

Susan Kerrigan

University of Newcastle

Creative Practice Research: Interrogating creativity theories through documentary practice.

Abstract:

This paper presents research into creative practice that broadens understandings of theories about creativity by investigating a practitioner's agency through documentary production practice. The primary theory used to interrogate my self-reflective process-based research into documentary creativity is 'The System's Model of Creativity' (Csikszentmihalyi, 1999). This paper will provide a brief summary of the findings of a larger research project investigating my documentary creative practice, while also presenting an alternative way of using theory about creativity to interrogate the complex internalised layering that is creative practice.

Discussion of my creative documentary practice research identifies internalized and embodied knowledge and the acquisition of externalized knowledge, both of which were acquired and consequently embodied during the production of two oral history documentaries. This primarily systemic approach to creativity research may be useful to other researchers as this particular creativity theory is generic and should, therefore, transcend form and content.

Biographical note:


Susan Kerrigan is an academic and a practitioner based researcher in film and video production with the University of Newcastle, NSW, Australia. Working as an academic since 2003, Susan is also in the final phase of her PhD in Communication and Media Arts. Susan's professional television experience was with the Australian Broadcasting Corporation where she worked across a variety of film, video, multi-camera studio and multiple camera field productions.

Keywords:

Documentary Creative Practice

Introduction

This paper presents a cross-disciplinary creative practice research study that draws on the fields of psychology, sociology, cultural production, communication and documentary studies. The research presented here broadens the understanding of creative practice in relation to documentary production process. By selecting key arguments from a more detailed self-reflective PhD study of documentary production practice, this discussion will spotlight a number of creative practice examples, which expose a practitioner's agency, their internalisation of cultural and social systems and the relationship between the two. This practice-led research was undertaken during the production of two cross platform oral history documentaries on Fort Scratchley, NSW. *Using Fort Scratchley* video documentary is distributed on DVD a documentary trailer can be viewed through a youtube search titled 'Fort Scratchley documentary trailer'. The online documentary *Fort Scratchley a living history* which presents a timeline of the Fort's history is also accessible online (www.fortscratchley.org).



Promotional images for 'Using Fort Scratchley' (2008) & 'Fort Scratchley a living history' (2007), Dir: Susan Kerrigan

An outline of the Fort Scratchley research project will explain the documentaries that were created and state the research problem: expressed here as a self-reflective investigation of my documentary creative practice framed by the three components of the system model; domain, individual and field (Csikszentmihalyi 1999: 315). This will be followed by a brief methodological overview and a documentary literature review of 'creativity', paying particular attention to Grierson's seminal definition of documentary being the 'creative treatment of actuality' (1933: 8). The link between documentary scholars' interpretations of creativity and psycho-socio-cultural theories about creativity will provide the theoretical background for the investigation into creative documentary practice. These investigations are also supported by psychological research that argues that creativity practitioner research needs to situate practitioners within their social and cultural environments (Pope 2005: 38; Sternberg 1999: 339, 458). The body of the paper will explain how 'The Systems Model of Creativity' (Csikszentmihalyi 1999: 315) has been applied to my practitioner-led research context. While the creative systems model can be applied externally to

artistic and production contexts, the prevailing argument is that it should also be simultaneously applied to the individual's internalised creative process (Csikszentmihalyi 1999: 332). The conclusion will discuss the appropriateness and limitations of using these psycho-socio cultural creativity theories for creative practice research.

Research Project



Fort Scratchley Parade Ground 2008, Photo by Roger Hanley, Copyright: Federal Government of Australia.

The research began in April 2004, through an industry/academic research initiative called ‘The Living History of Fort Scratchley’. This research was set up as a collaborative industry and academic research project conducted with the University of Newcastle [UoN] and Newcastle City Council [NCC] with an aim to produce an historical thesis and two short video documentaries on Fort Scratchley, Newcastle. I agreed to be involved as my professional career as a television producer/director fuelled my interest in undertaking research that was practice-led. Over four years, the research project grew in size and scope as it was also attached to the AUD \$10 million restoration of the Fort Scratchley site that was funded by the Australian Federal Government. Eventually two documentaries were created as cross platform works—the approach to both narratives was to use oral histories to tell communal stories about Fort Scratchley’s history.

The DVD *Using Fort Scratchley* was produced primarily to be sold at the Fort, the documentary is fifty three minutes in length and was launched in June 2008 when the fort was reopened to the public.¹ Unfortunately the documentary failed to gain a film

festival screening nor a television broadcast. While this was disappointing, the documentary was made to screen and sell at the Fort and it can be argued that the documentary's failure to reach a wider audience reflects the Fort's poor public profile and the documentary's specialised and localised content.

Fort Scratchley a living history was launched online in 2007, and updated in 2008. It was created as a tool to promote the fort to the broader tourist market, in the hope that it could boost local and international awareness of the historical significance of the site as a tourist attraction. The website contains over three hundred media files, photographs, paintings, videos and archival documents which can be accessed through a dated timeline. To streamline users interactions, the dates have been grouped into prescribed 'tours', developed around the various communities who used the site; the Awabakal (the local indigenous tribe), Maritime, Military, Coal Mining and Theatrical. Website user statistics show on average 183 users per month, with 45% of those web users returning to the site. The total number of users over two and a half years is 8,084. The distribution statistics of both creative artefacts is useful for this study, in so far as it confirms the community's appreciation of the documentaries. However, it should be noted that the research does not rest on the consumption of these documentaries as the primary research focus has been practitioner and process-based.

Embarking on this research as a lone practitioner, I intended to undertake many editorial and production roles by multi-skilling, multi-tasking and in some cases learning craft practices to service the production requirements. Unfortunately, I was not able to complete all the technical production tasks on these documentaries as intended and additional crew had to be brought in to assist. While the project was always considered to be low-budget, it was not until the end of the research that the significant lack of funds was calculated. The final cash budget for both the online and the DVD production came in at AUD \$39,000, thus making these documentaries more micro-budget productions.² The consequences of these financial and contextual production constraints underpin this research. The initial research focus was very broad (Kerrigan 2006: 2) and was adjusted to accommodate the changes to the documentary process when the project was expanded to include the creation of the online documentary. The final research problem was stated as 'Creative documentary practice internalising the system's model of creativity: A case study into linear and online documentary practice'. This research statement reflects a practitioner focused methodology, designed to investigate my creative documentary process framed by the three components of the system's model; domain, individual and field.

Methodology

The research was undertaken using a Practitioner Base Enquiry (PBE) methodology (Murray 2000). Successfully used in other practitioner-led research environments such as teaching (Burton 2005) and nursing (Johns 2006), PBE has a similar methodological approach to action research, participant observation³ and auto-ethnography. Research outcomes generated through practice-led and self-reflective investigations were once attacked as being unreliable, particularly from a positivist

paradigm, as it was seen that research findings would be difficult to reproduce since the research was so uniquely and individually based and was centred around content, methods or processes that superficially appeared as being particular to supposedly ‘one-off’ artistic contexts. For example, twenty five years ago, Silverstone, who used a participant observation methodology argued that it was difficult for research participants (in this case, film-makers) to take on both roles as practitioner and researcher because they were unable to address difficult questions like ‘what’s going on here?’ (Silverstone 1985: 203). More recent arguments supporting practitioner-led research methodologies suggests that Silverstone’s arguments are now outdated and are no longer sustainable (Bell 2008: 176; Milech 2004: 7). Advocates of practitioner focused research argue that the knowledge generated from an insider or practitioner’s point of view is important as it completes the total body of knowledge and understanding about what is ‘going on’ for the practitioner during the production of a creativity activity (McIntyre, 2006: 1). There are documentaries that take a reflective approach including *Sherman’s March* (McElwee, 1988), *Video Fool for Love* (Gibson, 1996) and *The Good Woman of Bangkok* (O’Rourke, 1991), all of which can be seen as instances of productions that question the role of the film maker and their creative choices in the development and production of films based on actuality. It is important to realise that these documentary forms use film as an auto ethnography medium, and that the self-interrogation evidenced in these three examples differs somewhat from the self reflexive interrogation of process practiced in this study. The evidence gathered for this study focuses on collecting data that demonstrates my creative documentary process primarily in the form of a reflective learning journal that spanned four and a half years.⁴ Also used for analysis was documentary production paperwork, email correspondence and the works themselves. The literature review for this study paid particular attention to how the documentary discipline interpreted and defined ‘creativity’, ‘creative processes’ and ‘creative practice’. This review revealed many variations in how these terms were used and their implied meanings. Consequently, a significant knowledge gap was identified which will be briefly addressed below.

Documentary literature review

The seminal definition of documentary is the ‘creative treatment of actuality’ (Grierson 1933: 8). While documentary scholars have rigorously discussed the interpretations of ‘treatment’ and ‘actuality’, discussions around the definitions of ‘creativity’ and ‘creative process’ have not been rigorously debated in the documentary nor screen production literature.⁵ There is a debate within documentary that attempts to explain the term ‘creative’, but the premise of this debate rests on Romantic understandings of ‘art’ (Winston 1995: 17) which, from a rationally based research focus on creative activity, are problematic. Though these arguments have been critiqued from within the documentary literature (Corner 1996: 18), the issue continues to be discussed because commonsense notions of ‘creativity’ are used throughout documentary literature to imply that a documentary film makers’ work is creatively manipulating objective ‘truth’. More recently, Stella Bruzzi rebuts this argument when she states:

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).

Furthermore, arguments that support Bruzzi’s position (Kerrigan & McIntyre 2010) provide a more in-depth articulation of these issues in regard to interpretations of creativity through the documentary form. Kerrigan and McIntyre argue that approaching creativity from a Romantic perspective is highly problematic and that it is possible to approach creativity in documentary from a rationally based and systemic foundation, thus enabling an improved understanding of the pragmatic elements of creative practice:

If artists and art can be seen in rational terms ... then it becomes possible to embrace the social factors that are at work on the author, artist or documentary film-makers (Kerrigan & McIntyre 2010: 116)

By broadening the definition of documentary creativity, and bringing it into line with current research on creativity and creative practice (Sternberg 1999; Pope 2005; Negus & Pickering 2004; Sawyer, 2006), it becomes possible to reconceptualise creativity so that it can be seen 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 (McIntyre 2006: 2)

By defining creativity from a more logical, pragmatic and transparent position it becomes possible to realign current understandings of documentary that assert ‘that documentary, like fiction is authored’ (Bruzzi 2006: 163). From the perspective of a rational understanding of creativity, a perspective outlined in detail by Keith Sawyer in his book *Explaining Creativity: The Science of Human Innovation* (2006), it can then be argued that the documentary film maker works as an agent who can legitimately be seen to creatively shape reality without jeopardising notions of objective truth. An alternative explanation of this idea can be seen through the distinctions evident in participatory and performative documentary production practice.⁶ The former can be seen as contentious as the documentary film maker’s creative choices are seen to be visible in the film, whereas the performative mode of production not only identifies the film maker as a participant in the film, it also exposes the film-maker’s and their documentary participants’ performances that are subsequently captured and edited into the film. As Nichols argues, ‘performative documentary shares a rebalancing and corrective tendency with auto-ethnography’ (2001: 134).

As Bruzzi further argues, ‘the new performative documentaries herald a different notion of documentary ‘truth’ that acknowledge the construction and artificiality of even the non-fiction film’ (2006: 186). Regardless of the documentary mode used to classify the product—for example if the documentary film-maker is in the film, making a cinema vérité style film or, as in the case of the Fort Scratchley documentary—shaping an expository and historically style of documentary, a documentary practitioner is authoring and creatively constructing actuality through the documentary production process.

It is therefore the practitioner's creative treatment that is directly connected to their understanding and ability to deliberately construct and manipulate the 'actuality' that unfolds because of their actions and in some cases in spite of their actions. Therefore, research that investigates a documentary practitioner's creative agency from this rational perspective will expose that agent's ability to participate in the construction of a reality that they themselves record and edit. This situation of realigning the notion of creativity with a rationally based research approach brings a new meaning to the phrase 'the creative treatment of actuality'.

The remaining sections of this paper will interrogate my creative documentary engagement, through an exploration of my process and practice which draws on language and approaches of rationally based theories about creativity.

Creative practice research

Psychologists studying creativity acknowledge the difficulties in providing a conclusive set of qualities to describe a creative individual (Nickerson in Sternberg 1999: 392-430). However, while studies of gifted and talented geniuses have also been unable to provide acceptable explanations of individual acts of creativity (Albert & Runco 1999; Weisberg 1993), prominent psychological researcher Robert Sternberg argues that continued, common sense support for Plato's notion of the muse has 'probably made it harder for scientific psychologists to be heard' (Sternberg 1999: 5). Research that focuses on creative practice by drawing on psycho-socio-cultural theories of creativity exists in poetry (Pope 2005), screenwriting (E McIntyre 2006), journalism (Fulton 2010) and literature (Csikszentmihalyi 1996; Paton 2008). Of particular note is an in-depth study of forty fiction writers that argues 'that the systems model is also relevant to Australian fiction writing' (Paton 2008: ii). Moving away from the written word, creative practice research that uses psycho-socio-cultural theories about creativity, alternatively called confluence approaches to creativity, exists in performance (Pope 2005; Sawyer 2006), music (McIntyre 2003, 2008; Negus & Pickering 2004; Sawyer 2006), fine arts (Becker 1982; Csikszentmihalyi 1996; Wolff 1981), theatre (Bailin 1988), media practice (McIntyre 2009) and documentary practice (Kerrigan 2008, 2009; Kerrigan, & McIntyre 2010). In order to appreciate these approaches, research which debunks Romantic and mystical approaches to creativity and creative practice (Boden 1990, 2004; Kerrigan & McIntyre 2010; Sternberg 1988, 1994; Wolff, 1981; Zolberg 1990) needs to be understood in some detail so that a truly multi-disciplinary approach to creative research can emerge. For example, research into creativity from within psychology supports the positive relationship between creativity and knowledge acquisition and argues that 'rather than breaking out of the old to produce the new, creative thinking builds on knowledge' (Weisberg in Sternberg 1999: 226). In support of the connection between knowledge and creativity is the 'the 10 year rule' (Howe 1999: 5) and the use of common phrases such as 'practice, practice, practice'. Both perspectives emphasise the benefits of deliberate practice in order to acquire master level skills. Drilling down further into some of the theories about creativity, researchers from various disciplines continue to make distinctions between a practitioner's creative process and the product, the latter

of which is the end result of creative practice (Bailin 1988: 61-86; Csikszentmihalyi 1995a, 1999; McIntyre 2003: 2; Pope 2005: 38; Sawyer 2006). As a further example, social psychologist Teresa Amabile describes creativity as ‘the confluence of intrinsic motivation, domain-relevant knowledge and abilities, and creativity-relevant skills’ (Sternberg and Lubart in Sternberg 1999: 10). Cognitive psychologist Robert Weisberg’s argument also has credence: ‘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’ (in Sternberg 1999: 242). With these ideas in mind, it can be seen that confluence approaches to creativity developed out of the need to demonstrate how the convergence of multiple components could be used to explain the phenomena of creativity (Sternberg 1999: 10-11). Furthermore, this approach demands an investigation of the social and cultural factors that impact on individual or creative group performance.

The Systems Model of Creativity: A confluence theory

The System Model of Creativity is a confluence model and, when applied through a self-reflective methodology, becomes a useful analytical tool as it assists practitioner researchers in exploring their level of immersion within their disciplines of practice. This research analysis is broached by exploring the model’s three components which, as Csikszentmihalyi argues, interact in the following way:

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)

Using these ideas as a focus, the analysis for the Fort Scratchley research project was divided into three sections to mirror the components of the system’s model, with a primary focus on revealing the complexity of individual processing that occurred during my creative documentary practice.




Figure 1, The Systems Model of Creativity (Csikszentmihalyi 1999: 315)

The *domain* was the first component analysed, specifically tracing my domain relevant skills as a documentary practitioner, which include factual knowledge, technical skills and special talents in the domain in question (Amabile 1983: 362). These domain relevant skills are traced across an individual's lifetime and are 'considered the basis from which any performance must proceed' (Amabile 1983: 362). To expose the areas where my practitioner domain knowledge resides the analysis was separated into parts, the first part identifying my early interests in art, photography and amateur theatre. The development of these interests was then mapped against my formal and informal secondary education and family influences and preferences. Also mapped was my internalised domain knowledge acquired through tertiary education—the acquisition of a Bachelor of Arts (Communication Studies) degree—and past professional practice—a thirteen-year career in film and television production with the Australian Broadcasting Corporation. Past practical experiences are significant and need to be outlined within the data analysis because the embodied skills and knowledge from these experiences are tacitly reproduced, sometimes also working at a level below consciousness, which informs an individual's practical engagement. As argued by Csikszentmihalyi 'the full range of the individual's conscious processes—include[s] those unconscious contexts that occasionally surface in awareness' (Csikszentmihalyi 1992: 20).

Providing an overview of the accumulation of this domain knowledge confirms my habitus, which is defined as a form of embodied knowledge that is drawn on and reproduced through practice (Bourdieu 1993). By laying out a self-reflective analysis of my habitus, it was possible to confirm the depth of embodied and internalised domain knowledge, which in turn exposed my starting point for the Fort Scratchley documentary practice.

The second part of the domain analysis addresses my acquisition of new knowledge and skills acquired throughout the Fort Scratchley production timeline. A list of multiple domains and sub-domains was identified followed by an appraisal of how information from those domains was accessed by me. The two prominent domains were, firstly, the body of knowledge that constitutes Fort Scratchley's history and, secondly, the domain of documentary production practice. The Fort Scratchley historical domain was further broken down into six sub-domains: the historical development of Newcastle; Australian military history; Australian maritime history; Australian coal mining history; Awabakal history; and the history of Newcastle's outdoor theatre productions. On the other hand, the documentary production domain was broken down into two sub-domains of low-budget documentary production and website/online production. What is important to remember about these domains is that they were identified by me, as containing knowledge that was missing from my existing domain knowledge, and it was necessary for me to access this domain knowledge and rules of practice so that that knowledge could be 'learnt', before the documentaries could be completed. Two years of domain knowledge acquisition was engaged in and, during this time, two research trips were completed, one to the Australian War Memorial, the other to the Powerhouse Museum in Sydney. There were also many field trips to the Fort Scratchley Historical Society and the Newcastle Region Maritime Museum. Interacting with, and reflecting on, multiple field opinions

helped me to internalise institutional knowledge about how cultural exhibitions are packaged for public access as well as local knowledge of Fort Scratchley. By immersing myself in the Fort Scratchley domain, I was fulfilling the first stage of documentary research and development that is traditionally engaged in by documentary film makers.

This domain analysis confirms the embodiment of documentary skills and knowledge that I engaged in and the subsequent accumulation of this knowledge that is manifest through my habitus. Also identified through this domain analysis were gaps in my documentary knowledge and skill. These domain knowledge gaps were categorised as technical knowledge of video equipment, practical skills for video camera and editing operation and editorial knowledge of documentary structures specific to the Fort Scratchley story. Further immersion in these domains of knowledge helped me as a practitioner to develop these missing skills and knowledge, which was necessary for engagement in documentary practice that could be considered to be creative in the terms discussed in the rationally based research literature (Sawyer 2006).

The second section of analysis based on the systems model was that of the *individual*, which specifically analysed my 'documentary practice'. Documentary theorists argue that a documentary practitioner's role in shaping and interpreting the narrative is at the heart of documentary creativity: '[d]ocumentary is *authorial* in that it is about creativity and transformation based on vision' (Corner, 1996: 14). Furthermore, Kilborn and Izod argue that the two significant components to documentary production are actuality and creativity. In this case:

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

Further analysis of my learning journal entries identified how the narrative was shaped through both individual and collaborative documentary production practice. So too, the individual analysis section was also broken into parts. The first part looked at the planning processes and how I conceptualised and shaped the Fort Scratchley history into a factual narrative. The second part explored the group creativity processes undertaken in relation to the production crew who collaborated with me to create both documentary products (Kerrigan 2008, 2009).

Determining the conceptual approach to the video documentary's narratives was possible once the preparatory stages of domain acquisition were completed. The gathering of the 'truth' of the historical development of the Fort Scratchley site involved consuming, filtering and mediating each community's myths, facts and opinions. Engagement with site histories from five communities followed a predictable documentary production process. The repetitious experience of researching one community's use of the site, locating participants to be interviewed about that site use, and then editing the interview/s with archival material demonstrated a predictable staged documentary production process. Thus, the learning journal analysis confirmed that the shaping of the documentary narratives was, as mentioned, typically repetitious and cyclical. This description makes the process sound effortless but this was not the case. Sometimes the process was difficult

to accomplish and this had the effect of increasing my anxiety and resulted in a lack of confidence about the clarity of the documentary narrative itself. This anxiety was at times allayed by the familiarity of the production process as continued work on gathering the details of each community's story followed a predictable pattern, which help to reduce anxiety, and in turn contributed to me being able to build confidence in my narrative approach. The familiar, repetitious cycling of the process discussed here could also be described as the 'second nature' sensations of habitus (McIntyre 2003: 42). After much iteration I was able to construct an appropriate and acceptable video documentary narrative that could adequately represent the different communities use of the site, without inadvertently showing biases, perpetuating myths or misrepresenting a community's historical use of the Fort Scratchley site.

These fluctuating levels of uncertainty and anxiety were identified as a normal part of the process of creative practice that could be explained through theories of 'flow', also known as optimal experience. Csikszentmihalyi argues that 'optimal experience requires a balance between the challenges perceived in a given situation and the skills a person brings to it' (1992: 30). If an individual's skills are below the level of the challenge the individual will feel anxious about successfully completing the task at hand. Alternatively, if the individual's skill meets the level of challenge they can end up in a state of flow 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 1992: 29). It was observed that states of flow were experienced during the construction of the online documentary where the benefits of previous immersion in Fort Scratchley's community histories, and construction of the video documentary narrative resulted in an effortless and enjoyable construction of the online documentary.

The third section of analysis was that of the *field*. The field, according to Csikszentmihalyi's formulation of the systems model, has the power to select novelty that is then archived in the domain. From this perspective, the field is a social organisation which holds opinions and also critiques the success of cultural artefacts. Field's are therefore 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 in Sternberg 1988: 331). In the case of the Fort Scratchley documentary, the field was primarily made up of those who contributed to and collaborated on the creation of the documentaries during production. Through a previous conference paper I had identified the field as being

nineteen technical crew, twenty interviewees, and twelve institutions. Institutions in this case are Museums and Cultural bodies that house archival material as well as the Local Council who commissioned the work (Kerrigan, 2008: 266).

Again, it was necessary to break down the field analysis of the data into parts in order to map my collaborative field interactions, as well as how those interactions changed the language, codes, and conventions used throughout the documentary process. Essentially the latter analysis is about how field opinions were mediated by me as practitioner, through the linear and website production process. Skills in mediating

field opinions, and also my own self reflective decision making process, became a crucial part of my creative documentary practice. In this regard it is argued that

The ability to be self-critical follows from the internalization of the rules of the domain and the opinions of the field. That's what makes people detached, able to know what is needed, and able to apply criticism to the work as it develops (Csikszentmihalyi 1995a: online)

Therefore, the analysis of my documentary practice revealed that during the Fort Scratchley production process, my cultural literacy was continually expanding and the knowledge acquired from both domains of the history of Fort Scratchley and documentary practice placed me, as documentary practitioner, in a better position to create something that could be acceptable to field members who understood and represented those domains.

Conclusion

Through this brief discussion, it has been possible to argue that creative practice can be researched using the language and approach presented by the creative systems model. In some instances, it was necessary to incorporate other theories of practice, for example habitus and flow, in order to more accurately analyse the data that was examined. The main difficulty with the analysis was unpacking my documentary practitioner experiences into one of the three sections of this systemic model. In order to accommodate internalised and externalised knowledge and skills it became necessary to break each section into multiple parts for a more detailed examination, as it has to be acknowledged that some of the examples could not be seen to be completely discrete, in that some of them could well be placed in any of these three sections of field, domain or individual for analysis. For example, during the individual analysis the collaborative interactions with crew members could also be placed in the field analysis section, where interactions with others are currently situated. With these limitations in mind, this data analysis is able to confirm that it has been possible to investigate my creative documentary practice using a confluence creativity theory.

Following from this, one of the research findings identifies the limitations with linear explanations of a practitioner's creative documentary practice which is simultaneously internalised as well as being evidenced externally through the practitioner's actions. The evidence seems to suggest that, in line with Csikszentmihalyi's own understandings of creativity, there is less linearity and a more iterative and recursive process at work. Therefore the systems model, like all models, while useful for analysis does not give a complete understanding of the complexity of creative practice.

Another finding is that the language used in the system's model does not reflect the production language used for documentary production process research. This means that creativity research analysis of this type could be misleading because it separates theory from discipline practice, when indeed the purpose of this research is to bring together discipline based practical research that extrapolates the creativity theory/practice nexus. In order to address this problematic more fully, further research

is necessary that includes a systemic approach that canvases other theories about creativity. In this case, discipline specific language and structures can be more easily accommodated in the Generic Model of Group Creativity (Paulus & Nijstad 2003). So too, by way of rigorously exploring the documentary production process, it could also be possible to apply staged creative process theories (Wallas 1976; Csikszentmihalyi 1996) as well as drilling further down to explore theories of intuition (Bastick 1982). These theoretical approaches could be used to more adequately situate creative practice within a paradigm that includes individual, social and cultural agency. The application of these additional theories about creativity could also more effectively illuminate the relationship between agency and structure in order to improve understandings of creativity, creative practice and creative process. In the meantime, this study contributes to self-reflective research studies into creative practice as it shows it is possible to use the systems model of creativity to extrapolate the social and cultural interactive and embodied aspects of an agent's creative documentary process.

Endnotes

1. Two hundred and fifteen DVD's were purchased within the first twelve months, the DVD sells for \$15, and all profits go directly to the upkeep of the Fort.
2. These funds were raised through a number of University of Newcastle small research grants and direct support from the Newcastle City Council.
3. Previous research by Roger Silverstone using a participant observation research methodology regarding the production of a BBC Science program was published in 1985.
4. The first entry was on 7 May 2004, and the last entry was 31 December 2008 with a total page count of 149 typed pages.
5. The texts reviewed were Austin & de Jong 2008; Ayers (et. al) 1992; Bruzzi 2006; Cohen, Francisco Salazar & Barkat 2009; Compesi 2007; Dancyger 2002; Dannenbaum, Hodge & Mayer 2003; Mollison 2003; Nichols 2001; Proferes 2005; Rabiger 1998; Renov 1993; Rosenthal 1988; Wayne 1997.
6. Examples of participatory documentary are *The Good Woman of Bangkok* (O'Rourke 1991) and *Sherman's March* (McElwee 1988). An example of a performative documentary is *Geri* (Dineen 1999).

List of works cited

- Albert, R & Runco, Mark 1999 'A History of Reserach on Creativity', in R. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of Creativity* (pp. 16-31) Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Amabile, T 1983 The Social Psychology of Creativitiy: A Componential Conceptualization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45(2), (pp. 357-376)
- Austin, T and de Jong, W (Ed.) 2008 *Rethinking Documentary New Perspectives, New Practices*: McGraw Hill, Open Univerrrsity Press.
- Ayers, R, Mollison, M, Stocks, I, Tumeth, J (Ed.) 1992 *Guide to Video Production* (2nd ed.) Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Bailin, S 1988 *Achieving Extraordinary Ends: An Essay on Creativity*, Boston Kluewer Academic Publishers.
- Bastick, T 1982 *Intuition, how we think and act*, Chichester; New York: Wiley.

- Becker, H 1982 *Art Worlds*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bell, D 2008 'Is there a doctor in the house? A riposte to Victor Burgin on practice-based arts and audiovisual research' *Journal of Media Practice*, 9(2), (pp. 171-177)
- Boden, M 1990 *The Creative Mind, Myths & Mechanisms*, New York: Harper Collins.
- Boden, M 2004 *The Creative Mind: Myths and Mechanisms* (2nd ed.): Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P 1993 *Field of Cultural Production*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Bruzzi, S 2006 *New Documentary: a critical introduction*, London: Routledge.
- Burton, D & Bartlett, S 2005 *Practitioner Research for Teachers*, London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Cohen, H, Francisco Salazar, J, and Barkat, I 2009 *Screen Media Arts*, Sydney: Oxford University Press.
- Compesi, R 2007 *Video Field Production and Editing* (7th ed.), Boston, MA: Pearson and AB.
- Corner, J 1996 *The Art of Record*, Manchester, New York: Manchester University Press.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M & Csikszentmihalyi, I (Ed.) (1992) *Optimal experience Psychological studies of flow in consciousness*. USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M 1995a 'Creativity across the life-span: A systems view'. *Talent Development III, Gifted Psychology Press*. Retrieved from http://www.davidsongifted.org/db/Articles_id_10009.aspx [accessed 30 July 2010]
- Csikszentmihalyi, M 1996 *Creativity: Flow and the Psychology of Discovery and Invention*, New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M 1999 Implications of a Systems Perspective for the Study of Creativity, in R. Stenberg (Ed.), *Handbook of Creativity* (pp. 313-335). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dancyger, K 2002 *The Technique of Film and Video Editing* (3rd ed.), Burlington, M.A.: Focal Press.
- Dannenbaum, J, Hodge, J, Mayer, D 2003 *Creative Filmmaking from the Inside Out: Five Keys to the Art of Making Inspired Movies and Television*, New York: Fireside.
- Dineen, M. (Director) 1999 *Geri*, U.K.: Channel 4
- Fulton, J. 2010 'Print journalism and the creative process: the social organisation of journalism and its influence on print journalists' creative practices'. Paper presented at the *Media, Democracy & Change: Refereed Proceedings of the Australian and New Zealand Communications Association Annual Conference*, Old Parliament House, Canberra 7-9 July 2010
- Gibson, R (Director) 1996 *Video Fool for Love*. Australia: Kennedy Miller Productions.
- Grierson, J 1933 'The Documentary Producer' *Cinema Quarterly*, 2(1), pp. 7-9.
- Howe, M 1999 *Genius Explained*, Cambridge: University Press.
- Johns, C 2006 *Engaging Reflection in Practice* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Kerrigan, S 2006 'Reflecting on Documentary Video Practice' *Speculations and Innovations: applying practice led research in the Creative Industries*, 1-17. Retrieved from www.speculations2005.qut.edu.au/Spin_embedded.HTM [accessed 30 July 2010]
- Kerrigan, S 2007 *Fort Scratchley a Living History* Retrieved from <http://www.fortscratchley.org> [accessed 30 July 2010]
- Kerrigan, S (Director) 2008 *Using Fort Scratchley*, Australia; PhD Productions

- Kerrigan, S 2008 *Collaborative and Creative Documentary Production in video and online* Paper presented at the International Symposium of Electronic Art, 14th, Singapore
- Kerrigan, S 2009 *Applying creativity theories to a documentary film maker's practice*, Paper presented at the *Aspera 2009 - Beyond the Screen*, Adelaide, South Australia Retrieved from <http://www.aspera.org.au/node/44> [accessed 30 July 2010]
- Kerrigan, S and McIntyre, P 2010 'The 'creative treatment of actuality': Rationalising and reconceptualising the notion of creativity for documentary practice' *Journal of Media Practice*, 11(2), pp. 111-130
- Kilborn, R and Izod, J 1997 *An Introduction to Television Documentary, Confronting Reality*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- McElwee, R (Director) 1988 *Sherman's March* Australia: 157 minutes.
- McIntyre, E 2006 Facilitating the Script: creative research in practice. *Speculations and Innovations: applying practice led research in the Creative Industries*, Queensland University of Technology, 1-15. Retrieved from www.speculations2005.qut.edu.au/Spin_embedded.HTM [accessed 30 July 2010]
- McIntyre, P 2003 *Creativity and Cultural Production: A Study of Contemporary Western Popular Music Songwriting*. Macquarie University, Sydney, Aust.
- McIntyre, P 2006 Creative Practice as Research: 'Testing Out' the Systems Model of Creativity through Practitioner Based Enquiry. *Speculations and Innovations: applying practice led research in the Creative Industries; Queensland University of Technology*. Retrieved from www.speculations2005.qut.edu.au/Spin_embedded.HTM [accessed 30 July 2010]
- McIntyre, P 2008 Creativity and Cultural Production: A Study of Contemporary estern Popular Music Songwriting. *Creativity Research Journal*, 20(1), pp. 40-52.
- McIntyre, P 2009 *Rethinking Communication, Creativity and Cultural Production: Outlining Issues for Media Practice*, Paper presented at the Communication, Creativity and Global Citizenship: Refereed Proceedings of the Australian and New Zealand Communications Association Annual Conference, Brisbane, July 8-10, Brisbane.
- Milech, B and Schilo, A 2004 'Exit Jesus': Relating the Exegesis and Creative/Production Component of a Research Thesis. *TEXT, Special Issue No 3*(No 3, April), 12. Retrieved from www.textjournal.com.au/speciss/issue3/milechschilo.htm [accessed 30 July 2010]
- Mollison, M 2003 *Producing Videos, A Complete Guide*, St Leonards, Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Murray, L and Lawrence, B 2000 *Practitioner-based enquiry: principals for postgraduate research*, London; New York: Falmer Press.
- Negus, K and Pickering, M 2004 *Creativity, Communication and Cultural Value*, London: Sage.
- Nichols, B 2001 *Introduction to Documentary* Bloomington, Ind. : Indiana University Press.
- O'Rourke, D (Director) 1991 *The Good Woman of Bangkok*, Australia: O'Rourke and Associates.
- Paton, E 2008 *Creativity and the Dynamic System of Australian Fiction Writing*. University of Canberra, Canberra.
- Paulus, P and Nijstad, B 2003 *Group Creativity: Innovation Through Collaboration*, Online: Oxford University Press.
- Pope, R 2005 *Creativity - Theory, History, Practice*, Oxon, England: Routledge.
- Proferes, N 2005 *Film Directing Fundamentals*, Oxford, UK: Focal Press.
- Rabiger, M 1998 *Directing the Documentary* (3rd ed.), Woburn, MA: Focal Press.

- Renov, M (Ed.) 1993 *Theorizing Documentary*. New York: Routledge.
- Rosenthal, A 1988 *New Challenges for Documentary*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Sawyer, K 2006 *Explaining Creativity - The Science of Human Innovation*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Silverstone, R 1985 *Framing Science The Making of a BBC Documentary*, Great Britain: British Film Institute.
- Sternberg, R. (Ed.) 1988 *The nature of creativity- Contemporary psychological perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sternberg, R. (Ed.) 1994 *In Search of the Human Mind*. Fort Worth, Texas: Harcourt Brace.
- Sternberg, R. (Ed.) 1999 *Handbook of Creativity*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Wallas, G 1976 'Stages in the Creative Process', in A Rothenberg, & Hausman, C (Ed.) *The Creativity Question* Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- Wayne, M 1997 *Theorising Video Practice*, London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Weisberg, R 1993 *Creativity: Beyond the Myth of Genius*, New York: W.H. Freeman & Co.
- Winston, B 1995 *Claiming the Real*, London: British Film Institute.
- Wolff, J 1981 *The Social Production of Art*, London: MacMillian.
- Zolberg, V 1990 *Constructing a Sociology of the Arts*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.