch gun at Fort Scratchley. While I was unable to email a photo to Colbec assistant I was able to supply some video of him firing the six-inch gun (Kerrigan, Journal: 15 June 2007).

The aim to complete the website by 30 June, 2007, as laid out in the Equity Research Fellowship timeline (see Table 4, page 71) was not achievable by mid-June 2007 the website production was, however, nearing completion. By the beginning of July, Shannon Murdoch felt the website architecture was working in the way he had anticipated:

> Just spoke with Shannon. He feels that he has completed the website! How fabulous is this!!!!
> We briefly discussed some site hosting issues, and Shannon said that he would make a document for me explaining what the priorities are for the server.
> 1. 250 megabytes for site, 2. Server space & server speed, 3. Server speed for video downloads

> Waiting for David to return from surgery, after his pelvic operation.

(Kerrigan, Journal: 2 July 2007)

The last note at the bottom of the entry was personal but I have included it here as it marks a moment from my personal life that affected the emotional energy I had to devote to this project. My husband David had fallen from a roof, whilst volunteering at the local Primary School. The fall had fractured his pelvis and it was a very serious injury that took him six months to recover from. The result was that my personal support network had collapsed and my emotional attention was re-directed to family matters. It is difficult to argue that this was a gender specific constraint, given that my husband and I agreed to role-reversal when I commenced full time academic work, and he agreed to undertake part-time work while also doing more of the home duties to care for our two daughters. It is difficult to quantify the exact amount of process loss that was incurred on the website production at this time but it is fair to claim web-site progress slowed down considerably.

I was now in the final stages of preparing for the public launch of the website, this involved contracting a company to host the website and securing permissions to publish all the historical artworks and documents online. The *Newcastle Herald* refused permission to publish their newspaper articles online. The website contained thirty-one newspaper articles published within the last 50 years which had to be re-written or eliminated. What
initially appeared to be a time consuming obstacle did in fact turn out to be beneficial for the website, ‘After three days I completed that task and in fact it has improved the integrity of the website information’ (Kerrigan, Journal: 30 July 2007).

Figure 24 - Newcastle Herald article, 9 August, 2007

The website was also shown to the FSHS committee for their reaction. Again I did not document their reactions in my journal but I remember ten elderly men and I squeezed
around an old computer which had internet access. These men were almost disappointed with the website, or maybe a little confused. I came to realise that they thought I was creating a new website for their FSHS organisation. This was a little awkward. I had never promised to re-do their society’s website. Thankfully one of their members clearly articulated that my website showed the history of Fort Scratchley across all communities, whereas the FSHS website was designed to showcase the society of volunteers who looked after the Fort.

The website *The Living History of Fort Scratchley* was publicly launched the second week of August, 2007 and a flurry of local media activity followed (for example see Figure 24, page 130).

Here is a list of media interviews that I conducted and also listed are the number of site hits that occurred as a direct response to the media campaign:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Media Event</th>
<th>Site Visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday 6th</td>
<td>ABC radio on Monday</td>
<td>43 site visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday 7th</td>
<td>Uni media Release</td>
<td>24 site visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 8th</td>
<td>KOFM &amp; 2HD News grabs</td>
<td>77 site visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 9th</td>
<td>The Herald article</td>
<td>133 visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday 10th</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>71 visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday 11</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>32 visits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of the 11th August the web statistics showed that there were 227 unique site visitors, with 166 web users returning to the site for a second time. In total 5,941 pages were viewed within the first week of web publication. (Kerrigan, Journal: 12 August 2007)

Though work on the website was completed I regularly checked website statistics and analysed how people searched for the website. As a result I felt that there were some improvements that could be made and Shannon completed some web optimisation tasks. The website title was adjusted from “The Living History of Fort Scratchley” to *Fort Scratchley a Living History* as I felt this may also improve search engine results (Kerrigan, Journal: 21 November 2007). Secondly some HTML text was added to the website ensuring that the Google searches could display the opening lines of the website’s text which previously could not be decoded because of the Flash website encoding. I observed that when searching Google, the website did not appear on the first page of results. It was more like page four or five. To improve the website’s Google listing Shannon registered the website with Google. This took four months to take effect but on December 9, 2007 the website appeared on the first page of a ‘Fort Scratchley’ search request (Figure 25, page 132).
Now that the website had been launched I felt no obligation to film the ongoing restoration work at the Fort but pressure for me to continue was being applied by NCC and FSHS. As part of the restoration of Fort Scratchley a stakeholders’ workshop was held, hosted by ICS (International Conservation Services). ICS was working for three clients: Commonwealth Department of Finance and Deregulation, Newcastle City Council and Suters Architects. ICS’ brief was to engage volunteer FSHS workers ‘as well as … several other community groups with an interest in the Fort precinct’ (ICS, 2008: online), to develop an interpretive approach for the site. I was one of the invited community stakeholders and attended the one-day workshop in October 2007 to help ICS come up with such an interpretive approach. At the workshop I received some very useful anecdotal feedback on my documentary.

…it was interesting because there were many people there who approached me to discuss my documentary. Most of those who had seen it wanted to know if I was going to change the ending. There were others like the architect who wanted to view it and more interestingly members of the Fort Scratchley Historical Society mentioned the stories from the documentary twice. Firstly, they mentioned the Awabakal stories that the documentary contains and secondly, when a comment from the floor about the Fort being a ‘world without women’ (was raised) the documentary was mentioned again because it contains a segment on the AWAS who served at the Fort. While I am still unsure about how to improve the ending of the documentary to tell the restoration story,
what I was impressed with was how the FSHS had taken ownership of these stories that were in the doco and how these stories had become their own. (Kerrigan, Journal: 21 November 2007)

My concern that FSHS members would not be comfortable with the multiple community approach that the documentary embraced evaporated as I observed FSHS members retelling stories from the documentary that had expanded their understanding of the multiple community histories of the site. My observations from this event confirmed that the documentary, which was critical of the stalled restoration process, had indeed been accepted by those who had seen it. I felt proud of my work, in that my authored documentary had assisted in the meaning-making process of this social grouping of Fort Scratchley field experts.

Following the stakeholders’ workshop, I was asked to meet with NCC’s Bruce Carpenter and ICS’ Ian Trapnell. At this meeting some real progress was made and it was agreed that Council would provide additional funding for me to re-work the ending of the documentary and incorporate the restoration of the Fort. The ICS representative discussed plans to display some of the documentary footage on large screens to be installed in Fort Scratchley’s tunnels. Here are my reflections of the meeting held in early February 2008:

**DVD**
1. Confirmed that the “Using Fort Scratchley – Re-deployed” DVD would be sold at the Fort by the council.
2. Confirmed that the Council would like to see the ending of the documentary changed to reflect the successful restoration of the Fort.
3. Susan to prepare a budget to present to Council asap to ensure that funds can be made available for this re-editing of the documentary.
4. DVD front cover design, branding and logos to be discussed.

**Booklet**
5. Booklet layout to be distributed as PDF to ICS, NCC’s Bruce and Rochelle.
6. Booklet front cover design and branding and Logos to be discussed.
7. Booklet corrections feedback to Susan so that booklet can be finalised and prepared for print.

**Website**
8. Discussed using [www.fortscratchley.org](http://www.fortscratchley.org) as the official Fort Scratchley website.
9. Looked at some other front-end examples that could apply to FS website.
10. Rochelle to complete brief.

**Installation:** [proposed for Fort Scratchley’s tunnels]
12. Also discussed was the creation of a video installation to be housed in the tunnels at Fort Scratchley.
13. Proposed as a multiple screen installation + audio, it would re-create the Japanese attack sequence.

From a creative process perspective, this meeting was extremely significant because it confirmed that the information and the packaging of these products was acceptable to the field. This meeting provided field verification for me, or field acceptance. Up to this point I was unsure exactly what the field’s intentions were for these products. This meeting confirmed that the field intends to use the products exactly as they were designed to be used. (Kerrigan, Journal: 17 February 2008)

A month later Newcastle City Council was sent an invoice for $5000 to cover the completion of the documentary. The agreement included changes to the ending of the documentary that would remove all the political comment about the failed restoration process, include colour grade and online & DVD authoring, as well as finalisation of the booklet.\(^{18}\)

With the additional funding from NCC in place and the restoration of the Fort underway I now felt willing to shoot additional footage and re-edit the ending of the Film Festival version of the documentary. I had to organise a few more interviews, one of these was with Project Architect Mark Fenwick who I had been wanting to interview for four years. Previously I had tried to contact Fenwick for an interview, but I was asked not to pursue the interview by the restoration construction contractor, until the funding issue was resolved. I organised to film Fenwick at the fort (Using Fort Scratchley, 2008: from minutes 46.31; Fort Scratchley a Living History; 2008, date 4/6/2007).

As I was now officially re-editing the documentary I tried to make arrangements with the editor Kathy Freeman to return to the project. Kathy was working full-time as an editor with the local TV station and as we both found it difficult to manage the work via emails so I decided to re-edit the ending myself:

> Working by myself made it very difficult to judge the content and the meaning held within the content. I had to get Louise [a colleague] in to look over it for me. Louise was great, and she provided really good feedback on the edit and made me feel like the restoration section was actually working. Louise had a few minor suggestions, which were easy to incorporate. (Kerrigan, Journal: 28 March 2008)

\(^{18}\) As I was the only academic remaining on the ‘Living History of Fort Scratchley Project’ I had inadvertently become responsible for the completion of the Fort Scratchley booklet though it should have been the responsibility of the project’s Chief Investigator, Dr Erik Eklund. A draft version of the booklet text was completed in April 2007, approved by FSHS, and a number of images, artworks and sketches that I suggested were to be included in the booklet. During 2007, a Design Honours student had been given the task to design the layout of the booklet and the images. The task was not completed during the student's honours year and by 2008, both Dr Eklund and the Honour's student had left the University. I was faced with chasing up the now graduated student and overseeing the final layout of the images, captions and proofing the text. Finally, the co-author of the text Julie McIntyre took over the last stages of proofreading the booklet and captions in May 2008. The booklet was published and available for purchase at Fort Scratchley’s opening ceremony on 4\(^{th}\) June 2008.
The extra funding also meant that I could address some of the documentary aesthetics by paying for a professional colour grade. However, I was realistic and knew there was nothing that could be done about some of the very amateur camera work which remains in the documentary as evidence of my learning. I sub-contracted a local production house to colour grade the documentary. Gavin Banks at *Good Eye Deer* began work on the grade on 31 March, 2008, with the expectation that we would be done within two weeks.

I was looking forward to finalising the documentary but the first few days were not spent on the colour grade, instead Gavin went back over the edit and addressed some of the pacing and timing issues that he felt were necessary to fix and would improve the overall flow of the narrative:

> While I always felt that the previous cut worked well, the new fine cut significantly increases the dramatic moments and draws the viewer into the immediacy of the action. It's not that you run out of time, its that you run out of knowledge about how to fix something. It's a knowledge issue which is related to time. (Kerrigan, Journal: 2 April 2008)

Ten days were spent fine-cutting the documentary. Gavin made lots of subtle changes to each edit. He replaced images with better quality files and re-organised the file management to make the files more stable, this work eliminated the rendering error that was still occasionally recurring. As this process progressed Gavin expressed criticisms of the pace, rhythm and timing in the edit. Consequently, I was forced to defend the decision that I had made in allowing a relatively inexperienced editor to work on the project:

> We had lots of discussions about the expectations on Kathy to actually edit the doco. I believe that the task was too great for her. Sitting next to Gavin seeing what he has done is the first time that I feel like I have had someone flying with me. But...now we’re having a problem with the drive. Gavin is saying words like ‘it’s not stable’. Scary stuff!! (Kerrigan, Journal: 9 April 2008)

Overall, work on the edit was going well but I still had a dilemma about how to end the documentary which was again attached to external constraints:

> Feeling rather compromised. Trying to tie up the loose ends is extremely difficult. Trying to get a final image of the Fort to end the doco is unachievable at the moment, given that the restoration at the Fort isn’t completed, and that I need to complete the documentary. (Kerrigan, Journal: 18 April 2008)

The two deadlines that I was working towards were very close to colliding. The documentary had to be finalised a few weeks before the scheduled re-opening of the Fort, so that it could be duplicated and ready for sale on the same date. This meant I was effectively trying to film the Fort’s completed restoration before it was actually completed. However, things finally came together and an exported copy was delivered to NCC’s Bruce Carpenter for approval. An email reply confirmed his approval:
Thanks Susan
Received disc and had a look at the ending, it looks fine to me. No political stuff. I have processed the 2 invoices and payment should be received by mid next week. Is the disc you sent me the final version or is there more work on polishing it up. If so when can I see the finished product?
Thanks
Bruce

The ‘political stuff’ Bruce had been referring to had been resolved and the restoration had finally occurred so all traces of the political tone that ended the original version of the documentary were removed. I realised that this documentary was not a piece of investigative journalism, but it needed to satisfy the brief which was to tell the history of the Fort and to document the restoration process. I confidently replied to Bruce and said that the final version would be ready in two weeks. The end was in sight. Gavin had completed the fine cut and was now working on the colour grade and the day arrived when I went over to collect the completed exported documentary project file:

Arrived at Gavin’s today to approve final edit of doco and export only to find out that the media drive had failed completely, meaning that we can’t get access to the files which created the documentary.

Spent the next 4 hours trying to get the media drive to talk to the computer but it’s completely f**ked… so now we are re-building the doco using the FCP software file saved on Gavin’s computer and drawing on media off “Kathy’s Honours” drive. (Kerrigan, Journal: 30 April 2008)

Thankfully, the Final Cut Pro project file, the blueprint of the documentary, had been saved to Gavin’s machine and the integrity of the file was not affected by the drive crashing.

However, when opened an error message stated that 653 media items were missing. Those 653 media files were on the drive that had just crashed and to indicate the severity
of the error Final Cut Pro displayed all the missing media in red. This image (Figure 26, page 136) became a trigger for my anxiety as I began to eliminate all the red ‘Media Offline’ errors in the timeline.

The project’s backup drive was connected automatically to the project file and 90% of the media was reconnected to the timeline but this proved to be incorrect because we soon realised that there were still many missing files:

After two trips back to the Uni to collect media from my office and backups on DVD and CD I realised that we were missing some animation files. Not only do I not have backups of the files I don't have the software files used to make the animation (they were on the drive that crashed).

Called animator, Geoff, who after 4 hours called back to say that he had the software files and we can re-render ... so just when I think we are nearly at the finish line recovering files I realised that there were other, really important files on that drive that are now gone too...

Cried ... in front of Gavin, editor who I don't know that well... (Kerrigan, Journal: 30 April 2008)

This intense work took its toll, as my reflections show:

…spent all day re-connecting the media piece-by-piece. Seems that every function in the software program just won't work...you know, try plan A, then plan B, then plan C, oh now we've downloaded more software so we go back to plan A...it's horrible. And my brain's stopped working...I can't remember where I've saved stuff (filenames and pathways). (Kerrigan, Journal: 6 May 2008)

It took three weeks to relocate the missing files and to reconnect every media file correctly. There were many issues that hampered progress:

1: An extended project timeframe from 2004 to 2008, meant the project was originally created on FCP version 4.5 but was being completed on version 6.0.4, (released November 2007). The consequence of this was that FCP was not able to correctly reconnect each piece of media and in some cases even though we thought 90% of the media was re-connected, when we checked, it was obvious that the media was not displaying correctly in the timeline and many clips had to be reconnected by manually searching the 2 back-up drives for file names.

2: If the file name was not found I had to go back to the camera tapes and re-import footage for the edit. Out of 70 tapes, there was one issue with incorrect tape numbering.

3: All the Freeze Frames used in the documentary, mostly to avoid inappropriate and awkward camera moves had to be redone using an old exported copy of the edit, which was of a lesser quality.
4: Some of the clips that had been re-timed or slowed down to work better in the sequences jittered when played back. Gavin worked out how to solve this by double handling each clip, re-timing it through motion and bringing it back into FCP’s timeline.

May 2008 was a blur, spent manually re-constructing the edit as well as going up to Fort Scratchley to film the final month’s restoration work. Because of the issues with FCP, it meant that I would be able to have some footage in the documentary that showed how different the Fort looked after restoration. The credit roller contains still images of the newly restored Fort from 7 May 2008 (Using Fort Scratchley, 2008; minutes 51.29-51.56; Fort Scratchley a Living History, 2008; dates 2008, 1/3/2008, 28/6/2008)

After all of the problems with reconstructing the documentary edit, Gavin was able to successfully Media Manage the files and put them all on a new stable drive. We then disconnected the 3 drives connected via daisy chain and exported the documentary (Kerrigan, Journal: 7 May 2008). Once the documentary was exported I returned to the University’s computer system to author the DVD and to finalise the DVD extras. Ten DVD extra segments, 33 minutes in length, were included on the DVD. There were, however, more technical issues in reducing the file size of the media down to fit on a DVD but as I had spent all the project’s extra funds paying Gavin for the unanticipated three weeks of work re-building the documentary I had no funds left. For this reason, I had to take on the technical role of authoring the DVD.

After a number of attempts I managed to reduce the file size to fit but I have not documented this experience in my journal. It was, however, documented through emails to Gavin, explaining the issues I was having and asking for advice. The stress of meeting the DVD duplication deadline was exhausting. I handed the master DVD over to NCC’s
Rochelle Wamsley on Saturday the 24th of May. At this point I was extremely grateful to Rochelle for overseeing the responsibility of the DVD duplications. Figure 27 (page 138) shows the finished product.

The field’s acceptance of the project is demonstrated in the way Newcastle City Council promoted the documentary as part of the Fort’s re-opening celebrations (Figure 28).

Figure 28 - Invitation to the premier community screening of Using Fort Scratchley

The celebrations commenced with the screening of Using Fort Scratchley on Friday 27th June, 2008. There were two screening sessions that evening. The first was for invited guests and was attended by all documentary participants and Newcastle City Council dignitaries including Newcastle’s Lord Mayor John Tate. Sixty copies of the DVD were
sold at the documentary's first public screening for $15 each and every documentary participant was given their free copy.

The second screening was open to the general public and was promoted through articles in the *Newcastle Herald* and through newspaper advertisements (see Appendix J - Fort Scratchley Community Preview). The ABC also conducted a radio interview with me and ten double passes to the screening were given away.

The re-opening of the Fort was celebrated through a number of other formal engagements (Figure 29). At the official re-opening ceremonies the Lord Mayor mentioned the documentary and recommended people buy a copy of the DVD. Also during the re-opening weekend, the website was displayed in a room that was set up with two computers, so the general public could view the website. I filmed the handover ceremony, where ownership of the Fort was officially transferred from the Commonwealth Government to Newcastle City Council. This was the last time that I filmed at the Fort.

Figure 29 - Newspaper advertisement for re-opening of Fort Scratchley

One of the possible outcomes of the project that had been discussed was ICS’ intention to display some segments of the videos on screens in the tunnels. This did not eventuate and I had no further contact with ICS believing that the cost was probably too prohibitive. As it was, the signage that ICS was producing was not installed in time for the re-opening ceremony which proved to be disappointing for NCC, for FSHS and for the general public.
In December 2008 I updated the website to include the restoration. Footage from the re-opening ceremony was added. So, too, were some ‘before and after’ photographs clearly showing the extent of the restoration across the whole site.

Poorly structured post-production processes might have really seen me struggle to rebuild the documentary but my management of the post-production crisis reveals the meticulous process of managing the media, backing it up on CD and DVD, as well as managing the videotapes through log sheets and transcriptions. In this case, the benefits of my embodied knowledge of production processes derived from my past creative practice protected me and the project from disaster. My habitus ensured that I was able to manage the technical crisis that delayed the completion of the documentary.

These reflections on the final stages of the documentary process demonstrate the benefits that come as a direct result of field acceptance. Specifically, gaining privileged access to the site, securing an interview with the architect and receiving additional funding supplied through NCC to complete the documentaries, supports my idea that I had not only immersed myself in the field, that is the social organisation that can affect the structure of the domain, but my work was also now approved by the field. I had become a member of the field, both of documentary practice itself and also the field of those who held significant knowledge of Fort Scratchley. So, too, my relationship to the domain of Fort Scratchley knowledge had changed.

5.3.4 - Consumption of Cross Platform Documentaries

Keith Sawyer argues, ‘the intermediaries in the field play a critical role in evaluating creative works, but after they’ve made their choices, the ultimate test for a creative work is whether or not it’s accepted by a broad audience’ (2006: 126-127). The consumption of the documentaries by this broader audience is demonstrated through both qualitative and quantitative means.

The Fort Scratchley site users’ acceptance of the documentaries can be discerned through sales of the DVD – two hundred and fifty three DVD’s, were sold between June 2008 & September 2010. The website statistics (see Appendix K – Website Statistics from 2007-2010) show an average 183 users per month visiting the site, with 6,644 unique site visits, with 45% of those users returning to the site. This brings the total number of website visits over 35 months to 10,004. The statistics reveal that website users stay on the site for an average of eight minutes and nineteen seconds. The greatest loss of users is recorded as 48.3%, which comes within the first thirty seconds of a site hit. It has been difficult to determine the exact reason for this rate of loss. One explanation could be due
to search engine hits on the site that do not materialise as actual website users. Alternatively the high number of losses could also be accounted for by users clicking away from the loading screen. Of those users who remain, most stay online for fifteen minutes. Over those 35 months 234 users have stayed online actively using the site for more than an hour. The top three nationalities visiting the site in ascending order have been Australia, United States and Japan, and this usage pattern has been consistent since the launch of the site.

To date the video documentary *Using Fort Scratchley* has not been screened at a Film Festival nor has it had a public television broadcast. While discussion of the rejection of the documentary appears in the analysis above, Film Festival and broadcast screenings were not part of the original NCC brief. Submitting the documentary to these forums was something that I chose to pursue because I wanted feedback on my work that provided validation of my creative abilities beyond the Fort Scratchley field. The need for social validation can be seen as part of my *industry* practitioner habitus, where it is customary and logical for a documentary to be tested out and critiqued via industry networks. Furthermore, it is worth noting that I only attempted to have the Film Festival version of the documentary broadcast. The second version, which has been submitted with this exegesis for examination, contains the additional footage about site restoration and was never sent out to broadcasters nor entered into a Film Festival for consideration.

Other feedback on the documentary came when I was approached by a high school teacher, Darren Pettit from Hunter School of Performing Arts who wanted to obtain a copy of *Using Fort Scratchley* to use as part of the year 9 NSW History Curriculum. I was able to direct him to the website:

> He was pleased and said that it would fit the syllabus. Then he showed me the Syllabus, Stage 5, Mandatory Site Evaluation. The conclusion is that the website can be marketed to Secondary schools as complying with the Syllabus for Year 7-10 History. Darren teaches year 9 students. (Kerrigan, Journal: 17 February 2008)

Further confirmation that the documentary had been accepted by the Fort Scratchley field occurred on the 68th Anniversary of the Japanese attack on the Fort, in June 2010. The main promotional image used for the event was a freeze frame of the Japanese submarine from the documentary animation (Figure 30, page 143). I was invited to attend the event as a VIP guest and was delightful to hear FSHS President Bill Hopkins, re-tell one of the the stories from the documentary, during this speech.
Thus, local communities have embraced the documentaries which have now become part of the social fabric of the history of Fort Scratchley and the artefacts themselves have become part of the domain of knowledge usable by future documentary makers.
Chapter Six: Conclusion

It can be said that Fort Scratchley documentary production processes described here represent predictable experiences for an independent, low budget documentary practitioner. However, the use of self-reflective research observations contributes new knowledge to the field of documentary and creativity by reconceptualising documentary creativity from a systems perspective. The Systems Model of Creativity, the predominant theory for this reconceptualisation, provides the theoretical framework that supports this creative documentary practice analysis through the three components of Domain, Individual and Field. The main difficulty with the tripart analysis was limiting my observations to one of the three components of the model. By necessity each area of analysis had to be broken into sub-sections to explicate both internalised and externalised practitioner knowledge and skills that were used during creative documentary practice. However, the examples used in most sections are not discrete. Some examples could have been placed in all three areas of analysis and convincing arguments could have been constructed to support the creative characteristics of them within the multiple components of the Systems Model. For example, during the analysis the Individual aspects of the interactions with crew members discussed through the Generative Collaborative Documentary Practice section could also have been explored under Field analysis, as working with crew could equally be described as interacting with field experts.

Determining which area of analysis each experience belonged to was a subjective choice made by me as researcher/practitioner. It is the compressed and complex nature of an individual's creative practice and the unpacking of self-reflective experiences for research that may make these analytical choices open to critique. However, an epistemological justification which accounts for this subjective research approach has been detailed in the methodological section. Nonetheless, these analytical interpretations of documentary practice as a holistic and complex process, are supported by Csikszentmihalyi’s argument (1999) that creativity can begin anywhere in the creative system and occurs at the intersection between Domain, Individual and Field.

The analysis of the Domain determined the starting point of my creative documentary practice as being the accumulated embodiment and internalisation of my past family and screen-practitioner experiences. The reflective analysis of my personal background identified the sources and development of my intuitive knowledge, both from professional practice and from social engagements as understood through Bastick’s (1982) notion of intuition. My intuitive abilities also guided me and helped me to identify gaps in my knowledge during specific stages in my creative process. The knowledge gaps identified
at the beginning of the documentary process were initially categorised as technical knowledge, practical skills and editorial knowledge. Acquiring these new skills through this project and combining them with existing knowledge and skills fulfilled my documentary practice aspirations. One of the limitations of acquiring skills ‘on-the-job’ was that there were times when the unmastered skills were captured through the practice of videotaping and audio recording and so they appear in the final documentary product as evidence of my ongoing immersion in the learning process. These instances represent an unavoidable constraint of my creative context. They also illustrate my lack of understanding of the amount of time that it takes to internalise skills in order to function proficiently. Much of this had to do with the range of multi-tasking technical and editorial skills I was attempting to simultaneously master. The necessity to perform these multiple roles due to limited funds has, however, provided me with invaluable insights into the process of skill development and mastery. My inability to multi-task proficiently can be seen in part as a resourcing issue that occurred because of the structural contexts of the project that dictated the projects resources. These include human resources as well as access to technology and know-how. While these contexts may be viewed as containing the project, they must also be viewed as enabling. For example the University supplied a structure that facilitated this research, while also supplying the majority of the technical and human resources used to complete the project. Furthermore, it has to be said that the University as an educational and cultural institution provided a similar structure to that afforded the project had it been made independently for broadcast or distribution. The University did however fulfil a similar role to an independent production company even though there were instances when it lacked specific institutional knowledge and human resources that could have made the Fort Scratchley production experience more streamlined. The human and technological resourcing had a major impact on the creative quality of these documentaries. These resources were specific to this institution and could be identifiable in other institutions as well but it is the identifiable variations of the resourcing which constrain and enable creative productivity.

The Individual analysis revealed how I personally built on the knowledge learnt through my phase of Domain acquisition and how the conceptual approach to the documentary’s narrative was mapped. Uncovering the ‘truth’ of the stories involved consuming, filtering and mediating various Fort Scratchley community’s myths, facts and opinions. Interacting with and reflecting on multiple field opinions helped me to internalise local knowledge so that I could construct an appropriate and acceptable documentary narrative which would accurately reflect the historical events, as detailed in the source material.
The cyclical nature of my production process was also observed. My experience of a familiar logical yet predictable production process reassured me as it had become in an intuitive sense ‘second nature’ to me and was of particular benefit when I was struggling to make sense of the unfamiliar processes of documentary narrative shaping and construction. Furthermore, observations of my experiences confirmed that the familiarity and predictability of screen production processes gave me the confidence to make creative choices about the documentary’s narrative, which went against the dominant overarching military narrative of Fort Scratchley.

As Csikszentmihalyi (Nakamura & Csikszentmihalyi 2002) has noted some individuals use anxiety to overcome or transcend obstacles while others give in. Despite many moments of anxiety and disappointment my will to achieve the creative outcome, to produce a documentary on Fort Scratchley that captured and made senses of its meaning of place helped me to transcend the anxiety. Having experienced anxiety previously in professional and personal life I was, and am, aware of the doubled edged nature of this emotion. In some instances I see anxiety as an emotion that can be overcome through reflective concentration on the problem that is causing the anxiety, deciding on a plan of action to overcome it and then setting about acquiring the skills and know-how to reduce and eliminate the anxiety. Once transcended, anxiety gives way to understanding, satisfaction, enjoyment and sometimes flow. For this reason the final outcome of the project, despite having mixed reactions from the Field is a rewarding record of my creative persistence. Reflection on these experiences using the notion of ‘flow’ allowed me to understand that feelings of uncertainty and anxiety are part of the process of creative practice and that it is normal to experience both positive and negative emotions during creative production practice.

The Field analysis looked at how the Fort Scratchley and documentary community could be evaluated through the Nested-Audiences Model (Figure 6, page 54). With a better understanding of the way that these sub-groupings use knowledge it was possible to analyse the different influences that the Field had on the production of the two documentaries. Analysis of those groups confirmed that practitioner skills and personal backgrounds contributed both individually and collectively, to the creative potential of the group process and output. Through the Field analysis three creative group approaches were used as the basis for analysis of the Fort Scratchley context; ‘Generic Group Creativity Model’, ‘Actual Group Creativity’ formula and an elucidation of the two types of rationale for group decision-making, either preference-based or information-based decision-making. It can be argued, however, that using group creativity theories to explore self-reflective observations from one practitioner has its limitations. In order to confirm
group members’ experiences of the same process secondary data was collected from other crew members, and it was analysed in conjunction with my reflective observations to provide a balanced perspective of those experiences. Finite amounts of time to complete tasks were seen as being important to creative output. The time taken to teach practitioner processes was recognised as an inhibitor to the creative potential of the group but, irrespective of this, process loss was balanced by individual and group resilience which was sustained even though there were changes in working environments, changes in crew skill levels and technical disasters. Future research that explores documentary production group dynamics using a combination of Practitioner Based Enquiry and qualitative methodologies needs to be undertaken so that creative group dynamics for filmmaking can be more accurately measured. However, within the scope and complexity of this research it was possible to apply these group creativity theories using personal observations of my experiences as a documentary producer, writer, director. The successful delivery of both documentaries confirms that the process that I led was collaborative and did engage group members, effectively enabling their work to contribute to the creative process and to the quality of the work produced. Finally, the Individual analysis confirmed I was simultaneously drawing on and developing the intuitive aspects of my creative documentary practice where I, in line with Bastick’s (1982) definition, embodied and internalised domain knowledge through a group production environment that nurtured collective and individual creative practice.

The field interactions observed throughout this study revealed a number of opportunities within the process for field members to provide feedback and for that feedback to be incorporated into the documentary products. While it is commonly understood that Field feedback i.e. test audience screening, in the form of audience preference is important at the end of the post-production process, this study also confirmed that Field interactions and opinions did contribute to the quality of the work as it was being researched and constructed. Field opinions were received and mediated by me as the documentary creator throughout the entirety of the project’s timeline. In addition to this it was confirmed that not all field feedback was useful and in some instances ill-informed field feedback confused, misdirected and momentarily inhibited my creative momentum. Finally, my observations of the field confirmed that I was immersed in the conventions and codes of the Fort Scratchley domain and accordingly this immersion had helped me to be accepted by the Fort Scratchley field. The Fort Scratchley field’s acceptance gave me privileged access to people and places that had previously been restricted and as such authorised me to create documentaries that mirrored the values and opinions, and mediated, the biases of the Fort Scratchley domain and field.
This research provides a generalised self-reflective framework for creative practitioner analysis that aids in determining uniquely individual, yet systemic creative practices. One of the main findings of this research is the confirmation of the duality of practice that operates on a number of levels. Firstly, duality of practice has been identified in regards to the embodiment and acquisition of Domain knowledge as being necessary for creative practice. Secondly, the placement of the Individual within the creative system is important as they simultaneously draw on their internalised Domain knowledge and use it specifically for the betterment of their practice while also using their position in a larger social system to gather more Domain knowledge specifically for use in practice. Thirdly, this research confirms the duality of practice in line with the theory of structuration whereby the individual practitioner makes choices about actions within individual and social structures. The connection between agency and structure is reiterated in the final paragraphs of each section of analysis and it is also embedded in the term generative practice. In line with structuration theory, Elizabeth McIntyre’s reflective study of fictional scriptwriting concludes that:

> [i]n order to engage with the Systems Model at the level of production, it becomes necessary to explore the question of agency and structure, or to what degree a producer exercises their right to choose (agency) when opposed by the limitations of various factors such as culture (structure). (McIntyre, E. 2006: 10)

As a documentary practitioner this research confirms that I acted as a ‘conditioned agent’ who was aware of the antecedent cultural conditions that I operated within as I was regularly experiencing my ability to choose the path that my practice would take. I also experienced times when it was necessary to conform to the contextual social and cultural conditions I operated in and there were also moments when it was necessary to challenge those contextual conditions. It is within these moments that my creative choices became visible. All the while my ability to choose was effected by my internalized and externalised domain knowledge and skills. Indeed, it was my determination not to be consumed by anxiety and subsequently, my confidence in my own abilities and skills to overcome obstacles and execute practice that informed the choices I made during practice. These creative choices were not free from constraint, but in some instances the constraints of the context or production environment were so internalised and embedded in my documentary practice that I was unaware of both the effects of the constraints and the fact that I had made a choice about what to do next. Hence, dispositions seen as ‘second nature’ arose, which can be so familiar for a practitioner that they give the feeling of being able to freely make choices about practice. Accordingly, the individual’s depth of immersion in the Domain and Field signifies the implicit and embodied nature of intuitive practice. Nevertheless, this intuitive practice did contribute to creative choices even
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through, as previously emphasised, I was at times unaware of the choice I made and the constraints I was working within. The intuitive and internalised social, cultural and contextual conditions of practice did exist and did effect the course of action that I chose. Consequently, those actions then required further decisions and actions, and through the identification of such a self-perpetuating process the notion that practice is generative was confirmed.

Overall, this research has laid out the generative state of my creative documentary practice. It was complex, iterative and re-cursive and confirms the argument that ‘[c]reativity is a process that can be observed only at the intersection where individuals, domains and fields interact’ (Csikszentmihalyi, 1999: 314). Identifying how these three components theoretically interact is explicated through the Systems Model, though others have developed this model further. For example, McIntyre’s Revision of Csikszentmihalyi’s Systems Model of Creativity (see Appendix L) accommodates an addition to the model whereby a fourth component is inserted at the centre of the model called ‘Explicit Process’. Elizabeth McIntyre concludes that:

> By utilising an explicit framework for production, such as Wallas’ four stages of the creative process, the systems model of creativity could be utilised at the micro level of action, allowing it to become a workable and practicable tool rather than an abstract explanation of creativity. (McIntyre, E, 2006: 11)

In principle, I agree with McIntyre’s point that the Systems Model does now show explicit process. However, I do not agree that the revision as it stands provides a more precise explication of creative process. Instead my research suggests that the creative process can be identified at the intersections between the three components of Domain, Individual and Field. In fact Csikszentmihalyi makes this same point when he argues that creative individuals internalise the system. The problem is to find a way to represent ‘agency’ in the model without representing it a number of times, which is what Csikszentmihalyi does when he places the individual in the system and then argues that the individual internalises that system. It should be possible, even on a theoretical level, to more accurately represent the mediated actions of conditioned agency between the components of the Systems Model.

Therefore, the key finding to come out of this research is the confirmation that creativity occurs through an individual’s interactions within cultural and social systems. In order to accurately represent this in a diagram it is necessary to adjust the Systems Model accordingly. This adjustment, incorporating a Venn diagram (see Figure 31, page 150), enlarges the three circles so that they more obviously overlap, and the terms ‘transmits information’, ‘selects novelty’ and ‘stimulates novelty’ are placed over the intersecting
sections of the Venn diagram.

The individual has been renamed Agent and the adjustment makes it possible to see how the movement of agent, social and cultural information, deemed as being novel by those structures, progresses through the creative stages of stimulation, selection and transmission. Most importantly, creative practice is identified where Agents, Domains and Fields intersect. In this sense the phrase ‘creative treatment of actuality’ in relation to documentary practice may still be used, but, through the modification of the model it is possible to better understand the ‘creative’ aspect of documentary practice in relation to a systemic process.
Appendix A - April 2004 Video Budget

Total Grant Funding $ 20,000.00
Budget History $ 6,500.00
Budgeted Video $ 13,500.00
Spend to date: $3,759.73
Remaining $ 9,740.27

University Accounts Codes
P462-1151 with positive balance $7,452
P462-1152 with positive balance $5,826
Total $13,278

Video Total $ 8,990.00
Remaining $4,288.00

Original Budget April 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Assistant</th>
<th>$ 1,000.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camera operator</td>
<td>$ 1,760.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>$ 1,760.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering</td>
<td>$ 300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrator</td>
<td>$ 400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Mixer</td>
<td>$ 200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrol</td>
<td>$ 200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titles/Graphics</td>
<td>$ 550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music + rights</td>
<td>$ 1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright Photos &amp; footage</td>
<td>$ 500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape stock spent</td>
<td>$210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$ 620.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 8,290.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment left over</td>
<td>$ 700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 8,990.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spend</th>
<th>Estimated</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camera</td>
<td>$ 1,959.86</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 1,799.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 3,759.73</td>
<td>$(240.27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B - Domain Acquisition for Susan Kerrigan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal or Informal Educational Category</th>
<th>Tacitly acquiring knowledge through audience participation.</th>
<th>Observing rules of practice</th>
<th>Engaging in practice</th>
<th>Being a member of the field and discussing opinions about the work of others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family</strong>&lt;br&gt;(birth to present)</td>
<td>Television viewing habits forming through family routines</td>
<td>Watching my mother and grandmother take photographs. (My grandma always cut off people's heads!). Observing my Uncle make home movies and videos</td>
<td>Learning how to take photographs of family holidays, social occasions and overseas travel.</td>
<td>An immersion in and absorption of language to discuss multiple numbers of non-fiction popular culture transmissions from a family members point of view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exposure to Popular Culture</strong>&lt;br&gt;(birth to present)</td>
<td>Learning the forms of visual, aesthetic and narrative transmission of domain knowledge by attending Film Festivals and Theatrical Film releases.</td>
<td>Access to visual story telling for non-fiction narratives through popular culture</td>
<td>Immersion in and absorption of language to discuss non-fiction popular culture transmissions from an audience members point of view.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Education</strong>&lt;br&gt;(1973-1985)</td>
<td>Access to elementary instruction in Art, Photography, English and History as part of the compulsory schooling system</td>
<td>Learning photographic skills and aesthetic techniques like framing and composition as part of photograph class in the compulsory schooling system</td>
<td>'as above'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tertiary Education</strong>&lt;br&gt;(1987-1989)</td>
<td>Learning the forms of visual, aesthetic and narrative transmission of domain knowledge by exposure to tertiary course requirements</td>
<td>Learning aesthetic techniques like framing and composition of video footage at the Tertiary level</td>
<td>Access to visual story telling for non-fiction narratives seen as part of the Bachelor of Arts Communication studies degree.</td>
<td>'as above'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amateur Practice</strong>&lt;br&gt;(1985-1989)</td>
<td>Learning aesthetic techniques and how to manage and purchase photographic equipment</td>
<td>Learning to work with actors and crew in amateur theatrical environments</td>
<td>An immersion in and absorption of language to discuss multiple numbers of non-fiction popular culture transmissions from an amateur film-makers point of view.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Practice</strong>&lt;br&gt;(1990-2003)</td>
<td>Learning visual, aesthetic and narrative production practice on-the-job in an auto didactic and semi formal instruction through ad-hoc mentoring, in single camera, multiple camera field, multi-camera studio productions.</td>
<td>Learning to understand screen influenced performances from actors and non-actors in single camera, multiple camera field, multi-camera studio productions.</td>
<td>Participating and training on-the-job in television production practice as a Producers' and Directors' Assistant, Continuity, Producer &amp; Director for single camera, multiple camera field, multi-camera studio productions.</td>
<td>An immersion in and absorption of language to critique multiple numbers of non-fiction popular culture transmissions from a practitioner's point of view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research Higher Degree</strong>&lt;br&gt;(PhD study 2004-2009)</td>
<td>An immersion in and absorption of language to critique theories of non-fiction documentary practice from a researcher/practitioner's point of view.</td>
<td>Learning to be a reflective practitioner for the purposes of this study.</td>
<td>Learning to work in a low-budget documentary environment in a single person crew.</td>
<td>Acquiring knowledge of Fort Scratchley's and the site's history through interactions with community groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C - Using Fort Scratchley Credit List

Page 1
Producer/Writer/Director
Susan Kerrigan

Page 2
Editor
Kathy Freeman

Page 3
Original Music
Mark Tinson

Page 4
Thanks to all Participants

Roller
Narrator
Vicki Kerrigan

Additional Narration
Taiyo Namba

Camera
Susan Kerrigan
Anthony Davison
Isaac Turier
Simon Farrell
David Washbourne
Kathy Freeman

Lighting
Isaac Turier
Anthony Davison
Susan Kerrigan

Location Audio
Susan Kerrigan
Production Assistant
Samara Ladd-Hudson

*Tunnels Footage*

Director of Photography
Anthony Davison

DV Stedicam
David Washbourne

Lighting Assistants
Tom Hancock
Isaac Turier

Production Assistant
Kathryn Freeman

*Japanese Sub Animation*

Principal Animator:
Geoffrey Hookham

Animator
Bill Famarkis

Background Animator
Matthew Brown

Disappearing Gun Animation
Scott Gavin

Audio Post Production
Mark Tinson
Audio Noise Reduction
Benchmark Studio

Musicians
Rod Barns and the
Dungeon Big Band

Piano
Terence Koo

Drums
Nic Cecire

Special Thanks to
Bill Hopkins
Carl Christie
John Cater
Mervyn Allan
John Mangan
Gionni Di Gravio
Vincent Di Gravio
Roberta Bonnin
Brian Regan
Dr Erik Eklund
Anni Turnbull
Prof Peter Stanley
Bob Cook
Evelyn King
Peter Morris
Martin Herrington
Newton Family
Laffey Family
Green Family
Roger Quinn
Andrew Evans
Daniel Conway
George Hyde
University of Newcastle
Fort Scratchley Historical Society
Newcastle City Council
KBR Constructions
Newcastle Maritime Museum
Newcastle Region Museum
Newcastle Region Library
The Newcastle Herald
The Powerhouse Museum Sydney
The Australian War Memorial

"War on our Doorstep"
2NURFM Radio recordings

UK Hydrographic Society
John Shortland, 1797
Eye Sketch of Hunter’s River

Collection of the
Newcastle Region Art Gallery,
NSW, Australia

Walter Preston, 1820
Newcastle Hunter River, New South Wales

Unknown artist, 1830
Nobby's Island from Mullumbimba Cottage, Newcastle

Joseph Lycett, 1818
Newcastle in NSW, looking towards Prospect Hill

T.R. Brown, 1812
Newcastle, in New South Wales,
with a distant view of Port Stephens

Unknown artist, c1820/28
View of King's Town
Frederick Terry, 1853/55
The Nobbies from Newcastle

©Newcastle Region Art Gallery

Collection of State Library of New South Wales
Joseph Lycett, 1818
Corroboree at Newcastle

Collection of National Library of Australia
Joseph Lycett,
Images from “The Lycett Album”

State Records NSW
William Keene, 1854
Stratigraphic Sketch from Nobby’s Island Newcastle to Burwood

Associate Producers
Vicki Kerrigan
Dr Phillip McIntyre
Dr Judy Wells

(c) 2007
PhD Productions
## Appendix D - Australian War Diary, June 8, 1942

### WAR DIARY or INTELLIGENCE SUMMARY

_Erase heading not required._

**Unit: Scratchley Battery**, R.F. & B...  
**Date and Time:** From ...1421, 1520, 23/5/42, To ...0600hrs, 3/7/42...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Summary of Events and Information</th>
<th>Remarks or Appendices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scratchley Battery</td>
<td>6/5/42</td>
<td>0217</td>
<td>White flares and sounds of gun-fire to North</td>
<td>Fort Log Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0218</td>
<td>Alarm sounded - gun-fire appeared to be directed from seaward.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0219</td>
<td>To F/O from R/G. White flares and gun-fire to North. Bty at Alarm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0220</td>
<td>No target visible in beam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0222</td>
<td>Fire opened up by Battery at enemy vessel, not visible in any beam, but located first time by gun flashes at bearing 067° and approx. 5000 x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Four rounds fired from Battery. During this action rounds were observed to fall left of Battery into harbour - others appeared to pass overhead. After the fourth round from the Battery there was no answering fire from the enemy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0231</td>
<td>No. 2 gun out of action - damaged f.h.w.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0237</td>
<td>Parties posted as guards over unexploded shell also smashed E.I. wire in street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>Port closed to outward shipping till daylight 9th June. Port is open to inward shipping - advice Nobby's.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9/5/42</td>
<td>0106</td>
<td>Until otherwise ordered examination lights on &quot;Mimbi&quot; to be extinguished</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2240</td>
<td></td>
<td>White very light S.S.E. off Battery approx. 15 miles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E - War Diary Store Order, June 8, 1942

ISSUE AND RECEIPT VOUCHER—UNIT.

NOTE.—Stores on account of this Voucher are not to be forwarded to the C.O.O. unless receipt of authority to do so is forwarded.

Stores are not to be despatched by any circumstances, to be despatched without being proceeded by this form.

Approval is requested to WRITE OFF Stores from charge of

(Approved by) Store Officer

(For A.A.O.D. use only.)

Description of articles to be returned or written off

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number of Quantity</th>
<th>Reason for Return</th>
<th>Date of Receipt</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>A.A.O.D. Code</th>
<th>Ledger Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tones Vent. 4-in Mk. X</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section B.I.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cartridges R.L. Filled 6-in Gun</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filled 288. Nozomax, Fused 800</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I certify that the above-mentioned ammunition were expended during action against the enemy on the morning of 8/6/42.

Section B.I.

Received Stores as shown above.

C.O.O. Approved. C.O.O.

Signature of Newcastle District Defence Commandant

Date 19 19 8 JUN 1942
Appendix F- A/V Installation Plan Fort Scratchley

80 Pounder DVD Installation
Existing 80 pounder in working order
1. Video package of history of gun & cleaning of gun
2. VHS footage of restoration of gun
3. PM John Howards site visit & firing of gun

Draft Proposal of Fort Scratchley’s DVD Installations

6 inch Gun DVD Installation:
Existing six inch guns in working order.
Accessed through tunnels or from gun
1. Video package of history of guns,
2. Video package of how the guns fire
3. Archive footage of military gun training.
5. Animation of Jap sub attack + narrative about attack.
6. Artefacts: Shell fired from Jap sub.

Disappearing Gun DVD Installation:
Existing Disappearing Gun emplacements (empty circular spaces)
Accessed through tunnels
1. Video package of history of disappearing guns,
2. Threat of Russian invasion + animation of what guns looked like at FS.
3. Artefacts: Disappearing Gun Barrel

Commanders House DVD installation:
Existing Buildings, lived in by Peta Adams
1. Video package of history when building were constructed.
2. Oral History I/V of Peta and her Sister recollection of living at the Fort.
3. Artefacts: Italian POW's Maroon uniform (?)

Barracks DVD installation:
1. History of Forts Survival - Video Explanation of Fort refurbishment $5.5 million + vandalism
2. Visual poster display of guns from the fort, original cost, and where they are now. (info from Australian War Memorial)
3. Oral Histories from Marie Kildney re being stationed at the fort.
4. Artefacts: Fort Scratchley Historical Society
5. War time: Fort Scratchley’s interaction with Fort Wallace, Fort Shepard and Nobbies.
6. Video explaining First Coal Mine exploration underneath FS
7. Aboriginal habitation in the area
8. Artistic representation of the area
9. Theatre presence at Fort Scratchley during the 80's and 90's.
Appendix G - Example Documentary Edit Script

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Uni</th>
<th>Writer</th>
<th>Kerrigan</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Client</td>
<td>NCC</td>
<td>Producer</td>
<td>Kerrigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Fort Scratchley</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Art Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job #</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code #</td>
<td>Draft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIDEO</th>
<th>AUDIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;W Photos of six inch guns</td>
<td>(06.26.10) The firing of the heavy guns during peacetime was a spectacle in itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot of Royal Dalton China cup and plate &amp; shelly cup and plate</td>
<td>Firstly we had to open all windows because of the vibrations and to make sure all valuable china was secure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy 100%</td>
<td>(22.04.00) But with the other ones when they fired them before they’d used to walk around to all these houses around here, and delivering leaflets, to all these houses, telling them to open the windows, because the guns were going to fire at certain times. And they’d used to open their windows, because the window would rattle but it wouldn’t break but if you didn’t open the windows there would be glass flying everywhere,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960’s training camp footage of geyser</td>
<td>(06.26.25) They were fired out to sea and permission had to be granted by the Harbour Master to make sure it was safe for our own boats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl 100%</td>
<td>(16.8.09) There was normally, an add put in the paper and a notice to Marinas also because we had to close the range, as it was called, out to sea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy 100%</td>
<td>;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(22.5.31) So it sailed out, and Nebbies OK’ed it to go.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIDEO</td>
<td>AUDIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl 100%</td>
<td>and it went down the coast. Any way the shoot started about nine o'clock, and about eleven o'clock. I was on number one gun and I was a layer at the time and I was firing the gun,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp; W photo Exterior OP</td>
<td>(16.9.20)Any how the Battery Commander at this stage, and I was an Observation Officer at the time up in the OP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy 100%</td>
<td>(16.8.30)So the RAAF, crash boat used to tow the target up and back and up and back.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy 100%</td>
<td>(22.05.31)They've got to keep loading the gun and make it safe, make safe. Any way another order come over, number one gun go to bearing, oh about two twenty or something I think it was any way it was down south, and we were firing the target up this other way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>re-enactment, eye going to sight</td>
<td>(22.06.15)and it was down south, and they didn't say what it was, they just said to go to bearing two twenty, and then we reported that it was on bearing and they said &quot;FIRE&quot;! Come over the amplifier, and I looked through the telescope and I couldn't see nothing...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>re-enactment MCU enters frame and yells &quot;for Christ sake fire that gun!&quot;</td>
<td>(22.6.35) So I reported to the number one, &quot;Target Obscured&quot; And he got to on the telephone and said &quot;Target Obscured&quot; and he hang up. And the order come again. Number one fire! So I did the same thing, &quot;Target Obscured&quot;! Anyway he brought his 3PO Back... Anyway someone stuck their head out the window, and said &quot;For christ sake fire that gun!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIDEO</td>
<td>AUDIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy 100%</td>
<td>(22.7.04) So I squeezed the trigger. And just as I squeezed the trigger I was looking through the telescope and I could see the bow of a ship just coming into the telescope, and if there's blooming well been another coat of paint on the bow. It would have hit it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy 100%</td>
<td>(22.07.15) The shell landed right in front of it, and it splashing water 60 feet in the air and the ship sailed through the splash.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl 100%</td>
<td>(16.9.40) and the bulk carrier almost stood up in the water, stopping and turning around.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy 100%</td>
<td>(22.7.20) And the captain turned the ship around to the right, and it went out to sea and disappeared out to sea and come in later. right around he come back in again. And then he come up to the fort and was looking for the bloke who fired the gun. That's it, so I kept out of the way, so the battery commander got onto him. (laughs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl 100%</td>
<td>(16.9.54) But I understand later he was fined 400 pound for crossing against the Notice to Marinas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy 100%</td>
<td>(22.7.42) yeah the battery commander, it was their fault in the first place but they called me up into the OP and wanted to know why I didn't fire the gun and I said well you don't follow orders as well as I do. I said if you can't see a target you don't fire on it. I said I reported that the target was obscured, and I said it was your fault, I said, I said. It was the battery commander assistant's fault he should have reported bring to procedure then I would've known what was going on.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H - Flow Chart

Figure 7.1b The current model of the flow state. Flow is experienced when perceived challenges and skills are above the actor's average levels; when they are below, apathy is experienced. Intensity of experience increases with distance from the actor's average levels of challenge and skill, as shown by the concentric rings. Adapted from Csikszentmihalyi (1997).

Appendix I - Musical Composition Brief

Project: The Living History of Fort Scratchley
Contact: Susan Kerrigan, University of Newcastle PhD Student.

Doco Synopsis:
Fort Scratchley, a Newcastle Military installation was closed in 1972. The highlight of Fort Scratchley's military career occurred on the 8th of June 1942, when it's two six inch guns returned fire on the I-21, a Japanese Submarine. The enemy fired 25 rounds on Newcastle. Interviews with soldiers who served at the fort from 1942 through to 1972, provide engaging and colourful stories of military and family life at the Fort. They reveal that it was more than a military establishment, it was a place to be proud of.

Though this prime piece of inner city Newcastle real estate has been virtually empty since 1972, the federal government is now funding a $5.5 million dollar refurbishment of the site. This documentary intertwines oral history stories and historical research into the site usages; aboriginal, convict, coalmining, maritime and artistic communities, in order to illustrate the cultural significance of this place and what it means to the individuals and communities who have become sentimentally attached to Fort Scratchley.

Documentary duration: approx 45 minutes
Medium: Mini-DV, 16:9
Distribution: On site at Fort Scratchley
Other Distributions outlets: The potential is there to enter the completed Documentary in to National and International Film Festivals, however at this stage these avenues have not been fully investigated.

Musical Composition Brief
Two melodies - 1st Melody Brief - Active: preparing, sense of urgency, suspense building to a climax which is positively resolved. (Suggest the SFX of Gun Firing could be the resolve)
Musical Styles and Arrangements:
1. Colonial (folkie, bush band) - 1800-1870
2. Military (Marching Band style – opening titles) - 1870-1940's
3. Swing (Big band sound) - 1940
4. 70's disco style - Closing of the Fort 1972
5. Modern Industrial – visitors & artists return to fort

2nd Melody Brief - Sentimental: reflective reminiscent music which is melancholy as well as being supportive. It should illustrate a loss or longing of days gone by. It should not build to a climax, and there is more a feeling of acceptance than a resolve.
Musical Styles/Arrangements
6. Romantic Nostalgic (strings & flute)
7. Military
Appendix J - Fort Scratchley Community Preview

Tunnel into 200 years of our history

COMMUNITY PREVIEW WEEKEND
Join us in celebrating the fascinating history and restoration of Fort Scratchley.

Events include:

**FRIDAY 27 JUNE 2008**
7.15pm  Public Premiere Screening of “Using Fort Scratchley, Re-Deployed... the story of a location in transition”. Created by Susan Kerrigan, The University of Newcastle. Limited seating, bookings essential on 4974 5000.

**SATURDAY 28 JUNE 2008**
10.00am  Parade of exmilitary vehicles to the Fort. Starting at Horseshoe Beach car park, then driving via Wharf Road, Watt and Scott Streets and Parnell Place, finishing at the Fort.
11.30am to 3pm  Exhibition of exmilitary vehicles at the Fort near the Master Gunners Cottage.
11.30am & 3.30pm  DET Hunter and Central Coast Wind Ensemble European Tour Farewell Concert at the Multi-Purpose Centre.

**SUNDAY 29 JUNE 2008**
10.30am for 11am  Official Opening Ceremony and Gun Firing.
11.30am to 4pm  Community Celebrations at the Fort, including tunnel tours and gun firing demonstrations.

For information visit www.fortscratchley.com.au
Appendix K - Website Statistics from 2007-2010

2007 - Website Monthly Statistics

### Monthly history

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Unique visitors</th>
<th>Number of visits</th>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Hits</th>
<th>Bandwidth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2007</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>94.04 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2007</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>13816</td>
<td>24537</td>
<td>3.79 GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2007</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1470</td>
<td>2705</td>
<td>570.20 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2007</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>1542</td>
<td>262.71 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2007</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1456</td>
<td>2821</td>
<td>382.17 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2007</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1016</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>253.34 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>1177</td>
<td>13897</td>
<td>33882</td>
<td>5.32 GB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Visits duration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Number of visits</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0s-30s</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>35.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30s-2mn</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>13.9 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2mn-5mn</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>12.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5mn-15mn</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>18.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15mn-30mn</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>10.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30mn-1h</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1h+</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.1 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2008 - Website Monthly Statistics

### Monthly history

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Unique visitors</th>
<th>Number of visits</th>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Hits</th>
<th>Bandwidth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2008</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>108.89 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2008</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>1206</td>
<td>161.04 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2008</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>166.34 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2008</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1003</td>
<td>1552</td>
<td>289.24 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2008</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>7040</td>
<td>12121</td>
<td>1.27 GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2008</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>3897</td>
<td>6574</td>
<td>966.82 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2008</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>3064</td>
<td>5286</td>
<td>880.89 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2008</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>3166</td>
<td>587.72 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2008</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>2365</td>
<td>3975</td>
<td>557.58 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2008</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>2892</td>
<td>5324</td>
<td>890.72 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2008</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>5894</td>
<td>11223</td>
<td>1.98 GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2008</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>2091</td>
<td>3741</td>
<td>809.55 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1381</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>33164</td>
<td>56900</td>
<td>8.56 GB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Visits duration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Number of visits</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0s-30s</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>43.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30s-2mn</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>15.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2mn-5mn</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>10.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5mn-15mn</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>13.4 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15mn-30mn</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>7.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30mn-1h</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>6.1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1h+</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.5 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2009 - Website Monthly Statistics

**Monthly history**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Unique visitors</th>
<th>Number of visits</th>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Hits</th>
<th>Bandwidth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2009</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>2150</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>893.18 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2009</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2380</td>
<td>4381</td>
<td>928.93 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2009</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>2421</td>
<td>3903</td>
<td>830.09 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2009</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>2721</td>
<td>4629</td>
<td>1.21 GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2009</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>4229</td>
<td>7013</td>
<td>1.72 GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2009</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>5004</td>
<td>8380</td>
<td>1.46 GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2009</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>3141</td>
<td>4947</td>
<td>861.15 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2009</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>3583</td>
<td>5961</td>
<td>910.42 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2009</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>5589</td>
<td>9789</td>
<td>1.40 GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2009</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>5706</td>
<td>8876</td>
<td>1.18 GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2009</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>4213</td>
<td>6777</td>
<td>1022.84 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2009</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>2954</td>
<td>509.09 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2403</td>
<td>3624</td>
<td>43103</td>
<td>71460</td>
<td>12.78 GB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Visits duration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Number of visits</th>
<th>Number of visits</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0s-30s</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30s-2mn</td>
<td>609</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2mn-5mn</td>
<td>340</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5mn-15mn</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15mn-30mn</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30mn-1h</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1h+</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2010 - Website Monthly Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Unique visitors</th>
<th>Number of visits</th>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Hits</th>
<th>Bandwidth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2010</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>2725</td>
<td>4402</td>
<td>909.99 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2010</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>2956</td>
<td>4769</td>
<td>1.24 GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 2010</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>3178</td>
<td>4875</td>
<td>960.29 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 2010</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>2205</td>
<td>3582</td>
<td>671.98 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2010</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>2662</td>
<td>4310</td>
<td>990.00 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 2010</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>2717</td>
<td>4424</td>
<td>729.42 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul 2010</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>3011</td>
<td>485.41 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug 2010</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>3657</td>
<td>5934</td>
<td>1.10 GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 2010</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>3956</td>
<td>6498</td>
<td>966.55 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 2010</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>3096</td>
<td>4911</td>
<td>791.43 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov 2010</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>3375</td>
<td>5408</td>
<td>753.10 MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 2010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2061</strong></td>
<td><strong>3213</strong></td>
<td><strong>32521</strong></td>
<td><strong>52124</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.43 GB</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Visits duration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Number of visits</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0s-30s</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>60.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30s-2mn</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>14.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2mn-5mn</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>8.2 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5mn-15mn</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>7.8 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15mn-30mn</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>3.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30mn-1h</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3.3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1h+</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix L - McIntyre’s (2006) Revision of Csikszentmihalyi’s Systems Model of Creativity
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