

Name: Amanda Jeannette Sibanda
Student No: 604S1478
Course: Journalism and Media Studies 4: Television
Lecturer: P. Hills
Work: Critical analysis and Self Reflexive work
Due Date: 25 May 2007

The piece that we produced was not entirely satisfactory, especially on the technical side of the production. The shots of the case study were over exposed, and so the effects used to tone down the lighting caused the shots to flicker when the piece was viewed on a television screen. Most of the filming for the documentary was not done with a tripod and this was evident when we viewed the other documentaries, especially the work done by Rat Race productions. Their shots were steady and this added a certain amount of beauty to their piece. This is something that we should work towards.

I thought that the sound was great in the piece, except for the interview with Nicholas Henwood which was conducted over the phone. The quality was dilapidated by the fact he was on his cellular phone and had no access to a landline. He has some useful information which we thought would be great for the piece, and so we decided to provide subtitles for the interview in the hope that it would save the value of his words. We did not choose and use a format to show who the speaker was through out the clips that we used. This was a flaw because the visuals could have been placed in a better position, where they could be viewed without any subtitles on them, and in a space whereby the viewer could also tell who was speaking. Mr Henwood did not supply us with a mugshot for the piece and we could not get a one on his staff profile on the University of Cape Town website. This could have added more value to his voice. We also lacked visuals for Thabo Mbeki and Lindiwe Hendricks. This would have helped 'liven' up the parts where the piece just had their photographs.

I felt that some of the voice-overs on our piece were fast. I could have done the recordings slower, and this would have also helped to convey more emotion on the piece. Instead of it being a general voice-over, it could have helped carry the piece in the way that Raging Ferret's voice-over done by Palesa did.

The other grievances from the residents at the Imbizo was a good aspect in the piece, because it conveyed the general annoyance at the council committee by residents. The Imbizo also showed that there are other sanitation issues that needed to be addressed by the council, and this put the bucket system in a broader context. The inclusion of 'many faces' in the piece was what also helped the piece. There were many sides to the story and so the viewer could arrive at their own 'conclusion'.

I feel that the piece lacked in the investigative journalism side to it. At the end of the day, it felt like a simple documentary without much 'probing' from us. There could have been more questions asked about why the bucket system is even still in place – looking at the agenda of the government or municipalities. Are people not pushing hard enough to get the system eradicated? Or is it because the higher powers actually have flushing toilets of their own? Etc.

The actual documentation of people's lives was lacking in this documentary. There is a significant amount of talking heads which could have been avoided. The executive producer felt that we should have had some of the bucket workers commenting on their job while at work. This, as much as it may be said to constitute good journalism I was not willing and still am not willing to do. My ethics came into play whilst filming this documentary. The job is evidently and obviously demeaning and dehumanising, and for me to even dare ask how a person is feeling while carrying buckets of human waste, I felt was a no go area out of respect to the men. The men are older than me, they are people's fathers, people's husbands, and most importantly people. When I actually plucked up the courage to ask about the job, I was answered with a stare that translated to 'what do you think?' and the man walked away. Who could blame him?

Like Hill Collins (1991), I feel that women, especially Black women have a different lived experience to 'other' men and women from other 'races'. This is why I think that the executive producer could not appreciate where I was coming from when I stated that I would not talk to bucket workers whilst on the job. I was not and am not asking for a better mark. If my invasion of those men's spaces was good journalism, then I deserve a lower mark than the mark I was given because I did not do that. If their job is easily compared to race car driver's jobs – in terms of the fast pace – and can be covered 'easily', then I did not do what I was meant to do – besides the fact that race drivers

probably can afford to wipe their behinds with dollar bills, their job is more glorified and they would be more than willing to talk about their job, as compared to someone who works on the bucket system.

Rob Reese covered the story prior to us, and managed to present his work to audiences that included municipal workers. He had a camera (photographic), which made it easier for him to get the workers to talk to him because it is not a moving medium. The amount of anger from the municipality and some of the workers themselves at the portrayal of the workers by Rob Reese also played a role in how the story was treated. I feel that as much as the executive producer felt that we could have covered the story in the way that Rob Reese did it, taking Reese at face value would not have been wise either. During our interview with him he seemed to have other agendas with the story, and I feel that there was a certain way of covering the story that was expected of us.

Since we did not fulfil the above, I feel that we were not granted a fair constructive criticism session. I felt that we were judged according to what suited the executive producer at the time, including adding a D to the assessment grid, instead of giving us a C. which is what we deserved *if* we were being marked like everyone else. A class mate had to point that out to the executive producer, when he wanted to give us a D. *If* we were all being judged the same then the D would not have been a mark that we deserved.

The production of this 10 minute investigative documentary was happening in conjunction with my media studies course. This allowed me to be more critical of the way that the journalism 'industry' works and the world in general. I found that some of the decisions that used to 'come naturally' were now put into question, and I realised that I am in a space to change the 'norm'. After all:

I am the stone that the builder refused
I am the visual
the inspiration
that made lady sings the blues

I'm the spark that makes your idea bright
the same spark
that lights the dark
so that you can know your left from your right

I am the ballot in your box
 the bullet in your gun
 that inner glow
 that lets you know
 to call your brothers son

the story that just begun
 the promise of what's to come
 and imma remain a soldier
 til' the war is won
 Boondocks theme song (www.boondocks.com)

During the shooting of the piece I was not really hands-on. I was present for the shoots, but Jans felt that I was “bossy” and so I let go of the ‘réigns’. This was quite a big mistake on my part because the final product is a group effort, and so any bad shots – for example, the case study’s shot – reflect badly on the group and not just the individual who was handling the equipment in question.

As the editor of the piece I felt very comfortable with Premier. It is a programme that is easier to use than Avid and has more shortcuts which makes the editing process less frustrating than it could be on Avid. The long nights in the edit suite were to be expected. I tend to obsess over work and I can work until the last minute of the last hour, if that will make a positive difference to the final product. Lindile and I switched roles at times so that I could rest and concentrate on something different. We worked well together on this piece because we were all we had – she even chose to sleep on the floor of our edit suite to provide me with moral support.

Reference:

Hill Collins, Patricia. “Toward an Afrocentric feminist epistemology”. In Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness and the Politics of Empowerment. Routledge: New York. 1991 [1990].
 Website: www.boondocks.com