Creativity in Practice:

Applying the systems model in the creation and development of a radio documentary.

Robert Crosby

c3202338

Table of Contents

Abstract

Examining Csikszentmihalyi's systems model of creativity in relation to the stages of creativity developed by Wallas, this exegesis will examine how the aforementioned theories are applied to the creative process. Using the 10-minute radio documentary '*Do The Legal Thing*' (Crosby, 2016) as a case study, a Practioner Based Enquiry (PBE) approach will be utilised to evaluate the theory/practice relationship.

Introduction

'*Do The Legal Thing*' (Crosby, 2016) is a 10-minute radio documentary centred on online piracy in Australia. Initially conceived as a counterpoint to the negative perceptions of digital piracy, the documentary takes into consideration the arguments leveled against film and television industries, such as distribution, as well as presenting an historical framework in the form of the challenges faced by the music industry at the start of the millennium. Much like the process of developing the project, the documentary ends on a reflective stance that posits that while there are contributing grievances, the effect of piracy ultimately is to the detriment of those who generate content: the creators and producers.

As this project was conducted individually, I was required to undertake the role of radio producer across all stages of production. As McLeish (2005) notes, the producer is required to 'stimulate interest and fresh thought' (p. 276). This conception of the role was particularly defining during the three stages of production; notably in the pre-production infancy, but likewise through gathering and shaping information subsequently. Furthermore, the responsibility of 'assessing, reflecting and anticipating' the needs of the audience required I defined the pre-existing knowledge the listener would require on the documentary subject matter, while ensuring they found it to be relevant, personal and engaging (McLeish, 2005, p. 276).

In detailing the exegetic process, a discussion of the theoretical perspectives used to evaluate the radio documentary is complemented by a methodological approach undertaken to record the development from conception to realised product. Further analysis of the theoretical framework details the application of Csikszentmihalyi and Wallas in relation to the case study. Finally, the exegesis outlines the manner in which

the individual's creative process has been affected by undertaking this project.

Theoretical Perspectives

In assessing the effectiveness of my personal creative practice against a theoretical framework, the systems model devised by Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi and the stages of creativity developed by Graeme Wallas will be used as determinants. With Csikszentmihalyi's interrelationship of the individual, domain and field being widely acknowledged as the authoritative position in explaining the creative process, it is relevant to see how its application can be seen to contribute to the novelty and value of the radio documentary case study (McIntyre 2012, p. 77). Similarly, the four stages of creativity theorisied by Wallas (1945) - preparation, incubation, illumination and verification - provide a systematic framework in which individuals can trace their development. While the stages Wallas and by extension Bastick, in his contraction of the first three stages into intuition (1982, pp. 310-1), are considered relevant in examining creativity, it is important to note that the non-linear process individuals may experience the stages in, makes it worthy of critical analysis in order to determine how it can be applied to my own personal practice (Marshall 2010, p. 17).

By implementing a theoretical perspective in the assessment of the radio documentary, there is both personal enlightenment to be revealed, as well as an academic appraisal of the ideas underpinning the creative work, which entail the relevance of theory in assisting individuals develop various skills. Such skills include those outlined by Bourdieu (1998) regarding cultural production, namely habitus and different forms of capital. By using theory in addition to practice, the individual is able to increase their understanding of both the practical application of producing content, in this case '*Do The Legal Thing*' (Crosby, 2016), as well as the ideas that inform the product - resulting in a well-rounded practioner.

Methodology

Practioner Based Enquiry

In order to analyse my own creative process throughout, I implemented a Practioner Based Enquiry (PBE) approach. Similar to the concepts espoused by Donald Schonn

in '*The Reflective Practioner*' (1983), the self-reflective nature of PBE enables the individual to experience a transmission of skill and theory alike, through a 'networked environment' that allows for the 'acquisition of intellectual autonomy' (Murray & Lawrence, 2000, pp. 9-10). In progressing through this passage, the individual is able to identify their actions - in much the same manner Wallas (1945) suggests through the stages approach. Likewise by engaging with domain knowledge, field experts and accounting for individual practice, the PBE approach can be seen to resonate with the systems model.

With PBE used primarily in a creative context to evaluate a practioners work through self-reflection, the process can be seen to trace the progression of a work through the perspective of the creator (McIntyre, 2006, p. 4). As a result, the reflective nature enables individuals to 'learn and develop' via personal examinations, outside scrutiny and "studying texts from the wider sphere" (Bolton, 2001, p. 4). From this perspective, the role of PBE can be understood to be an engagement of the three interrelated aspects of Csikszentmihalyi's systems model.

Methods - Production Documents

In order to record the progression of the project through PBE, a series of production documents and initial versions of the final recording have been used to trace the development of '*Do The Legal Thing*' (Crosby, 2016) over time. Furthermore, interview transcriptions allowing the radio producer a readily available account of the five-interviewee recordings, production schedules tracing the planned and actual delivery of deadlines and work in progress presentations can be seen to allow for qualitative and quantitative feedback throughout the stages of production. As a result of these measures, it can be noted that the individual can identify the practical progression of the documentary against the related theoretical concepts.

Methods - Advantages and Disadvantages

As with any methodological approach to research, the validity and flawed nature of PBE is worthy of critical assessment. While the attraction of a self-reflective means of analysing the creator's own personal practice can be seen to provide insight into how a creative product - like the radio documentary case study - functions against a set of

underpinning theories (Murray & Lawrence, 2000), there are legitimate criticisms. As the collection of data is subject to the individual's own biases, the manner in which PBE accepts such an introspective view reliant on personal, rather than objective discernment, can be seen as being in conflict when accounting for creative practice (Zuzanek, 2004). As a result, the reliance on the individual in constructing a 'Rashomon'-esque understanding of their own practice (Heider, 1988, p. 74), has led to scrutiny from the field of psychology (Nisbett & Wilson in McIntyre, 2006, p. 8).

Why is PBE appropriate?

Despite criticisms questioning the validity of PBE as form of research (Sternberg, 1994), the process does have a practical application in appraising my own project. As the exegetic process is designed towards an introspective position, PBE lends itself towards this notion (McIntyre, 2006, p. 9). With creative practioners expected to exhibit 'an insiders view' rooted from an 'ontological and epistemological base is rationalism', the individual has to display a perspective that accounts for their own interpretation, all the while accounting for the academic scholarship informing such behaviour (McIntyre, 2006, p. 9). From this, the PBE methodology will allow me to trace my creative production while providing a theoretical understanding of how novel and valuable things come into being (McIntyre, 2008, p. 1)

Analysis

Systems Model

Applying the Systems Model devised by psychologist Mihalyi Csikszentmihalyi to the creation and development of '*Do The Legal Thing*' (Crosby, 2016) required me as radio producer to move away from the individual-centric approach popularised by Romantic and Inspirational creative myth (Boden, 2004, p. 14), towards a confluence model factoring in the interrelationship of the domain, individual and field (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996, p. 28). Applying this theoretical position alongside the Practioner Based Enquiry (PBE) methodology, allowed for a greater understanding of the components that influence the production of creativity, as such the manner in which these components interact through a dynamic, non-linear prism provides an effective base from which to reflect on the production of the radio documentary case

study. While the Systems Model will be used as the primary theoretical position, Wallas' stages approach will similarly be incorporated to demonstrate the progression of creative development.

Domain

Commencing the major creative work process just prior to August with a submission deadline of early November, provided me with a three month period in which to draw upon the 'set of symbolic rules and procedures' comprising the domain to create a novel and valued product (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996, p. 27). Originally unsure as to how to approach the brief, I opted to conduct the work individually in order to ensure both a heightened sense of responsibility and creative control. As an avid listener of audio-based programming, both conventional radio and long-form podcast, I was attracted to the idea of working within the audio domain. As part of my preparation stage of 'gathering information necessary to the process' (McIntyre, 2012, p. 41), I engaged with broadcasts of Triple J's news and current affairs program '*Hack'*, as well as idiosyncratic conversational podcasts including '*Like I'm A Six-Year-Old*' (Ballard, 2015), '*Linoleum Knife*' (Duralde & White, 2010), '*The Osher Günsberg Podcast*' (Günsberg, 2014), '*TOFOP' (*Anderson & Clausen, 2010) and '*Wilosophy'* (Anderson, 2014). From this I felt a degree of immersion within the Domain to the extent where my habitus allowed me to identify a creative aesthetic to associate with (McIntyre, 2012, pp. 72-3). Subsequently I sought to decide on a subject matter that would be appropriate in meeting my personal capabilities and the audience's interest. Amongst the 'various ideas' I speculated upon during this tentative stage, I became intrigued by the issues relating to Australia's rates of illegal downloads (Rothenberg & Hausman, 1976, pp. 75-6). From this I settled on producing a 10-minute documentary examining the contributing factors of online piracy. In researching this area I drew heavily upon '*Copyfight*' by Phillipa McGuinness (2015), while articles on piracy (Beirne, 2015; Easley, 2005; Lam & Tan, 2001; Marshall, 2004) further enabled me to qualify the original hypothesis of '*Do The Legal Thing*' (Crosby, 2016). In constructing the narrative present throughout the documentary, I engaged with a selection of film documentaries that allowed me to identify the optimal way to piece together varying forms of audio. Taking note of the 'shared conventions' present throughout full-length features including '*All This Mayhem*' (2014), '*All You*

Zombies: Bringing Predestination To Life' (2015), '*Bowling For Columbine*' (2002) and '*God Loves Uganda*' (2013), I noted editing methods present that saw multiple perspectives cut together when discussing a specific point (Sawyer, 2012, p. 216). This was especially pertinent in Ava DuVernay's '*13TH*' (2016), while visually specific, it helped to pinpoint structural beats as well as the importance of music throughout. These same methods were incorporated throughout my own work during the four primary sequences, bookended by introduction and conclusion. With reference to the first sequence (1.30 - 2.15), the decision to cut between the various subjects enabled a more engaging discussion on the impact streaming has had on online piracy, than if I simply allowed the interviews to play out in full (Crosby, 2016). As a result my knowledge and skills drawn from the domain informed my creative practice which resulted in the adoption of this editing style.

Individual

As the individual acting within the systems model, it was crucial that I assessed my previous experience in media production projects in order to account for deficiencies. Having primarily worked in visual-oriented projects previously, I was drawn in part to the audio format in order to increase my capital as a practioner, however I was not so unfamiliar with the medium that I would be forced to start at an elementary stage. Working as a writer, editor and director across all my previous assessment based projects including a short-length video documentary and radio mockumentary, I felt adequately prepared for the task. In crafting as a solo practioner the process at times felt to relate to the Romantic ideals of creativity, as I was acting in isolation (McIntyre, 2012, p. 15). However, upon reflection I acknowledge the true theoretical position I engaged with was confluent as devised by Csikszentmihalyi (1988, p. 325). As I drew upon Historically (H) creative works, my own Personal (P) creativity was affected by experts, while the feedback I received from the field through progressive assessment highlighted this position (Boden, 1994, p. 77). Viewing my work during the incubation stage, I experienced a problematic relationship with the 'temporally discontinuous' notion, as outlined by McIntyre (2012, p. 41). While I was both consciously and unconsciously assessing the procedures influencing the documentary, I found myself often contemplating additional challenges after the appearance of others that I had incubated on (Rothenberg & Hausman, 1976, p. 70). Considering an

illumination which resulted in the editing style described above, the experience of 'not consciously thinking about the problem' while watching other films allowed me to draw upon the techniques used professionally and apply them to my own practice (Rothenberg & Hausman, 1976, p. 70). In this sense I have some reservations about Wallas' stages; while it is acknowledged that they do not function non-linearly (Marshall, 2010, p. 17), my experience entailed multiple challenges across the production that saw me continually incubate and illuminate before reaching a validated verification on the documentary as a whole (Rothenberg & Hausman, 1976, p. 70).

Field

Presented as a group of cultural intermediaries or gatekeepers who determine which creative products are accepted into the domain, the field proved to be the most influential aspect of the systems model in helping me achieve verification (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996, p. 28). Furthermore, the 'complex network of experts, with varying degrees of expertise, status and power' helped to shape the documentary from the initial flawed distribution hypothesis, to the holistic view of the impact caused to individual artists by piracy (Sawyer, 2012, p. 216). Through conducting interviews with a number of individuals, a recurring point brought up was the relationship between the music industry and piracy. In researching the topic further, I came to critically analyse my original hypothesis; where by focusing on the consumer approach towards piracy alone, it failed to account for the additional factors which came to provide integral sequences in the end product (4.35 - 6.00 & 6.20 - 9.00). Discussing the revised hypothesis with my supervisor Dr. Susan Kerrigan, she verified my decision and encouraged me to pursue this course of action. Conducting a subsequent interview with Associate Professor Phillip McIntyre (Appendix A), the insight he provided in relation to my domain research enabled me to complete the production phase with a range of perspectives on piracy that supported this new direction. As the production of '*Do The Legal Thing*' (Crosby, 2016) was part of a progressive assessment structure, the interactions I had with the field (Dr. Susan Kerrigan and Dr. Michael Meaney) provided a number of judgments which saw me realise the final product ahead of schedule (Sawyer, 2012, p. 216). Working to an initial schedule (Appendix B) approved by the field, I remained on-track throughout

the first half of the semester, however despite allocating time and resources in the lead up to the recommencement, I parted somewhat from the intended plan. Suffering from a lack of intrinsic motivation during the mid-semester break, I commenced editing before scripting a narration. Ultimately this proved to be a seminal moment in the production, as the early drafts formed the majority of the final documentary. Dividing the recordings into the four primary sequences, upon receiving feedback from Susan I was verified in my progression. With a rough cut of the documentary running at 11.30, 90-seconds longer than the planned length, I was initially reluctant to trim the project. However in examining my work and identifying various repetitive and extraneous sections within sequences, I applied an approach taken in the production of Kanye West's album *'Yeezus'* (2013):

> "Well I didn't reduce it. Rick Rubin reduced it. He's a reducer, not a producer." (*Kanye West. Zane Lowe.* 2013).

By viewing the post-production stage as an encapsulation of 'reducing to an exact form' - verification - I was able to move towards stripping away unnecessary elements and pacing the documentary in a manner that engage the audience quickly, before developing at a rate that allows information to be processed (Rothenberg & Hausman, 1976, p. 70). While by no means do I find my undergraduate documentary to be comparable with the work of Rick Rubin or Kanye West, for my skill and experience level, the reception I garnered at the course screening validated my work as members of the field and domain alike praised the documentary.

Conclusion

Through the development, production and exegetic reflection of the making of the radio documentary '*Do The Legal Thing*' (Crosby, 2016), I came to a conclusion that differed from my initial expectation. Having originally approached the subject of online piracy with an agenda that the structures affecting distribution and pricing were the cause of the issue, I ultimately reached a conclusion that was informed by the theoretical position developed by Mihalyi Csikszentmihalyi. By reconciling my Individual bias through engagement with the Domain and Field, I came to pivot my perspective towards a larger creator-consumer dynamic spectrum. By accounting for

the impact piracy has had in a historical context with the music industry and using it as a bellwether for media industries currently, I was able to develop a creative produce that met the quantifiable criteria I set for myself - a 10-minute radio documentary on online piracy - while also adopting a confluence perspective that presents an interrelationship of systems to account for creativity.

References

- *13TH* (2016) motion picture, Netflix, United States.
- *All This Mayhem* (2014), motion picture, Screen Australia, Australia.
- *All You Zombies: Bringing Predestination to Life* (2015), motion picture, Screen Australia, Australia.
- Anderson, W. (2014) *Wilosophy with Wil Anderson*, audio podcast, iTunes.
- Anderson, W. & Clausen, C. (2010) *TOFOP*, audio podcast, iTunes.
- Ballard, T. (2015) *Like I'm A Six-Year-Old*, audio podcast, iTunes.
- Bastick, T. (1982). *Intuition: How we think and act* (New York: Wiley).
- Beirne, R. (2015). Piracy, Geoblocking, and Australian Access to Niche Independent Cinema. *Popular Communication*, *13*(1), pp.18-31.
- Boden, M. (1994) *Dimensions of Creativity* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).
    - (2004) *The Creative Mind: Myths and Mechanisms*, 2nd edn (London: Routledge).
- Bolton, G. (2001). *Reflective Practice: Writing and Professional Development* (London: Paul Chapman).
- Bourdieu, P. (1998) *On Television and Journalism* (London: Pluto).
- *Bowling For Columbine* (2002) motion picture, United Artists, United States.
- Crosby, R. (2016) *Do The Legal Thing*. (online) Soundcloud. https://soundcloud.com/user-138550605/do-the-legal-thing-online-piracy-radio-documentary, date accessed 31 October 2016.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1988) 'Society, Culture and Persons: A Systems View of Creativity' in R. Sternberg (ed). *The Nature of Creativity: Contemporary Psychological Perspectives* (New York: Cambridge University Press), p. 325.
    - (1996) *Creativity: Flow and the psychology of discovery and invention.* (New York: HarperCollins).

- Duralde, A & White, D. (2010) *Linoleum Knife*, audio podcast, iTunes.
- Easley, R. (2005). Ethical issues in the music industry response to innovation and piracy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *62*(2), pp.163-168.
- *God Loves Uganda* (2013) motion picture, Variance Films, United States.
- Günsberg, O (2014) *The Osher Günsberg Podcast*, audio podcast, iTunes.
- *Hack* (2016) radio program, Triple J, Sydney.
- Heider, K. (1988) The Rashomon effect: When ethnographers disagree. *American Anthropologist*, *90*(1), 73-81.
- *Kanye West. Zane Lowe.* 2013, radio program, BBC Radio 1, London, 23 September.
- Lam, C. & Tan, B. (2001). The internet is changing the music industry. *Communications of the ACM*, *44*(8), pp.62-68.
- Marshall, L. (2004). The effects of piracy upon the music industry: A case study of bootlegging. *Media, Culture & Society*, *26*(2), pp.163-181.
- Marshall, J. (2010) Thinking outside and on the box: Creativity and inquiry in art practice. *Art Education*, *63*(2), 16-23.
- McIntyre, P. (2006) Testing Out' the Systems Model of Creativity through Practitioner Based Enquiry". *Speculation and Innovation: applying practice led research in the creative industries.* Queensland University of Technology. Retrieved 25, August, 2008 from the World Wide Web: http://www.speculation2005.net
    - (2008) 'The Systems Model of Creativity: Analyzing the Distribution of Power in the Studio', *Proceedings of the 4th Art of Record Production Conference*, The University of Massachusetts Lowell. 14th – 16th November 2008.
    - (2012) *Creativity and Cultural Production* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).
- McGuiness, P. (2015). *Copyfight* (Sydney, NewSouth Publishing).
- McLeish, R. (2005) *Radio production* (Amsterdam: Focal Press).
- Murray, L. & Lawrence, B. (2000) *Practitioner-based enquiry* (London: Falmer Press).
- Rothenberg, A. & Hausman, C. (eds) (1976) *The Creativity Question: A Reader* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press).

- Sawyer, K. (2012). *Explaining Creativity: The Science of Human Innovation*, 2nd edn (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Schon, D. (1983) *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action* (New York: Basic Books).
- Sternberg, R. (1994) *In Search of the Human Mind* (Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace).
- Wallas, G. (1945) *The Art of Thought* (London: C.A. Watts & Co.).
- *Yeezus* (2013) CD, Roc-A-Fella Records, United States.
- Zuzanek, J. (2004) Experience Sampling Method: Current and Potential Applications. Retrieved 18/10/04 from University of Waterloo website http://www.lifestress.uwaterloo.ca/images/ESM.pdf

Appendix A - Phillip McIntyre interview

The piracy issues faced by Film and Television industries at the moment seem to mirror those confronted by the music industry at the start of the millennium. What can the Film and TV industries learn from the response taken by music?

The initial reaction to changes with digital are two fold for the music industry. Firstly, the welcoming of digital recording, which people were warned at the time was going to be a problem for them which it wound up being. Master recordings could be cloned directly, that has its benefits and its downsides. Downsides were quite literally that they could be cloned and people could take them, so they were losing possession of most of their material. There reaction initially was to try and stamp it out, stop things in there tracks. After a while that manifested into things like the Napster case where they took Napster to court, in terms of downloading because things could be streamed quite easily with programs like that. Then they realised that the people they were targeting were actually their customers and that's probably not a good look for a business; so they were losing customers two ways, both in terms of reputations, but certainly people stealing the music which is quite literally what it was. They've had to actually accommodate themselves to all the digital changes that have occurred,

they've renegotiated royalty payments from people like Pandora and Spotify. At the same time tried to circumvent a lot of piracy as well. I guess the simplest way the music industry as a whole tried to get around, and I think the industry as a whole realised this in a general sense, not necessarily the record companies was that you have to go with what your customers are trying to do. It's actually dead easy for them to get material, but most people are willing to spend to purchase music, so long as the supply and demand fits. The film industry has kind of facing exactly the same thing and the music industry has been a bellweather industry for a lot of people, not just film but also publishing and various other places as well. I noticed that film changed its tactic from demonising piracy to actually encouraging people who didn't. Of course (stealing through BitTorrent) that still occurs, but there's a whole education process that goes with that, which I think the film industry realised much faster than the music industry did.

In the early 2000s, P2P music file sharing sites such as Napster and Kazaa were seen as major threats to the livelihood of artists. In 2016, music distribution is shifting towards digital and online streaming. How did this change occur?

The Napster court case was instrumental in this, they didn't stop file sharing, but they took the companies that were profiting from 'illegal' file sharing, took those people to court and those people had to work within a commercial sphere, so pay people for what they were doing. The negotiation in terms of what the payment is has been where the problem has occurred for the music industry as well. I don't think that changed a great deal for them though, other than bringing companies like Napster and Kazaa into the fold, so that they were operating in a legal sense. I don't think the film industry has got itself to that position quite yet.

Audiences are consuming content digitally, yet traditional distribution structures still privilege geographically specific releases. In a time where the Internet allows for universal simultaneous releases, is this still an effective model.

I think were starting to see a move away from location based, especially from the artist point of view, people are actually launching recordings in all sorts of ways. One

of the most obvious ones was what U2 had done in terms of its relationship with Apple, which didn't go down too well, 'here you have it', but everybody has to have it and some people didn't want it. So there are experiments of distribution and launching material, so I think especially from the artist's point of view they've accommodated themselves to all those shifts. And that change in distribution systems has been radical for record companies, because the shift for them over a long historical period has been away from controlling the production, quite literally when artistes and repertoire people where original producers. To then having that gone away and artists leasing material to them and then distribution being what they controlled with promotion and then distribution gets taken away from them. All they've really got left is promotion, so much so that they've now starting looking at 360 degree deals, they want a cut of everything. I can't see those deals working for artists as well. So they've had to move away from location-based, or geography-based distribution systems from the material part of it to the digital world which is online, everywhere at every time.

Arguments have been made concerning the convenience of pirating and the higher costs Australians face compared to the rest of the world (iTunes: US song price - 0.69-1.29; AUS - 1.19-2.19). Are these arguments valid, or do they represent problems that exist within current distribution practices?

I don't think they reflect current distribution, what they reflect more is people's willingness to pay for a particular product. Say you pay $3 for a cup of coffee and quibbling about a 3 minute song, that costs a lot of money to make at $2-$3. I think there's a problem on the demand side with what is seen as the value for money that you're actually getting. And it's the same with print material as well; audience attitudes have always been the same. I can remember in live performances where we used to charge $2 on the door. $2 and you'd still have people trying to sneak over the back wall trying to get in, or you'd have the local detective coming up and saying 'I'm not paying, because I'm the local detective' - it was just $2. I can tell you that the cost of strings on the guitar would have cost me $6 at the time, so we weren't covering costs at all. It's the same way with what's occurring now in terms of pricing through iTunes; $2.99 in Australia, 69 cents in the US - there both negligible prices.

In an interview with the BBC in 2015, Kevin Parker, the creative force behind critically acclaimed group Tame Impala said that whether he purchased a CD or downloaded music illegally, the experience could be just as valuable.
Should the value of art extend beyond a physical product OR should the value of art be judged by how willing people are to pay?

Value comes in all sorts of ways. It isn't just there in a financial sense, but in a cultural, social and symbolic sense as well. Value coming at us in all sorts of ways. People like myself are going to be interested in music no matter the economic processes that occur and I'm in the fortunate position where I can have a brand new song within 3-4 minutes. I've just got to sit down and write one, I can write one every day if I want to. Most people aren't in that position. I think the relationship between music as art and music as commerce is premised on a set of beliefs that are really quite archaic and anachronistic. I think there has always been a relationship between those two things, but some people hold certain beliefs and aren't willing to admit it.

Radiohead famously offered their 2007 album "In Rainbows" available online with a 'pay what you feel' option. Crowdfunding had also offered audiences the ability to directly contribute to artist's projects. Are these subversive tactics practical or do artists require large degrees of pre-existing capital in order to profit from going against traditional release strategies?

With the case of Radiohead, they had a very firmly established reputation before they offered their material for whatever you wanted to pay, they were 5-6 albums in and established a very large international reputation as a result. There was a demand there for Radiohead, they knew they were going to make some money out of it. However, we haven't heard too much from Radiohead in terms of the results of that particular process, they've been unwilling to talk about how much money they actually did make as a result of giving it away for free. For their next album they didn't use the same tactic - that tells you something straight away. It didn't really work for them, despite having a massive reputation. So it's not going to work for a band like my own, because we don't have the same international reputation. I could say "pay what you

think it's worth', but if there not willing to pay $2 at a show, what are they going to give me for my CD? So I don't think that process works, it would only work for artists that are already well established, and even then it's doubtful. Crowdfunding isn't as subversive as it's made out to be, it certainly eliminates the finance from record companies or other sources but there are all sorts of ways to finance a recording. What I've found through experience with crowdfunding is that it's very difficult to plan, because you're never really sure what people are going to commit. The other thing is through working in retail is that 'a deal isn't a deal' unless everyone stands to profit, what sort of reward is the individual crowdfunder looking for; are they looking for monetary return, control over the recording or are they just trying to feel good by doing it. A couple of problems with crowdfunding as well, so I don't think they are either the answer to the particular problems that are faced, they certainly could be part of a mix of solutions.

In the past campaigns against piracy have likened downloading films to "stealing a car/handbag". What would be a better way to change the "widespread acceptance" attitudes held by downloaders?

There really interesting positions to take; most people if they can get it will get something for free. I could because it's dead easy and in fact quite a lot of people do… that doesn't make it right. I think there's an education process needs to occur there. The other argument is that artists if they're 'true artists' aren't interested in money and want to connect with an audience, which is an idealistic sort of an argument. Most musicians that I'm aware of, firstly they like to eat. There's a belief system at work which is really just used as a justification.

What is the best way to balance the needs of consumers, while ensuring artists are compensated for their work?

I don't know if there's a best way, but I think that compensation firstly is an important thing. One of the bands I was in, 2 or 3 of the performers were on the dole and I was working in a music shop at the time and the CES came in and we were getting a fair amount of publicity and said "How much are you making for each gig?", because

these guys are on the dole. I just laughed and basically itemised all our costs and then itemised all our income - we actually owe them money, can you pay them extra. I don't think people realise the situation most musicians are in, in terms of their income and how that's diminishing across the board. I actually did an exercise the other day in terms of live performance, comparing the income of the average musician, not the top 1.5% that everyone sees in publicity terms, the other which is where the bulk of musicians are. I did an exercise comparing income between 1976 and currently, got the figures for both and then put both figures into RBA's inflation calculator and while it looked like the income was moving up, in real terms it actually diminished across that period. So that's happened for live performance, incomes from recordings have similarly dropped right off, they've increased in terms of digital sales but the overall between digital and other forms has progressively gone down, but in that progressive movement down there's been a increase in the percentage of digital. So recordings gone down, live performances gone down and if you're lucky you might make some money out of publishing, but the deals that have been done between publishers and places like Pandora and Spotify are risible. The returns are really quite minor, to have major artists who have major hits getting royalty returns of $17. So all of those forms of income have actually diminished. What I think should actually occur is the relationship between what the demand side is thinking and the supply side have to come into some sort of equilibrium. And by that I don't just mean financial, I mean culturally and social equilibrium as well.

Does piracy contribute to a culture where art isn't valued or do people just find it easier not to pay?

A little bit of both. The unwillingness to pay what the supply side would see as a reasonable figure has really devalued the music output.

Appendix B - Production Schedule

Week	Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
4	**14 August**	**15 August**	**16 August**	**17 August**	**18 August**	**19 August**	**20 August**
		Research	**PITCH PROJECT** Tutorial	Email Interview Subjects	Research	Research	
5	**21 August**	**22 August**	**23 August**	**24 August**	**25 August**	**26 August**	**27 August**
	Workshop Microphones and Marantz	Start Proposal	Tutorial Acquire Pro Tools Licence	Confirm Interview Subjects	Research	Research	
6	**28 August**	**29 August**	**30 August**	**31 August**	**1 September**	**2 September**	**3 September**
		Start Production	Tutorial Interview - Rebecca Bierne	Proposal	Proposal	**PROJECT PROPOSAL DUE**	OHS Paperwork
7	**4 September**	**5 September**	**6 September**	**7 September**	**8 September**	**9 September**	**10 September**
		Production - Formal Interviews	Tutorial	Exegesis Proposal	Exegesis Proposal	**EXEGESIS PROPOSAL DUE**	OHS Paperwork
8	**11 September**	**12 September**	**13 September**	**14 September**	**15 September**	**16 September**	**17 September**
		Production - Formal / Informal Interviews	Tutorial	Production	Production	Log Files	
Mid Semester	**18 September**	**19 September**	**20 September**	**21 September**	**22 September**	**23 September**	**24 September**
		Review Audio	Narration Scripting	Narration Scripting	Transcribe Interviews	Transcribe Interviews	Narration Scripting
Mid Semester	**25 September**	**26 September**	**27 September**	**28 September**	**29 September**	**30 September**	**1 October**
	Collate consent releases	Transcribe Interviews	Narration Scripting	Narration Recording	Narration Recording	Narration Recording	
9	**2 October**	**3 October**	**4 October**	**5 October**	**6 October**	**7 October**	**8 October**
		Commence Post Production	**PAPERWORK DUE** Tutorial	Pro Tools - Import Files	Pro Tools - Edit Files	Wrap Production	
10	**9 October**	**10 October**	**11 October**	**12 October**	**13 October**	**14 October**	**15 October**
		Pro Tools - Edit Files	**WORK IN PROGRESS SEMINAR** Tutorial	Pro Tools - Music	Pro Tools - Levels and Fades	Assembly Edit Complete	
11	**16 October**	**17 October**	**18 October**	**19 October**	**20 October**	**21 October**	**22 October**

		Pro Tools - Edit Files	Tutorial	Pro Tools - Levels and Fades	Pro Tools - Music	Rough Cut Complete	
12	**23 October**	**24 October**	**25 October**	**26 October**	**27 October**	**28 October**	**29 October**
		Pro Tools - Music	Tutorial Pro Tools	Pro Tools - Levels and Fades	Pro Tools - Bounce Project	Project Complete	
13	**30 October**	**31 October**	**1 November**	**2 November**	**3 November**	**4 November**	**5 November**
		Start Exegesis	**MAJOR PROJECT SUBMISSION - 12.00pm**	Exegesis	Exegesis	Exegesis	Exegesis
14	**6 November**	**7 November**	**8 November**				
		Exegesis	Exegesis	**EXEGESIS DUE**			