

It is not about what you say,
it is about how you say it

- An analysis model on storytelling in radio documentaries

Av: Sonja Kutinlahti och Björn
Persson

Handledare: Carl-Gustaf Lindén
Södertörns högskola | Institutionen för
Samhällsvetenskaper
Kandidat/Magisteruppsats 15 hp
Journalistik C | VT 2017



SÖDERTÖRNS HÖGSKOLA | STOCKHOLM
sh.se

Abstract

This bachelor's essay sets to create a prototype analysis model that can be used to analyse radio documentaries. The purpose is to develop a new tool to understand radio documentary storytelling from a listener's perspective.

To create the analysis model we have used Mia Lindgren's doctoral thesis *Journalism as research: Developing radio documentary theory from practice* (2011) and film theorist Bill Nichols *Introduction to Documentary* (2010).

The result, a prototype of an analysis model, is a list of questions that is to be used with the help of the essays theory chapter. In short the model looks at the aspects of the story idea, motif, scenes, sounds, narrator, music, interviews, dramaturgy and the six modes of documentary storytelling as explained by Bill Nichols.

The analysis model is then tested, with aim to find ways to improve it in future research. The test takes form as two analyses of two radio documentaries, *Granaten Excalibur - och den svenska vapenexporten* by Måns Mosesson and *The Rhino Hunter* by Simon Adler.

The results of the test shows that the analysis model functions well in giving insight to the storytelling of the analysed radio documentaries. Though, the test also shows that the analysis model has to be complemented with deeper explanations of dramaturgy, scenes, music and narrator. Also, the used film theory by Bill Nichols has to be tested on more radio content to determine its functionality on radio.

In conclusion the research shows that the analysis model works and can be tested on more material and developed further.

Key words: analysis model, auditive documentary, podcast documentary, radio documentary, storytelling

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Purpose, research questions and delimitations	3
2.1 Purpose	3
2.2 Research questions	3
2.3 Delimitations	3
3. Background	5
3.1 The coming of podcast and the state of radio documentary research	5
3.2 Definitions – Journalism	6
3.3 Definitions – producer	7
3.4 Definitions - Radio Documentary	7
4. Method	11
4.1 Forming an analysis model	11
4.2 Testing the analysis model and doing a content analysis	12
4.3 Method and theory criticism	13
4.4 Selection of material	14
5. Theory and previous research	15
5.1 Previous research	15
5.2 Mia Lindgren on radio documentary theory	16
5.3 The six modes of documentary	19
6. Result: Analysis of two documentaries	22
6.1 Model for radio documentary analysis	22
6.2 P3 dokumentär – Granaten Excalibur – och svenska vapenexporten	23
6.3 Radiolab – The Rhino hunter	31
7. Conclusion	37
7.1 How the model works and how it does not	38
7.2 Discussion	40
Bibliography	42

1. Introduction

How does one tell a story in long format radio programme in a captivating way? The question has been nagging both of us over a long period of time. This essay is our way of trying to better understand what it is that makes radio documentaries work from a listener's perspective. We have chosen to look at specifically radio documentaries because we feel there is still a lot to learn about them.

Radio storytelling and documentaries have become more accessible with the advent of podcasting, the invention that lets producers publish their product on platforms online, with or without publishing companies as middlemen. Traditional media publishers have followed suit. For example Swedish public service company Sveriges Radio now supplies all its programming, with the exception of ad hoc-live broadcasting from press conferences and such, through its own podcast application, its website and third party podcast applications. Podcasts give the listener the possibility to stop, rewind, and start over episodes, something that is not possible with streaming radio. Podcast has made it possible to capture radio from the momentariness of the live broadcast. Listeners can now choose themselves what, when and where to listen. Also, without the limitations of a tight programme schedule, producers are freer to make longer programmes.

We think important that journalists learn how to use the long format radio to its full potential. Audiences' preferences are ever changing and the journalists' difficult task is to be able to keep telling engaging stories, stories that the audience wants to listen to. If possible, we hope to be able to increase the understanding of radio documentary storytelling. The way we think it can be done, is to have more and better analysis tools.

There is a lot of research done on various aspects of the medium of radio and auditive storytelling. History, dramaturgy, sound effects and narration are a few examples of these aspects. With podcasting growing among both established media organisations and independent producers, researchers have easy access to the output that is radio programmes and podcasts. Still, there is a lack of unified language and theory on specifically the storytelling in long journalistic format radio programmes, of which radio documentaries are an important part.

In auditive storytelling, such as radio, podcasts and radio documentaries the only way of communicating is with sound. Compared to storytelling through film or face-to-face storytelling this can be seen as limiting, liberating or both.

It can be limiting in the sense that abstract concepts can be harder to explain, without losing the audience's attention. Storytelling in film can use the visual dimension to compensate for the shortcomings of the auditive dimension and vice versa. Auditive storytelling must try its best or not at all to explain such things. On the other hand, the combined power of the visual and the auditive dimensions can make the audience passive. The sound-only storytelling however allows the audience to paint its own pictures and almost co-create the story itself. Audio storytelling works with the audience's imagination.

Out of a journalistic point of view, letting the audience paint their own image of the story can be challenging. How the audience paints their own image of the story depends on which state of mind the audience is, which affects how the void of that which is not mentioned or only hinted, is filled and with what. It is important to point out that the audience is not one individual, or even a homogenous group of individuals. Each listener will fill that void in their own way, depending on worldview, previous knowledge and ideology, to name a few factors.

With the challenges of auditive storytelling in mind we want to see if an analysis model that helps journalists understand radio documentary storytelling could be made, using existing radio theory and adding knowledge from film documentary theory. The analysis model should help journalists understand how something can be understood and why, from the perspective of a listener that lacks insight into the production process of a particular documentary.

2. Purpose, research questions and delimitations

2.1 Purpose

The primary aim of the essay is to contribute to the research of storytelling in radio documentaries and doing so help journalists understand the storytelling they do in their radio documentaries, from a listener's more limited perspective, which lacks the insight into the production process. We argue that awareness of the choices we make as storytellers helps us become better in the craft of telling a story. To this end, we will create an analysis model through a combination of modern radio documentary theory and film documentary theory. The model is meant to be used to analyse the storytelling in radio documentaries.

We believe radio producers sometimes make storytelling choices without knowing why they make these choices. Our hope, and the secondary aim of this essay is for it to be helpful for producers of radio documentaries, the journalists, in understanding their own documentaries but also the documentaries they consider as good quality.

2.2 Research questions

We want to answer these questions:

1. How can film documentary theory help us develop the existing radio documentary theory into an analysis model?
2. How can we improve the analysis model resulted from question 1 by testing it on the documentaries *Granaten Excalibur - och den svenska vapenexporten* by Måns Mosesson (A) and *The Rhino Hunter* by Simon Adler (B)?

2.3 Delimitations

This is a bachelor's essay and as such, the scope of the model that we will build and test is limited. We will read theory in radio documentary studies as well as film documentary studies, but exclude anything that cannot be related to the longer format of documentaries.

There are a number of academic works about fictional radio storytelling but we choose not to use those since fiction does not have the ‘limiting’ factors that journalism is supposed to have vis-a-vis objectivity and impartiality, to name two.

Further, we are only interested in making up a model that can be used to understand radio documentaries. Perspectives from theory about other journalistic formats may be interesting and thus incorporated into this essay – the model itself will, however, be built to not accommodate anything other than radio documentary analysis. Whether the model has a wider application is for other to test or not are of no consequence for this essay.

Lastly, since the purpose of the model is to make the producer understand his/her own product from the listener's point of view we also exclude theory that cannot be applied to that end.

3. Background

3.1 The coming of podcast and the state of radio documentary research

Podcasting is one of the most influential inventions to change the radio medium. A podcast is a radio-style programme that is published through the internet, often on a web page or through an application that makes it possible to subscribe to the programme for future listening. Play-on-demand is a key feature of podcasts. The podcast took off in 2005 when Apple's iTunes started to publish more content (Jham, Duraes, Strassler, & Sensi, 2008). Since podcasting is not bound to streaming radio's inherent constraints, editorial, technical and schedule wise, podcast's can be considerably cheaper and easier to produce and distribute. Even the hardware needed to make a podcast is affordable for many (Sterne et al 2008). In conclusion, podcasting has opened up the market for more programmes from more producers.

According to Sveriges Radio, their podcast and online radio content has gained more listeners every year. According to their website, podcasts have 900,000 listeners and downloads per week (Jönsson, 2016). In their 2017 research on podcast listening among over 12 year olds in America, American Edison Research concludes that podcasting continues to rise with monthly listeners growing from 21% to 24% year over year (Edison Research , 2017). In Sweden Mediebarometern 2016 rappers that of the 68% of participants (6002 people) listen to radio on some platform and 9% listen to webb- or podradio. In 2015 Mediebarometern reported that 7% listen to webb-or podradio (NORDICOM 2015; 2016).

In an article for RadioDoc Review, Siobhan McHugh, lecturer in journalism at Wollongong University, and one of the founders of the academic journal, wondered why there are so few academic studies about radio documentaries (McHugh 2014). After all, the podcast has been around from 2005 and radio documentary from around the 1930's (Åberg, 2012). McHugh thinks it is because the radio is invisible and when it is over it becomes absent. Before the advent of the podcast, the radio documentary was not easily accessed after the broadcast and therefore difficult to research. The podcast form has freed the radio documentary from this limitation. Also the listener can listen to the programme more than once and even rewind it,

making it possible for a deeper listening process. An audience that listens carefully also desires better quality which means that the producers of radio documentaries need to learn more about the art of audio storytelling (McHugh 2014; Crook 1999).

Critical analysis especially on radio documentaries and theories on narrative methods in radio is not a popular research field. This is not to say that there is no research done. Researchers like Tim Crook (1999), Carin Åberg (2012), Mia Lindgren (2011), Berit Hedemann (2006), Susanne Björkman (2009) and Rudolf Arnheim (1936) are some examples of researchers who have studied the history and form of radio and radio documentaries. What seems to be lacking though, is an unified theoretical language to describe the storytelling aspect of radio documentaries. Radio theory tends to loan its language from other study fields, and yet it is considered its own specific art form (Åberg, 2012). Also, the term radio documentary is not largely used even if long format radio programmes are mentioned.

As of late, it is possible to see a development of how radio medium interested researchers are organizing the research. For example RadioDoc Review, established 2013 at Wollongong University in Australia, and Radio Journal: International Studies in Broadcast & Audio Media, established 2003 internationally, are among the first academic journals on radio documentaries. Both collect critical analyses on radio and sound media across a variety of platforms.

3.2 Definitions – Journalism

According to the public service-tradition identified by Donsbach, a journalist's job is to be an informant to the public. Journalists should ground their work on objectivity and facts, not opinion. Journalists' responsibility is to give information to the people so they can make informed decisions (Donsbach, 2010).

We wish to add the dimension of 'truth' since that is what claims of presenting reality implies. Telling 'the truth' is not easy. Most often, whenever someone is telling 'the truth' that person is telling 'a truth'. For example, a documentary could state that 'investing on the stock market is a safe way of making money'. The statement can be both true and false. It is historically true if you have a long term perspective and you spread your stock holdings across business sectors and countries, and are free to sell at the time of your own choosing.

On the other hand, the statement is false if you have a short term perspective, if you do not manage the risk or if you for any reason must sell at market low point. One example of the latter is the period in time around the last turn of the century when telecom crash happened.

In this essay, we use 'journalism' in regards to a product's properties. A journalistic product, or 'journalism' must portray real people, events, and/or phenomena and meant to be spread not to a specific individual but to a large audience with the intent on giving the audience new perspectives or insights.

3.3 Definitions – producer

When nothing else is mentioned in this essay, the producer is the maker of the documentary in question. The producer in our meaning is the one that actually creates the documentary i.e. plans the work, does the research, structures the outline of the story, writes the manuscript, edits, does the interviews and so on. The producer controls the production and is therefore the storyteller – the producer has creative power when choosing how to tell the radio documentary. Since we consider a documentary to be a journalistic product, being a producer also means being a journalist, if nothing else is mentioned.

Sometimes the producer has an executive producer (EP) who is responsible for the publication of the product. The powers of the EP may vary but the role usually comes with the right to say 'No' to publishing a product if it does not fit certain quality requirements. For the purpose of this essay, we assume that the EP does not use this power to effect changes to the content of the documentary according to personal political views or preferences.

3.4 Definitions - Radio Documentary

A documentary should be about facts, real events and real people. This is something many feel characterises documentaries (Nichols 2010). It cannot be the only characteristic of a documentary, since topical news are also about facts, real events and real people and they should not be covered by the documentary umbrella label. Also, a number of films are based on reality and true stories but cannot be considered documentaries. It is therefore not as simple as it first could appear to explain what a 'documentary' is.

The definition this bachelor's essay uses is formed with the help of documentary film theorist professor Bill Nichols, tv-documentary historian professor Leif Furhammar and media researcher professor Mia Lindgren. We want to argue that even though radio and film are different, the concept of documentary is similar in both. Therefore we believe film studies will be helpful to deepen the understanding of radio documentaries.

John Grierson, the man said to have come up with the word documentary itself, defined documentary in the 1930s as the "creative treatment of actuality" (Grierson, 1933). However, the meaning leaves much room for interpretation of how creatively one can handle reality, says Nichols. Instead, he offers a definition of documentary as follows:

Documentary films speaks about situations and events involving real people (social actors) who present themselves as themselves in stories that convey a plausible proposal about, or perspectives on, the lives, situations, and events portrayed. The distinct point of view of the filmmaker shapes the story into a way of seeing the historical world directly rather than into a fictional allegory. (Nichols 2010:14)

Our input to this rather long and complicated sentence is that what also shapes the story is the receiver. Meaning, the individual person watching the documentary will also shape its content according to the person's specific way of seeing the world. This can happen subconsciously.

The degree to which the documentary represents and interprets the reality is what either reinforces the status of the product as documentary (the documentary is objective and represents reality as it is) or weakens it (the documentary interprets and makes up facts). Nichols reminds us that definitions are never perfect and one has to leave room for interpretation and ambiguities. A definition should not put boundaries on creativity.

One difference we find interesting between documentary film and radio documentary is what profession the producer think he/she has. In film, the producers can be filmmakers or other creative types like poets and writers. In radio, almost always the producers of the documentaries identify as journalists. Meaning people working at or publishing through a traditional journalist medium like public radio. This is the case with the two documentaries this essay uses (motivation for the choice is explained in the 'Method' chapter) as analysis

subjects and their respective programme creators. P3 Dokumentär is a label for documentaries published by Sveriges Radio in their radio channel P3. The channel buys documentaries made by journalists working independently or for independent production companies. RadioLab is created by Jad Abumrad and Robert Krulwich, both professional journalists. Even with the podcast medium opening the market for audio content producing for the masses (Holt, 2015) radio documentary itself has stayed very much a medium for journalists.

Film professor and historian Leif Furhammar writes about television documentary history about the difficulties of defining documentary in his book *Med TV i Verkligheten - Sveriges Television och de dokumentära genrerna* (1995). What essentially tells the documentary apart from a long format television news story is that documentary speaks the language of cinema. It strives for cinematic beauty in one way or another. A documentary is a piece of art. The definition is more than difficult and he concludes that he will do as so many before him: when choosing his study material he looks at the department which has produced the programme. If produced by the news department it is not a documentary and if produced by the documentary department it is a documentary. Nichols too writes about the effect a production company can have on the definition of 'documentary'. If Discovery Channel is considered to produce only documentaries, all programmes produced by Discovery Channel are documentaries.

Mia Lindgren writes how in English both 'documentary' and 'feature' are used to describe deeper, longer format radio stories without always making a distinction between the two different words. However, some academics and experts divide the documentary as a more truthful and journalistic format and 'feature' as a more artistic way of telling (Lindgren, 2011).

According to Lindgren, documentaries have the ability to influence and spread ideas and do so in strong empathic ways. The radio documentary is powerful for sharing personal experiences and stories about people. Radio makes normal people into heroes by making them main characters. Also, radio creates pictures inside the head of the listener. It is a very personal way of telling a story, as the story is taking place in the mind's eye of the listener.

“We cannot protect ourselves emotionally from the impact of a close voice-recording of someone sharing their story of love or suffering...” (Lindgren 2011:43).

With all this considered, we chose to define ‘radio documentary’ as a long format programme about real people and real events. It can be a product of creativity but must at least be a product of journalistic means. A radio documentary is in our definition journalism. Radio has the ability to emotionally move us but a documentary does not have to do it. What we think is essential is that the documentary proposes a way of looking at things rather than claims to represent the world in any absolute way.

4. Method

4.1 Forming an analysis model

Through selectively combining the chosen works of researchers in the fields of film documentary and radio documentary we will develop a content analysis model. This content analysis model will take the form of a list of questions and theory that explains how the list of questions should be applied. The questions are made to reflect the two theories chosen so that when we analyse and answer the questions, the different theories come to use.

The two theories we have chosen is Mia Lindgren's doctoral thesis *Journalism as research: Developing radio documentary theory from practice* (2011) and film professor Bill Nichols theory on the six modes of documentary film as presented in his book *Introduction to Documentary* (2010).

In her thesis, Lindgren does interviews with radio documentary practitioners to complement academic and industry writings in the radio documentary field and related. She then presents her conclusions as a theory, under "Chapter 2 – Radio Documentary Theory" (Lindgren, 2011:36–85). She then uses this theory to analyse a radio documentary she herself has produced. Lindgren's theory on radio documentary production helps us identify the ingredients of the documentary, such as music and how they are used when telling a radio documentary. We present her theory under the 'Theory and previous research' chapter. The fact that she has used her theory for analysis purposes gives us direction for how to apply it.

Using Bill Nichols documentary film theory, we will add the dimension of 'modes' to the analysis model. This dimension deals with determining the perceived purpose of a documentary by looking at how the story is expressed. Different modes use different methods to express the story of the documentary, and thus different modes have different purposes in storytelling.

Mia Lindgren's theory is the basis that we complement with Nichols theory to build the list of questions. The list of questions is not found in Lindgren's doctoral thesis, but it is created by us, with the help of Lindgren and Nichols.

The analysis model will be tested on two documentaries and the results used to suggest further improvements.

4.2 Testing the analysis model and doing a content analysis

We use a definition of ‘content analysis’ stated by Klaus Krippendorff: “content [...] emerge in the process of a researcher analyzing a text relative to a particular context”. (2013:25)

We understand this to mean that the content lies in the eye of the beholder, whom has individual experiences and culturally collective conceptions and ideas. The content is the interpretation of a text. In this sense ‘text’ refers to the object of analysis including not just actual written texts but also images, videos or audios, for example (Krippendorff, 2013). Of course, the producer of a text has a purpose for producing that text, a meaning to be conveyed, but it is left to the receiver to interpret. Interpretation is not only based on the receiver's reference frame but also how much trust the receiver has in the producer. In the end, the message sent might be different from the message received.

The analysis model will be tested on the following two documentaries:

- A. Granaten Excalibur - och den svenska vapenexporten, published by P3 Dokumentär
- B. The Rhino Hunter, published by Radiolab

To test the analysis model, we will each on our own listen to one of the documentaries and answer the questions we have listed in the list of questions. This means one of us will listen to and analyse documentary A and the other will do the same with documentary B. We will then listen to ‘the other’ documentary and read each other’s analyses and compare it to the model to make sure that the analysis is coherent.

If the analysis model leaves room for different interpretations, we will point this out as part of the result and discuss improvements. We will reflect on how the model works how it does not work. The shortcomings will be discussed with the goal of trying to better the model.

Since our purpose is to make an analysis model, the conclusion chapter will be about how the analysis model works and does not and about how the analysis model could be improved.

4.3 Method and theory criticism

One possible criticism is that the parts from Lindgren and Nichols are used without adjusting them in any way. The list of questions has the same structure as Lindgren has in her doctoral thesis on radio documentary. Also Nichols theory has been used as it is in his book. The theory used to define how the list of questions is to be used is left unchanged because we do not believe ourselves competent enough to dismiss Lindgren's and Nichols without testing their works first.

Another criticism could be that Lindgren's theory, which we use, has not been tested on other material than her own documentary. This raises questions about the validity and reliability of her theory. This uncertainty is a reason why we are interested in testing it. We test her theory on new material and look it critically, with the aim to improve the analysis model we have based on her theory.

The reason why we have chosen to use documentary film theory to study radio documentaries is that in our opinion the film theory has longer history and tradition than radio theory. Not only because film has existed longer but also because scholars have taken a bigger interest on it (Åberg, 2012). That is not to say that research in radio documentaries does not exist. What we want to argue, is that the longer tradition in film documentary studies and the established language therein gives us more insight in the art of radio documentary storytelling.

Lastly, it has to be said that Bill Nichols theory on modes of documentary has been argued by Tim Crook to function well on radio content (McHugh, 2014; Tim Crook, 1999). Though the version Tim Crooks argues for in 1999 is the one Nichols has published in 1991. The version we use is updated and from 2010 and includes an expanded treatment of the six documentary modes as also takes account the new trends and movements in documentary film since the first edition.

4.4 Selection of material

To test the model that we will compose, we need radio documentaries to test it on. We are avid radio documentary listeners and have listened to several hundreds of documentaries even before the essay work started. Our consumption habits have intensified in preparation for this essay. We have done this so we know that the documentaries we have chosen are different from each other in some aspects but fulfil our definition of what a documentary is.

The reason we have chosen the documentaries from P3 Dokumentär and Radiolab is that they are both respected in their respective countries.

The P3 Dokumentär brand has been in use since 2005 and has won recognition in Sweden. In 2014 it won Stora Radiopriset (radioakademin.org 2014) and Måns Mosesson won Stora Journalistpriset the same year for a documentary in three parts published under another Sveriges Radio channel's documentary brand, P1 Dokumentär.

Radiolab is an American radio programme launched in 2006 and broadcast via the public radio channel in New York (WNYC). Radiolab can be listened in over 300 radio stations in the United States but the content is also available online as podcasts. Radiolab won the Peabody award in 2010 and their documentary '60 Words' won the Peabody award in 2014. The Rhino Hunter is produced by Simon Adler who is one of the main producers of Radiolab.

To choose from the hundreds of documentaries from P3 Dokumentär and Radiolab we have listened to many documentaries according to our interests and personal preferences.

We have also read articles listing popular radio. Not to say that these articles are scientific, but they have given inspiration and feel for what other avid listeners appreciate. *Granaten Excalibur - och den svenska vapenexporten* is found in a web article from P4 Kronoberg (Kvennberg, 2015) and *The Rhino Hunter* in an article in Thrillist (McQuade; Standley; & Taylor, 2016).

In the end we have made a partly subjective choice according to our interests and personal preferences. The result is that we have chosen *Granaten Excalibur - och den svenska vapenexporten* and *The Rhino Hunter*.

5. Theory and previous research

5.1 Previous research

Carin Åberg makes a compact summary on the history of radio research in her book *Radioanalys - Att undersöka radions lyssnare och program* (2012). Topics of interest in research on radio has often changed through new innovations in technology. For example when commercial radio took off in the Nordic countries in the 90's researchers became interested in documenting radio history. Other study interests have been radio content (what kind of programmes are broadcasted), quantitative content analyses and studies on the objectivity in the programmes, to name a few. Åberg does not name the radio documentary as a study topic.

The term 'radio documentary' is not always the obvious choice when referring to long format journalistic radio programmes. Some use the term 'feature' or 'documentary feature', some use 'programme', some use 'radio drama', some use 'documentary'. In our experience when reading through previous research, there seems to be no one way to refer to the radio documentary, no unified terminology.

Åberg (2012) writes how in the 1930's some researchers like German Rudolf Arnheim (1936) studied the methods used to make drama in various radio programmes. He, however, did so through film studies, not on radio's own terms.

Tim Crook is an example of more contemporary studies on radio storytelling. His book *Radio drama: Theory and Practise* (1999) partly goes through the history of radio drama (also called radio theatre) and steps needed to produce radio dramas. He also touches the subject of documentaries as a part of radio drama storytelling. He also argues for using Bill Nichols theory on the six documentary modes on radio, which we have done in this essay on radio documentary.

Mia Lindgren has not only researched radio documentary storytelling in her doctoral thesis, which is used in this essay, but she is also active as a writer and editor of RadioDoc Review

and Radio Journal, academic online journals that study and review the audio medium and bring together radio scholars.

5.2 Mia Lindgren on radio documentary theory

This chapter describes the theory presented by Mia Lindgren in her doctoral thesis *Journalism as research: Developing radio documentary theory from practice* (Lindgren 2011). The text will describe her discoveries, that is, the practices producers use when making a radio documentary as a theory on radio documentary storytelling. Lindgren introduces her thesis chapter 2 by describing the essence of radio documentaries and their significance as media products. This is included in our definition of radio documentary.

Mia Lindgren uses two methods in her doctoral thesis and calls these “research *on* practice” and “research *through* practice”. Research through practice refers to her analysis and reflection on the radio documentary she herself produced as part of her thesis.

This theory chapter focuses on the results Lindgren concludes in her research *on* practice. What this means is that Lindgren’s collects data by fieldwork studies. This involves interviews with international radio documentary producers who, as Lindgren puts it, provide new insights into the creative process and add a new dimension to existing literature on radio studies, writes Lindgren.

It is important to keep in mind that the aspect of reflection on such things as background research and planning are not used by us since we are only interested in the parts of Lindgren’s theory a listener can perceive in the final product.

The categories of aspects of a documentary that are presented below are in the same the order as in Lindgrens thesis.

The Story Idea and Motif

Her theory builds upon an idea that producing a radio documentary is a form of delicate craftsmanship. There are many steps in the production and the producer has to go through various choices. According to Lindgren it starts with coming up with a story idea and finding the documentary’s central motif. The radio documentary itself then consists of what Lindgren

refers as radio documentary ingredients that are arranged into a programme. These ingredients are: scenes, sounds, narrator, music and interview(s). These ingredients are then mixed in the editing room into a documentary through the use of dramaturgy.

The story idea has to be interesting and it has to stimulate curiosity in the listener and in the producer. A good story gives insight into the human condition and is initiated by people's stories. It keeps the audiences grip because it is a curiosity and a wonder.

Motif, the thread that keeps the programme together, is the theme that the documentary investigates. If there is no central point the documentary falls apart into sequences without meaning. A centre of a story can be for example an emotion or a theme.

Scenes

Scenes create authenticity with recordings of a situation as it happened. It is not so much about information as it is to place the listener in the reality of the story. An interview can happen inside a scene but is almost secondary to the feel of the situation. A producer can affect the authenticity of the scene by their presence – people act differently when they know that they are being recorded. The scene is still a real recording of a real situation. Lindgren does mention the term radio pictures. This means pictures the listener creates in their mind to visualise a scene when listening to a radio story. This is also called 'radio filme'. These pictures are affected by the listener's personal memories and experiences, making every listening experience different. A skilled producer is aware of the radio pictures and is able to put them to use.

Sound

Sound in this context is everything besides speech. Sound is usually separated in two categories: Wild sound that is non-staged or staged recordings from the real world, and special effects that are created in a studio. Using sound to flesh out stories is also called 'acoustic film-making' that makes a documentary stand out as its own art form. Different sounds have meanings. The hooting of an owl can mean night and the ticking of a clock the passing of time, means Lindgren. Even silence carries meaning in radio documentary interestingly enough. It can be a cue for reflection or a moment of respect.

Narrator

“The narrator in a radio documentary is the glue holding together the many different components that make up the storyline.” (Lindgren, 2011:56).

The narrator’s role can be taken by anyone but often is taken by the producer. Narrator ensures that the listener is following the events of the story and does not get lost. Lindgren quotes Tim Crook when she writes that the listener should be allowed to learn with the producer.

A narrator can manifest in different ways. In an interview with Lindgren, radio producer Berit Hedemann says:

The narrator can be big like an almighty God that can see all parts of the programme and into the heads of all the participants simultaneously, or she can be small and cunning like an inner voice who whispers insights to you. The narrator can be formal or informal, full of humour or humourless, serious, critical or friendly; depending on which role she has selected for herself and which role suits the programme. The narrator can be almost invisible and objective, or very noticeable, dominant and subjective. (Lindgren, 2011:57)

Music

Music is often used in documentaries to evoke emotion and mood. Much like sounds, music creates a feeling of time and place and can be important when creating scenes. It can be used to highlight an emotion important in understanding the scene. Different music can indicate different emotions. Soft guitar can be romantic and strong orchestral music a cue for battle and aggression. Of course the producer has to be careful when choosing the music as taste in music is very subjective. Wrong music can be disliked by listeners and ruin their listening experience.

Interview

The interview is called the ‘bread and butter’ of journalistic work by Lindgren (2011:59). Interviews are used in multiple ways for example to gather information and have eye witness stories. Lindgren lists three types of interviews, credited to Karen Buck and Liz Gray in the *The abc of interviewing, ABC Training Book. (Sydney: Australian Broadcasting*

Corporation)¹: accountability, discovery and information interview. Accountability interviews are the ones that hold the interviewee accountable for something, a politician or a lobbyist for example. Discovery interview aims to get the interviewee to reveal something about the subject or themselves. The interview can reveal something private and emotional about the interviewee. It can be an insight to the human condition. Information interview is the one that strives to answer the classic journalistic questions: Who? What? When? Where? How? and Why? It can be an interview with an expert or an eyewitness. Lindgren concludes that the emotional, personal interview is the hardest kind. To be able to create a relaxed almost conversation like situation leads to emotionally impactful interviews.

Dramaturgy

Dramaturgy, the composition of drama, is then created with the collected ingredients. Classic dramaturgy involves usually a beginning (setting the scene and giving some context), rising drama (character and story development), climax of story (representing a change), falling action (mopping up after climax) and then finally a resolution (the end). A dramaturgy can also follow the journey of a hero, who through hardship or other events somehow changes fundamentally, which also changes the hero's life. In its most simplistic way dramaturgy can consist of a beginning, middle, climax and end. According to Lindgren, in radio a clear dramaturgical structure is key in creating a story that the listener can easily follow even with only audio cues.

5.3 The six modes of documentary

Bill Nichols is a pioneer in research of documentary films. He has done work on identifying different categories for documentaries and modes that documentaries use to tell their story. In *Introduction to Documentary* he explains the six modes that documentaries use (Nichols, 2010). Depending on the mode, the documentary asks different questions and angles its topic in different ways. It is quite possible that a documentary uses a combination of the six modes, all of them or just one.

¹ Not available for the public.

Poetic mode

The poetic mode of documentary describes reality with associations. Poetic mode sacrifices continuity and moves without limits of time or space. The idea is to give the audience a sense of something, not necessarily giving new information. The mode is artistic and as the name says, poetic. Nichols calls it the modernist avant-garde.

Expository mode

The expository mode is a traditional narrative method in documentaries and often what first comes to mind when one thinks of documentaries. It is also the used mode in news reports. Its goal is to be in first hand informative and in second hand beautiful, if at all. The expository mode in documentaries organizes information into a rhetorical frame often using logic as its main argument. It means that the documentary wants to be persuasive and uses rhetoric, the art of argumentation, to be it. The mode uses often a direct voice, which means that there is often a commentator voice that directly addresses the audience. It tells the audience who a person in the documentary is, for example “Bill has been a dentist for 30 year. He likes his job”, or narrates events, for example “Bill is on his way to his office when he gets a phone call”². Nichols calls this the voice-of-god or a voice-of-authority. It means an objective voice that most of the time is all-knowing and not physically visible.

Observational mode

The observational mode uses observation without interruption. The camera or recording device is a witness of sorts, recording events and situations. The observer (the producer who makes the recording) can either be at the place by chance or the situation is special and planned to document. For example, football matches or political speeches are usually planned to be documented. Nichols uses the word voyeurism to problematize the mode. Voyeurism in this context is not sexual but means the will to observe. Is it unethical to want to watch people and where goes the limit? Is it less voyeuristic to listen than watching people? When should you stop recording? Making documentary thus poses some ethical issues especially when using the observational mode. It is nevertheless a very common method in documentary storytelling.

² Author's own example.

Participatory mode

The participatory mode differs from the observational method in that the producer becomes a visible actor who can participate in the events and interact with the subject of the documentary. The producer does not try to hide behind the camera or microphone. Interviews are a classic example of participatory mode in documentaries. Participatory mode claims ‘what you see happens because we are here to document it’ while observational mode claims ‘What you see would have happened regardless of the camera’. Participatory mode can be used to show the audience a journey of discovery with the producer. That is, the producer learns about the subject with the audience, and is not only re-telling about the discoveries afterwards.

Reflexive mode

The reflexive mode is for creating discussion. The documentary comments itself as a product or problematizes its subject and is aware at the same time that what is being told is only a presentation of reality. It means that the documentary may question how it presents reality and if it is even truthful in its representation. Satire is possible in the reflexive method. An example of how reflexive mode can be used is that those who are interviewed or followed by the camera are actors and the whole presentation of reality is an act. But the presentation can still tell something about our world, maybe something hard to tell with the help of real people. If the subject is difficult and sensitive the reflexive mode can make itself useful.

Performative mode

The performative mode described by Nichols is to produce ideas, dreams, norms and constructions by telling it from the perspective of one person or event. Thus, to let one human experience or event describe a larger concept. All knowledge is subjective and the documentary can only make an attempt to describe a problem or issue (Nichols, 2010). The documentary may be driven by the producer's own experience or personal history. Personal, subjective stories that strive from the producer's own life and experiences are more common in modern documentary reporting (Lindgren, 2015, RadioDoc Review). Nichols writes:

Performative documentaries intensify the rhetorical desire to be compelling and tie it less to a persuasive goal than an affective one - to have us feel or experience the world in a particular way as vividly as possible. (Nichols 2010:203)

The performative documentary therefore tries to describe a feeling and a mood of reality, drilling into things in existence, which are subjective and special. It invites the audience to experience through the eyes of others and feel, addressing us emotionally rather than intellectually.

6. Result: Analysis of two documentaries

6.1 Model for radio documentary analysis

The following list of questions is our conclusion of the theory chapter. It is created by us to correspond to the theoretical work by Mia Lindgren and Bill Nichols presented earlier. When doing the analyses of the two documentaries we have chosen, each question will be answered by referring to its corresponding theory. The analysis model is made up by both theory and list of questions. The 'modes' section is taken from Nichols while the rest of the questions match Mia Lindgrens theory. The order of questions follows Lindgrens presentation of her theory.

List of questions

Story

- The Story Idea: What is the plot of the documentary? What happens in it?
- Motif: What is the central theme of the documentary? What does it try to say?

Radio documentary ingredients

- Scenes: How does the documentary make use of scenes? What kind of function do they have?
- Sounds: What kind of sounds does the documentary use? Wild sounds or special effects? How do they affect the listening experience?
- Narrator: Who narrates the story? What, if any, kind of a role does the producer take as a narrator and how does that manifest?

- Music: What music is used in the documentary and what effect does it have?
- Interview: What kind of interviews (Accountability, discovery and information) are used in the documentary? What purpose does the interview serve?
- Dramaturgy: What kind of dramaturgy does the documentary follow? Is it the classic dramaturgy for example: A beginning (setting the scene and giving some context), rising drama (character and story development), climax of story (representing a change), falling action (mopping up after climax), then finally resolution (the end).

Modes

- Bill Nichols six modes: Which of the six modes does the documentary use? How do they manifest? Is there an apparent dominant mode? How long does it take of the programme?

6.2 P3 dokumentär – Granaten Excalibur – och svenska vapenexporten

Aptly named, this documentary is about the arms project Excalibur, a joint venture between Raytheon and Bofors approved by the governments of Sweden and USA. With the intention to supply both countries with a precision round to be fired by artillery, so called indirect fire, it has been in use since 2003, in the Iraq War. The documentary was produced by Måns Mosesson and published in 2012 by the public service company Sveriges Radio's channel P3.

The Story idea and motif

The story is about the development and use of the Excalibur grenade with flashbacks to the Second World War and points of interest after to give a background of Swedish policy development, spread throughout the story. The mainstay of the plot is about the Excalibur grenade. The motif of the story, on the other hand, is to tell the story of the Swedish export of military equipment in general and to the USA specifically, relationship that at least seems different from other military trade relationships. More to the point, the focus is on Sweden's formal, ideal-driven stance of 'no export', the general exceptions from this stance and how it works in practise, i.e. when these policies conflicts with Sweden's national defence stances of neutrality and freedom from alliances.

To use an analogy, the story of the conception use of the grenade serves as a vehicle for the underlying story of the contrapositives of theory and practise of Swedish weapons export.

For these dimensions, story idea and motif, the model is easy to apply and helps the analyst understand what the documentary is about on the surface and what the underlying motif is.

Scenes

According to Mia Lindgren, a scene helps to create authenticity by placing the listener in the centre of whatever is happening. With a narrow view, this includes only audio recordings from an actual event with authentic sounds and people hopefully not adjusting their behaviour and responses because of the recording of it. However, if one broadens the definition, a reconstruction of an event along the tradition of new journalism is just as much a scene.

In the case of Excalibur, using Lindgren's definition, there are a few scenes. One example is when the producer shortly describes the setting and pre-interview meet with lieutenant colonel Johan Lewin of the Swedish defence agency for military equipment (Försvarets Materielverk, FMV). In the scene, producer and narrator Måns Mosesson describes Lewin showing a grenade, tinkering with it as he describes it. This can technically be called a scene but is of no real consequence for the story or motif. It does, however, helps the listener to anchor in the interview situation.

Most scenes in the documentary are of a different kind. Through new journalism-esque technique, Mosesson has reconstructed scenes with a combination of interview material, archive material and exposition by Mosesson. The retelling by the interviewee US army sergeant Bruce Marciszewski, combined with a playback of sounds from a tv-console basketball game and expository narration by Mosesson, is employed to retell the first time Marciszewski fired the Excalibur in combat. This could be considered a scene in way that accepts new journalism as a tool to create scenes, even if it lacks some of the hallmarks of the scene as described by Lindgren.

But there is also another dimension to the discussion of what constitutes a scene: can a scene be a collage of different scenes? Can a scene depict an abstract situation presented through a collage of smaller, more concrete and isolated scenes? We would answer 'Yes' and give an

example why: at one point in the documentary, Mosesson wants to set the stage for a segment of the interview with Kjell-Olof Feldt, who was involved in the policy making of Swedish weapons export at the time. Mosesson wants the listener to understand the changing political climate during the late 1960's with regards to a growing anti-war, anti-(American) imperialism movement, and how weapons export became a controversial issue. He achieves this through a collage of archive material from anti-war demonstrations, news radio features from weapons exhibitions in Latin America and narrated exposition narrated by himself. All this together makes up what we consider a scene in a more abstract sense.

Sounds

Mosesson seems to make little and subtle use of special effects sounds and when it happens, it is usually a part of replayed archive material. One example is from a promotion film for a particular Bofors cannon which ends in the cannon shooting automatic fire: "boom, boom, boom, boom".

One sound that is hard to tell if it is 'wild' or an effect is the sound of birds chirping during parts of the interview with sgt. Marciszewski. As it is used it gives the impression of the interview taking place outside in a park or in the woods, and maybe it is. But during other parts of the interview, we do not hear the sound. This can mean that the interview is actually several different interviews, that the interviewer and interviewee met at a place where this wild sound exists but had to find place more suited for audio recording or used to signal to the listener that the interview, which is about the experience of a soldier, takes place far from the time and place spoken of in the interview(s).

On another note, we wonder how large a difference there is between the 'Sounds' and 'Music' categories, since they are often if not always there to achieve the same goal. These categories could be analysed in a more common context since they seem to be used as if to serve the same function at times.

Narrator

The producer, Måns Mosesson, narrates the story. There seems to be no shyness in using narration to move the story along, and it does not cause any problems. Mosesson uses narration to do exposition, translation, clarification and to put emphasis on certain parts of

story. The effects of emphasis is another factor that has been less than obvious to us before this analysis – how narration is used to put emphasis on certain words or sentences of interviewees or archive material to, maybe, amplify certain facts or views. Emphasis on the part of the producer can change the takeaway of a documentary and must be considered a powerful tool since it is not always an obvious one.

An example of emphasis is early in the documentary, when an excerpt from a George W. Bush speech is played, as a means of explaining how the US government, not long after the start of the War in Afghanistan, changes focus towards Iraq and starting war there. The one minute long excerpt starts in the middle of the speech:

GWB: States like these, and their allies, constitutes an axis of evil arming to threaten the peace of the world. Some of these regimes have been pretty quiet since September the eleventh...

Mosesson: George Bush pratar om Irak [Eng: George Bush talks about Iraq]

GWB: ... but we know their true nature. Iraq continues to flaunt its hostility toward America and to support terror. The Iraqi regime has plotted to develop Anthrax and nerve gas, and nuclear weapons for over a decade.

Right after, sgt. Bruce Marciszewski comes in:

BM: I'm not entirely sure why we were supposed to go to Iraq...

Mosesson: Bruce känner sig inte helt säker på varför George Bush vill in i Irak [Eng: Bruce doesn't feel entirely sure about why George Bush wants to go into Iraq].

BM: I know the initial report was that, y'know, we were looking for weapons of mass destruction, that was the intel we received. I mean, you know, in my opinion it could have been false intel, you know, you never know what you are going to get until you go in there and find out.

(Mosesson, 2013 minute:second 06:55)

The question here is 'why does Mosesson emphasise this? Is it aesthetic, is it to make a point or is there some other reason?' We cannot know without asking Mosesson and even then, he himself might not know why he did this. It is important to mention that the target audience of

the P3 Dokumentär brand is considered proficient in English by Swedish standards, translation is therefore seldom required. Nonetheless, Mosesson uses this narrative instrument several times, translating and thereby repeating something just mentioned, to an aesthetically pleasing effect.

For this part of the model, tendency analytical tools such as mass media rhetorical analysis could be added to further the models analysis range and gain deeper understanding.

Finally, one more thing is important to note. All the interviewees in the documentary accepts or benefits from or, to the way the Swedish policy works in practise. This could be a problem, if not for Mosesson who makes it the role of the narrator, and especially as an interviewer, to question the motives, actions and rationalisations of the interviewees. Through this technique, the documentary does not become one-sided but rather a combination of 'let me tell you a story' and 'come with me while I investigate'-types of relationship with the listener.

Music

As with many other aesthetic topics, music is very subjective in the way it speaks to the audience. Even still, there can be culture common connotations associated with a particular type of music. In this documentary, most if not all of the music is of the 'dark and ominous' persuasion, indicating either that something is serious, wrong, suspicious or mysterious, to name a few interpretations and depending on the context. For example, at one point sgt. Marciszewski recalls entering Iraq and seeing faeces running down the street and smelling it from his vehicle, with the retelling accompanied by the 'dark and ominous' music, clearly saying something, but what is anyone's guess: is it the invasion, the sanitary hazard, something else or all three?

A second example is during the part of the interview with Marciszewski, when he says he is not sure why they went into Iraq. In the background there is a piano playing in way we would consider emphasises the confusion of not knowing why they were about to go into Iraq. Both this and the previous example can be considered examples of using music as an instrument of 'tell' in a context of 'show, do not tell'.

A third example is using the Phantom of the Opera-theme. It is played after John Halvey of Raytheon explains that the Swedish and U.S. teams did some team building to create a good working relationship. A short part of the theme is played directly after Halvey's telling of the process and as a result we consider this use of music to be 'showing' rather than telling. It is difficult to suggest how to develop the model to understand the use of music in radio documentary making. Music, as Lindgren mentions, is a most difficult component to get right in the making of a documentary. It is also a difficult ingredient to analyse and describe in theory, without going in depth in music's psychological effects in the listener. What is music to others can be noise to others.

Interviews

In the Excalibur documentary, a number of people are interviewed. Weapons developer John Halvey from Raytheon, weapons developer lieutenant colonel Joakim Lewin from the Swedish agency Defence Materiel Administration, Excalibur user sergeant Bruce Marciszewski from the U.S. military, politician with responsibility for weapons export Kjell-Olof Feldt (Swedish Social Democratic Party) and director general Andreas Ekman Duse of the Swedish agency deciding on military export (Swedish National Inspectorate of Strategic Products).

The interviews with Halvey and Marciszewski are mostly discovery and information interviews about their involvement in the Excalibur development project and live use of the grenade, respectively, and what they feel about their involvement. Marciszewski gets a critical question, an accountability question about killing, but otherwise his interview is mostly about his experiences as a soldier. This is the face value of the interviews. However, both interviews also functions to give the issues of war waging and weapons developing a human side. It is not some soldier that shot and killed with the Excalibur and that we get to know – it is Bruce, who happens to be a soldier that has shot and killed with the weapon. It is not an anonymous, cold hearted weapons developer that we meet, it is John Halvey who takes pride in his work which is developing weapons. It seems that these two either share more of their person or are given space, through editing by Mosesson, to be persons rather than just professionals. The same can be said about Kjell-Olof Feldt and his interview.

The interview with Lewin is mostly an information interview about weapons development. The interview with Ekman Duse is an information interview with one or two critical questions about the Swedish balancing act. He gives insight into the particular relationship between Sweden and the USA. Kjell-Olof Feldt is the only person high-level decision maker of the five, being the highest ranking civil servant in the finance department and later trade minister at the time of which his interview is focused on. His interview includes both the informative side of what, when, where etcetera, and discovery, which is mostly about working at a time when this balance act started and having to work out the policy for these questions. He is also questioned why one would think that one can sell weapons and be assured that they will never be used, which is the spirit of the policy in question. He also gets to share what seems to be joy for working with complex issues and dislike of the issue matter.

It should be said that while one easily can recognise an emotional interview, there is a difference between having an emotional interview and an interview where a person is let to show their humanity, as discussed in regards to the interviews with the two Americans and Kjell-Olof Feldt. Mosesson simply lets people be people. The characters are more than the interviews they give. Either one likes wars or not, people should still be able to empathise with sergeant Marciszewski as a human being, which not all journalists are able to do. This is a difficult ingredient to produce, and yet probably the most necessary in a radio documentary.

The effect seems to come about by Mosesson, both in the interview situations and the editing room, letting the interviewees be more than the role they play in the documentary.

Subjectively, this is a good example of a good practise since humanising people doing things that some people consider immoral - whether killing in war or building weapons - can inspire self-reflection.

Dramaturgy

First, there is an introduction, a beginning, that in many ways resemble a lead paragraph in a printed news article. This is accomplished through a collage of archive material, clips from interviews and a presentation of the subject by the narrator.

Then, we are suddenly introduced to sgt. Marciszewski, who carries the documentary, tying the story and the interviews together. We are told the story of the run-up to the Iraq war,

where the grenade is first used. We are also introduced to two other interviewees, Halvey and Lewin of the development team.

After about a fourth of the documentary we come into what can be considered a second act but still a part of the beginning. In this part of the documentary, we flash back to the Second World War and we are told the story of how Sweden took the position towards weapons export that the country currently has. Here, we meet the fourth interviewee, Feldt, who explains the thinking of the time after World War 2 and the resulting policy position.

After this, about halfway through, we come into a third act which is when the drama intensifies. We get to know that there will be an Iraq war and how much more urgent of the developers gets. We are also reminded of the Swedish government's dislike of the war, all the while the development continues.

A fourth act can be said to start with one fifth to go. This is when the U.S.A. actually invades Iraq. During this act, we are introduced to the fifth and final interviewee Ekman Duse. In this interview we are told how the policy works today and why the U.S.A.-relationship is of special importance to Sweden. We are also told the story of when Marciszewski uses the grenade in combat for the first time, which is the story's climax, and how the development project ended and how the developers appreciate their involvement the project, the story's 'falling action'.

Finally, the documentary is ended by Mosesson, the narrator, explaining that Sweden has just put in their first purchase order of the grenade [note: the war started in 2003 and the documentary was published in 2012]. This is the end.

It has been difficult to draw a line between when one part of the dramaturgy ends and another begins and after a few listenings, we can identify why: the story and the motif does not follow the same dramaturgy. While the story is seemingly straight forward, the motif behind the documentary is never resolved – the contradiction between a strong, independent national defence on the one hand and weapons export to countries that are not, nor suspected of going, at war or with internal armed conflicts on the other hand, is not solved. This distinction is important, and could be pointed out in the theory and list of questions.

Mode

Granaten Excalibur is focused on informing the listener about a process but more so a national policy and how it came into being. It is first and foremost a product of logic, explaining what is going on and why through factual presentation. Narration is used to speak directly to the audience in a voice-of-god sense. The listener that also happens to know how the Iraq War came about, should agree that at least most music and sounds are used to emphasise the facts, for example music that emphasises the confusion about why the U.S. government went into Iraq.

Altogether, this documentary is a good example of a documentary that according to Bill Nichols classification should be considered as 'expository'.

6.3 Radiolab – The Rhino hunter

Radiolab is an American radio programme launched in 2006 and broadcast via the public radio channel in New York (WNYC). Radiolab can be listened in over 300 radio stations in the United States but the content is also available online as podcasts. Radiolab won the Peabody award in 2010 and their documentary *60 Words* won the Peabody award in 2014. *The Rhino Hunter* is produced by Simon Adler and takes on the subject of animal conservation.

The story idea and motif

The documentary takes on the subject of animal conservation but from the perspective of a surprising party – hunters. The story follows Corey Knowlton, who paid to hunt and kill a black rhino in Namibia. The black rhino is an endangered species and Knowlton ended up getting a lot of media attention. Activists were outraged at him and he received death threats. Yet to Knowlton, and so many other hunters, the answer to how to save the black rhino is connected to the want to hunt it. By paying big sums of money for the licenses to kill endangered animals, hunters are supporting the actors who work to save the animals. The documentary follows Knowlton's journey to Namibia and makes effort to describe also the opinions and perspectives of the other side of the conservation debate than the side of the hunters.

The central theme can be heard in this excerpt, from the final reflection Corey Knowlton makes on his views on wildlife conservation:

Do you really value it? Do you value it past making 75 characters in your iPhone and tweeting about it? Do you value it past watching animal planet? To me, I know, and I care, and I placed an extreme value, financially, physically, emotionally on the survival of the black rhino.

(Adler & Kielty, 2015, minute:second 48:41)^[3]

The documentary asks a similar question – what kind of a value do we put on wildlife? Is there a right or wrong way to save it? Is there other questions to be considered apart from what is an effective method when trying to save a species? Even though the emphasis on the story is on the perspective of hunters wanting to save wildlife, the documentary does problematize hunting. It does so by letting the listener hear the sounds of hunting and the brutality of it and by letting also those opposing hunting say something.

Jad Abumrad and Robert Krulwich present the documentary as an attempt to nuance an otherwise, at times, aggressive and polarized debate climate around trophy hunting. They explain that the documentary is about the strange relationship between wanting to hunt and kill an animal and wanting to save it.

When analysing the story idea and motif in *The Rhino Hunter*, the model is easy to apply. The topics are good to be discussed together.

Scenes

Lindgren's definition of a scene, a recording of reality as it happens, is easy to apply to *The Rhino Hunter*. It delivers many scenes that are purely recordings from event as they happen. We get scenes like the ones from the Western Hunting and Conservation Expo at Salt Lake City, the arrival to Namibia, Simon Adler's encounter with a black rhino, the hunt with the Swedish hunter Stefan Lindström and Corey Knowlton's hunting trip for the black rhino that is the anticipated climax scene of the documentary.

The documentary mainly takes place outside of the recording studio creating the feeling of travelling with the story and the characters (Knowlton and Adler) to places like Namibia, Africa. The scenes make the story happen in a much bigger place than the studio – it truly takes place in the real world, making the documentary feel authentic and rich. A good example of this is the scene where Adler is on a car drive trying to spot a black rhino.

Through the scene the hum of a car can be heard in the background, steady and grounding. It indicates movement. Adler describes the car ride through the thick savannah grass like driving through a cloud, a mental image that is dreamlike and beautiful. When they finally spot a black rhino, it is with excitement that Adler lets out a “Oh shit, there it is!... Oh man okay.” (Adler & Kielty, 2015). Rather than really inform the listener of anything, this describes the joy of seeing a wild animal. The listener then gets a description of the pre-historical, dinosaur looking animal, but it is the joy in Adler’s voice that is important for the scene. As Lindgren writes, information is almost secondary to the feeling.

The scene’s purpose is to put in words, or closer, to put in sounds, what Adler describes as the moment when he understood the possibilities of successful conservation and the joy of being able to witness animals in the wild. It helps the listener become emotionally invested in the documentary, which in its turn makes scenes from the hunts of the animals all the more powerful. Therefore, when hearing the sound of the gunshots, aimed at what is described as a beautiful big reindeer with sphere-like antlers sticking out of its head, and the uncomfortably excited shouts of the hunters, the listener is lured to feel somewhat conflicted. On the other hand the scenes can contribute to the listener feeling the happiness of successful wildlife conservation and on the other hand they contribute to describe the means that are used to save the animals – the trophy hunting.

In the case of *The Rhino Hunter* scenes become a way to shift the listener’s empathy from perspective to another. But in Lindgren’s theory on scenes, the aspect of how scenes help to direct the listener’s feelings is not closely discussed.

Sounds

Sounds play a crucial part in bringing life into the documentary and the scenes. Both wild sounds recorded in the field with Adler and special effect sounds produced in the studio are used. For example, in the very beginning of the documentary a series of voices that express hate towards the man who killed the popular lion called Cecil in 2015, are mixed to become a sound montage. There is echo, overlap and static that create a haste and aggressive quality to the sound montage of hate. It indicates to the listener that the topic of the documentary is volatile and emotional to many. An example on wild sounds are the sounds of gunshots from the hunt, the sound of a duck calling ‘whistle’ at the Wildlife Conservation expo and the

sound of Corey Knowlton singing happily in Namibia, getting ready for a day of hunting. The sounds work to flesh out the story and give the documentary more dimensions and feel of reality.

However, analysing music and sounds in the same context would help the analysis process. As it is in the original version presented by Lindgren, the analysis of the narrator cuts off the thought process of sounds and music as ingredients of similar function.

Narration

Simon Adler, the producer of the documentary, works very much like a guide through the documentary. He narrates the story in first person so that his own reactions and feelings can be clearly heard through the events. Also, he refers to himself as 'I' and 'me'. For example "Now one of the things that surprised me..." or "...Finally clicking into place with me". Even in interview situations Adler let the interviewees address him and express a personal contact to him. Corey Knowlton texts him, sings on their trip in Africa and lets Adler use his personal video recording from the hunting trip Adler couldn't participate in. Small things like him testing the microphone or being unsure about a question is left in the documentary, making him into a familiar, sympathetic character. This lets the listener connect with the person Simon Adler, a sort of relationship develops, rather than having Simon Adler as purely a listener's guide-for-hire. This could potentially become a problem, if the narrator tries to manipulate the listener's opinions. However, Adler manages to remain humble giving the listener space to form their own opinions. Adler never says that one way to think is better than another. He states what he thinks and gives examples on what other people think, without moralising which is better.

The various aspects of the narrator should be described in more detail in the theory. Questions on how different narrator roles affect the story and listening experience should be answered in the theory, so it can be analysed. Also tendency is an aspect that should be investigated.

Music

There is little to no music in *The Rhino Hunter* and when there are talk-free moments, the silence is taken over by ambience music, which is instrumental music with little to no rhythm often composed with a computer. Sometimes the ambience can be heard in the background of

an interview, giving cues to listen to more closely or giving a cue for an emotional change. The ambient music is created with a computer. The musical sounds are long dragged and mystical, sometimes a curious string of quick, short and soft sounds like drums beating indicates a shift or a change in the story scenery. This happens for example once in the middle when we move to Africa and in the end, when we are back in the studio to listen to the end credits.

Different kind of music should be more described in the theory. For example, ambient music could be categorized as sound by some and it needs to be clearer in the theory which it is.

Interviews

There are four main interviews in the documentary. First, a central one with Corey Knowlton in the beginning, then a shorter one with a landowner Adler visits while in Africa, the Swedish hunter Stefan Lindström and the anthropologist Richard Leekey, who has directed the wildlife programme in Kenya for a short time and is of the opposite opinion about animal conservation.

The interview with Corey Knowlton, which is the longest and most central interview in the documentary, is both a discovery interview and an accountability interview. As a discovery interview, we learn the story how he ended up winning the auction for the license to kill the black rhino in Namibia, as a favour to an old friend. Knowlton tells how the media attacked him and he and his family started to get death threats and how he felt through the process. He tells about his early days, when his family was still poor and he would go out to hunt with his father. It was then he got introduced to hunting, an interest that would grow, and that later led him to animal conservation, that became his passion. The interview lets us know Knowlton as a person and not only as the man who kills animals. As a discovery interview is meant to do, the interview gives insight to the human condition. When this part is over, Adler shifts his focus to confront Knowlton about his beliefs and his work. It is here the true emotionality of the interview comes to life, even though it also an accountability interview.

Knowlton talks about his passion of wildlife conservation and the arguments that support his way of doing it. Adler asks very tough questions that make Knowlton emotional and agitated. It comes to the point where Adler suggest they take a pause but Knowlton takes a moment

and answers in a way that catches attention. He sounds close to teary eyed when he tells how much the animals and his work mean to him, and how he feels frustrated when people judge him as a killer. The interview ends in this discovery, which reveals the listener something private and emotional about Knowlton, that in turn gives a new dimension to the story: if a hunter feels this passionate about animal conservation, can he be completely in the wrong?

Dramaturgy

The core dramaturgy is Knowlton's journey from winning the auction and the license to kill the black rhino to the moment he kills it. In this big story arc the true story takes place. We visit smaller, but important sub-storylines that fleshes out the motif of the documentary – the question of if there is a right or wrong way to save a species. The Rhino Hunter can also be described in a classic dramaturgy.

The documentary begins at the Western Hunting and Conservation Expo, which sets the scene to the conflict in the story: How can you argue to save an animal if you want to kill it? The documentary then rises drama by introducing us to Corey Knowlton and his personal dilemma that is followed to Namibia. Not only does this develop Knowlton's character but it also develops Adler's character. He starts to understand the conservation problem piece by piece, and with him so does the listener. The climax of the story is when Adler first, with joy, understands the benefits the conservation model has on the wildlife in eastern Namibia and when he then has to confront the flip side of it: the hunting and killing of the animals. This confrontation takes place when he follows Stefan Lindström on his hunting trip and it does not go as well as planned. For the falling action other conservation models are discussed and criticism is heard. Finally, for the resolution we witness Knowlton hunting down the black rhino. The story wraps up back in the studio where the final discussion takes place. There the central moral conflicts are discussed and Knowlton gets the final word, stating his beliefs.

Even if the documentary's title, The Rhino Hunter, suggest that Knowlton is the story's main hero, this is only partly true. A big role falls also to Adler who is partly the narrator, but also partly meant to be the listener in the story. Meaning, he undergoes a change in the story, when he learns new information that changes his feelings toward the subject.

Dramaturgy theory should be improved and described in more detail. Lindgren's theory does not feel quite enough and needs to be complemented with dramaturgy theory from literary studies for example.

Modes

The documentary can be described as using mainly the participatory mode. Simon Adler's interaction with the story's characters is the centre of the storytelling. He is always present in scenes, asking questions, listening or experiencing in first hand. One of the few times Adler is not present is in the final scene, when Corey Knowlton hunts down the black rhino. In this scene, the observational mode is used. Though Adler does narrate some bits of the scene too, ensuring that the listener understands the course of what happens. This is an example of the documentary using the expository mode, meaning that Adler works as a commentator voice, narrating the event. The dominant mode is still the participatory, which takes about 40 minutes of the documentary's 51 minutes and 8 seconds.

Even if it works well in the case of this documentary, Bill Nichols theory on modes should be further studied and possibly modified to fit the radio medium better.

7. Conclusion

This bachelor's essay aimed to answer the following questions:

1. How can film documentary theory help us develop the existing radio documentary theory into an analysis model?
2. How can we improve the analysis model resulted from question 1 by testing it on the documentaries *Granaten Excalibur - och den svenska vapenexporten* by Måns Mosesson (A) and *The Rhino Hunter* by Simon Adler (B)?

The answer to the first question is the analysis model resulted from the going through Mia Lindgren's radio theory and Bill Nichols film documentary theory on documentary modes. The analysis model consist of the theory chapter and the list of questions represented.

The answer to question two comes in two parts. First, with the analyses of the two radio documentaries, and second with the discussion on how the analysis model works and how it does not. This discussion on improvements takes place under the conclusion chapter.

7.1 How the model works and how it does not

This chapter will conclude what works with the analysis model and which parts we have found in need of development.

Overall the list of questions were very useful, and the general structure helped with the thought process. In both documentary analyses the analysis of the story idea and motif works well and feels straightforward. Tracking the face value, the story idea, in a documentary have been easy. Tracking the motif can be a little trickier since it might be hidden underneath the story, written between the lines or, as mentioned in our analysis section, use the story as a vehicle. With that being said, this part of the analysis model works well.

The ingredients section, on the other hand, has clearer problems. Lindgren's definition of a scene is too restrictive and needs revision. We believe that new journalism-reconstructions (the movement in journalism practise where scenes and situations are reconstructed with the help of witness's and artefacts when the journalist has not been there herself) as well as the more abstract scene construction should be considered scenes since they fill the same function, as seen in *Granaten Excalibur [...]*. As it is described now in the theory, a scene is a real recording of real events. What the theory considers to be scenes should therefore be altered into a wider definition. As seen in *The Rhino Hunter*, the impact scenes have on the listener's feelings toward the subject matter is also an important aspect that should be investigated more.

Our critique of the strict sense of 'scenes' is summed up in the following questions: which qualities must a retelling of a happening have to be considered a scene in radio documentaries? Is a scene defined by superficial, quantitative factors as Lindgren describes, a real recording of a real event, or should it be replaced by a definition based on qualitative effects like how a retelling affects the listener's perceived involvement, even if it is reconstructed?

Music and sound often serve the same function - enhancing the scene. Sounds and music should be analysed together, after scenes in the list of questions, as they are closely related to each other and to the scenes. Otherwise the theory on sound works fine.

In the list of questions, narrator comes after sound and before music and interview. As with music and sound, narrator and interview are closely related and should be considered as complements to each other. After all, in radio documentaries it is often the narrator who makes the interviews, and sometimes exposition is done in between one and the same interview. To help the thought process of the analyst, we believe 'narrator' and 'interviews' should be placed together, after story idea and motif. 'No' documentary is without these components and they are core to understanding story idea and motif.

The narrator section needs further development as Lindgren's definition leaves some aspects uninvestigated. Literary theory could be one way to develop the narrator dimension of the model. There are studies, where the role of the narrator and storyteller are examined in long format journalism in written form, for example Cecilia Aare's master's thesis *Att se genom de andras ögon - Narrativa strategier för att skapa inlevelse i reportage* from 2014 and further studies as a part of doctoral studies. We propose that theory from these sort of studies should be incorporated.

Music, as noticed in the P3 documentary, can be used in different ways - sometimes to complement what an interviewee says, 'show', sometimes to 'tell' the listener what to feel and sometimes as a part of archive material, 'show'. In the 'show' sense, when establishing a scene, it is less problematic, but when used in the 'tell' sense the impartiality of the documentary and the producer can be questioned. How does the music affect the tendency of a documentary? This should be looked at more closely.

What also should be looked at closely in the music description is the use of different genres. In both documentaries ambient music was used, and this genre should be explained in the theory.

Closely related to sounds and music, archive material serves an important purpose. It is used to create scenes, convey the zeitgeist of a particular time both as exposition and conveying

the feeling of a situation. It is central to any producer that makes documentaries about historical events and should be considered an ‘ingredient’ in its own right.

Interviews as earlier mentioned should be moved in the list of questions right after the narrator section. Otherwise, the model works well in this regard.

The dramaturgy theory should be developed. Lindgren does not go in depth with explaining various dramaturgical strategies, which can lead to a superficial analysis. We believe literary or journalism studies have much to offer in developing this dimension.

We have also noticed, when analysing *Granaten Excalibur* [...], that the dramaturgy can and should be analysed both on the story level and the motif level of the documentary. This can help the analyst to more clearly distinguish between story idea and motif and what effect these differences they have on the documentary.

Bill Nichols theory comes from film documentary studies and as such does not take radio’s special properties into consideration. Nevertheless, it works well in many ways and especially for the documentary we tested the model on. However, we wonder what observational mode could be in an journalistic, auditive product, where only sound is used. Film uses both visual and auditive components, but there is a risk that the audience misunderstands a situation. Removing the visual component increases the risk of misunderstandings which leads to a follow up question: can one make auditive, journalistic products using only ‘observation’? The modes should be tested on more documentaries in order to make any sort of conclusions.

Finally, the analysis model must be tested on more material in general, to really understand how and if it works in a broad sense.

7.2 Discussion

Testing the analysis model on only these two different radio documentaries has already revealed things to improve. But the test is in not conclusive as it is only two documentaries that have been tested. Testing the analysis model on more material is therefore necessary to give the model better reliability and validity. What also can be improved is the scope of

theory used in the analysis model. We have chosen two theories we felt worked well, but there is definitely room for more precision.

If we look at details, only testing if Nichols modes can be applied to more radio documentaries could help determine if all of the modes can be used to analyse radio.

Björn believes that for Nichols theory to be fully adapted to radio, researchers could look at the modes as hypotheses and do hypothesis tests of each mode. By trying to create documentaries with a mode's definition as a recipe, researcher could come to disprove or accept the theory.

Sonja on the other hand feels that simply analysing more radio content with the help of the modes is enough to determine their functionality on radio.

We also think that the model can be developed by adding some sort of tendency analysis. This should be added as a dimension in the end of the list of questions using the analysis of the other parts to form a conclusion about tendency. The mass media rhetoric analysis or discourse analysis could be of help.

Bibliography

Adler, S. & Kielty, M., 2015. *The Rhino Hunter*. Radiolab. New York: Radiolab. Retrieved 21 May 2017.

Arnheim, R., 1936. *Radio. The Art of Sound*. London: Faber & Faber.

Björkman, S., 2009. *En lyssnares röst*. Stockholm: Carlsson Bokförlag.

Carrier, S., 2014. [Online]

Available at: <http://transom.org/2014/brief-history-of-documentary-forms/#npr> Retrieved 21 May 2017.

Crook, T., 1999. *Radio Drama: Theory and practice*. Milton Park: Routledge.

Donsbach, W., 2010. Journalists and their professional identities. In: S. Allan (ed.). *The Routledge Companion to News and Journalism*. London: Routledge pp. 38-48.

Edison Research, 2017. *The Podcast consumer*, Somerville: Edison research. Available at: <http://www.edisonresearch.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/The-Podcast-Consumer-2015-Final.pdf>

Furhammar, L., 1995. *Med TV i verkligheten- Sveriges Television och de dokumentära genrerna*. Borås: Stiftelsen Eteredierna i Sverige.

Grierson, J., 1933. The documentary producer. *Cinema Quarterly*, 2 (1), pp. 7–9. Available at: <https://ia800307.us.archive.org/13/items/cinema02gdro/cinema02gdro.pdf>

Goldman, J. G., 2016. Why did the death of Cecil the lion cause such an uproar?. *The Guardian*, 5 May. <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2016/may/05/why-did-death-of-a-single-lion-cecil-cause-such-an-uproar> Retrieved 15 May 2017.

Holt, K., 2015. Medieanvändare som nyhetsproducenter. In: *Hanbok i journalistikforskning*. Lund: Studentlitteratur AB, pp. 411-424.

Hedemann, B., 2006. *Hør og Se*. Kristiansand: IJ-forlaget.

Jham, B. C., Duraes, G. V., Strassler, H. E., & Sensi, L. G., 2008. Joining the podcast revolution. *Journal of Dental Education*, 72(3), pp.278-281. <http://www.identaed.org/content/72/3/278.full>

Krippendorf, K., 2013. *Content analysis: an introduction to its methodology*. Thousand Oaks California: SAGE Publications Inc.

Kvennberg, E., 2015. *P3 Dokumentär-fantastens bästa poddtips*. [Online]

Available at: <http://sverigesradio.se/sida/artikel.aspx?programid=106&artikel=6221647> Retrieved 19 May 2017.

Ledin, J. & Moberg, U., 2010. Textanalytisk metod. In: M. Ekström och L. Larsson (ed.). *Metoder i kommunikationsvetenskap Upplaga 2:4.* Lund: Studentlitteratur AB., pp. 153-176.

Lindgren, M., 2011. *Journalism as research: Developing radio documentary theory from practise.* Perth: u.n. Available at:
<http://researchrepository.murdoch.edu.au/id/eprint/5858/2/02Whole.pdf>

Lindgren, M., 2015. Balancing personal trauma, storytelling and journalistic ethics: a critical analysis of Kristi Melville's *The Storm*. *RadioDoc Review*, Article 8. Available at:
<http://ro.uow.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1049&context=rdr> Retrieved: 19 May 2017.

McHugh, S., 2014. *Developing critical theory of the radio documentray and feature form*, Wollongong: University of Wollongong. Available at:
<http://ro.uow.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2899&context=lhapapers>

McQuade, E., Standley, L. & Taylor, D., 2016. *The 11 best 'Radiolab' episodes.* [Online] Available at: <https://www.thrillist.com/entertainment/nation/radiolab-podcast-best-episodes> Retrieved: 21 May 2017.

Mosesson, M., 2012. *Granaten Excalibur - och den svenska vapenexporten. P3 Dokumentär.* Stockholm: Sveriges Radio.

NORDICOM 2015; 2016. *The Media barometer: Some basic tables.* Available at:
<http://www.nordicom.gu.se/en/media-trends/media-barometer>
Retrieved: 22 May 2017.

Radio Journal: *International Studies in Broadcast & Audio Media*, 2017.
www.intellectbooks.co.uk. [Online]
Available at: <https://www.intellectbooks.co.uk/journals/view-Journal.id=123/> Retrieved: 19 May 2017.

Radioakademin, 2017. *radioakademin.org.* [Online]
Available at: <http://radioakademin.org/2014/09/stora-radiopriset-priser-till-gert-fylking-p3-dokumentar-och-skolministeriet-lotta-brome-och-kodjo-akolor-arets-programledare/>
Retrieved: 16 May 2017.

Radiolab, 2017. [Online]
Available at: <http://www.radiolab.org/about/> Retrieved: 21 May 2017.

Sterne, J., Morris, J., Baker, M. B. & Moscote Freire, A., 2008. *The Politics of Podcasting.* Montreal: McGill University.

The Peabody Awards, 2017. [Online]
Available at: <http://www.peabodyawards.com/award-profile/60-words> Retrieved: 20 May 2017.

Åberg, C., 2012. *Radioanalys – Att undersöka radions lyssnare och program.* Lund: Studentlitteratur AB.