



© 2011, the Author. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution license (CC-BY 3.0)

Roberts, G. 2011. Opening Pandora's (black) box: Towards a methodology of production studies. *Wide Screen*. Vol 3, no. 1.

Journal Title: *Wide Screen*

Vol. 3, No.1, June 2011

ISSN: 1757-3920

URL: <http://widescreenjournal.org>

Published by Subaltern Media, 153 Sandringham Drive, Leeds LS17 8DQ, UK

OPENING PANDORA’S (BLACK) BOX: TOWARDS A METHODOLOGY OF PRODUCTION STUDIES

GRAHAM ROBERTS

Abstract: This piece is an attempt to draw some conclusions from - and to rise to some of the challenges thrown down in - the articles contained in *WIDE SCREEN Vol 2, No 2 (2010) - Special Issue: Production Studies*. My overall aim is to answer a question raised by Dorota Ostrowska i.e. “Why should we bother?” My answer is, because there is a problem – linked to Ostrowska’s question, “Are the reasons mostly practical and associated with the fact that film studies scholars are not familiar with methodologies necessary to carry out research into film-making process?” There are problems and issues with more ‘traditional’ film studies which I believe ‘production studies’ – and a particular methodology utilising production itself - can address. In essence I am joining Cindy Chan’s call to “theorize from within”, which for me requires taking a position from within production culture as well as cultural practice).

In the opening piece of *Wide Screen 2.2*, Dorota Ostrowska asked “why there is such a reluctance or lack of interest in examining film-making processes as a contemporary phenomenon” (Ostrowska 2010). In response to her implied question (used in an earlier version of the paper) “Why should we bother?”, I reply, “because there is a problem.” In short – to quote Ostrowska – “We don’t understand yet how to see a film as shaped by its process of production ...” Ostrowska continues: “Are the reasons mostly practical and associated with the fact that film studies scholars are not familiar with methodologies necessary to carry out research into the film-making process, such as conducting extensive interviews or using observational techniques employed by ethnographers, anthropologists and geographers?” (Ostrowska 2010). I reply with an emphatic 'YES!' – and argue even more strongly that most scholars are hampered by the fact that they do not/have not got their hands dirty in the world of production itself.

Cindy Chan added in her piece for *Wide Screen 2.2*, “The case of the Hong Kong producer shows the inadequacy of existing theories and methodologies to conceptualize industrial models and professional positions situated in different cultural contexts” (Chan 2010). In my own way I would like to join Chan’s call to “theorize from within”, which for me requires taking a position from within the production culture as well as understanding its cultural context.

So, what is the problem that forces me to respond to Ostrowska’s rhetorical question, “Why should we bother?” In her ‘Towards a Positive Definition of World Cinema’ Lucia Nagib states, “Over the past decade, film theory has been subjected to a recycling process, often indicated in book titles by words such as ‘rethinking’, ‘unthinking’, ‘reinventing’ or ‘reconstructing’”.ⁱ Nagib was justly critical of *World Cinema: Critical Approaches*, edited by John Hill and Pamela Church Gibson (2000). She said, “This pioneer attempts to look at World Cinema as an independent theoretical subject”ⁱⁱ The problem is that the editors do not give the reader much idea of how to study cinema. I think that Nagib is opening the question rather than answering it.

Nagib adds: “Whatever the case, the fact remains that seeing Hollywood, with all its stars and stripes, as the only really international cinematic current denies a positive existence to all other world cinemas, which are thus made incapable of originating independent theory.”

Agreed - but what is the ‘independent theory (or methodology)? Nagib, in a direct criticism of much ‘world cinema’ work, including that of John Hill and Pamela Church Gibson, continues in ‘Escaping Binarism’: “less conventional approaches (to for example Bordwell & Thompson) have been attempting to forge a positive concept of World Cinema. An example is Dudley Andrew’s imaginative proposal of ‘An Atlas of World Cinema’ ... Its aim is to ‘model a set of approaches, just as an atlas of maps opens up a continent to successive views: political, demographic, linguistic, topographical, meteorological, marine, historical.”ⁱⁱⁱ

This rich mix of ‘views’ could be viewed as just a clutter of methodologies. At worst, it is admitting that film studies has not got its own methodology or discipline and suggesting that we cobble together the theories from other fields and their theorists. I admit to taking an extreme view here (even verging on a parody of the attitude of some traditionalist commentators towards

perceived ‘soft’ subjects such as film and media studies). However – in a period of increasing criticism and decreasing funding for our subject, the study of film and production in particular (both theory and practice) does need to show itself as a robust *discipline*. A lack of methodologies unique to film studies (specifically to deal with production) leaves us open to attack. My advice is to defend through methodological rigour.

I think Nagib’s work is rich and thought-provoking and makes a valuable contribution to the field. I believe her ‘polycentric’ approach has great potential. Indeed *Wide Screen 2.2* takes such a ‘polycentric’ view. However I am concerned by her defence of ‘middle-level research’ (Bordwell) or ‘piecemeal theory’ (Carroll).

I absolutely agree that “The hardest aspect of developing new theoretical models is the necessary knowledge of the cultures generating the works of art in focus.”^{iv} Surely the ‘cultures’ under investigation must include those of film-making and the cinema industries?^v Thus we come to the methodological question: how do we do it?

Cindy Chan’s piece in *Wide Screen 2.2* points to John Caldwell (et.al.) in *Production Culture* proposing an integrated cultural-industrial method of analysis, i.e. to integrate cultural analysis with political and economic frameworks. Caldwell proposes, specifically, “theorizing from the ground up.” This leads into my suggestion that we need to take a position/perspective from *within the production itself*, analyzing, even theorizing, cinema as a creative *industry* from within, and to do so by utilising the tools of social sciences. This is an appropriate methodology because social science, by nature, deals with the social, and cinema is a medium that is socially *produced*, socially *distributed*, socially *consumed* and socially *controlled*. It is easy enough (to paraphrase Antonio Gramsci) to set out the position – more difficult to decide on the manoeuvre. Most authors willing to advise a student on a social science approach^{vi} will agree that research design is key to shaping any study and that there is a critical relationship between research question, research plan(s) and overall justification for any research undertaken. The issue of particular methodology is more challenging. As Clough and Nutbrown put it (in ‘What Methods’): “ ... Remember that methods are created for particular research tasks, not simply lifted from a research methods manual.”^{vii}

While the question is key, I argue that questions in the field of cinema studies should be social and predicated on the understanding that cinema is socially produced and consumed in an industrial context with a technological imperative. A serious study of production will require quantitative and qualitative (content) analysis, survey techniques, comparative research designs and the use of secondary and archival material. Thus, I would suggest we are moving away from both traditional arts analysis^{viii} and cultural studies.

Cultural studies and critical theory do combine sociology, literary theory, film studies and cultural anthropology within a social context. My disquiet is centred upon its ‘catch all’ nature. I am concerned about the field of cultural studies because, as a result of its praiseworthy democratic ethos – anything goes – nothing is privileged and too many methodologies are combined. In any event Cultural Studies as a discipline, if indeed it is such, is too ‘individual’ in focus for our field of study.^{ix}

I believe the arts and cultural studies tradition could (indeed does) lead us to the opposite extremes of over-reading and under-reading without a clear knowledge of why the resulting conclusions are flimsy. Neither approach can ever attempt to answer the big questions: which movies are you making and watching and why? Or, perhaps more importantly, what movies can you *not* make or watch, because they are not being produced. Thus I remain convinced that in order to understand cinema within a matrix that is situated socially, industrially and institutionally, we need a social science methodology. A number of theorists have helped me to this conclusion, Pierre Bourdieu above all. It is important to remember that his work was empirical and grounded in the everyday life of creators and its instrumental functions. In terms of industrial practice, Bourdieu’s great contribution is the concept of ‘habitus.’ In *The Outline of a Theory of Practice* he introduces us to ‘Structure and the Habitus’. Later he expands on this in *The Logic of practice* (Chapter 2 – Structures, Habitus, Practices and Chapter 5 – The Logic of Practice).

The key point about ‘habitus’ is that it is not arbitrary but consists of “systems of durable, transposable dispositions’ (i.e. ways of seeing and doing), ‘structured structures predisposed to

function as structuring structures”.^x For Bourdieu actors are not agents of free-will. ‘Habitus’ is in effect a complex arraignment of dispositions - the internalization of the objective structure. ‘Habitus’ and structure mutually produce (reproduce?) each other, and the dispositions and the social positions are mutually harmonious. “‘Habitus’ engenders all the thoughts, all the perceptions, and all the actions consistent with the particular conditions they operate in. Sometimes we might hear this called a ‘feel for the game.’”^{xi} This is more than knowing the rules of the game. It is the knowing of what is going on, what is likely to happen next. Bourdieu uses the term *sens pratique*. I take this to mean everything from the MPAA ratcheting up high budgets for marketing to stop others entering the market place through to knowing what you are supposed to wear to a meeting at Screen Yorkshire and why expectations and mode of address are different at BBC Bristol. I would include the utter necessity of how to do deal with the builders working next door as you are trying to film your tender love scene and the difference between ‘paying for your trouble’ and bribery.

It could be argued that Bourdieu’s approach is too ‘structuralist’ (even defeatist). His in-depth, detailed cultural anthropology carries with it a sense of unchanging –and therefore unchangeable certainties. This is a position I (and in *Wide Screen 2.2*, Erik Knudsen) would not take. There are other thinkers who can help us towards a methodology which allows for development (and possibly hope). David Hesmondhalgh is particularly useful, offering a different view as someone who has worked through Bourdieu and started to move away from his ideas. Hesmondhalgh is more empirically based and gives a clear indication of how hard the field is to perceive and observe.^{xii} He is far more clearly focused on the cinema industries as opposed to the ‘high art’ considered in much of Bourdieu’s work. Hesmondhalgh takes a more autonomous view of individuals and thus makes ‘independent’ film producers – such as myself - feel better about what they do and more optimistic about the prospects for change: the big issue still remains as to whether or not such ‘autonomy’ exists in reality.

Throughout his work Hesmondhalgh uses terms such as ‘conditions’ (not ‘laws’) and ‘accept’ (not ‘force’) which seems to imply a clearer consciousness of the process among those who operate within it. Hesmondhalgh believes that “a model of power as coercion ” does not offer sufficient explanation.^{xiii} Creative workers are ‘symbol creators,’ says Hesmondhalgh, and puts

forward the idea of a ‘complex professional era.’ He builds on a historical model (pace Raymond Williams) of patronage replaced by ‘market professionalism.’ In the 20th century ‘market professionalism’ is replaced by ‘corporate professionalism’: now, according to Hesmondhalgh, we have ‘complex professional’ era, that is, “a combination of loose control of creative input with much tighter control of the reproduction and circulation.”^{xiv} For Hesmondhalgh, the ruling creatures of the cultural jungle are bigger and hairier than ever but they don’t even care about the product (their core activity is probably hardware – or water supply), thus the opportunities for the creativity of the smaller creatures on the ground might be greater. Ideally, “loose control of symbolic creativity remains at the heart of the way companies manage creative work.”^{xv}

I still find myself – theoretically – somewhere between Bourdieu and Hesmondhalgh but convinced of their core methodology: social anthropology and thus the great invention of modern anthropology i.e. long-term, hands-on fieldwork. This core methodology would need to be informed and supplemented by methodology from other (related) disciplines including history (investigating sources – their usefulness and validity), sociology (sampling, interviewing and/or focus group design) and political communications (particularly framing).^{xvi} Without wishing to fall into the myopic position of which I accused some scholars of film studies, I feel we do need to take cognizance of models and methodologies from economics, law and business/management studies (in particular the analysis of business models and management theory, and practice issues of personnel management). I would contend that this needs to be done “from within” i.e. within the black box which is film production.

As Ostrowska notes in her piece for *Wide Screen* 2.2 (whilst recommending the work of Bruno Latour): “Opening the black box, means a different way of thinking about scientific facts, which emphasises their social dimension and the act of constructing and assembling the fact ... We could think about the end project ... not as an object but as a social process with its own history and its own dynamics” (Ostrowska 2010). There are caveats within Latour’s oeuvre that, attractive as his work may be, does recommend caution. In *Pandora’s Hope: Essays on the Reality of Science Studies* (1999) Latour reformulates theories (based upon further research in the ‘90s) to warn us to avoid using his results to attack ‘natural science’ from a ‘social sciences’ perspective, albeit from a sense of natural enthusiasm.^{xvii} Nonetheless as Ostrowska puts it: “in

order to understand the science-in-making it is necessary to go to the laboratory and follow the scientists at work” (Ostrowska 2010): for ‘laboratory’ read ‘production’ and for ‘scientists’ read ‘producers.’ To further quote Ostrowska, “dependency on technology is something that both worlds share” (Ostrowska 2010). I feel comfortable in suggesting that, as social scientists, we should engage in long-term fieldwork,^{xviii} with a focus on *practice*: the object of study should be observed, lived and studied from within. This is a methodology widely used in the field of media education but not as thoroughly in research.^{xix}

What would such a methodology look like in practice? I recommend reading of Erik Knudsen’s piece in the *Wide Screen* special edition. Knudsen speaks of: “Deep and fruitful insights [which] developed from reflecting on my own practice question assumptions ... I was beginning to realise that poverty was my creative friend, not my enemy. It would bring the best out of me, shake me out of complacency and challenge me to question my assumptions about the language of filmmaking...as a creative practitioner I must take risks and have the courage to do so” (Knudsen 2010).

From my own position as erstwhile academic and sometime producer I would like to share the experience of Endgame Pictures (endgamepictures.co.uk) along with our sister company Rainfall (rainfallpictures.com). Endgame Pictures Ltd was founded by myself (during my time as Director of the Institute of Communications Studies, University of Leeds, U.K.). Endgame has already completed several film projects, including community-based, education-centred and drama projects shot on digital video, involving both ICS staff and students. Rainfall Pictures Ltd is ICS AV Production Lecturer Stephen Hay’s production company. From a decade or so of production experience I have selected examples of productions which are producing tangible (and RAE/REF-able) research outputs.

‘Cross Purpose / *Malentendu*’ (2001) is a short film (10 minutes) linked to the ‘International Cinema’ research project (developed at the Institute of Communications Studies, Leeds) looking at new forms of practice linked to the opportunities presented by digital production with a particular focus on how we can write/shoot and produce films more disposed to cross-national distribution. One of the issues we explored was the feasibility of dubbing (rather than sub-titling)

movies. After several ‘focus groups’ (involving showing commercially available films in both sub-titled and dubbed versions) and many and various interventions at international conferences we (i.e a combination of Rainfall – Stephen Hay directing – and Endgame – myself producing and my partner Heather Wallis script-writing) shot a movie. The results raised more questions than it answered (but surely that is what research should do).

'Words to Music' (2009) is a short fiction film project based on a 20-page script, uniquely involving the participation of a performer with profound multiple disabilities including severe communication difficulties. The project proposed to afford full engagement in the film production process to an individual from a client group virtually absent from the screen by virtue of disability level. In doing so, it aimed to create a positive image of severe disability on screen, whilst documenting the production process to further disseminate the key production learning involved, to share with film industry professionals and others working professionally with severe multiple disability.

'JOE STRUMMER SLEPT HERE' (Endgame/Rainfall, in post-production) is a 20 minute documentary looking back at a unique moment in musical/cultural history. Rainfall (Stephen Hay) had access to the personal archive of a close friend who had shared a weekend with Britain's pre-eminent band as they imploded on a ‘busking’ tour in 1985. I (Endgame) had the historical context (and contacts) to make the story a movie. Beyond the sheer impact of the story there are genuine and significant research outputs:

- 1) Use of technology - linked to an ongoing project (ICS, Leeds) investigating the use of digital ‘stills’ SLRs as a viable camera for moving images. Thus we shot JOE STRUMMER on a Canon EOS 7D^{xx} and are now formulating production strategies (and research papers) to utilise its obvious advantages (cost, mobility) and to deal with technical issues (in particular the camera's natural tendency to act like a stills camera).
- 2) Copyright – as producer on this project I am grappling with the copyright issues of bootlegged recordings of performances which have emerged from the nature of the film (who owns the rights to an ‘illegal’ recording of an event which in itself was ‘a-

legal'?)^{xxi}



1. The author (second right) on a shoot with Rainfall collaborators (Stephen Hay, MD of Rainfall is first right) for 'JOE STRUMMER SLEPT HERE', Glasgow, May 2010.

These interventions in both production and research on and within production have led me to

establish a clear position as to the methodological approach I take. I have moved from what I see now as a form of ethnography (or participant observation) to what would be seen more usually (within the social sciences) as ‘action research.’ I believe that such a methodology is most useful for looking at ‘organisations’ and, as Martyn Descombe puts it, “has a particular niche among professionals who want to use research to improve their practice.”^{xxii}

To quote Descombe further on the characteristic elements of action research, it should be:

- *Practical.* It is aimed at dealing with real-world problems and issues, typically at work and in organisational settings.
- *Change.* Both as a way of dealing with practical problems and as a means of discovering more about phenomena, change is regarded as an integral part of research.
- *Cyclical process.* Research involves a feedback loop in which initial findings generate possibilities for change which are then implemented and evaluated as a prelude to further investigation.
- *Participation.* Practitioners are the crucial people in the research process. Their participation is active, not passive.^{xxiii}

I concur about the validity (and attractions) of the above but more than this I am convinced of action research’s value beyond the circle of practitioners to those interested in practice. Action research offers a window into the ‘black box’ of (a) production. The research value of these interventions in production practice should underline and be underlined (not negated) by the sheer power of being engaged in production. Thus I was struck, as I wrote this response to *Wide Screen 2.2*, by the imminent arrival of David Gauntlett’s *Making is Connecting: The social meaning of creativity, from DIY and knitting to YouTube and Web 2.0*.^{xxiv}

To quote Gauntlett:

Making is connecting. I mean this in three principal ways:

— *Making is connecting because you have to connect things together (materials, ideas, or both) to make something new;*

— *Making is connecting because acts of creativity usually involve, at some point, a social dimension and connect us with other people;*

— *And making is connecting because through making things and sharing them in the world, we increase our engagement and connection with our social and physical environments.*^{xxv}

There may be the impression that while all this practice (and accompanying research into practice) will be a lot of fun, it may ultimately produce more heat than light. That is why it is important to stress the *research* as well as the *production* element of our activity. Thus, Denscombe (quoting Edwards and Talbot^{xxvi}) reminds us that: “Practitioner research can only be designated action research if it is carried out by professionals who are engaged in researching, through structured self-reflection, aspects of their own practice as they engage in practice.”^{xxvii}

A point well made - but less us remember the joy (*and* intellectual power) of ‘making.’ Which returns me to Ostrowska’s intervention: “the magic of cinema is in the emotions experienced not only by the spectators but also by their makers during the process of film-production” (Ostrowska 2010). This view illuminates and chimes with Alejandro Pardo’s contribution to *Wide Screen 2.2* where he asks the following questions: “Firstly, up to what point can we talk about creativity in the producing of films? And secondly, how is that creativity practiced? ... of all the professions related to the film industry the job of producer is probably the least recognized and, at the same time, the most difficult to define” (Pardo 2010). Pardo rightly highlights the producers as the “the greatly forgotten ones”^{xxviii} The role of the ‘producer’ is also highlighted in the particular case study by Shekar Deshpande included in *Wide Screen 2:2* ('Anthology Film. The Future is NOW: Film Producer as Creative Director') and echoed in Feigelson’s overview of changes in France, identifying a refreshing move away from the ‘*politique des Auteurs*’ even in the land of its birth: “The French context of film production changed drastically after 1990 ... The function of producer changed radically as he became more involved with financing the cultural industry. It means that the "policy of author" established by the so called "New Wave" after 1959 was also transformed: producers were playing a new role along with film makers.”

A focus on ‘practice’ and the black box of the film production not only illuminates the role of the

producer but also (pace Latour) turns the spotlight on technology. Melis Behlil notes the crucial role of TV.^{xxix} Behlil also suggests that “Further research looking into individual firms in depth would benefit not only the scholars of Turkish cinema ...” (Behlil 2010). I would contend that this chimes well with my concept of a continuous action research project into production.

Finally, in order to not slip into complacency in my replacement of film studies with a methodology based on the action research of practice, I recall that Patrick Vonderau urges caution :

“Lesson #6: What is “Production Studies” all about anyway? : the use of interviews is rather problematic when it comes to the digital sphere, not least while “studying up” the above the line-talent such as Orlova. The basic insight to be won from what I have described here is that the rather traditional anthropological methodology Caldwell, Mayer and others have added to their mix of cultural studies-informed production analysis overstates the importance of human agency and individuality in a process which is far more complex and in fact rather faceless ... instead of “studying up” or down, perhaps “studying through” might be a way out of that dilemma, “tracing ways in which power creates webs and relations between actors, institutions and discourses across time and space” (Shore and Wright 1997: 11)” (Vonderau 2010).

Undaunted by the caution I am encouraged by the reference to “studying through” – not so far from “theorizing from within” production. I hope the work presented in *Wide Screen 2.2* contributes to a paradigm shift for production studies. Above all else, let us not forget the link between ‘Magic, Emotions *and* Film Producers’ and also the need to get to grips with creativity: ‘MAKING IS CONNECTING.’

About the Author: Dr. Graham Roberts is CEO/MD of Endgame Pictures. He is former Director of Liverpool Screen School (and previously Director of the Institute of Communications Studies, University of Leeds). He holds visiting status at Leeds Trinity UC, The University of Ulster and UTAR (Malaysia).

Contact: endgamepictures.co.uk@gmail.com

Notes

ⁱ Lúcia Nagib, 'Towards a Positive Definition of World Cinema', in Song Hwee Lim and Stephanie Dennison (eds.) (2006), *Remapping World Cinema – Identity, Culture and Politics in Film* (London: Wallflower Press), p. 30. Nagib points us in the direction of A. R. Guneratne and W. Dissanayake (eds.) (2003) *Rethinking Third Cinema* (New York and London: Routledge), C. Gledhill and L. Williams (eds.) (2000) *Reinventing Film Studies* (London: Arnold), D. Bordwell and N. Carroll (eds.) (1996) *Post-Theory: Reconstructing Film Studies* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press), and E. Shohat and R. Stam (1994) *Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the Media* (London/New York: Routledge).

ⁱⁱ Ibid.

ⁱⁱⁱ Ibid. pp. 32-33.

^{iv} Ibid. p. 36.

^v This is not to suggest that Nagib is not aware of production issues, see (for example) her contribution to Sylvia Harvey (ed.) *Trading Culture: Global Traffic and Local Culture in Film and Television* (2006), where she discusses Brazilian films and the importance of scripts in attracting financial support.

^{vi} See for example Peter Clough and Cathy Nutbrown (2002), *A Student's Guide to Methodology*.

^{vii} Clough and Nutbrown (2002) p. 140.

^{viii} i.e. the methodologies of (critically) looking, listening, *reading* and questioning. The looking and listening are central to films as finished products (as presented). There is no point studying cinema if you are not interested in looking and listening to films, but it is not enough.

^{ix} I should point out here that my views are not held by my co-editor of *Wide Screen 2.2* and that I have not consulted any of the contributors to this issue. Their contributions must be seen as *stimulae* to my own particular position, not as a statement of theirs.

^x Bourdieu, The Logic of practice (Chapter 2 – structures, habitus, practices) p. 53.

^{xi} Ibid.

^{xii} Hesmondhalgh, *The Cultural Industries* (Sage, 2007) pp167-8

^{xiii} Hesmondhalgh p.168.

^{xiv} Hesmondhalgh p. 256.

^{xv} Hesmondhalgh p. 171.

^{xvi} Here I would recommend Robert Entman's work, especially *Media Power Politics* (The Free Press, 1981) and *Democracy Without Citizens: Media and the Decay of American Politics* (Oxford University Press, 1989). Entman has contended that journalists have biases which cause them to give more weight to certain features of the stories they cover. These biases have become *institutionalized*, creating a style of coverage that makes the development of

public policy difficult.

^{xvii} As can be seen by the number of ‘Lacanian’ with no foundation in the science of psychology. One of the attractions of ‘ANT’ and its founders is an ability to a) question the theory from within (often with a self-effacing humour: ‘the three things wrong with ANT is ...’) and b) a desire to never let it settle – thus the marvellously titled *Actor Network Theory and After* by Law and Hassard.

^{xviii} Underpinned with historically focused comparative study, e.g. Ostrowska & Roberts' *European Cinemas in the Television Age* (Edinburgh University Press, 2007). This type of project requires teamwork and can be multi- or inter- disciplinary. In any event it requires a focus on a research question.

^{xix} I would recommend that readers to refer to *The Journal of Media Practice*. (ISSN: 14682753: Online ISSN: 20400926) for a periodical which I think shares my position but is remains more pedagogically than research focused. I would welcome an informed (as opposed to my opinionated) view.

^{xx} The video format it produces is 1920 x 1080p .mov file with H.264 compression i.e. a picture quality that challenges film (and far more than digital video).

^{xxi} This project has had an impact on my current teaching at Leeds Trinity University College working with production students.

^{xxii} Denscombe, Martyn. *The Good Research Guide*. Philadelphia: Open University Press, 2003, p. 73.

^{xxiii} Ibid pp. 73-4.

^{xxiv} <http://www.makingisconnecting.org/>

^{xxv} Ibid.

^{xxvi} Edwards, A. and Talbot. R. *The Hard-pressed researcher*, Longman, 1994 p 52 emphasis added by Denscombe)

^{xxvii} Denscombe p. 75.

^{xxviii} Pointing out how central the creative producer was to the most successful system of them all, i.e. Hollywood.

^{xxix} Echoing the central argument of Ostrowska & Roberts (2007).

Bibliography

Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Field of Cultural Production*. Cambridge, UK: Polity, 1993

_____. *The Logic of Practice*. Cambridge, UK: Polity, 1992

Caldwell, J.T. *Production Culture: Industrial Reflexivity and Critical Practice in Film and Television*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008

Clough, Peter and Nutbrown, Cathy. *A Student's Guide to Methodology*. London: Sage, 2002

-
- Cottle, Simon (ed.). *Media Organization and Production*. London: Sage, 2003
- Croteau, David. and Hoynes, William. *The Business of Media*. California: Pine Forge, 2001
- Denscombe, Martyn. *The Good Research Guide*. Philadelphia: Open University Press, 2003
- Goulding, Christina. *Grounded Theory*. London: Sage, 2002
- Hammersley, Martyn. *What's wrong with Ethnography?* London: Routledge, 1992
- Harvey, Sylvia. (ed.) *Trading Culture: Global Traffic and Local Culture in Film and Television*. Eastleigh (Au.): John Libbey, 2006
- Hesmondhalgh, David. *The Cultural Industries*. London: Sage, 2007
- Hill, J, Gibson, P.C. (eds.) *World Cinema: Critical Approaches*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000
- Latour, Bruno. *Pandora's Hope: Essays on the Reality of Science Studies*. Massachusetts, London: Harvard University Press, 1999
- _____. *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007
- Law, J. and Hassard, J. (eds.). *Actor Network Theory and After*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999
- Mayer, V., Banks, Miranda J. and Caldwell, J. T. (eds.) *Production Studies. Cultural Studies of Media Industries*. New York: Routledge, 2009
- Nagib, L. 'Towards a Positive Definition of World Cinema', in Song Hwee Lim and Stephanie Dennison (eds.), *Remapping World Cinema – Identity, Culture and Politics in Film*. London: Wallflower Press, 2006
- Ostrowska, D. and Roberts, G. *European Cinemas in the Television Age*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007
- Ostrowska, D. and Roberts, G. (eds.). *Wide Screen*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (2010) - Special Issue: Production Studies. Available at:
<http://widescreenjournal.org/index.php/journal/issue/view/4/showToc>
- Zuber-Skeritt, O. (ed.) *New Directions in Action Research*. London: Falmer Press, 1996