

Creative tourism, people and research

Potential of arts-based research methods to analyze creative personality and to frame creative tourism reality in Portugal, portrayed in CREATOUR documentary

Master Thesis

Submitted by Vanessa Ágata de Abreu Santos
(20180169)

Student at Aalborg University, Aalborg, Denmark
Department of Department of Culture and Learning
Faculty of Humanities, Aalborg University
Study Board of Cross-Cultural Studies
MA Tourism
Year of registration: 2018
Supervisor: Vilhelmiina Vainikka
Keystrokes: 190532
79 pages

June 2020

Abstract

Research is a creative activity that can be carried out at different stages of the research process (Kara, 2015). Both creativity and research are concerned with seeking solutions to problems to render a subject in a distinctive way, so it can be applied in communities (Ahmed, 2009). Theories of creativity, specifically about the investigation of why some people are more creative than others, have focused on a variety of aspects (Rhodes, 1961). The factors which dominate creative tourism literature identify the person as vital but are not focusing on this element. Hence, this thesis will focus on studying the people portrayed in CREATOUR documentary, to outline a creative person's ability, personality characteristics, as well as of process learning on an individual and on a societal level (Carter, 2004; Makel and Plucker, 2008, Runco, 2004; Swann, 2006; Batey, 2012; Walsh, Anders and Hancock, 2013). These will provide further insight about creative people, while also showing different cognitive approaches that try to describe thought mechanisms and techniques for creative thinking (Sternberg, 2009).

CREATOUR research-and-application project (Duxbury, Richards, 2019) - "Development of Creative Tourism Destinations in Small Cities and Rural Areas" (creatour.pt) contributed to the development of the creative tourism body of knowledge in Portugal, by studying and gathering a multitude of definitions of creative tourism and the people interested in taking part in it. This team of researchers have been struggling in finding answers regarding the definition of creative tourism and finding out who is the consumer of creative tourism in Portugal. Hence, this thesis proposes a new research methodology, which uses a theoretical framework based on creativity, structuring the different stages of this research process based on it. The use of an arts-based research methodology (ABR) as a paradigm, emphasizes CREATOUR documentary and qualitative data (semi-structured interview and open-ended questionnaire) as a particular stream of interest for creative tourism research. The analysis-discussion section also uses ABR in the format of screenwriting analysis - a series of videocasts on YouTube about Creative Tourism, to demonstrate how the use of creative methods could work both as an input and output to a more democratized and collaborative knowledge production about creative tourism and tourists.

Keywords: Creativity, creative tourism, creative people, creative research methodology, arts-based research.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Vilhelmiina Vainikka, for being such an inspiring, flexible and open guide through this maze of knowledge. Without her, I would not have the chance to follow the path I've chosen for this research. It was a very hard but also gratifying process, because I had the space to express my creative self while writing about creativity; at the same time, I was pushed so hard, that it felt like my brain was at a CrossFit gym for four months. It was my go-to safe harbor during the difficult period of Covid19 quarantine, so I am grateful for this.

I would also like to thank Juliana Alves, for planting this seed in my mind - to write about this topic, and I wish to acknowledge the constant supporting shoulder of Paula Remoaldo, that even offered her time to co-supervise me. I am truly thankful to both Juliana and Paula for believing so much in my "crazy ideas" and encouraging me to take the ideas to practice. This gives me confidence to be more myself.

Furthermore, I would like to thank Sílvia Silva, Tiago Castro and Nuno Barbosa for their kindness and availability at all times to help me in this research process. To spar with them about this topic was highly valuable to piece the puzzle and to conclude that we are on the same page, in terms of perceiving creative people and understanding the relevance of research dissemination to broader audiences.

Last but not least, I would also like to thank CREATOUR project (n.º 16437), which is funded by the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT/MEC), through national funds and co-funded by FEDER through the Joint Activities Program of COMPETE 2020 and the Regional Operational Programs of Lisbon and Algarve.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

1	INTRODUCTION	6
	1.1 CREATOUR project and research contributions	8
	1.2 CREATOUR documentary	11
	1.3 Research problem	12
	1.3.1 Research questions	15
	1.3.2 Research aims	15
2	PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE	17
	2.1. Arts-based research as a paradigm	17
	2.1.1 Epistemological considerations of this study	18
	2.1.2. Ontological considerations of reality	19
	2.2. Philosophical underpinnings of understanding a documentary	20
	2.2.1. Documentary as the portrait of a reality	20
3	LITERATURE REVIEW	22
	PART I	
	3.2. Creativity	22
	3.2.1. Creativity attributes in the context of art	23
	3.2.2. “The Four Ps”	25
	3.3 Creativity and person	26
	3.3.1 Creative processes	33
	3.3.2 Social aspects of creative processes and the “zone” of learning	35
	3.3.3 The “creative class”	38
	PART II	
	3.4 Creativity in research	40
	3.4.1 Creative tourism research	41
	3.4.2 Creative tourism conceptualizations	43
	3.4.3. Creative research methods applied to creative tourism research	45

4	METHODOLOGY	47
	4.1 Creative research methodology	47
	4.1.1 Arts-based research	48
	4.2 Arts-based data analysis structure	50
	4.2.1 Open-ended e-mail questionnaire	52
	4.2.2 Semi-structured interview by Skype	54
	4.3 Tools used to analyze the documentary	56
	4.3.1 Modes of representation	56
	4.3.2 Participants' testimonials	57
	4.4 Qualitative research and secondary data	58
5	ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION	60
	SCREENWRITING - CREATIVE TOURISM TALKS	60
	EPISODE I: WHY PRODUCING A DOCUMENTARY TO PORTRAY CREATIVE TOURISM IN PORTUGAL?	61
	EPISODE II: FRAMING CREATIVE TOURISM IN PORTUGAL THROUGH A DOCUMENTARY	67
	EPISODE III: PARTICIPANTS' PERSPECTIVES	78
	EPISODE IV: FINAL REFLECTIONS	89
6	CONCLUSIONS	98
	6.1 Recommendations for future work on the topic	103
	6.2 Limitations of this study	104
7	BIBLIOGRAPHY	106
8	APPENDICES	
	APPENDIX I CREATOUR DOCUMENTARY SUBTITLES	
	APPENDIX II EMAIL QUESTIONNAIRE	

APPENDIX III SKYPE INTERVIEW

APPENDIX IV Q4B – VISITOR SURVEY (WP4.2)

1 INTRODUCTION

“Creativity is both the glue that binds together the fundamental building blocks of tourism and also the lubricant that makes the tourism system evolve into new dimensions”.

(Greg Richards, 2016)

Creativity became an essential feature of tourism when destinations started replacing culture-led development strategies with creative development (Greg Richards and Julie Wilson, 2007). In the past forty years, culture has moved past its original socialization role, where the presence of creative types worked as a glue to gather more creative people around a location, to then become the fuel of the tourism economy and a resource pool of creative and artistic abilities that feeds tourism production and consumption of places (Richards, 2017). The issue here is to understand who these creative people are, since their function is vital to develop communities and regions and attract travelers to visit creativity-based destinations.

The idea for ‘creative tourism’ emerged from a European project – EUROTEx – which focused on stimulating craft production through tourism (Richards, 2005) and the term was coined by Greg Richards and Crispin Raymond (2000). Creative tourism is a subfield of cultural tourism and became the key development option to meet the aspiration for more meaningful experiences from tourists’ end and as a response to the escalating commercialization of cultural objects and galloping concerns about the commodification of local cultures, resulting from cultural tourism (Richard Prentice, 2001, 2005; Melanie K. Smith 2016). Creativity became an integral part of modern tourism economy turning traditional cultural tourism practices into a closer participation in everyday life under a more personalized learning process about the intangible heritage knowledge, skills and expressions of the destination (Richards, 2012). In this line of thought,

creative tourism works as a participative platform intertwining a variety of actors and highlighting an appreciation for all the stakeholders that actively engage in the production of their creative experiences as participants (Richards, 2017; Duxbury & Richards, 2019). Hence, there is a strong focus on people in this subset of tourism. Adding to this, creativity consists of at least four components which also dominate creative tourism literature and are identified as "the four Ps": (1) the creative process, (2) the creative product, (3) the creative place, and (4) the creative person (MacKinnon, 1970; Mooney, 1963). This study will delve into the latter. There is still no general consensus on who are the "creative tourists" (Faisan Ali, Kisang Ryu & Kashif Hussain, 2015; Wuttigrai Ngamsirijit, 2015; Siow-Kian Tan, Ding-Bang Luh & Shiann-Far Kung, 2014), and there are several controversial opinions about the "creative class" (Richard Florida, 2002, 2004, 2012).

Creativity as a theoretical framework is crucial to my understanding of creative people, both at an individual and at a societal level. It is important to look at creativity on an individual level, to learn more about common personality traits found in creative humans and at a societal level because of the learning process, which is at the core of the creative tourism framework (Duxbury & Richards, 2019), articulating the creative work as a joint-activity, in which actors interact and affect each other and the flow of knowledge produced (Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi, 1996; Brian Uzzi & Jarrett Spiro, 2005; Hans H. Bauer, Mark Grether & Mark Leach, 2002).

In line with this, there is an important gap of knowledge that this study aims to contribute, concerning the choice of methodology in tourism research to learn more about the people that participate in creative activities. This gap was first found in cultural tourism and has lengthened to creative tourism, because of its economic orientation of the results within this research field. Much of the early research in cultural tourism was concerned with the study of the economic development and impact of this type of tourism, very much encouraged by the flocks of visitors that were economically enriching the visited destinations. Hence, the academic research "effort was directed at gathering empirical data on the profile of cultural tourists, their motivations and behaviour, mainly through survey research" (Richards, 2010). Although this method has substantially improved researchers' knowledge about the consumer behaviour, the ATLAS

Cultural Tourism Research Group highlighted a growing dissatisfaction among researchers with this more traditional quantitative approach, with them claiming for a more qualitative-oriented research approach as a breeding place for methodological innovations, which could complement the field with new insights about emerging social and cultural dimensions, exposed by this type of tourism (Richards et al., 2012).

Connected to this, there is also an issue with academic dissemination of knowledge, which limits its availability to broader audiences. Much of the research produced is usually read by only a limited number of people, limiting its societal impact and reach. On the other hand, it seems that academic researchers aim to have an impact on society and its development with their studies (Wiljan van den Akker and Jack Spaapen, 2017). For this to happen, academic knowledge needs to be presented in new formats. In line with this, this thesis focuses on the study of how the use of a creative research methodology and arts-based methods (Helen Kara, 2015; Patricia Leavy, 2019) might contribute to a closer connection between academia and society in the field of creative tourism, since creativity is “present in all locations and layers of society, allowing a more equitable participation” (Richards, 2017) and creative tourism promotes interaction between people, making the roles of actors more equitable during the learning process and transfer of artistic skills of a creative activity (Richards, 2017). It seems to be a gap worth filling, as this methodological approach opens the possibility to use creativity as a tool to discover, construct and disseminate knowledge in a wider way, and might contribute to a fruitful development of individuals and communities that engage in creative tourism.

1.1 CREATOUR project and research contributions

CREATOUR research-and-application project (Duxbury & Richards, 2019) - "Development of Creative Tourism Destinations in Small Cities and Rural Areas"- contributed to the development of the creative tourism body of knowledge in Portugal, by studying and gathering a multitude of definitions of creative tourism and the people interested in taking part in it. Creative tourism is considered to be an “evolving field” (Duxbury & Richards, 2019) and CREATOUR research project

is “still halfway to reaching its goals” (Noemi Marujo, Maria do Rosário Borges and Jaime Serra, 2019, p.713) in terms of releasing studies about what is creative tourism and who are its participants. To date, there are only two published studies by CREATOUR which examine the profile of the tourists that participate in creative tourism activities in Portugal. These studies follow the classical quantitative approach and were carried out under the method of self-administered surveys (appendix iv), reviewing the sociodemographic characteristics, travel behaviour and motivations, following the working package strategy¹ established by CREATOUR for this purpose.

First, the study of the “Profile of creative tourist in north-western of Portugal: an exploratory approach to creative experiences”, done by Olga Pinto de Matos, Paula Remoaldo, Juliana Araújo Alves, Vítor Ribeiro, Ricardo Gôja Carvalho, Isabel Freitas and Miguel Pereira (2018) presents a dominant profile - a Portuguese woman with higher education. It also shows that the participants who engaged in creative activities in the north of Portugal during 2018 (and completed the self-evaluation form) didn’t do it because of their own motivation as the primary reason to visit the place, but because they knew the facilitator of the activity and were influenced by this to participate in the workshops. The studies undertaken by the Lab2PT² team of researchers were considered inconclusive because of the gap of knowledge about personal motivation from the participants’ end. These authors (2018) concluded that “defining the concept of creative tourism and who the creative tourists are, is not an easy task”.

¹ CREATOUR’s main purpose was to monitor the delivery of pilot initiatives and get the assessments of tourist-participant experiences, with the intent of seeking their motivations and defining creative tourist profiles. This monitoring process of CREATOUR project constitutes one of the work packages of the project and was defined as follows: 1) Organizations keep basic data on events held, number of participants, and general observations; 2) Visitor-participants complete brief evaluation form (self-administered questionnaire) and research centers (R&D) develop, distribute, manage and analyze the multilingual evaluation form. Pilots ask participants to complete the form, gather data about them, experience assessment and suggestions and the data is compiled monthly and sent to the research center; 3) Results from monthly input and compiled quarterly with national/regional summaries. Full data will be available to partners. In-region RCs conduct an analysis of regional results; 4) Research centers conduct interregional and other comparative analyses.

² <https://www.lab2pt.net>

The second study on this matter, “The Creative Tourist Experience in the Alentejo region: A case study of the CREATOUR project in Portugal”, carried out by Noemi Marujo, Jaime Serra and Maria do Rosário Borges (2019), shows that participants in creative activities in the southern region of Alentejo are of an active professional age, have a higher level of qualifications and travel with their partners or in an organized group. Regarding their motivations, the results revealed that participants “seek original experiences and want to stimulate more creative behaviour” (Marujo, Serra and Borges, 2019, p. 705). However, it is still not clear what is creative behaviour or how do participants grasp their experience.

I believe there is a need for more sophisticated analyses of creative tourists that could draw on their perspectives, as makers of their own creative experience (Maitland, 2007; Raymond, 2009; Maisel, 2009; Tan et al., 2013). Therefore, the purpose of this thesis is to make the connection between participants’ perspectives and CREATOUR final documentary (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kWf_o6RfX0). By participants I mean not only tourists, but including all the protagonists (visitors, researchers, artists) that were depicted in CREATOUR final documentary, accessible to the public on YouTube. Furthermore, on the application of this audiovisual method, it is important to highlight that this study utilizes pre-existing visual information (Loizos, 2002) that was produced before this research and was not done for this purpose. Regardless, for Loizos (2002), any recording of events and actions in time and space, makes it a powerful tool for research, although its use in this context is still limited. The obstacle found is that the image is only a form of representation of reality, and like any form of representation, it does not always function as a mirror. Despite this controversy, the choice of using CREATOUR documentary as a method is because it enabled and encouraged participants to be reflective on their creative tourism experiences and the video contributed to shape this reality and disseminate it to a larger audience. On a more technical level, the use of video can be considered a creative method for its artistic production, as it is a method that it is not easy to execute itself; it requires people with artistic and production skills to edit it, organize it and interpret it. Perhaps this is one of the reasons why these creative methods are not done as often

in academic research and it is “easier” to elaborate surveys or conduct interviews, as not everyone has the know-how to produce a movie (Leavy, 2019).

1.2 CREATOUR documentary

This being said, I think that CREATOUR final documentary as a method will add knowledge to creative tourism research as it derives from a range of social science, educational psychology, and arts-based research paradigm, that helps to better understand cognition, aesthetic considerations and questions about a reality (Gubrium & Harper, 2013; Harris, 2012; Margolis & Pauwels, 2011; Mitchell, 2011; Heath, Hindmarsh, & Luff, 2010; Goldman, 2007; Shwalb, Nakazawa & Shwalb, 2005). As a postmodernist project, film crosses, incorporates and reconstructs borders of different disciplines, research paradigms and cultures (Gribich, 2013).

“Video can be subject to a diverse range of methodological and analytic interests and provides new and distinctive ways of presenting culture, practice and social organisation; it creates unique opportunities for the analysis of social action and interaction and can help provide distinctive contributions to observation, method and theory”.

Heath, Hindmarsh & Luff (2010, p.13)

CREATOUR documentary was directed by Nuno Barbosa and coordinated and co-produced by the researchers of CREATOUR from the Center for Social Sciences of the University of Coimbra - Nancy Duxbury, Tiago Castro and Sílvia Silva. This film was first presented in the University of Algarve, in October 2019, at the 3rd CREATOUR International Conference: *Creative Tourism Dynamics: Connecting Travellers, Communities, Cultures and Places*. According to the researchers introduction in the premiere, the documentary was centered in voicing all participants perspectives about their experience of several creatives activities provided by CREATOUR pilots in Portugal. Furthermore, it was done with the purpose of outlining the perceptions of CREATOUR’s researchers, the mentors of the pilots’ projects and the participants, who came together to develop this final product of CREATOUR project. All participants presented their

different perspectives, while the researchers all reflected on the links between creative tourism initiatives, active participation and connecting with the local community and place while travelling, through artisanal and artistic techniques and creative self-expression of both hosts and visitors (Richards, 2011). Thus, CREATOUR final documentary appeared as a rich method that contains plenty of data that could address (at least to some extent) the researchers inquiry about who is the creative tourist and what is creative tourism. By watching the video documentary, the viewer may learn more about the participants personalities, interests and lifestyles, as participants experience the workshops in-loco and inform the viewer what are the creative experiences about.

1.3 Research problem

This study was developed as is because during my internship as a researcher working in CREATOUR project, I was informed about my colleagues's struggle with defining who is the creative tourist and their several attempts to consolidate creative tourism as a "solid" definition. They could not answer these research problems until this point, at least not fully with the method they have been using until now. While reflecting on this matter, I realised the level of complexity and different dimensions that this topic entails. Nevertheless, I was encouraged by my colleagues to pursue and investigate this topic, which I accepted as an interesting challenge.

My first assumption while reading the survey's questions (appendix iv) is that little attention was given to scrutinize the participants' perceptions about their own experiences with CREATOUR pilots. As explained above, the data about their perspectives on this topic has only been collected through self-administered surveys applied to all the four regions of Portugal, in which CREATOUR pilots operate, targeting the participants of the creative tourism activities.

The self-administered surveys with Likert-scale questions have been the main method of CREATOUR team of researchers until now to collect data about the participants evaluations on their creative tourism experiences and they rely on self-report, which only measures what respondents think about themselves towards the notions they are given in the survey (Danili and Reid, 2004). Likert scale is universally used, and I understand that it is a common method to

create understanding about a topic. The responses are easily quantifiable and subjective to computation of some mathematical analysis with the use of for instance in this case, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). With this approach, the responses are coded in an accessible way. But when examining the data, a single number represents the participant's response, as the participant does not take a stand on a particular topic, because she/he only provides a closed yes or no answer, responding in a degree of agreement. In this line of thought, likert scale options seem to accommodate neutral or undecided feelings of participants (Likert, 1932) and "attitudes about a specific item exist on a vast, multi-dimensional continuum" (Herschel, 2013). Also, it is not unlikely that participants' answers will be influenced by previous questions, or will heavily concentrate on one response side (agree/disagree). Thus, the likert scale presents itself as unidimensional and only giving multiple options of choice, and the space between each choice can't possibly be equidistant.

Furthermore, this survey was designed based on a literature review carried out by all research teams of the project and it includes several sections with socio-economic indicators, where respondents were asked to answer questions related to their socio-demographic profile (e.g. gender, age, level of education, work situation, place of residence), travel companions, previous participation in a creative experience, reasons for visiting the destination; characterisation and evaluation of their creative tourism experience. The problem is that this evaluation is very much reliant on people's written competence about emotional and symbolic aspects of their creative experiences, which might be difficult to be access by the use of surveys (Dunn & Mellor, 2017). On the other hand, because CREATOUR's "draft" of the creative tourist profile is based on these demographic characteristics, travel behaviours and motivations, these enabled the researchers not only to gain a more concrete understanding of a set of individuals that demand specific needs and wants relating to creative products, but also to inform tourism marketing and managerial decisions of creative tourism pilots', in respect to the profile of their potential customers for the development of their product and activities. Hence, the indicators used in the survey help reveal the level of tourism development and the importance of tourism for municipalities and towns and rural areas to learn more about their visitors (Vojnovic, Knezevic, 2013). Still, this clearly

shows that the studies developed until now are mainly economically driven and results-oriented, focusing on learning about consumption and habits of creative tourism participants. In my perspective, this happens because countries like Portugal are very much reliant on tourism (World Travel & Tourism Council, 2020) and therefore there is a “growth fetish” (Higgins-Desbiolles, Carnicelli, Krolkowski, Wijesinghe & Boluk, 2019) occurring in tourism that has burgeoned it as an industry, and at the same time maturing it as a field of inquiry (Xiao & Smith, 2006, 2007), showing the need for rethinking and researching tourism through a more social approach.

Because of this, it seems relevant to start by questioning the methodology used until now to understand more about the participants in creative tourism in Portugal, as it is not serving its purpose and it does not seem to address the complexity of the topic. Hence, I’ve taken this study to suggest a different research approach and method to “critically interrogate the practices which generate tourism research and tourism realities” (Ren, Pritchard, Morgan, 2010). This research uses creativity as a theoretical framework to frame the different stages of creative tourism research and explore common personality traits and other factors found in creative people, while also providing examples of following contributions of creative research practices that use a creative research methodology as an add-on to the process of studying creative tourism. Notwithstanding, I see my approach as complementary to the one already in use by CREATOUR research teams. As Kara (2015) rightly observed, there is a lot of creative work going on in quantitative methodologies, so I don’t intend to undermine or disregard the quantitative approach. But doing research is also a creative activity in different stages of the process (Kara, 2015) and I will attempt to find out if it adds value to the research work in creative tourism research, especially because creative research methodology and creative tourism use the same key concept - creativity. Therefore the aim is to explore this further, leading to the following questions:

1.3.1 Research questions:

- 1) How can the use of CREATOUR's documentary and my analysis of it through an arts-based research approach, contribute to the body of knowledge about creative people that participate in creative tourism?
- 2) What do the documentarists' voices (provided by the email questionnaire and skype interview) add to the framing of the "reality" of creative tourism in Portugal, through the documentary?
- 3) What knowledge can be added to creative tourism research by the participants (visitors, artists and researchers) testimonials in the documentary?

1.3.2 Research aims

The research aims are twofold: to use creative research methodology and arts-based approach to contribute to the body of knowledge of creative tourism research in Portugal and discuss how creative methods can work as a form of knowledge production and a legitimate source of interest and knowledge dissemination for academia. This implies the combination, transfer, and conversion of different kinds of knowledge in the research, which also happens in the practice of creative tourism, when people interact and learn (Harorimana, 2009). Hence, this study explores and discusses the intersections, relationships and shifting controversies of creative people, the role of artistic expressions to communicate personality characteristics, art as a vehicle for self-expression and representation of realities. Therefore, I include perspectives on creativity and tourism from areas such as creative tourism, psychology, philosophy, theory of cinema and education, since this is a very kaleidoscopic topic that seems to take different shapes according to the approaches taken and therefore being very difficult to encapsulate.

Furthermore, this research will be carried out through a people-centered perspective, as it aims to construct a research based on the critical enquiry that questions the purpose of tourism research practices, along with the philosophical enquiry about the subjectivity and complexity of framing and constructing a tourism reality for knowledge discovery and dissemination, through

the use of art-based methods. The main purpose of using this creative methodology is to question the rigidity of reality and works as an attempt to democratize knowledge and promote collaboration and involvement of more actors in the construction of creative tourism in Portugal.

2 PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE

2.1. Arts-based research as a paradigm

This thesis intends to explore a specific methodological approach that imposed itself during the 1970s and 1990s in the social and educational context and it is called arts-based research (ABR). Shawn McNiff (1998; 2011) defined arts-based research as including all practices that use artistic processes as a way of investigation and knowing.

ABR is usually used as an effort to go beyond restrictions that limit communication between the researchers and the researched, in order to express meanings that otherwise would be unintelligible (Barone & Eisner, 2012). It is a versatile approach that can be used at different stages of the research process (Kara, 2015) namely in the research design, for those that might think more visually and need visual tools such as spidergrams, mind-maps, timelines. It can be applied to literature review, by utilizing personal documents such as diaries, self-published literature, creative literature (such as zines) and literature containing creative research methods. ABR can also be present in data gathering, with enhanced interviewing with for instance the use of photo-elicitation in tourism research (Rakić, Chambers, 2010), poetic inquiry, journals, mapping, drawing, painting, collage, performance, music composition, among other artistic methods. Arts-based research can also be applied in the analysis and discussion sections with, for instance, the use of poetic enquiry, by creating a poem from or about the data collected. In another example, ABR can take the shape of a metaphor analysis, to analyse how the researched people see the world or represent the reality for themselves, or even a screenwriting, as I will do, that can include all kinds of dialogue participants might be using, voicing the different people that participate in the research process, even if indirectly (Kara, 2015). Within this context, arts-based research most concrete contribution to knowledge formation is inviting to a reflexive engagement. Because of art's potential to agglomerate humans in groups and engage them

around activities, it seems to be a good method to contribute to building and recasting social relationships.

2.1.1 Epistemological considerations of this study

“Epistemology” can be described as the study of knowledge, raising research questions such as “how do we know what we know?”. For some, knowledge is discovered, while for others it is constructed. In my case, I perceive it as a dialectic process where knowledge is both discovered, constructed and deconstructed in a chaotic fashion and not organised by a specific order of events and always under construction. As my research work is within social sciences, specifically tourism, a field that comprises social, cultural, economic, demographics, artistic, behavioral and many other fields, my main concern is with hermeneutics and problems with interpretation of knowledge, since my main aim is to be understood when I am building a puzzle of knowledge. To tackle this, my practice during the research process usually includes constant reasoning between opposite ideas, which in the beginning battle to win over the other, then in the middle gain and/or loose priority, but in the end tend to complement each other and controversy serves as the determining factor in their relationship, even if the result still seems contradictory. With the process of raising questions to shape what I know, I learn to allow mental space for opposing assertions, based upon a dialogue of arguments and counter-arguments, advocating propositions and counter-propositions. Hopefully, I am able to translate this space in the analysis/discussion section of this thesis, as it aims to mirror my mental space of open discussion, where the purpose is not to find the truth, or be the owner of the formulated knowledge, but to highlight my position towards it and that knowledge is malleable and built in collaboration with others. In my perspective, these are crucial aspects that affect the construction and communication of knowledge and that could be improved in academia.

Thomas Kuhn (1970) problematised the scientific notion of progress towards truth, stating that all our propositions about the world are assembled in assumptions about what exists, how they can be assessed and how the scientific process ought to be worked. Thus, here I propose an

epistemological approach grounded in an epistemology that embraces creativity, adopting less fixed views of meaning (Leavy, 2019), because “conferring and creating meaning is necessarily caught between individual enunciation and its social frame” (O'Regan, 1994, p.337).

In this line of thought, I use CREATOUR's video documentary to ascertain how I know about creative tourism in Portugal and access and work on my assumptions of who is creative and how could I design a research process that could translate the symbiosis between the documentary, as a creative object of representation of creative tourism practice, and my screenwriting, as a creative method that voices the participants' stances on what is to be creative and what is creative tourism in their perspectives. “When participants voice their views and ideas about a practice, the potential to create meaningful experiences is amplified” (Leavy, pg. 93, 2019) and that is one of the main aims of creative tourism - to provide meaningful experiences (Prentice, 2001: 2005; Smith 2006). In this context, meaningful experiences are built through artistic productions based on sensorial practices, so in this sense, art builds knowledge through the senses and builds community because to create meaning, humans need to share their experiences with each other and the way of doing so is in collaboration.

2.1.2. Ontological considerations of reality

One of the most disconcerting pursuits in philosophy lies exactly in this question of pondering what is really real, as opposed to what one might think or define as real and how one can know the difference. This thesis makes reference to this in the sense that it uses a video to analyze a specific reality - the reality of creative tourism in Portugal. Therefore, it includes a philosophical criticism about the nature of reality, both to question the rigidity of reality provided by more classical methods that are being used by my colleagues and the main one (documentary) used in this study, to question the representation of reality. With what regards the use of self-evaluation surveys to collect data and create knowledge about this topic, I must say I see a certain fixation in science to design “boxes” of definition, to categorize and establish the reality in question. I agree with Putnam (1988) when he argued that knowledge should not “be eventuated in final

solutions, and the discovery that the latest view still does not clear away the mystery, is characteristic of research work.”

The problem with ‘what is reality?’ arises from a consciousness of ourselves as living in a world which seems to be outside of, and yet is the cause of, our conscious life. My reflections on this led me to think if we can know of the world beyond our perceptions. The artistic (and philosophical) approach I am using in different stages of the research process places creative tourism inside a continuous cycle of reflection. This study calls attention to the importance of the reflection on the subjectivity of reality and articulation of personal experience within creative tourism, followed by the identification of further action plans of a new practice (Barbour, 2011). CREATOUR documentary provides the viewer with the various nuances given by all participants that represent the reality of creative tourism in Portugal, so this arts-based method articulates illusion and reality, in the sense that it helps making sense of experience for the ones who view it and create meaning for those who experienced it (Gifreu, 2011).

2.2 Philosophical underpinnings of understanding a documentary

2.2.1 Documentary as the portrait of a reality

According to Daramola (2001, p.173), “the documentary contains real experiences, real people, and real situations or settings”. However, such actualities can be treated creatively by the director and team that produced the documentary. Approaching documentary as the “real” went on to dominate ‘the international language of commercial cinema, in both documentary and fiction’ (ibid., p. 26). Whether developing either in parallel or in response to each other, the complex and intricate relationship between fiction and documentary resulted from the tension of distinguishing one from the other.

Grierson (1933) defined documentary as ‘the creative treatment of actuality’. In another definition of documentary film provided by Cantine, Howard, and Lewis (2000) “in its most basic sense, a documentary is a film in which the filmmaker allows the action or events to unfold naturally with minimal interference”. Blanc (2014) noted that the discourse of the documentary

should facilitate the introduction of recognizable features to the viewer, as in representations of the other both near and different from ourselves (p. 127). On the other hand, Nichols (1992) claimed that 'documentary' is actually a 'fiction unlike any other' (Nichols 1992, pp. 108–109). He highlighted that 'every film is a documentary' and that even fiction film provides 'evidence of the culture that produced it and reproduces the likeness of the people who perform within it' (Nichols 2001, p. 1). He made a distinction, however, between those documentaries that are concerned with 'wish-fulfilment' and those that are concerned with 'social representation', noting that the former is synonymous with 'fiction' and the latter with 'non-fiction films of social representation' (Nichols 2001, p. 2). Documentaries of wish-fulfilment 'make the object of the imagination concrete, visible and audible' and are either positively or negatively received by the viewer as indicators of reality and truth (ibid.). A documentary is often perceived as realistic, so the assumption of the viewer is that things have happened in front of the camera as they would have happened if the camera had not been there. This controversy about the definition of documentary happens because contemporary dictionary definitions of 'documentary' share features centering on reality, information giving, simplicity, authenticity and the absence of narrative plot. These features are also part of CREATOUR documentary and will be further explored in the analysis section to understand more about its coherence as a portrait of a reality (Nichols, 1994, p. 1).

3 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This section addresses elements that would benefit the literature to date about the topic of creative tourism, which is relatively new. This theoretical framework is structured in two parts. The first part concerns creativity definitions, recurring trends and conflicts across literature focusing on creativity and the individual in the context of art, personality traits of creative humans, the influence of social aspects in creativity and the various cognitive and emotional factors that influence the process of being creative, to gain more insight about the creative individual. In the second part, creativity is used in the context of research, as a key concept in connection with creative tourism, with following examples of creative research methods applied to creative tourism research, to illustrate creativity as a cognitive frame in the process of analyzing the phenomenon of creative tourism.

PART I

3.2. Creativity

The field of creativity studies dates back to the 1930's and the first studies concerned establishing domain differences (Patrick, 1935, 1937, 1938). It is still an ambiguous term to define and open to a fair amount of debate because actual creative behavior might be controversial and complex to understand. Creativity may also be difficult to define because its meaning has changed a number of times throughout history. It was often used outside of the social and behavioral sciences way before it became a legitimate and accepted concept for research and theory, also because there are cultural differences in behavior that are related to it (Kerr, 2009). Hence, creativity as definition must open space for variation, as it may be expressed in several ways in different domains of human performance across different nations (Kerr, 2009).

According to the *Standard Definition of Creativity* (Runco and Jaeger, 2012) there are two main criteria in creative studies: originality and utility. This means that creative things should always be original and unique. If something is not original, it is not considered creative. Secondly,

creative things require effectiveness. If creativity is employed to solve a problem, the solution has to be fitting. Therefore, originality and utility are not sufficiently on their own and are dependent on each other to form creative things. Nevertheless, Barbara Kerr (2009) argues that the effectiveness of creative things is extremely difficult to operationalize, as ideas and solutions that are fitting in one context (e.g., environmental, social, cultural, historical) might not be effective in others. Effectiveness in the context of economic research on creativity, takes the form of value, describing how original and valuable products and ideas are depending on the current market (Rubenson, 1991; Rubenson & Runco, 1992, 1995; Sternberg & Lubart, 1991).

3.2.1. Creativity attributes in the context of art

In the case of creative arts, effectiveness is quite personal, and sometimes its function is merely aesthetic rather than functional (Runco and Jaeger, 2012). In terms of uniqueness, it is important to consider the shifting attitudes in creative acts in the context of history of art, as the first art works were not primarily concerned in reaching originality but were a mere representation of surroundings. So, it is in the context of art where one finds the most diverse and controversial expressions of creativity. In this sense, art as a subjective field, defies the intent of defining creativity as a “solid” concept in terms of originality. On the other hand, modern emphasis on the importance of artistic originality is what defines the original work from a copy (Gazda, 2002). What is considered original in an artist's work is rarely noticed by the public as such and frequently not recognized by the artist itself, because of its novelty and subjectivity. It is assimilated only after being repeated a “limited number of times” (David Hare, 1964, p.139). In this case, repetition of a task provides meaning to originality and the recognition of a creative act requires reflection reached with repetition (Kara, 2015). However, in contemporary art, the process of repetition can also originate the loss of originality, exactly because it becomes repetitive, bringing nothing new and being already on its way to becoming unoriginal. The meaning recognized in the artwork is usually attributed by art critics and subject to (mis)interpretations and justifications. At the same time, it is understandable that meaning is not formulated by artists, as the point of the creative act is expressing oneself “in a parallel language”

(Morellet, 2019, p. 198). Adding to this, Bruner (1962) described how creativity requires “effective surprise” (p. 18) and Cropley (1967) pointed to the need for creative things to be “worthwhile” (p. 67) and reflect some “compelling” property (p. 21). With regards the usefulness of artworks, it depends on individual and group uses and interests and this changes over time. Individuals perceive art as meaningful or valuable based on sensorial experiences, so usefulness in this context assumes different forms of value such as sentimental, historical, ideological, practical, ornamental, hedonic and so forth (Abbing, 2019). In this respect, art can be perceived as useful in personality formation. As an exercise of abstraction, it contemplates one or more values appreciated by the individual. Art can also be considered functional in the way of serving specific purposes, as for example, in the case of CREATOUR’s documentary, where film serves the utilitarian purpose of representation and documentation (Morellet, 2019) of creative tourism in Portugal. There are many other examples such as graphic arts when they are used for the purpose of advertisement; arts and crafts, for the purpose of decoration; performing arts and music for the purpose of leisure, entertainment, therapy and so forth.

Creativity in the context of art seems to have endless angles because in this context people have plenty of space to explore multiple solutions, employ original thoughts, and use their imagination. This is because arts foster these skills, encouraging unique responses and diverse ways of looking at things. Creative ability is the skill and talent to use one’s imagination to create and solve. Artistic ability is the acquired talent to create fine works of art: painting, drawing, sculpting, musical composition, design, among many others. Thus, art plays a fundamental role into the development of creativity, as a skillful expression, but they are not the same (Andreasen, 2012). This ability like any other needs to be trained, and participants who engage in creative training with exercises or activities significantly increase their creative thinking abilities (Ulger, 2016). Creativity is therefore a mental capacity to generate solutions for any work. Thinking and problem-solving exists in many different forms across many different areas. Usually the word ‘creative’ evokes images of visual artists, poets, composers, and this creates a general tendency to assume that creativity is more associated with the arts than the sciences, although it can be found in both and in other fields. For instance, the creativity of mathematicians/physicists such

as Einstein or inventors such as Thomas Edison have proved to develop unique solutions for very specific problems that changed the whole course of how humanity functions. Therefore, it is fair to say that scientists are as creative as artists (Ossola, 2014). Creativity can be then understood as a process and the ability of the person to produce work that is both novel (i.e. original, unexpected), useful and adaptive (Lubart, 1994; Ochse, 1990; Sternberg, 1998a; Sternberg & Lubart, 1991, 1995, 1996; Amabile & Pratt, 2016), through mental processes of thinking (Torrance, 1966, 1988; Guilford, 1967; Guilford et al., 1978; Ruscio et al., 1998; Howard-Jones et al., 2005; Chavez-Eakle et al., 2007; Gibson et al., 2009; Storm et al., 2011).

3.2.2. “The Four Ps”

There are several other attributes of creativity in addition to originality and functionality such as process, press, product and person (Rhodes, 1961), which include its own ramifications and also dominate creative tourism literature. These are usually identified as “the four Ps” (Florida, 2002, 2007; Richards, 2011).

Firstly, *process* distinguishes cognitive skills that articulate original and effective thinking. For instance, social processes where an individual comes up something that changes the general opinion or influences schools of thought about a topic. As a requirement for the creative process (Gabora, 2011; Runco, 2007a; Simonton, 2007; Weisberg & Hass, 2007), Royce (1898) adds the element of “variation” and Hutchinson (1931, p. 393) and included “practicality” in his view of creative process because “it makes transformations in the world” (ibid). The most well-known creative process was described by Graham Wallas in his 1926 work, *The Art of Thought*, as having four steps: preparation, incubation, illumination, and verification.

Secondly, in this context, the idea of *press* originates from “pressure,” so press theories examine things that exert an impact on the creative person or environment. These can be social factors (i.e. expectations), organizational factors, characteristics of the physical environment, or cultural influence (i.e. values). A creative environment is usually set out as either a social or psychological context that is necessary to the development of creativity. But while some environments may be supportive of creative works, others repress them.

Thirdly, *product* theories define creativity by examining the end results of the process, for example works of art, fiction or nonfiction works, performances, inventions, patents, publications and more. Product renditions are found to be the easiest to apply because of its physicality, its tangible nature. Jackson and Messick (1965, p. 313) argued that products must be “appropriate” and Kneller (1965, p. 7) claimed that products must be “relevant.” These were the “realistic or useful” standpoints resumed by Runco and Jaeger (2012), while looking at creativity didn’t seem to include the subjectivity of artistic work referred above. Creative products are usually perceived as having attributes such as originality, elaboration, and novelty, but also social value. In general, many researchers define a creative product as something new that has been brought into existence purposefully and creative products in all domains are considered to move society forward and highly implicate the active work of creative persons (Kerr, 2009). In line with this, I will develop further below the element of the *person*. Although the study of creativity on the individual and the identification of personality traits of talented, creative people has had the central focus for many years, because of creativity’s core in psychology, I still believe it is vital to revisit this, especially in the context of creative tourism. This is to further discuss the assumption in this field that creativity is essentially inherent to humans, which I debate with. I want to investigate the element of the *person* based on the idea that everyone can be creative (independently of having an innate talent), if they are trained under the “right” conditions (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996; Ulger, 2016). That is why I want to examine this further.

3.3 Creativity and person

Creativity is primarily a psychological and complex phenomenon that can be defined and researched from different perspectives and this section will focus on the person's ability, personality characteristics, as well as from the point of view of process learning of the individual (Carter, 2004; Makel and Plucker, 2008, Runo, 2004; Swann, 2006; Batey, 2012; Walsh, Anders and Hancock, 2013), to provide further insight about who might be the creative people.

Theories of creativity that investigate why some people are more creative than others have focused on a multitude of aspects. This happens because creativity is a multifaceted construct influenced by numerous factors (Plucker, Beghetto, & Dow, 2004). In the sequence of the previous section, where creativity was presented by the four categories of process, product, press and person, the creative person will now be further examined because I see that it is by the human condition that the other attributes can happen and are expressed. The person who is inserted in a specific environment is “pressed” by it, and therefore takes a set of steps, which form creative processes, to produce creative products that will add social value so society can move forward.

Creative individuals can be identified by their contributions, such as inventions, poetry, theories, and artwork. Dimensions of creative personality such as curiosity, risk-taking, and complexity have been found to be correlated with identity formation processes (Sica, Nasti, & Sestito, 2012). A creative personality is often considered to have more intellectual habits, such as openness, levels of ideation, autonomy, expertise, exploratory behavior, intelligence, temperament, tolerance for ambiguity and these are positively correlated with an individual’s creative performance (Feist, 1998; Zenasni, Besancon, & Lubart, 2008). Many researchers have utilized a variety of quantitative and qualitative methods to explore the personality of these individuals to identify common personality traits. This study provides lists of traits from different researchers that can be useful in identifying creativity and understanding more about the personality of individuals.

Morris Stein (1953) claimed that the creative person is an aggressive achiever, motivated by a need for order, self-sufficient, intuitive, self-assertive, curious, and empathic. Charles Vervalin (1962) recognised openness to experience and emotion, freedom from inhibitions and stereotyped thinking, aesthetic sensitivity, and flexibility as characteristics found in creative individuals. Frank Barron (1969) outlined creative individuals as having independence in judgment, greater expression of impulses and a preference for complexity. Eric Erikson’s (1979)

notion of building up this personality reflects an ongoing construction composed by experiences in the search for meaning.

Joseph Renzulli's (1986) conception of a creative person is based on giftedness of an individual. He identified the interaction between above-average ability, task commitment, and creativity as the necessary components for "gifted behaviors" resulting in creative productivity and that must be considered to explain what causes some persons to display "gifted behaviors" at certain times and under certain circumstances. Renzulli discussed the differences between "high intellectual ability or potential" and "high creative ability or potential" as two broad categories, which he referred to as either "high academic giftedness" and/or "creative/productive giftedness." The first concerns learning and academic giftedness. The second - creative/productive giftedness - is seen in individuals who are prone to be producers (rather than consumers) of original knowledge, materials, or products and who employ thought processes that tend to be inductive and problem oriented. In my perspective, it seems that Renzulli was only analysing the creative performance and not the causes that lead to it.

Howard Gardner's (1993) formulation of a creative individual is one who usually solves problems or fashions products in a domain, and whose work is considered both novel and acceptable by knowledgeable members of a field. According to Gardner, creativity should not be regarded as a construct in the mind or personality of an individual; rather it is something that emerges from the interactions of intelligence (personal profile of competencies), domain (disciplines or crafts within a culture), and field (people and institutions that judge quality within a domain). Here I can conclude that this author's concern was more related to the creative productivity of the individual and his/ her relationship with the environment, the validation of product creation through others and following contribution to society.

Mark Runco (1995) focused his study in analysing highly creative individuals and their best timing to develop and perform as such. He claimed that there two personality and cognitive "transformations" taking place in the development of high levels of creativity and productivity in

people of high ability. The first is the development of remarkable creative ability during the first two decades of life, and the second begins in adolescence and implies the transformation of creative abilities into an integrated set of cognitive skills, interests and values, creative personality dispositions, and moderately high ambitions.

Teresa Amabile (1996) argued that “people are more creative when they feel motivated primarily by the interest, satisfaction, and challenge of the work itself—and not by external pressures” (Amabile, 1996b: 79). She added rewards, self-motivation, and perseverance when frustrated to the list.

Gregory Feist (1998) combined research findings from many studies, exploring personality traits in scientific and artistic creativity and creative personalities and created a model called the Big Five. This model of personality states that all personality traits can be organized into five broad dimensions: openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism. The results of Feist's analysis show that creative people are more open to new experiences, less conventional and conscientious. In addition, this study found creative individuals are more self-accepting, self-confident, dominant, hostile, ambitious, and impulsive than their less creative counterparts. This research outlines the different personality traits of creative scientists and artists.

John Dacey and Kathleen Lennon (1998) conducted an extensive qualitative research, adding 10 creative personality traits to the list. They identified the following characteristics as contributing to the creative process: (1) tolerance for ambiguity, (2) ability to think outside of the box, (3) ability to imagine how things can be used outside of their intended purpose, (4) a flexibility that allows for change, (5) a willingness to take risks, (6) a preference for disorder and complexity, (7) a willingness to delay gratification, (8) freedom from gender role stereotyping, (9) a capacity to endure frustration and overcome obstacles, and (10) the courage to pursue creative endeavors despite consequences.

Sally Reis findings on her study on Gender and Giftedness (2001) show that that some gender differences exist in creative productivity in talented women, as compared to men. She argued that some talented women tend to diversify their creative efforts or feel obliged to diversify their efforts into several different areas including relationships, work related to family and home, personal interests, aesthetic sensitivities, and appearance, and found different periods of creative productivity that may exist in the lives of some highly creative women.

More recent research suggests creative productivity occurs when opportunities, resources, and encouragement interact with the innate creativity in persons with the desire to become creative producers. Over time, researchers have begun to study the traits that distinguish creative productivity in different domains such as science and the arts. The development and enhancement of creative productivity is a dynamic process that occurs during an interaction of creative persons with creative processes, products, and environments. More research is needed to understand how this occurs across domains. New directions are also needed for developing creative potential in talented adults because too few talented people have opportunities as adults to engage in sustained creative work (Kerr, 2009).

Zorana Ivcevic and John Mayer (2006) examined a narrower selection of creative personality traits, including cognition, emotions and motivation, social expression, and self-regulation. This research created profiles of creative characteristics and behaviors that differentiated between the conventional person, the everyday creative person, the artist, and the scholar. The results of this research indicate that the personality traits of creative individuals may influence the domain in which an individual is able to be creative. These authors identified openness to experience, creative role, persistence, trait hypomania (the capability to work with high energy in a specific field of study for long periods of time), and intellectual curiosity as traits that are more prevalent in creative individuals. They also identified a creative scholar cluster of traits that included risk-taking, intrinsic motivation and divergent thinking.

In the field of creative tourism, I found a more controversial perception on the element of creative person. Greg Richards and Julie Wilson (2007) state that “the notion of creativity sits

comfortably with the postmodern notion of identity and wanting to be different". Exploring this claim further, Sterneber and Perkins (2009) argued that creative people are characterized by nonconforming attitudes and behaviors as well as flexibility, traits also found in the very beginning of the study on this topic. It could be the case that Richards and Wilson, as creative people, are rebellious toward accepting that creative people behave differently, and this is a contradiction in itself.

In light of controversies, Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi (1996) had a very interesting approach to the study of creative people, discussing that contradictions are evident in their personality traits. He provided a list of 10 paradoxical traits of creative individuals, which include: (1) having high bursts of energy, but also being quiet and at rest, (2) a tendency to be bright and naive at the same time, (3) the ability to combined playfulness and discipline, (4) alternating between imagination and reality, (5) being both introverted and extraverted, (6) being both humble and proud, (7) avoiding rigid gender role stereotyping, to allow progress to be made in fields where traditional roles would have prevented entry, (8) being both rebellious and conservative, (9) having a passion for work and the ability to view it objectively, and (10) an openness that allows for both suffering and joy. The ambiguity found appears to be a necessary component of the creative process for Csikszentmihalyi (1996). He also added that creativity intrinsically requires a talented person who experiences a period of training; someone who is adventurous, and maybe even insubordinate, in negotiation with an audience that decides the quality of the creative person's creations. This author perceived creativity "as a process that unfolds over a lifetime" of a person (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996) and was concerned in understanding the enjoyment of the creative experience and its applications to other experiences in life, such as work, discussing the flow of individuals who are truly creative becoming completely involved in an activity, absorbed in the process of creating and not just focused on the product. In my view, this is still a very pertinent approach on personality underpinning for creativity, when paired with the tension that is created by the 10 paradoxes listed above.

To recapitulate, I started this section with the assumption that creativity exists in everyone, and there is a strand of research on creativity that assumes the same, highlighting that the general populations' have creative ability and provide an understanding of how to maximize this potential, since creativity is viewed as a personality style. This perspective provides a new window into supporting creative aspects of personality, shifting the focus of research from “how much creativity does this person have” to “in what ways is this person creative,” to create a new understanding of the creative personality (Selby, Shaw & Houtz, 2005). To this end, Edwin Selby, Donald Treffinger, Scott Isaksen, and Kenneth Lauer (2005) have developed a framework that allows for the identification of creative people, coming up with personality profiles for creative problem solving. *Developers* are identified as individuals who show the tendency of transforming the system from within, whereas *Explorers* tend to break gates and build new ground, working outside old systems. Another dimension identified by these researchers is the way in which people process information. Do they think about the problem by themselves or do they talk with others to digest new situations and develop solutions? In addition, a third dimension of this research highlights the priorities of those making the decision. Are they focused on the impact on other people or do they prioritize doing what is necessary to get the job done? This framework outlines traits that are similar to Feist’s (1998) Big Five model described above. The difference of Selby, Shaw and Houtz (2005) framework is that there are no preferred personality traits to enhance creativity. According to these authors, all traits are viewed as strengths that, if known and practiced, can be utilized to solve problems and create new solutions effectively.

This list could continue because many other researchers have contributed to the understanding of the personality traits of creative individuals. But then again, what comes out from these lists is the perception that creative personality is highly complex and full of opposites and contradictions. Due to several criticisms and inconsistencies that can be found in the nature of the personality of a creative person, it is important to understand more about personal creative processes of creativity and the environment in which one exists, appears to play a role in promoting everyday creativity, since environments may include opportunities for competition

allowing increased creativity, while environments high in friction and difficulty hinder peoples' creative abilities (Richardson, 1986).

3.3.1 Creative processes

Creative processes can be understood as the combination of several factors (Houtz & Krug, 1995; Treffinger, Isaksen, & Firestien, 1983) of both cognitive (primarily related to divergent thinking) and emotional type (primarily related to creative personality) that determine the production of ideas that are both novel and useful.

Creative processes constitute an important field of psychological research for more than a century, comprising a broad range of elements, which convergence on three main strands, namely: attentional factors or receptivity to both the environment and one's inner world (thoughts and ideas); motivational factors, as in the will to challenging the status quo and creating original products; and ability factors as the capacity to express complex and unusual ideas. This study will attempt to explore the motivational and ability factors, which will be described below in an intertwined way, since they are very much connected. The attentional elements will not be studied here since they are more directed to perceptual anomalies, being related to mental illness or altered states of consciousness and the field of psychiatry (Eysenck, 1972; 1976).

In this perspective, the classical model of Williams (1980, 1994) summarizes the literature from Joy P. Guilford (1950), a leading figure in creativity research, focusing the study on divergent thinking and Torrance's (1966) creative thinking. This model identifies eight creativity factors connected to creative processes. Four are referred to the cognitive-divergent aspect of creativity and four to the emotional-divergent aspect of creativity. For the cognitive-divergent factors of creative thinking, Williams valued: (1) fluency, as the skill to produce a large number of ideas, (2) the flexibility - the ability to change ideas passing from one category to a different one, (3) originality which is the capacity to produce rare and "out of the box" ideas, (4) elaboration - the facility to develop, embellish and enrich the ideas with details.

In addition, for the emotional factors of creative feeling, Williams (1994) indicated the main characteristics of personality: (5) curiosity - the capacity to investigate elements and ideas, finding new and not always direct and obvious connections); (6) complexity - the tendency to look for new alternatives and solutions to problems, to restore order out of chaos; (7) imagination, as in the ability to visualize the mental images; (8) risk-taking - the inclination to act under unstructured conditions and to defend one's own ideas. Emotions play a major role in facilitating creative thinking, as people attend to their own feelings as a source of information (Kung & Chao, 2019). Emotions lead individuals to question their preconceptions, explore uncommon ideas, and pay attention to associations between seemingly unrelated ideas (Webster and Kruglanski, 1994; Kruglanski et al., 2009; Tadmor et al., 2012), being context-sensitive and malleable (Schwarz, 2012). The overall idea is that personal creative processes are active choices as much as they are driven by inspiration or deep cognition. According to Amabile (1997), the three essential components of individual creativity are expertise, creative-thinking skill and intrinsic task motivation. Expertise implies practice, factual knowledge, technical competence and a special mastery in the target work domain. While knowledge and command, as creative abilities of an activity can be improved over time by practice, talent is the acquired artistic ability after the training period.

According to Burbiel (2009), creative thinking is the combination of idea generation and idea validation. While idea generation requires differing thinking skills to generate as many and as diverse ideas as possible, in idea validation confluent thinking skills are necessary to decide which are the most auspicious ideas. A similar process, "ideation-evaluation", has been described to be crucial to the three phases of the problem solving process (problem finding, problem solving and solution implementation) by Basadur, Graen & Green (1982). In artistic environments, the first step is a value in itself and validation is not that essential, as loose ends might even be desirable in a work of art. In more scientific settings, validation is usually required or often argued as absolutely necessary, because only very few ideas can be taken to realisation and recognition.

3.3.2 Social aspects of creative processes and the “zone” of learning

“Ideation-evaluation” processes can be either performed by one person or as a group (Basadur, Graen & Green, 1982). As a group dynamic, idea generation should be separated from idea validation and this is usually reached with training (Basadur, 2004). Hence, the importance of a good “master-apprentice relationship”, considered to be most effective for the teaching of creative-thinking skills (Weilerstein, 2003). The role and influence of the teacher in creativity is well documented in literature (Redmond 1993, Wong 2003, Amabile 2004). The mentor’s main function is to set goals and assign tasks. Nevertheless, a special sensitivity is necessary from the facilitator’s end, as both too much and too little guidance will impair creativity and productivity. Personal freedom, both in choosing which particular task to do next and how to tackle it, has been identified as a major source of creativity by several authors (e.g. Schepers & van den Berg 2007). Regarding this, Vygotsky's (1987) proposed an interesting model called the *Zone of Proximal Development* (ZPD), presenting a zone where learning happens between what one can do independently, along with tasks that could not be achieved unaided. He argued that learning and development are not separate entities, but are rather interrelated elements. In this sense, social interaction can work as a powerful source of creativity development. Vygotsky (1978) claimed that "the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers is reached" (p.86).

Fischer et al. (2005) defended the idea that creativity is in fact a social process. According to these authors, “the power of the unaided individual mind is highly overrated” and “most scientific and artistic innovations emerge from joint thinking, passionate conversations and shared struggles among different people, emphasizing the importance of the social dimension of creativity” (ibid. p.3). There are other factors such as courage to expose oneself to failure, the tendency to look for a number of alternatives and to see the gap that exists between how things are and how they might be which play a major role in shaping creativity. This emphasis on group work is based on the assumption that idea generation is best performed in groups and that interaction with others fosters creativity (Vester, 1978). This applies to the context of creative

tourism, which happens during the interaction of people. Richards and Marques (2012) noted that “a significant advantage of creative tourism is the direct encounter of tourists with locals” (in Sadeghnia & Amiryazdani, 2018, p.20). Participants use their creative skills and traits while interacting with others, in a “joint-operation of problem solving” (Richards & Wilson, 2007), creating an empathetic relationship which will engage them with the place and the community, where art (creative activity) has the capacity of making this connection. This is because creative activities are agents of knowledge and learning and an information rich means of conveying things that can also “touch people's hearts”.

Within the realm of social interaction, creativity is also understood differently from country to country, due to divergent linguistic approaches to creativity (Paletz, Peng and Li, pg.95, 2011). For instance, Chinese people tend to see creativity as an external social attribute related with the contribution of creative people to society, while Westerners perceive it more as an internal individual attribute (Niu, 2006; Paletz, Peng and Li, 2011). Scandinavian countries see creativity as an individual attitude that helps people to cope with the challenges of life (Smith and Carlsson, 2006). In this regard, it is interesting to point out that there are several studies about creativity and individuals with dual nationality (Leung, Maddux, Galinsky and Chiu, 2008, Maddux and Galinsky, 2009, cited by Saad, Damian, Benet-Martínez, Luas and Robins, 2013), and the results are that these individuals internalize the values, norms and execute each culture in a way that allows them to have different points of view. This process also facilitates the creation of original ideas (Crisp & Turner, 2011, Leung et al., 2008, Maddux & Galinsky, 2009, cited by Saad et al., 2013). Notwithstanding, the reasons for broader perspectives and formation of creative ideas are far more complex than simply having access to more words (Kharkhurin, 2011, Swann, Pope and Carter, 2011). I agree with Vygotsky (1978) that viewed the “self” as a complex emergent phenomenon continually produced in and by individuals in their interchanges with others. Vygotsky's (1978) claimed that one's mental image about herself/himself is usually articulated and negotiated in a group. And while creativity is often still associated with the “lonesome genius”, most creative work takes place in organisational settings and is usually conducted in groups (Redmond 1993) and creative tourism provides a great space for that to happen.

With what regards motivation, Amabile (1997) considers it a key component of individual creativity that is impelled by curiosity and determines what a person actually will do (intrinsic motivation). While Burbiel (2009) underlines that the process of idea generation happens inside the individual, Redmond (1993) claims that the individual should not be recognised as the ultimate source of any new idea or novel problem solution. So idea processing happens once it is expressed and communicated to the outside, within a group of people. Motivation is then influenced most directly by environmental factors (extrinsic motivation). According to Mumford (2000) a combination of extrinsic and intrinsic motivations might be the most effective way of boosting creativity - because creative work is linked to curiosity and independence, providing time to pursue topics of personal and professional interests.

Values are connected to motivations (Feather, 2004; Schwarts & Boehnke, 2004) and related to personality traits and justify individual's choices and actions (Dollinger et al., 2007). That is why this section is included, because values promote the pursuit of variety and novelty and are considered positive and significant predictors of creativity (Dollinger, Burke & Gump, 2007).

Values are learned beliefs that serve as guiding principles about how individuals ought to behave' (Parksand Guay, 2009, p. 676). Therefore, motivation can be uncovered as underlying reasons as to why certain attributes or expected consequences are desired (Reynolds and Gutman, 1988).

Summing up, creativity is an activity that requires a multitude of individual and social factors of creative thinking and creative process working all together. From the literature review above, it was possible to collect several keywords that are highlighted in the table 1 shown below:

Table 1 - Individual and social factors of creative thinking and process

INDIVIDUAL FACTORS	SOCIAL FACTORS
Curiosity	Interaction
Complexity	Master-apprentice relationship
Imagination	Joint-thinking

Risk-taking/ explorative behaviour	Problem solving
Motivations and values	Conversations
Fluency	Ideation conflicts
Flexibility	Shared struggles
Originality	Idea validation
Elaboration	Courage of exposure to failure
Autonomy	Migration/ multiple citizenship

Source: own. Based in Williams (1980, 1994); Guilford’s (1950); Amabile (1997); Vygotsky (1978); Burbiel (2009); Feather (2004); Schwarts & Boehnke (2004); Dollinger et al. (2007), Niu (2006); Paletz, Peng and Li (2011); Leung, Maddux, Galinsky and Chiu (2008); Saad, Damian, Benet-Martínez, Luas and Robins (2013).

In future research about this topic, these factors could perhaps constitute a toolbox for the analysis of the creative individual. By examining curiosity, complexity, imagination, risk-taking, motivation, fluency, flexibility, originality, elaboration, explorative behaviour and autonomy, one could better understand who is the creative person. In addition, to better investigate the individual creativity happening in groups, processes such as interaction, master-apprentice relationship, joint-thinking, problem solving, conversations, ideation conflicts, shared struggles, validation and courage of exposition to failure should also be taken into account.

3.3.3 The “creative class”

This is a theory advanced by Florida (2002) and it has sparked much debate and discussion. I will include it here because it has been commonly used in the context of creative tourism (Richards, 2011) to create understanding about creative tourists and also because it was a relevant theory to translate its time and context. Furthermore, I found some interesting details in Florida’s “creative class” that add knowledge to the topic.

This definition is an attempt to define who the creative people are, particularly inciding to its context. It was constructed from an economic perspective of regional economic development of

post-industrial cities in the United States in the beginning of the 2000's. This creative class from Florida represents a core driving force that marks a major shift from traditional agricultural and industry-based economies toward a new restructuring into more complex economic hierarchies. Florida proposed a class drawn from demographic data and extensive statistical research and established a segment made up of knowledge workers, intellectuals and artists. He then divided the creative class into two broad sections: 1) the super-creative core, which comprises a broad range of occupations (i.e. computer programming, research, science, engineering, education), with arts, design, and media workers forming a small subsection. Florida claimed that those forming this group are the ones that "fully engage in the creative process" (2002, p. 69). This group is considered innovative, creating commercial products and consumer goods. The function of its members is "along with problem solving, their work may entail problem finding" (Florida, 2002, p.69). 2) Creative professionals are the second group formed by those working in healthcare, business and finance and education. They "draw on complex bodies of knowledge to solve specific problems" using higher degrees of education to do so (Florida, 2002).

In addition to these two main groups of creative people, I want to highlight a smaller group also included by Florida in the creative class which is formed by bohemians and queer people. Florida (2003) "found that talent and creative capital is attracted to places that score high on basic indicators of diversity - the Gay, Bohemian and other indexes. It is not because high-tech industries are populated by great numbers of bohemian and great people; rather, artists, musicians, gay people and members of the creative class in general prefer places that are open and diverse"(Florida, 2003, p. 10). Furthermore, Florida (2012) also found that the presence of gays and bohemians offers a culturally tolerant people climate, gathering more creative types around a place. These are very relevant aspects that add strength to the factor of openness found by other authors described below and that was not very clear in its subjectivity. Furthermore, Florida adds the element of diversity to this composition of creative people.

In my perspective, there is a necessity for more qualitative research on this topic to enable us to move beyond the "creative class" provided by Florida (2002, 2012) and find out more about how do all the characteristics described above are expressed and articulate with each other during creative acts in creative tourism activities (Richards & Wilson, 2007).

PART II

3.4 Creativity in research

Creativity in research is context-specific, depending on the knowledge, skills and abilities of those involved, when and where the research is carried out and the processes mentioned above. According to Heinze (2007), there are five types of scientific creativity that align with the intent of this study: 1) formulation of a new idea or set of new ideas, which opens up to a new cognitive frame or brings theoretical claims to a new level of sophistication. In this case, to study creative tourism with the lens of creativity. 2) Discovery of a new empirical phenomenon that stimulates new theorizing. In this study, it is not a discovery *per se* but the use of documentary as a creative method can revivify CREATOUR research. 3) Development of a new methodology, by means of which theoretical problems can be empirically tested. Again, in this case, creative research methodology is not a new methodology, but one that is not so commonly used until now and not by CREATOUR research team). 4) Invention of a novel instrument that opens up new search perspectives and research domains. The screenwriting analysis might open up to new possibilities to look at the topic of creative tourism and creative tourists). 5. New synthesis of formerly dispersed ideas into general theoretical laws enabling analyses of diverse phenomena within a common cognitive frame, as creative tourism is an “evolving field” of research growing interest, not yet thoroughly investigated (Nancy Duxbury & Greg Richards, 2019).

In this sense, I can consider that I am attempting to open a new perspective on how to tackle the subject of examining what is to be creative and be part of the creative tourism reality in Portugal. By pursuing this research through the arts-based method of documentary, I am trying to inform creative tourism research about common characteristics of creative people told by themselves, while at the same time presenting an alternative method that might originate knowledge discovery and improve communication in this field of studies. In line with this, the use of arts-based methods can be considered a form of knowledge creation, although this is a very extensive

theoretical construct and is not the main theoretical basis of this research. Hence, I will not delve into it. However, knowledge is used to support my critical enquiry on recreating existing knowledge about certain dimensions of creative tourism (Argote, 2011). Knowledge creation can be defined as the act of producing knowledge created by individuals, amplifying it in social contexts, and selectively connecting it to the existing knowledge in a specific field (Nonaka & von Krogh, 2009). This affects this study because along my research about this topic, I realised that part of the research praxis is to take more classical approaches of gathering data, which often conditions knowledge, because research is often “ordered and orchestrated” (Ren, Pritchard, Morgan, 2009). Because of this, the creative research methodology I use aims to act as a more democratic form of knowledge construction and dissemination about creative people in the field of creative tourism.

3.4.1 Creative tourism research

The following literature review will provide an overview of the current state of art in creative tourism research, including an initial critique to more classical approaches of gathering data, along with the use of creative research methodology within creative tourism research.

Creative tourism is an “evolving field” and a subset of cultural tourism (Duxbury & Richards, 2019) and will be the field of this research.

“ Culture is the collective expression of the group’s personality - it's wishes, values and ideology. It is the sum total of knowledge and attitudes, a vast accumulation of ways of thought, of action and of emotional expression”

(Tseng and McDermott in Cattaneo, 1994, p.184)

Culture creates a framework of reality from which its members function (Kagawa-Singer and Chung, 1994) and the critical starting point starts exactly here, on the functionality that people are expected to have to contribute to society. This comes out of cultural tourism, where creative tourism is a sub-field. Much of the early research focused on the economic impact of cultural

tourism as cultural tourists began to arrive in growing numbers and spend relatively large amounts of money, so the research “effort was directed at gathering empirical data on the profile of cultural tourists, their motivations and behaviour, mainly through survey research (Greg Richards, 2010). Although this activity has greatly improved researchers’ knowledge about the consumer behaviour, the ATLAS Cultural Tourism Research Group outlined a growing dissatisfaction with this more traditional quantitative approach. Critical members of this tourism research group, in particular Esther Binkhorst, Marjan Melkert and Katleen Vos (...) started claiming for a qualitative-oriented research philosophy as a breeding ground for methodological innovations which could enrich the field of cultural tourism studies with new insights and perspectives”. This sets the ground of the discussion that this study brings off but concerning creative tourism, as an “extension of cultural tourism” (Kan et al., 2014, p.249). The intent here is to concentrate the efforts on the methodology used in the research, rather than the findings. This works as a reflective exercise of the methods that can be used, to hopefully complement the work of other researchers in the field of creative tourism.

Interest in creative tourism is rapidly growing within the field of tourism. Despite the rising number of creative tourism publications, it has not yet been thoroughly investigated due to its recent development (Bakas, Duxbury, & de Castro, 2018; Chen & Chou, 2019; Remoaldo & Cadima-Ribeiro, 2019; Zhang & Xie, 2018). Although creative tourism is a recent area of study, there are some examples of literature reviews carried out in the field of creativity and tourism (Richards, 2011). It is possible to verify that the growth in the number of publications about creative tourism happened in 2012, according to the Scopus database (Maldonado-Erazo et al., 2016). According to Maldonado-Erazo et al. (2016), specific terms such as "creative tourists" (Ali, Ryu & Hussain., 2015, Ngamsirijit, 2015, Tan, Luh & Kung, 2014) have led to the consolidation of the relationship between creativity and tourism under the name of creative tourism (Maldonado-Erazo et al., 2016). Additionally, the term "creative class" of Florida (2002, 2007) is also referred to by Richards (2011) and in the above section, concerning creative people. Carvalho, Costa & Ferreira (2019) also reviewed this field and mapped the evolution of the term creative tourism. They concluded that creative tourism literature mentions creativity as the common denominator

for this niche tourism, although creativity is mainly utilized as a conceptual framework for the development of tourism products, services and experiences, focusing on the economy, in territories and destinations (Richards & Wilson, 2007; OECD, 2014; Sano, 2016), which support this critical enquiry.

Carvalho, Costa & Ferreira (2019) claim that researchers and practitioners should “consider actors’ reflexivity about specialized consumption, and develop horizontal research based (...) local community skill development in the co-creation of creative tourism” (Carvalho, Costa, & Ferreira, 2019, p.19). In line with this, Duxbury and Richards (2019) also investigated the connection between creativity and tourism and concluded that research on creative tourism is now more focused in investigating creative tourist motivations and behaviours (among others). These authors highlighted the conceptual challenge of building the definition of creative tourism from the widespread series of definitions and suggest that “defining the field of creative tourism now requires a new framework for organizing the different elements that comprise this subset of tourism” (Duxbury and Richards, 2019). The active involvement of participants in creative tourism asks for a renewal of research methodological approaches, making creativity a key feature to develop appropriate research to possibly learn more about the participant that engages in creative activities (Chen & Chou, 2019). As mentioned above, until now the use of creativity as a conceptual tool only appears to generate economic and social success in the process of tourism development (Richards, Wisansing, Paschinger, 2019) while having the potential for much more, especially in terms of using it as an encompassing methodology for creative tourism research and reach a wider audience.

3.4.2 Creative tourism conceptualizations

Creative tourism was first introduced as a prospective form of tourism by Pearce and Butler (1993), “although they did not define the term” (Richards, 2011, p. 1237). The term ‘creative tourism’ was named by Richards and Raymond (2000) and the idea for more creative structures of tourism emerged from a European project – EUROTEx – which focused on stimulating craft

production through tourism (Richards, 2005). This form of tourism seemed to be the key development option to meet the aspiration for more meaningful experiences from tourists' end (Prentice, 2001: 2005; Smith 2006) and as a response to the escalating commercialization of cultural objects and galloping concerns about the commodification of local cultures resulting from cultural tourism. The *Green Paper on Cultural and Creative Industries of the European Commission* (2010) worked as a major source of legitimation of demands for more studies of and intervention in the creative field (Richards & Marques, 2012). This creative approach to tourism has shown its advantages, especially because of its potential for value creation (Richards and Raymond, 2000), although the link between value creation through creative tourism and local development isn't completely developed in literature yet, as for instance, communities are still unable to overcome barriers by themselves to "handle" creative behaviour, needing external entities to guide them (Richards, Wisansing, Paschinger, 2019). For example, the *Creative Tourism Toolkit*³ is an attempt to address this issue and develop sustainable tourism administration in designated areas of Thailand. In line with this, OECD claimed that the integration of tourism and creative industries should be done as a whole, "engaging not only consumers but also producers, policy makers and knowledge institutions" (OECD, 2014, p. 16). Hence the relevance of CREATOUR national project, which aimed to include different stakeholders in the process of building the different blocks of creative tourism.

In spite of several constructions on the concept of creative tourism that appear throughout time, CREATOUR's understanding of creative tourism follows Greg Richards (2011) approach, involving four dimensions which are: 1) active participation; 2) visitor learning; 3) creative self-expression and 4) immersion in a new environment - local culture, tradition and place. As more items keep being added to the term making it more "robust", creative tourism can take on many forms, such as a means of strengthening identity and distinctiveness, and as a form of self-expression or self-discovery and a form of edutainment (Richards & Marques, 2012). Creative tourism can also be encountered in several cases where visitors, service providers and the local community exchange

³ https://perfectlink.co.th/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/Creating-Creative-Tourism-Toolkit_Version-Eng.pdf

ideas and skills and influence each other in a synergetic way. In this sense, creative tourism is a means of social development, by involving participants in the creative life of the destination, a source of interaction and 'atmosphere' for places and source for recreating and reviving places (Marques & Richards, 2012). Furthermore, Duxbury and Richards (2019) claim that at the core of the creative tourism framework, one will find the learning process as the key focus of interactive workshops and creative experiences, which work as the basis of inspiration for the creative tourism concept. This would not happen without the broad range of "creative individuals, communities, and organizations enabling the environment (...) in which locals and visitors can interact creatively" (Duxbury & Richards, 2019, pag.6).

3.4.3. Creative research methods applied to creative tourism research

Duxbury and Richards (2019) compiled several case studies from international authors in their *Research Agenda for Creative Tourism*, that provide various research approaches that have emerged over the years, supporting the creative research approach while investigating the development of creative tourism. For instance, in Daniela Angelina Jelinčić and Matea Senkić's case studies on the 'The value of experience in culture and tourism: the power of emotions', the authors seek ways to create meaningful experiences into creative tourism activities. Jelinčić and Senkić (2019) conclude that more tourists seek experiences that mirror their own personal stories, and a fruitful experience creation must include this personal identification with worthwhile experiences based on creating innovative and sensory stimuli that engage participants to identify with them and/or to participate. These authors assert that since emotions instigate response behaviours, a participatory creative activity such as writing personal experiences can provide an experience for transformation.

In another case study, coming out from the 'Master's degree programme of Applied Visual Arts and Nature Photography' in Lapland, creative nature photography is used as a method to tourism and research and a contemporary discussion is initiated on introducing the tourist gaze in the Arctic through photography. This case studies is named 'Stories of design, snow, and silence:

creative tourism landscape in Lapland' from Satu Miettinen, Jaana Erkkilä-Hill, Salla-Mari Koistinen, Timo Jokela and Mirja Hiltunen and it uses art education as an embodied practice in terms of collaborative design processes in creative tourism. It also discusses active engagement and ways of introducing creative and cultural activities as tools for close collaboration between tourists and local communities, and the positioning of community members as visitors in their own topography. In a last example of the same chapter of Duxbury and Richards' book (2019), the case study 'Travelling Laboratories for Artistic Thinking', investigates the artist's way of producing a tourism experience through the methods of performance and mediation in silence and walking.

In sum, creative research methods appear to contribute to the understanding about creative human traits and skills, the meaning of their performance in society and tightly interweaving the creative individual and creative tourism activities. Hence, they are intrinsically connected and the use of creative research activities as tools contribute to creative tourism research.

The main aim of this literature review was to make the bridge between creativity research methodologies with creative tourism, overarching broader questions that allow for a deeper context to be looked upon, varying amongst themes that exercise influence in the process of conceptualizing this type of tourism and the ones who engage in it.

4 METHODOLOGY

“When we need to emphasize or learn something, it begins with a methodology”.

(Kwang Hyung Lee, 2014)

This section describes the importance of exploring different methodological avenues when studying creative tourism and creative people, to avoid inconclusive results about the topic.

As mentioned above, the methodology used by the CREATOUR team of researchers was not enough to grasp the complexity and diversity of this topic. So, in an attempt to contribute to this issue and also wishing to move away from ‘one dimensional epistemological prescriptions’ (Seale, 1998, p. 2), I am suggesting a more holistic understanding of tourism that include social and artistic aspects of creative tourism.

Dunn and Mellor (2017) argued that the emotional and symbolic aspects of people's experiences might not be accessed by mainstream methods that rely on people's written competence. Lawrence (2008) noted that the arts, by engaging the senses, provoke strong, affective responses that can subsequently provide a catalyst for learning beyond traditional, cognitive ways of knowing. In this regard, "the arts in research promote a form of understanding that is derived or evoked through empathic experience" (Eisner, 2008, p.7). It is something that can offer deep insight into what others are experiencing and that can provide a safe space for participants to express themselves and foster dialogue, especially about topics that are difficult to verbalize (Askins & Pain, 2011; Coemans & Hannes, 2017; Cohenmiller, 2018; Dunn & Mellor, 2017).

4.1 Creative research methodology

Creativity is very much connected with the act of problem-solving and with uncertainty, both core elements of research (Mumford, 2010). In my perspective, creative research in the context

of creative tourism serves both a practical and a theoretical purpose. Practically, in the sense that it intends to tackle complex questions, which happen “on the ground”. Creative research methods are highly appropriate for participatory and action research. And CREATOUR project is characterised as an “action-research” project due to its participatory content and activities. Coemans and Hannes (2017) argued that the use of arts-based methods in interactive settings seem a natural fit, thanks to their participatory nature between people and openness to different ways of understanding creativity.

According to Kara (2015), Creative Research Methods fall into five different categories: 1) research using technology, where there is already plenty of creativity being applied to this subset; 2) mixed-methods research, perhaps one of the most mature examples in academia ; 3) transformative research frameworks, such as feminist, activist and participatory research; 4) indigenous methodologies, which are considered a pillar of their own; 5) arts-based research (ABR), which is the one I am using in this study.

4.1.1 Arts-based research

Arts-based research is seen as "any social research or human inquiry that adapts the tenets of the creative arts as a part of the methodology ... the arts may be used during data collection, analysis, interpretation and/or dissemination" (Jones & Leavy, 2004, p.1, 2). Arts-based research (ABR) is a subset of creative research methodology and include the visual arts (such as drawing, painting collage), the performing arts and dance, as well as music, songwriting, film and several types of videos (e.g. video-art, documentary), storytelling and the written arts like fiction, creative prose, poetry, playwriting and screenwriting (Kara, 2015).

In this study I applied ABR in my data-gathering and analysis sections and reviewed creative tourism literature that utilizes creative research methodology. For the data collection, I use CREATOUR video-documentary as an ABR, because as the final cultural product of this project, it contains several meanings about creative tourism reality in Portugal. I also apply ABR in my data analysis, as I have written a screenplay with snippets of dialogue from all participants - visitors,

mentors, artists and researchers retrieved from the documentary and the director and the documentarists answers during the interview and questionnaire.

There is a key debate within the Western paradigm in arts-based research about how skilled one needs to be to use these artistic techniques in research. Kara (2015) has a flexible position stating that it depends on the context and that the final result does not need to be an artistic masterpiece to be presented to an audience, but I agree with Piirto (2002), that is especially critical in regard to this question, arguing that the researcher needs to hold skills to work with this methodology. My position is connected to my professional and academic background in the arts sector. I have been working in this field for almost two decades as a visual artist⁴, set designer, video producer, ghost writer, theatre actress, circus performer, artisan, jeweler, arts teacher, facilitator of arts and crafts workshops, cook, music and food events producer. I also graduated in Artistic Studies in 2008, which equipped me with a degree of critical and artistic knowledge to analyse different works in the fields of cinema, music, visual arts and theatre, from an aesthetical, philosophical and functional perspective. So, hopefully I hold the necessary knowledge to unveil the meanings provided in CREATOUR documentary, interview and questionnaire. Recently, I have also utilised ABR while working as a researcher for CREATOUR project at Lab2PT. I started producing and editing videos⁵ with the intent of capturing the voices of the stakeholders to illustrate their articulated needs and wants in the context of the research (Leavy, 2019). These videos were published on youtube and may work as new formats of knowledge presentation about CREATOUR's pilots from the northern region of Portugal, from Lab2PT to a broader audience (Kara, 2015). This creative research process seemed relevant because I observed that during the time I used videos as a method, I was creating a closer connection between the pilots projects, participants and CREATOUR research team, as I was collecting different stakeholders' perspectives about their experiences and the meanings and struggles of doing the creative

⁴ Portfolio: <https://vaaasantos.wixsite.com/vanessaagata>;
<https://issuu.com/vanessaagataabreusantos/docs/portfoliovanesa>

⁵ L Gueiteiro 2019: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0ED9CUal4b8&t=594s>
Encontrarte 2019: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oLndVNgEZes>

activities. To voice the stakeholders seemed to have worked well both for internal purposes (since the pilots had several communication issues to solve among mentors of the projects) as well as external (in the attempt to create interest among viewers that visit the youtube channel to “convert” them into potential visitors/participants). In line with this stage of a research process (presentation and dissemination), there is a very entertaining and instructive example called “Dance your PhD”⁶, where natural and social scientists use interpretative dance to present the findings of their PhDs. In my view, this is a quite effective way of communicating scientific results to larger and more diverse audiences (Cahnmann, 2017), creating an understanding between people of different fields.

4.2 Arts-based data analysis structure

Following the methodology described above, in my analysis I use the artistic process of screenwriting as a way of compiling the several meanings retrieved from all participants involved in the documentary. According to Kara (2015), “writing for research’ is a creative act that includes reflexive writing strategies within the research process. Nonetheless, current screenwriting research is mostly about historical contexts, theoretical readings and ethnographic studies, rather than screenwriting practice (Batty, 2015). Hence, this research showcases the opportunity to develop a narrative mode of qualitative reporting. In my screenwriting I include techniques of the so-called creative writing, elements from fiction, description and storytelling.

The main source of inspiration to the writing of my analysis was the article “The Body in Tourism” by Veijola and Jokinen's (1994) suggested by my supervisor, when she understood my research drive. Veijola and Jokinen's (1994) wrote this article in the form of a holiday diary based upon fictional conversations with well-known tourism sociologists who were invited to take part in “different episodes of this travel narrative in Mallorca” (Veijola, 2018). Veijola and Jokinen have written several international articles on tourism theories defying the codes of academic writing (Veijola, 2018) by using for instance fictional ethnography (Veijola and Jokinen, 2008) and

⁶ Dance your PhD: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nUQvJOSCoI4&t=16s>

“challenging the perceived neutrality of disembodied knowledge of tourism research” (Pritchard, 2007). Hence, this article made it possible to extend the creative research methodology to another stage of this research, because it was validated by time and accepted by academia almost three decades ago. “The Body in Tourism” (Veijola and Jokinen's, 1994) is still a very pertinent academic paper for the current time, written as a “methodological play” that emphasizes the absence of the tourist body in many analyses of tourism, as well as the absence of the researcher’s body when analysing the results of tourism research (Palmer, 2012). Hence, it influenced me in building my analysis as a collaborative screenwriting for a series of youtube video casts, creating a narrative/script that could sequence the ‘actuality’ (Grierson, 1933) of creative tourism in Portugal, animated by the articulation of voices of all participants.

CREATOUR documentary was done without an initial narrative/script, but in my analysis I decided to start by creating one with the purpose of allowing meaning (about creative tourism) to become more centred (Rosen, 1993, p. 73–74) and to focus my attention in the various details of the documentary, while crossing these with the documentarists responses. My intent was to convey and communicate the content that was enclosed in aesthetic experiences, enacted in creative practices and embodied in the artistic products portrayed in the documentary. Therefore I divided my screenwriting analysis - the *Creative Tourism Talks* - in episodes, by topics so that it is easier for the reader to have a rhythm within the dialogue and to understand the different parts that address the key aspects of my analysis (which are marked in bold in the analysis). The dialogue lines originate from the content of the questionnaire and the skype interview responses given by the researchers’/documentarists and documentary director, along with the participants’ testimonials in the documentary. This is intercalated with my detailed review and analysis of the documentary and a discussion fed by the responses provided by the open-ended questionnaire and the semi-structure Skype interview.

Last but not least, for ethical reasons, I decided to distribute the in-text literature citations between my dialogue lines and the lines of the researchers/documentarists, to avoid conditional cognitive bias wherein me could be interpreted as being “smarter” or superior in relation to my interviewees or the participants of the documentary. Despite being the “official” author of this

research, others have contributed to the process, so I want to avoid having “the smartest voice” to balance the overall dialogue.

4.2.1 Open-ended e-mail questionnaire

The purpose of using this method was to find out more about the documentarists’ perspectives and narrators’ voices in the construction of the reality of creative tourism in Portugal through a documentary. Therefore, I have sent Tiago Castro and Nuno Barbosa the following questionnaire by e-mail presented in table 2:

Table 2 - Open-ended e-mail questionnaire

Open-ended e-mail questionnaire
1. What was the main purpose of the documentary?
2. How was it structured?
3. Who facilitated it and what was the process?
4. Did the researchers prepare questions for tourists and artists? If so, what are the reasons for choosing these questions?
5. What did the researchers learn / learn from this documentary?
6. It seems to me that the 4 dimensions of creative tourism that you refer to in the video (active participation, visitor learning, creative self-expression and immersion in a new environment) function as key points in the responses given in the documentary. Do you confirm? If so, can you comment on this?

Source: own.

Their perspectives have significant implications for the study of this documentary. The documentary is based on the relationship that the documentarists establish with their audience. This is mainly the reason why in this thesis I provide the reader with the voice and perspective of the documentarists. Because I believe they are the major influencers of the construction of the “reality” that is being depicted.

With this said, the “voice” is considered one useful method of looking at documentary film well developed theory applied by T.S. Eliot in his essay, "The Three Voices of Poetry" (1943). His theory is based on the voice chosen by the documentarist, which gives a more flexible definition to what has become a confusing genre of film. The first voice is the voice of the creator talking to himself or to nobody. The second voice is the voice of the maker addressing an audience, whether large or small. The third voice is the voice of the creator when he attempts to create a dramatic character speaking in verse (Ibid, p.96). In this thesis I will only use the second voice.

Eliot's second voice - that of the creator talking to an audience - has the most obvious connections with this and documentary film in general. Throughout the history of documentary

film, narrators have told their audiences what to look at and many times what to believe. However, this voice has been used more artistically by Grierson (1935) and acts as a basis for his documentary theory. Grierson's philosophy of documentary was grounded in his belief that documentary is a didactic medium of social communication to be used by the documentarist “as a tool of creating a society” (Grierson,1935). Whether using a direct address to the audience or more subtle combinations of visuals and commentary, documentary has traditionally been thought of as a genre using the second voice.

4.2.2 Semi-structured interview by Skype

The answers to the above questionnaire raised more questions about the meanings and practicalities of the documentary and the discussions of the “reality” constructed in a documentary. As one can read below in the analysis/discussion section, the documentary’s trajectory was clearly influenced and controlled by the documentarists. Therefore, I have decided to have a skype meeting with the documentarists to get a deeper insight on this.

In the table 3 shown below, there is the list of open-ended questions, which allowed for a discussion with the interviewees (and which content is used in the analysis):

Table 3 - Semi-structured interview questions

Semi-structured interview questions
1. Did the researchers have a major influence on the direction and production of the documentary?
2. Was it predicted that the researchers would be the documentarists and narrators?
3. How was the selection of the projects done?
4. How did you organise the recorded activities?
5. What do the director perceives as documentary?
6. How was the process of assembling the documentary?
7. What was the central thread/ narrative of the documentary?
8. Did you rehearse any part of the documentary?
9. How does the director perceive the voices of the narrators?
10. How does the researcher perceive his own voice as a narrator?
11. Can you give me your perceptions about how real the topic you portrayed is, due to either logistical setbacks or others?
12. And how about the questions you did to the participants during the recorded activities, what was the process there?
13. From your experience while producing the documentary and while collecting the answers of the participants, what have you concluded from it with what regards of who are the creative tourists?
14. Why do you (Tiago Castro, researcher of CREATOUR) think is necessary to frame these participants and build up a creative tourist profile? What did you perceive about this subject from your experience working with CREATOUR?
15. What are the overall opinions of the contribution of the documentary for CREATOUR's research project?

Source: own.

4.3 Tools used to analyze the documentary

After getting the documentarists answers through the skype interview and engaging in an interesting discussion about various core points of the topic, I decided to cross this data with film theory and use documentary conventions and modes to be able to better structure my analysis. Documentary films can present information about factual topics with a variety of aims, record important events and ideas; to inform viewers; to convey opinions and to create public interest. Therefore common conventions are usually used in documentaries to achieve these aims and these include; actuality, exposition, voice-over/ narration, interviews, and montage, which are all present in CREATOUR documentary (Nichols, 2001).

The documentary's claim on actuality requires mediating a reality by using audiovisual information that comes from a synchronization of three elements: visual (images in movement), sound and text tracks. For this particular study, I consider the montage as the most relevant convention, because it is the spinal structure that visually presents the progression of ideas on a screen, articulating the different positioning of shots and text, which convey the meaning about creative tourism to the viewer (Nichols, 2001). The montage establishes the links between the words that protagonists say with the visual representation of the participants' thoughts and actions, and this helps position the viewer in the story, and helps him/her to better understand the story. While visualizing the footage of protagonists' performance and spaces where the actions take place, the viewer gets information about the meaning of the activities and importance of the activities and location. The importance of examining this phase in depth in the analysis section is crucial, particularly from the documentarists' end, as they were the "creators" of this reality. Therefore, the montage phase intrinsically links the various modes found in the documentary, as they affect the message and the film's portrayal of creative tourism "reality".

4.3.1 Modes of representation

Adding to this, there are modes of representation that are 'basic ways of organizing texts in relation to certain recurrent features or conventions' (Nichols, 1991, p. 32). A mode delivers a

perspective on reality, because the logic that a documentary follows, in its structure, says a lot about the positioning that the documentarist and its audience take while trying to mediate reality. The emphasis in this research is precisely about what its structure means and how it positions the different people involved. How does it create meaning rather than what meaning does it want to portray. And like this, the discussions about the real are attenuated, boiled down by the modes of representation, as one will perceive in the analysis/ discussion section.

The documentary modes of representation that are present in the documentary are expository, participatory and performative Nichols (2001). The expository occurs at the beginning and introduces the important topic of the film. This is important because it introduces the viewer to the content and creates the viewer's first impression on the topic of the documentary (Nichols, 2001). Furthermore, the participatory and performative modes happen because of the use of voice-over/narration, where the documentarists voice their specialist knowledge about the events that occur within the documentary. These are further explored in the analysis/discussion section, along with a discussion with the documentarists.

4.3.2 Participants' testimonials

I consider the visitors' testimonials a fundamental tool because they communicate their perspectives about their experiences by answering the following questions done by Tiago Castro and Nuno Barbosa during the shooting of the documentary: 1) What do you think about this creative activity? 2) What does it mean to you? 3) How did you feel?

The main purpose with these questions was to retrieve information about their feelings towards the creative activities and to inform the viewer about the content of the workshop. Regarding the questions to the artists and mentors of the pilots, the questions were: 1) What is the workshop about and what do you think about the concept of creative tourism? 2) What does it mean to you? By answering these, the participants freely expressed their personal opinions on the topic of creative tourism, so the testimonials are the "glue" that brings the story of the documentary together.

One of the primary ways (probably the first) human beings started to make sense of their experience was by casting it in a narrative form (Forster, 1927; Hymes, 1982; Scholes & Kellogg, 1966; White, 1981). To understand participants' perceptions, I had to look in great detail at the ways they made sense of their experience, particularly through narrative, sound and footage of the creative activities, as these factors act together, with their distinctive varieties of meanings informing one another, communicating meanings to the viewer (Gee, 1985). This image formation process depends on all participants' descriptions, narratives and media, contributing to the image creation process (Perez-Nebra & Torres, 2010). Sarah Michaels (1981) researched how people negotiate, construct and articulate their experiences in narrative strategies stating that in topic centered ones (like in this case), they tightly structure discourse on a single topic or series of closely related topics, establishing lexically explicit referential, temporal, and spatial relationships. Like this, there are no major shifts in perspective, or temporal orientation or even thematic focus. So, there is a high degree of thematic coherence and a clear thematic progression, as the documentary begins with temporal grounding, a statement of focus, introducing key agents, and indication of spatial grounding. This orientation is followed by elaboration on the topic (narrator's' role), finishing with a highly emotional punchline as a sort of resolution, signaled by a markedly lower pitch or falling tone, to close the documentary.

4.4 Qualitative research and secondary data

Researchers using creative and arts-based research methods are often situated within the qualitative research tradition (Coeman & Hannes, 2017; Knowles & Cole, 2008) and this applies to this study. In this study, the three qualitative research methods used together and shape the screenwriting in the analysis section. In my point of view, analysing descriptions provided by the 'informants' is a good tool of a qualitative research method, which will generate qualitative data that will allow me to see the respondent talking in some depth, choosing their own words, in the very settings of the creative activities. As mentioned before and just to highlight, CREATOUR documentary was not done for the purpose of being used as a method in this thesis, it was produced by my colleagues and not me, and so it is considered secondary data. My intent with

the use of this secondary data method is to navigate towards a possible new spectrum of opportunities to unveil the complex meanings of creative tourism, stepping out of a logic of trying to measure motivations, to translate the visitor into a profile, but “embracing an intuitive and rational ambiguity” (Montuori, 2006) that adds an alternative knowledge to the topic from the ‘informant’s’ perspective (Minchiello et. al, 1990, p.5).

5 ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

CREATIVE TOURISM TALKS

By Vanessa Santos

Screenwriting for a weekly series of YouTube videocasts about creative tourism in Portugal, animated by the articulation of voices of all participants in the CREATOUR documentary. These talks are divided in episodes, by topics to sequence the 'actuality' (Grierson, 1933) of this form of tourism.

Important notes: The dialogue lines originate from the content of the questionnaire and skype interview responses and from the participants' testimonials in the documentary. This is intercalated with my analysis of the documentary, which starts a discussion where the key aspects are marked in bold.

EPISODE I: WHY PRODUCING A DOCUMENTARY TO PORTRAY CREATIVE TOURISM IN PORTUGAL?

STRUCTURE AND MONTAGE PHASES

FADE IN:

INT. MY LIVING ROOM

LIGHT, NEUTRAL BACKGROUND

Scene description/ opening

Introduction to CREATIVE TOURISM TALKS, a new series on youtube done by one MA student of AAU university in Aalborg, that addresses different issues on this topic in several episodes.

CHARACTER NAME : VANESSA SANTOS

Host of this youtube channel and creator of the series on creative tourism. This channel is under the category of non-profit and activism on youtube.

VANESSA

Welcome to CREATIVE TOURISM TALKS, a new series here on youtube, where each week I will bring different sub themes within creative tourism, **to start a closer dialogue between academia and society on this topic.**

Fine and Sandoval (2004; 1991, 2000) have identified the importance of unpacking the 'space-between' academic and community relationships and reflexive academics have explored if they are co-constructing knowledge (Cruz, 2008; Luttrell, 2000). Therefore, we will focus on Portugal, as I worked there for one semester with CREATOUR team, a group of researchers in Portugal that investigate creative tourism. And so I'll have two guests to help me navigate this explorative quest on what is creative tourism through the lens of CREATOUR documentary and who are the people that participate in creative tourism activities.

I had the great pleasure to meet our first guest at the 3rd
CREATOUR International Conference
CREATIVE TOURISM DYNAMICS:
CONNECTING TRAVELLERS, COMMUNITIES, CULTURES, AND PLACES in
October 2019.

Tiago Castro is a cultural manager, urbanist and researcher under
the project CREATOUR - Creative Tourism Destination Development
in Small Cities and Rural Areas and PhD student in Sociology -
Cities and Urban Cultures with the research "The role of cultural
intermediaries in the dynamics of urban regeneration in small
cities".

My second guest is Nuno Barbosa, an independent producer /
director of video clips, promotional / advertising films and
documentaries from Portugal that won several national and
international awards.

Thanks for joining me in these difficult times of COVID-19.

Scene 2

INT. TIAGO'S LIVING ROOM
BACKGROUND WITH BOOKSHELVES

TIAGO

Hi and thanks for inviting me for your first session of these
talks. Yes, the whole world is in lockdown, so don't mind my
hair, this is my indoor style!

Scene 3

INT. MY LIVING ROOM

Vanessa

No worries, we are all in the same "bed hair" mode now and it is
good to see the actual real people reflected in a video...

Talking about that, I started this quarantine video project because I came across methodological issues about the depiction of the "real" and subsequent epistemological questions about reality in a film, while watching your documentary. With this I mean that I was examining it in the sense that it could also be a 'fiction unlike any other' (Nichols 1992, p. 108, 109). More specifically, I was intrigued about the use of this medium to frame the "reality" of creative tourism in Portugal.

What was the main purpose of CREATOUR team in deciding to make a documentary about creative tourism in Portugal?

Scene 4

INT. TIAGO'S LIVING ROOM

TIAGO

The main objective was to produce an audiovisual documentary about the activities developed, namely IdeaLabs, colloquiums, meetings and pilot projects, in particular the creative tourism activities developed, anchoring the project's dissemination strategy. The underlying idea was (and it was achieved!) to have a strong visual dimension, reflecting the creative nature of the project. In general, what was intended was to tell the story of the project in a captivating way and showing its practical side on the ground and that could be a more interesting non-academic output for civil society.

Scene 5

INT. LIVING ROOM

VANESSA

How was it structured?

Scene 6

INT. LIVING ROOM

TIAGO

It was not! Nuno Barbosa's goal for the documentary was to mirror reality in a visually appealing and true way. In this line of thought, there was no script defined a priori but a central idea of telling the story of the project and showing a little of what is

done from North to South. **The story was told during the assembly of the video as if it was a puzzle.**

The production was all in charge of the two of us - Tiago and Sílvia - being that Sílvia was more in the backstage and I in the field. The process was to contact the pilots who had activities scheduled but there were also cases where we were the ones to suggest that they do activities to shoot, in order to have greater diversity. For example, for the sake of logistics and the availability of everyone involved, we challenged pilots from the Algarve and Alentejo to concentrate activities in 5 days, in which we would shoot 1 to 2 a day depending on the duration of each one. It was necessary to manage our availability, the director and the pilots and their respective calendars. When filming, when interviewing pilots or participants, we asked precisely how they involved the local community, what they learned or created ... There were even situations in which we did not go to film planned activities because they were merely passive, that is, there was no active participation by visitors / participants.

Also, to avoid asking questions that could be too academic and block the interviewees in any way, we ended up asking simple and direct questions, almost always the director himself asking them, after I gave him "big brain washes" of creative tourism during the trips ... The interviews were done at the end of the activities and came out naturally because when we experienced them on the spot and live these activities, we were curious to know more about each project and how the people who participated felt. In other words, the testimonies were very natural and sincere, in a logic of sharing.

Scene 7

INT. LIVING ROOM

VANESSA

From what you just told, what I understand is that there was a bit of a controversy with what regards the documentary mirroring the reality you wanted to portray. **As I perceive it, you influenced the direction of the documentary and the projection of the "real".**

For example when you say:

"There were situations in which we did not go to film planned activities because they were merely passive".

Here it seems that you made the decision not to project the passive version of the creative activities, but that is still part of the "reality" when some of them happen.

In another example you mention:

"There were cases where we were the ones who suggested that they do activities to shoot, in order to have greater diversity". Here for reasons of logistics and diversity, it seems you manipulated the "reality", because the activities took place outside of real time.

Or for instance, when you stated: **"after I gave him "big brain washes" for creative tourism during our trips"**. You influenced the director's perspective on the topic of the documentary.

Lastly, when you said that **"the objective of a documentary is to mirror reality in a visually appealing and true way. In that sense, there was no script defined a priori but a central idea of telling the story of the project and showing a little of what is done from North to South ."** Although there was no script, the definition of a documentary as a "mirror of the real" proves to be at issue. In film theory, I have reviewed literature that argues that 'documentary' is actually a 'fiction unlike any other' (Nichols 1992, pp. 108-109), and postmodernist analysis has mulled over the impossibility of being able to capture reality, meaning, or truth (Minh-ha, 1993). For instance, this author (Minh-ha, 1993) claimed that valid interpretations can be made during narrativization of a particular story. Do you see this case aligning with this thought?

Scene 8

INT. LIVING ROOM

TIAGO

Yes, I do.

The logic behind was that initially, the idea was that the director would be hired to "do the job". But we (CREATOUR team

from CES, Coimbra) thought that it didn't make sense. What made sense for us was that at least one researcher would follow up with the director because **we foresaw that we would have a lot of rich moments for the research itself during the footage.** At the same time, **Nuno was not aware about what creative tourism was and he would have to handle a series of production and logistic struggles** (that I have experience with, because I have a background in cultural production and management). So it would be easier to include me in the process. That is how I ended up having a major role in the direction and production of the documentary.

In the very beginning, there was no provision made for Sílvia or I becoming documentarists or narrators. **The necessity appeared in the middle of the process because we didn't have a predefined script and needed a narrative thread.**

Concluding, the time limit set for the documentary was 40 minutes and so we knew we could not film all projects. At first we (researchers) thought about an hour but Nuno (the director) told us that would be too long for a documentary. Ideally we should make a documentary of 30 minutes, 40 minutes tops. That is how we knew we could not include all projects and also because some of them repeat the artistic skills (there is more than one project about ceramic, about wool). The geographic locations were the main considerations for the selection of projects.

VANESSA

Thanks for today and see you next week!

EPISODE II: FRAMING CREATIVE TOURISM IN PORTUGAL THROUGH A DOCUMENTARY

Scene 9

INT. LIVING ROOM

VANESSA

Welcome back to CREATIVE TOURISM TALKS.

Today we will start by exploring the **setting and frame narrative** of the CREATOUR documentary.

As far as I can understand, the story starts with the you (Tiago) as a narrator framing it to begin at the end, as you state in the beginning of the documentary that "this was the last day of filming", introducing the general time and space markers "these days in Alentejo", and a trip that was done "from the north to south of Portugal".

You as a narrator also express your feelings about the experience "I think I put on weight but I loved the days in Alentejo", stating that you "lost track of time or kilometres travelled by car to reach the creative projects around Portugal". It seems to me that the director Nuno Barbosa established these spatial and temporal markers and you as the initial narrator to start the narrative, serving as boundary markers in the narrative world of the documentary.

Scene 10

INT. LIVING ROOM

TIAGO

That's right.

During this process there was always space for discussion of ideas between Nuno and I to articulate the narrative in the documentary. In the end I can't get enough of it and I've already watched it more than thirty times! It is curious that **my own discourse as a CREATOUR researcher "is fed" by the experience of participating in this documentary, because it was a fieldwork**

**experience and in this sense yes, I consider myself a
documentarist. Almost like a storyteller.**

VANESSA

Now I would like to hear Nuno's perspective...
Nuno, **visually speaking, this topic seems to be translated by the
depiction of movement as the narrator Tiago is driving a car.**

**When analysing the documentary, I found this format as a
constant, where narrators use different transportation means -
they walk, ride a bike and sail a boat.**

Scene 11

INT. NUNO'S OFFICE

HIS CHILD IS IN THE ROOM ASKING NUNO TO GET THE ZEBRA COSTUME

NUNO

Hello and sorry that it took me a while to join the talk but my
child is here with me and she wanted to dress up as a zebra...

Working from home has its challenges during this period.

(laughs)

**Yes. My choice of the use of the camera in constant motion was
done on purpose to represent the topic and what it implies -
tourism implies movement.** Also, I see myself as the kind of
director that holds the camera over the shoulder. I didn't want
any static images or classic shots.

Scene 12

INT. LIVING ROOM

VANESSA

So there is a **concern of a cohesive narrative that also links the aesthetics of the visual footage**, right?

Scene 13

INT. NUNO'S OFFICE

NUNO

Regarding the visual aesthetics, I defined that before shooting. I did a treatment/ script about this where I wrote how I would approach the documentary visually. What kind of film shoots I wanted to have, for example I decided that the camera would never be still. Well, the camera is still only in one shot - in an interview we did to the mentor of the mosaic project in Conimbriga, but it is the only moment where the camera is in that format.

Scene 14

INT. LIVING ROOM

VANESSA

Did you rehearse any part of the documentary?

Scene 15

INT. NUNO'S OFFICE

NUNO

Yes. For example, Tiago had to re-do all the voice-over from the shots in the car because there was no quality of sound to keep the original one.

Scene 16

INT. LIVING ROOM

TIAGO

And all Sílvia's **narrations were also rehearsed** because of the **lack of script and disconnection of the narrative from the very**

beginning. She ended up narrating the text I said in the car during our trip, when the sound quality was not fair enough. But this voice-over/ narration process started with Nuno asking me: "Look, talk to the camera and explain or describe what is creative tourism."

Scene 17

INT. NUNO'S OFFICE

NUNO

Despite it being rehearsed afterwards, and parts of the speech re-utilised for Sílvia, it was super real and spontaneous because I turned the camera on, pointed it to Tiago and started asking questions in the most spontaneous way. That's when I started understanding the narrative thread I wanted to follow. In Sílvia's case, the narrations were all rehearsed and structured.

Scene 18

INT. LIVING ROOM

VANESSA

Narration seems to be a distinct component of your documentary, having objective voices intoned over footage, holding the weight of explaining this film's content. So, regarding documentary modes, I can identify the presence of the expository mode (Nichols, 2001) by its emphasis on rhetorical content, and its goals of information dissemination with what regards creative tourism.

Also, the visual footage functions to strengthen the spoken narrative where the viewer can see examples of creative activities happening. For instance, one can see that in the scenes of Caretos de Podence (masquerade men running), when a group of people was interlacing threads, or in the scene of the shepherd with his dog and flock in a field, or even when the old man was working reed, then a basket being done, a plate being painted, a family touring around, then again the iconic masquerade men shown again dancing around a fire.

This shift in your visual tactics gives rise to what Nichols (2001) refers to as "evidentiary editing," a practice in which **expositional images "illustrate, illuminate, evoke, or act in counterpoint to what is said...[we] take our cue from the commentary and understand the images as evidence or demonstration" of the narrative** (Nichols 2001, p.107). Meaning that **the engagement of rhetoric is done with supporting visual information founded in the expositional modality.**

Furthermore, in the **participatory mode** documentarists **"interact with their subjects rather than unobtrusively observe them"** (Nichols, 2001).

This interaction is present within this documentary for example when one sees Tiago Castro (narrator/ documentarist) actively engaging with the filmed situations, either by participating in the Idea Labs or in the pottery workshop.

With this footage, you **Nuno as a filmmaker, make it explicit that meaning is created by the collaboration between players, while sharing experiences between them, and stressing the actual lived encounter between all stakeholders.** As Nichols (2001) explains "what happens in front of the camera becomes an index of the nature of interaction between documentarists and subjects.

I can also identify **the performative mode.** Hongjian Wang (2016) stated that **this modality documents by reenacting the subjective perspective of the subjects in the documentary film.** By "performing" the point of view of the subjects, prompting the first to identify with the second. Tiago Castro both documents the events and also provides ethnographic reflections questioning the meanings about participants' feelings in relation to creative tourism. For example when he says:

"The researchers observed that participants (both foreign and Portuguese) were completely inspired by what they were doing. The most interesting aspect they noted was the connection that was formed between people, There was a friendly and familiar atmosphere in all workshops". Like this, **Tiago seems to create an open-ended, polyphonic space in which the participants are**

provided with the opportunity to define the meanings, messages, and understandings of what the topic - creative tourism - represents.

In general the performative mode of documentary is used to break from a monotone understanding not only through the use of dialogical principles of dialogical anthropology, but of experimental ethnography. In her book Looking Two Ways (1996), Toni de Bromhead claims that a documentary should reach for "hearts and souls not just minds" and that **central to documentary storytelling is "emotional response and empathy"**. For her, the cinematic is experiential, emotive, celebrates subjectivity and values the expression of opinion. Hence, the importance of including participants' testimonials, to add content to a topic that needs more clarification.

Scene 19

INT. NUNO'S OFFICE

NUNO

Yes, it seems that the creative activities have a great impact on community development (Tresser, 1996).

And I think that sums it up all regarding the structure we came up with along this year and a half of work.

Scene 20

INT. LIVING ROOM

VANESSA

But let's elaborate a bit more into the **narrators' voices**.
What do you perceive, Nuno? To whom do you think Tiago is speaking to?

Scene 21

INT. NUNO'S OFFICE

NUNO

In this case, Tiago was speaking to me but the way I see it, he is speaking to the audience. Because the one that is on the other side of the camera is the audience.

Scene 21

INT. LIVING ROOM

VANESSA

But at times it seems that Tiago is speaking to himself... For example when he says: **"I could eat something now"**.

Scene 22

INT. LIVING ROOM

TIAGO

It is a mixture of voices.

Scene 23

INT. NUNO'S OFFICE

NUNO

Yes and that's exactly why I think it came out beautifully.

Scene 24

INT. LIVING ROOM

TIAGO

Yes! Because I either speak to myself while thinking loudly, or I'm speaking to the hypothetical audience, because for example there were times that Nuno would tell me: "Ok, stop talking you are talking too much now. Cut. You don't need to explain that much".

Scene 25

INT. LIVING ROOM

VANESSA

But regarding Sílvia, it seems that she only speaks to an audience, as is explaining the experiences and describing dimensions of creative tourism.

Scene 26

INT. LIVING ROOM

TIAGO

No, she has several voices as well. When we understood that the audio of my shots as narrator was low quality and we had to re-do it, Nuno thought it was too boring to have only one narrator, a man in shades driving a car from the beginning to the end of the documentary narrating the whole thing...I agreed. So we concluded it would be more interesting in creating some kind of balance that is when we considered Sílvia as another narrator - a natural choice. She holds the "best" knowledge about the topic and she is a natural born communicator. And it worked very well!

The idea then was to create a bit more dynamic, meaning that while I was only driving the car, it was decided that Sílvia would be in different places moving around using different transportation means. We (Tiago and Nuno) thought: **"Let's make her take the train, the boat we only missed the hot air balloon."**

(laughs)

And just like that she seems like she is travelling around. That is why she appears walking in some shots, riding a bike and yes, that part needed to be rehearsed, as she didn't do it for many years and almost fell several times

(laughs)

Scene 27

INT. LIVING ROOM

VANESSA

I loved that part. It made me laugh because one could really tell she was a bit uncomfortable doing it.

Scene 28

INT. LIVING ROOM

TIAGO

The idea was also to have funny and goofy moments, for a more relaxed atmosphere.

Scene 29

INT. LIVING ROOM

VANESSA

But I still struggle with Sílvia's having several voices. I still don't see her impersonating other voices as a narrator, she was just shown in movement...

Anyway moving forward, from my perspective, **this documentary seems to have a very explicit topic centered story**, as it is set in motion with a retrospective about CREATOUR's team search for creative projects in Portugal, followed by an introduction given by the three narrators/researchers about the dimensions of creative tourism and the work of CREATOUR project. So, **the topic is immediately recognized and it is creative tourism, making it a topic centered story.**

Adding to this, the main researcher of the CREATOUR project - Nancy Duxbury - seems to expand the perception of the topic, by calling attention to the project's aim being **"more than a tourism project (...) connecting active participation, with travel (...) providing travellers with opportunities to learn about local cultures, artisanal and artistic techniques to exchange thoughts and ideas with local residents and creators, to have opportunities for self-expression"**. While this is being narrated by Nancy, some recordings of participants performing creative workshops are shown to the viewer. Also the narrator Sílvia Silva adds more content on the topic of creative tourism, when she states that **"Creatour's understanding of creative tourism involves 4 dimensions and these were the ones we (researchers) were looking for in the activities developed by the pilots involved, which are: active participation; visitor learning,**

creative self-expression, immersion in a new environment (in local culture, tradition and places)".

And how about the questions you asked the participants during the recorded activities, what was the process there?

Scene 30

INT. NUNO'S OFFICE

NUNO

When the people started doing the activities, we would wait for any moment where any of them would take a break, to approach them.

The questions to the visitors were basically these: What do you think about this creative activity? What does it mean to you? How did you feel?

The main purpose with these questions was to understand their feelings towards the activities and to inform the viewer about the content of the workshop.

It was very interesting to see how differently participants responded to these questions about the activities.

Regarding the artists or mentors of the pilots, the questions were: what is the workshop about and what do you think about the concept of creative tourism? What does it mean to you?
We didn't ask many questions or even other questions because this was mainly what we wanted to understand from them - the participants' feelings and the informative part from the mentors/artists end.

VANESSA

I think that the format of the interviewees responding to the questions without having someone asking them is more informal and seems to give a more natural flow to the story, but at the same time, it was a bit difficult for me to understand what they were

responding to...so thank you for clarifying us. It's important for the viewer to understand the questions, I think.

And today our time is up. We will continue exploring this part on the next episode.

Thanks for today!

EPISODE III: PARTICIPANTS' PERSPECTIVES

PERSONALITY TRAITS, FEELINGS AND LEARNING PROCESS

Scene 31

INT. LIVING ROOM

VANESSA

In the last episode we ended with the set of questions that were asked to participants regarding their perspectives on the concept of creative tourism and feelings about the creative activities. **Let's now watch their answers given in the documentary, to get a further insight about the participants.**

Scene 32 (CREATOUR DOCUMENTARY FOOTAGE)

INT. POTTERY WORKSHOP

Malin Löfgren/ Participant

00:05:02,520 --> 00:05:20,840

I do a lot of creative things: photography, filming, and such. But I wanted to do something more physical with my hands. I wanted to hold something in my hands. **Of course, you try and fail a lot, but that's how you learn.**

Scene 33 (CREATOUR DOCUMENTARY FOOTAGE)

INT. DRIVING A CAR

Tiago Castro/ Researcher CREATOUR and participant

00:05:21,920 --> 00:05:35,360

Not all the activities are easy. I'm thinking of that time, at Casa do Barro, in São Pedro do Corval, when I couldn't turn my wheel and mould the clay at the same time.

Scene 34 (CREATOUR DOCUMENTARY FOOTAGE)

INT. CLAY WORKSHOP

Ana Margarida Ferreira/ Participant

00:05:35,800 --> 00:05:51,960

It was much harder than I thought it would be, much harder to work on the wheel, to make something. From start to finish, the whole process, which is very technical and creative, is extremely difficult. That's why this art form is so important.

Marcelino Dores Paulino/ Artist, master potter

00:05:55,720 --> 00:06:13,680

It looks easy to centre the clay here, but it's not. **Clay is hard to centre, but there's a trick to it.** You learn to press your elbow into your hip to steady your hand, and the other shapes the clay.

Isabel Pereira/ Participant

00:06:14,240 --> 00:06:51,400

Watching the teacher with all that skill all that professionalism, I thought when it was my turn I'd do the same. **That's when you realise the time it takes to get that good when a technique is that hard to learn, but it's so good to try these things and at the heart of it, these initiatives value the practices, because if we don't, they disappear over time.** They're a way to go back in time when they had wonderful things.

Scene 35

INT. MY LIVING ROOM

VANESSA

A constant feeling that I noticed in these participants testimonials and that it was also said by you - Tiago - is that the activities were not easy to do.

It is very interesting to analyse that the participants' motivation during the learning process is set by the task difficulty and the value of the practice (which takes time to perfect and that is why it holds value). And at the same time, with the proper guidance to tell the "tricks", one is happy to reproduce the activity!

Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (2009) outlines the distance between what a learner can do without help, and what they can do with support from a "more knowledgeable other".

Santos and Silva (2016) asserted that craftsmanship involves technique and artisan work. The art of making objects is an “activity that requires physical and intellectual effort, as a logic that shapes objects that come from the imagination of individuals who have their knowledge rooted in everyday habits.

And in this process there is a series of values that bring together the creation of the artisanal object and the context in which it is produced” (p.111-112). I would also add that the artisan represents the context he/she is part of, contributing to the construction of his/ her cultural heritage.

In general, it seems that all participants took the difficulties of the activities as accepted challenges that in the end resulted in a positive feeling, either satisfaction of going through a **difficult learning process** along with a **feeling of nostalgia, of going back in time**, where things were handmade and therefore have more value (according to the participants perception).

From the participants’ statements, I can identify a relation between the task **complexity** and the feeling of **risk-taking** as a sign of courage exposing themselves and performing the activities.

Nevertheless, motivated participants that already recognize and value the knowledge, will encounter themselves at the zone of proximal development, that with the facilitator’s mediation, will encourage the development of the value of this learning skills and subsequently will encourage motivation and positive emotions in participants (Brophy, 1999).

Adding to this, Isen (2001) stated that a stronger emotion takes place when individuals face a problematic situation, and this emotion leads the individual’s attention to the new problem.

Therefore, when people pay attention to their own emotions, emotion helps them to internally decide the order of priority and allocate the surrounding resources according to that order.

Perhaps in the near future, a manipulation check could be done during creative tourism activities, in order to measure levels of difficulty in resolving tasks during the process of participating

in creative workshops along with the participants' emotional changes.

Scene 36

INT. LIVING ROOM

TIAGO

Yes, that could be a good idea.

I just would like to add that I think that the **“creative activities really seem to build the participants' ability to foster creativity, building bridges of communication between them” (Bresler, 2007).**

Scene 37

INT. NUNO'S OFFICE

NUNO

Yes, I remember that were people focusing their answers more on the activity itself, some others talking about the connection they felt with other participants..

I think that this documentary is important because in a way is “providing participants a voice” (Bresler, 2007) to express who they are, what are their feelings towards the activity and towards experiencing it as a group.

Scene 38

INT. MY LIVING ROOM

VANESSA

That's right. Tiago and the participants confirm in the documentary that positive interaction led to a stronger feeling of **human connection. This affirms the relevance of the social dimension within the process of creativity (Fischer et al.,2005).**

Let's revisit that in the documentary.

Scene 39 (CREATOUR DOCUMENTARY FOOTAGE)

INT. DRIVING CAR

Tiago Castro/ researcher CREATOUR

00:03:31,680 --> 00:03:54,720

We could see that both foreign and Portuguese participants were completely inspired by what they were doing. They were **curious**. **The most interesting aspect is the connection that forms between people**. There was a very friendly atmosphere in all the workshops.

TIAGO

00:12:30,680 --> 00:13:18,320

There's a party in the village of Faia, **where festival goers and local people come together**. It's very interesting to see this meeting between a traditional Portuguese rural culture and the urban, contemporary culture of the festival goers. Like, for example, Catharina in the Mondego Valley. It was interesting to **find more foreigners who moved to Portugal and that make up a cultural and artistic critical mass**.

Scene 40 (CREATOUR DOCUMENTARY FOOTAGE)

EXT. FAIA VILLAGE

Catharina Sligting/ Mentor of Estival da Estrela

00:09:02,920 --> 00:09:16,080

After a week spent together, **we became a family because there is no backstage. Artists become participants and participants can be artists**.

Scene 41 (CREATOUR DOCUMENTARY FOOTAGE)

EXT. FAIA VILLAGE

NEAR A BIG SCULPTURE

Marjorie Sloof/ Artist, sculptor

00:09:18,480 --> 00:09:57,640

It's like a Yoga pose and the flower head is growing towards the sky. My work is always about the **connection** between the earth and the sky. What we did last week was make a mosaic with Portuguese tiles. I also did that as a workshop. **The feedback I get is that**

a lot of people are grateful for being able to help me and I am so grateful to have them help me finish my work. People learn about what it is to make these big sculptures.

Scene 42

My living room

VANESSA

This is quite something! As Sternberg (2006) emphasises, the importance of receiving positive feedback about an individual's competence makes the learning situation more interesting (cf. Conti, Collins and Picarello, 2001).

Also, the learning community with a formed value system encourages the individual to increasingly active participation and to play a significant role in contributing to the formation of the participant's motivational predisposition (Schunk and Zimmerman, 2008).

Scene 43

INT. NUNO'S OFFICE

NUNO

I also remember this artist in Faia that if he would not have explained his workshop, participants might have thought that was simply a concert but the activity was much more profound than that...

VANESSA

Let's see that in the documentary.

Scene 44 (CREATOUR DOCUMENTARY FOOTAGE)

EXT. MUSIC WORKSHOP IN FAIA VILLAGE

Rámon Vangammeren/ Sound designer, musician

00:11:18,800 --> 00:11:50,800

This workshop was about the effect of sound on the human psyche. I am a sound designer and musician and we practice poetry via psychiatry. Or the other way around. We perform at the festival

and this workshop was about how I approach sound in a treatment with my patient, the poet. What kind of sounds I produce to make him feel certain ways and make him talk about his experiences more and better.

Scene 45

INT. MY LIVING ROOM

VANESSA

As Jurisevic (2006) mentioned, the professional competence of teachers for motivating people for creative behaviour presupposes complex professional knowledge. The one who is teaching has a dual role and it is interconnected on two levels: (1) on the level of learning content, as in the help and encouragement of participants in doing the tasks and (2) on the level of the forms of learning, as the motivation of participants for creative thinking and not for simply for reproductive learning, because the phenomena of motivation and creativity are interlinked in terms of content (Jurisevic, 2010).

From what one can see in the documentary, there are creative tourism experiences that seem to open "new drawers" of creative expression in our minds, showing that not all creative activities have to be traditional crafts, as Sílvia resumes. Let's watch.

Scene 45 (CREATOUR DOCUMENTARY FOOTAGE)

INT. VIC Aveiro Arts House

Sílvia Silva / Researcher CREATOUR

00:25:15,560 --> 00:25:31,080

Not all the activities we went to were related to traditional crafts. Creative tourism can also be modern, or even experimental, for example the activities we did at the VIC Aveiro Arts House.

Scene 45 (CREATOUR DOCUMENTARY FOOTAGE)

EXT. VIC Aveiro Arts House

Roi Carmeli/ Visual artist, musician

00:25:36,840 --> 00:25:59,680

The workshop is about kinetic sculptures and the possibilities of sound-making through analogue movement with different objects. It is very expressive and then take it through different pedals with different effects to create soundscapes. It is to play with sound, basically.

Scene 47 (CREATOUR DOCUMENTARY FOOTAGE)

INT. MUSIC WORKSHOP

Marlene Barros / Participant

00:26:17,560 --> 00:26:38,160

I think this experience opened another part of my brain that had never functioned before, or at least that I didn't know was there, so I was quite surprised with this sound factor. I think it opened up my head and my thinking, in that sense. I think it was really good.

Scene 48

INT. MY LIVING ROOM

VANESSA

Another detail I found is that a **personalized exchange of knowledge, in small groups during the workshops is also highly valued by the participants during their creative experiences**, as they can get more detailed explanations about the activities.

Let's see.

Scene 49 (CREATOUR DOCUMENTARY FOOTAGE)

INT. AT A LIBRARY, DURING THE NOISE PUPPETS WORKSHOP

Sofia Marques/ Participant

00:27:17,240 --> 00:27:54,320

We learned a bit about the electronic components you need to make a sound circuit. We learned to solder, we learned how to put the whole circuit together, with all the parts. And we ended up

with a sound circuit that worked, and made a few noises. It's interesting. I think it's a good way to do it with few people because it gives us more time to ask Martí questions and he would explain everything in detail. He's very good at explaining.

Scene 50

INT. LIVING ROOM

TIAGO

Yes, I totally share that feeling of proximity of being in a small group of people, allows a more personalised and stress-free learning experience.

According to Helena Catt (1999), "when part of a small group, communicating is less daunting and individuals are more likely to feel part of a process". Proximity is important for non-verbal communication, such as emotions, which are important to increasing empathy.

Scene 51

INT. MY LIVING ROOM

VANESSA

David (2003) explained that when one immerses in a social environment that respects and encourages a creative climate for participants' healthy personal development and for the realisation of their biologically given potential (self-realisation), this will make them more aware and will form a positive attitude toward creativity.

Throughout the documentary participants revealed a lot about themselves while engaging or choosing to engage in creative tourism experiences. There are more important statements to have to make us reflect further on this.

Let's watch.

Scene 52 (CREATOUR DOCUMENTARY FOOTAGE)

EXT. FAIA VILLAGE

Silvester Zwaneveld/ Comedian, illustrator, artist

00:11:52,480 --> 00:11:54,680

I am a stand-up comedian, but I am also an animator and
illustrator and my workshop is about illustrating comics. I
really enjoy being creative here in this country, because we can
enjoy the view, the food. **But I am always creative in my head
so I can't shut that down, I don't have to push it on my holiday.
It is THE holiday, so I am happier by the day.**

Scene 53 (CREATOUR DOCUMENTARY FOOTAGE)

EXT. COIMBRA

RIDING A BIKE

SÍLVIA SILVA (Researcher CREATOUR)

00:13:08,640 --> 00:13:33,400

Like Catharina in the Mondego Valley, **it was interesting to find
more foreigners who moved to Portugal and that make up a cultural
and artistic critical mass in these places in the interior of the
country.** Like in Vale do Ferro, in the municipality of Odemira,
we met a German couple: Helga, a jeweller and Walter, a sculptor,
and they organise workshops for visitors.

Scene 54 (CREATOUR DOCUMENTARY FOOTAGE)

EXT. VALE DO FERRO

JEWELRY WORKSHOP

Doris Difarnecio Mejia/ Participant

(First part) 00:14:29,800 --> 00:14:45,000

I can't stop smiling. I feel happiness,
**I am inspired deeply as an artist, as a person, as a human being.
To be here is happiness.**

(Second part) 00:36:19,040 --> 00:36:59,800

**We need each other. So this type of tourism is about bringing you
in and creating community. This is about who I am, this is what I
am, this is how I engage in life, in the world through an art
form, through a place, through how I believe**

and see the world, and I am moved. I am moved deeply. My partner got me these earrings here and now I move happily!

Scene 55

INT. LIVING ROOM

TIAGO

We were so lucky to have had people like Doris with precious testimonials that touched us to the point of triggering where to locate the scene in the documentary. For example, when we recorded Doris' testimonial, we just knew we wanted to close the documentary with a part of it (second part).

VANESSA

That testimonial also worked as a trigger for me. When I first watched the documentary, it made me think a lot about the identity of the person that chooses to engage in creative activities... Because this search of mine actually started when I wanted to understand the motivations of the participants. What makes them want to engage in these types of activities and so forth.

Several authors such as Amabile (1996), Gardner (1993), Torrance (2004) and Urdan (2007) emphasize the **individual's internal motivation as a personality trait that makes a key contribution to creativity**. On the other hand, Hennessey (2007) affirmed that in comparison with other **factors of creativity**, such as **knowledge and skills in a specific field**, motivation as one of the key factors of creativity is significantly more changeable in nature and dependent on the given situation or the **concrete learning context**. So it seems crucial to dedicate particular attention to analysing **creativity factors and human interaction** while performing creative activities.

Isn't it curious that we both had the same intuitive feeling about Doris? This makes me think about another dimension in creativity - intuition... Maybe it also plays a part in the creative process. But we will have to leave this hypothesis to another study.

(Laughs)

Thank you and see you again in your last episode.

EPISODE IV: FINAL REFLECTIONS

RESEARCH PROCESS, CREATIVITY AND CREATIVE PEOPLE

Scene 56

MY LIVING ROOM

VANESSA

Welcome to our last episode of this "season".

(laughs)

I now realise how much could be explored within this field. It is very inspiring to recognize that creativity connected with tourism is such a rich field of research, if one puts the stress in the people...

During the process of this research I fortunately grasped at an earlier phase that I had to find a new method, different from analysing the surveys, and move away from the idea of trying to measure participants motivations because I simply could not do it properly at this time. I felt the need to focus on people and for that I would also need close interaction with the participants like you had (Tiago) to be able to have more insight about their internal and external stimuli (Amabile, 1982) through an experimental study.

That is why I have used a different lens, to **combine findings of socio-cognitive aspects of creativity within the documentary and using this information as "the interactive interweaving of abilities, learning process and the environment, on the basis of which the individual realises the creative activities within a particular social context"** (Plucker, Beghetto and Dow, 2004, p. 90), while questioning the nature of creating and representing a **tourism reality through an art form.**

Scene 57

INT. LIVING ROOM

TIAGO

I want to bring back and reflect upon Doris's testimonial that
was very *sui generis*...

**It fits the studies that we developed until now in CREATOUR and
are not yet published...**

**She works in the art field, as a social worker and activist and
then her "condition" of interracial lesbian woman influences a
lot the way she approaches things in life** (this is what she tolds
us after being shot).

She came to Portugal to visit family members and she ended up
participating in a creative activity.

My impression is that the **people that participate in creative
activities always have a link to art and culture**, however small
it may be...Because in principle they have more sensitivity and
propensity to art.

VANESSA

That is an interesting add-on to this topic..

Strange & Mumford (2005) claimed that having **people with a wide
range of experience and a "colourful" background in the group
will contribute very effectively to enhancing creativity.**

Also, Conti, Collins and Picarello (2001) researched the
**influence of the role of gender and internal motivation in a
study of creativity and came to the conclusion that the social
context is the key factor for the stimulation of internal
motivation (concerning interest and satisfaction).**

This also made me think about **the "creative class"** brought up by
Florida (2002, 2012), where he found **relationships between the
creative class and the presence of LGBTQ communities as well as
"bohemians"**, explaining that a strong queer or "bohemian" presence
offers a propensity to gathering more creative types around a
place.

Adding to this, we can consider that **"tourists are performers"**
and that **identity can be constituted through narrative
performance (Noy, 2004)**. Furthermore, Langellier (1989, p.129)
stated that "the personal narrative implies a performative
struggle for agency rather than the expressive act of a pre-
existing, autonomous, fixed, united, or stable self". Thus, **the
participants' testimonials given in the documentary seem to be a**

site in which meaning – including that of the participant's identity - is being constructed.

VANESSA

Why do you - Tiago - as a researcher of CREATOUR, think is necessary to frame these participants and build up a creative tourist profile?

What did you perceive about this subject from your experience working with CREATOUR?

TIAGO

In that matter I consider myself an anti-researcher. I don't see the necessity of that.

VANESSA

My experience in this research process made me position myself with you on that thought.

For instance, Desforges (2000) and Meethan (2006) stated **identities are not single and fixed but multiple and malleable, so categorizing tourists in profiles may feel "unnatural for the self".** Tourism provides the opportunity for an individual to learn or try new role identities (Wearing et al., 2010), and narrating her/his experience allows her/him to reflect on what type of person she/he is (Desforges, 2000; McCabe & Stokoe, 2004; McCabe & Foster, 2006; Meethan, 2006; Wearing et al., 2010).

TIAGO

Yes, I am a dissonant voice in the CREATOUR team and the less educated, so I think the others (researchers) don't mind my opinion on this.

I think that when we try to determine a creative tourist profile, we are trying to segment creative tourism. Like the rural tourist, sun and sea tourist, etc. And the way I perceive it, **creative tourism is not another category of tourism. It is transversal and it is often combined with for example industrial**

tourism or any other. For example, one can embark on a nature retreat and at the same time, engage in one creative workshop. One can also choose sun and sea tourism and there's one creative workshop for the whole family to create something on the beach and they decide to engage.

It seems like in tourism research (or any other research field for that matter), **researchers always have to come up with definitions, almost like a box that needs to be ticked about the profile.**

VANESSA

But don't you think that happens because research teams need to provide the industry with results or for example, in the case of CREATOUR, to provide the mentors of the pilots with specific information, so that they can sharpen their communication to be able to attract and sell their products? At least this is my conclusion after working as a researcher in the CREATOUR project..

TIAGO

Yes, it is clearly that. It is very important that the mentors/artists of the pilots understand who wants to consume their products. In this sense, **the studies CREATOUR provides support them in finding out more about their target audience.** But at the same time, the problem is that many of them didn't define beforehand who their target audience would be while or before creating the product, making the activity for everyone. Then the communication of the product is dispersed.

VANESSA

I understand the mentors could have had a better strategy in relation to marketing and sales to target a specific audience before the release of the product, **but if we go back to our talk, when you mention that creativity is transversal and can be combined with other areas that are not artistic, I see a contradiction here.** When you said a person with an industrial background is interested in engaging in a creative workshop. I don't see how age, gender or artistic background is relevant for this case... And it becomes confusing to market this.

NUNO

I think that what usually happens is that there are creative people where their profession is not creative at all and then when on holidays, when they come across creative tourism activities, they see an opportunity in engaging in things that in the daily routines they don't have the chance to do. For example, someone that works in a factory, but at the same time likes to draw, or sculpt because they liked to do it as a child. I think in the creative tourist profile, the researchers should have the element of **curiosity**. I think each person's creativity might be hidden at times, because of life circumstances... Sometimes we think that people are not so creative because of what they work with, and end up being a big surprise.

TIAGO

For me that is the big question right there! And this could be a big discussion where we could dissect the whole educational system...

(laughs)

It (educational system) doesn't make people reflect and explore, but formats them to work in one field only doing specific tasks. For example, my father has always loved to draw, wanted to work as an engineer but could never make it. He ended up working 30 years in a bank and today he is a grumpy old man. But he is an extremely curious person... Another example, I am now watching the series *Genius* about Albert Einstein. He used to work in a patent office, which must have been a tedious job. Another example, Franz Kafka used to work as a public employee in a government department...

NUNO

Maybe that's why his work (Franz Kafka) revolves around bureaucratic struggles...

(laughs)

TIAGO

There are so many examples... For instance, Carlos Paredes (a well-known Portuguese guitar player) worked in the notary his whole life. **How many people don't have monotonous and repetitive jobs and these same people are extremely artistic or inventive?** But this is related to the economic system we have and it would be another long discussion.

VANESSA

And a relevant one, since it seems obvious that creativity could be encouraged and worked within a different educational environment...

Reber (1995) stated that **creative thinking** is characterised by **creative ideas, solutions and artistic expression**, and so Ryan and Deci (2000) identified the motivation of the learner by the following key factors: **(1) the knowledge and the learning represent an important value to the participant**. For example as we can confirm above, in Isabel Pereira's statement, she values the knowledge of pottery practice which was developed over a long period of time and the very practice of it, as it represents something culturally important, so according to her perspective, the execution of this art should remain active in people's memories and hands. **(2) The one who is learning wants to progress with his or her knowledge and learning competences**. For instance, Malin Löfgren does a lot of creative things and she wanted to do something more physical with her hands. Knowing that she would have to try and fail a lot, but as she said - that's how one learns. **(4) The learner believes that she or he can completely participate in the process of learning and if not, knows how to seek appropriate assistance**. Overall, all participants seem very satisfied with the workshop facilitator they had because there was a common personalised learning (good explanations of the activity in small groups). **(5) Both momentary successes and failures in connection with learning encouraged the participants to persist in active participation in the learning process and in achieving learning results**, as in Ana Margarida Ferreira's case, that sees the learning process as technical and creative and that is why it is important for her.

TIAGO

Yes, I think there is space for everything with CREATOUR pilot projects. For example, in the case of *Play Évora*, **creativity is stimulated not in the sense of creating an art piece, or with a cultural tour, but discovering the city with a gaming format.** This also presents an opportunity to explore how gaming and the stress felt while playing can stimulate creativity.

VANESSA

Definitely! It seems that the more we talk, the more ideas are generated! It is interesting to notice that.

But to conclude, what are your overall opinions of the contribution of the documentary for CREATOUR's research project?

TIAGO

This documentary as output of CREATOUR project has a lot of power because one of the biggest problems of the academy is not being able to communicate their research findings to society and/or having practical application of them.

There has been more and more knowledge written down, but it only reaches other researchers (and the ones that read it, right?). My main fight as a researcher is that I don't want to do research and write articles so that the papers will "seat at a desk" or be indexed in a journal, so then a few scholars only use it to skim and scan to get a few sentences that might support their thoughts. In the end, the amount of people that read your papers from top to bottom is very low, so that is why I ask myself what is the purpose of producing knowledge in the first place?

I conclude that if the produced research doesn't have practical use to society, it doesn't worth much. Many publications are done by researchers so that they can add more written items to their curriculum and attend conferences. My constant question is: how can a research that we do help someone in tackling a problem?

VANESSA

Yes, throughout my very short experience as a researcher, I also realized that there is a highly competitive environment with what regards producing research. And it is competitive not only towards fellow colleagues, but also at an individual level. It

seems that there is a lot of pressure in publishing knowledge, just for the sake of it. And in the end, this knowledge is "closed" in the platforms of prestiged publishers, not accessible to wider audiences and it seems that these factors contribute to the publishers acquisition of value - fed by competition between scholars and paid access. What I perceive is that if one is able to publish in a well established scientific publisher, this author is well acclaimed in his/ her scientific community. But what is really the use of the produced knowledge? And what about the wider community, the one that a researcher is studying?

This discussion is very relevant for my research, to support the purpose of the methodology I used.

The documentary is a visual method that is accessible for free on youtube and tells the story of creative tourism in Portugal and transfers the ideas of the action-research developed by CREATOUR and the diversity of activities created by its pilots, also showing the diversity of host communities around Portugal and the various types of participants. And this analysis format, also as an art method, creates a dialogue between all participants and the academy.

TIAGO

In my perspective when we watch the documentary, we end up identifying ourselves with it, being at the north, centre or south because **there is a human factor that is very present. There is complicity. A project with such a strong practical dimension demands the visualization of it, so it can be better understood.**

VANESSA

Yes, and is this human and social dimension that we need to keep examining.

Thanks a lot for the fruitful talk and I hope we can develop several points we touched here in further research and possibly create more videos to disseminate knowledge on this topic.

TIAGO

Yes, looking forward to that.

NUNO

I certainly hope so. It was very gratifying to learn more about creative tourism and next time I hope I can also be a participant and join the activities!

6 CONCLUSIONS

This section is divided into five parts. It starts by responding to the research questions: 1) How can the use of CREATOUR's documentary and my analysis of it through an arts-based research approach, contribute to the body of knowledge about creative people that participate in creative tourism? 2) What do the documentarists' voices (provided by the email questionnaire and skype interview) add to the framing of the "reality" of creative tourism in Portugal, through the documentary? 3) What knowledge can be added to creative tourism research by the participants (visitors, artists and researchers) testimonials in the documentary?

Since this knowledge is interconnected, the answers are not divided by paragraphs, but intertwined and combined. The chapter ends with recommendations for future work on the topic and limitations of this study.

This research aimed to contribute to the body of knowledge about creative tourism in Portugal. Although it only scratches the surface of studying personality dimensions of creative people, it shows that the creative tourism participants depicted in the video share the same cognitive and emotional factors of creative thinking and process. By developing a study that used creativity from a psychology stance, I could stress the relevance of how creative personality characteristics can provide a further insight about behaviours and motivations of creative people that engage in creative tourism in Portugal. At the same time, I found so many different angles in creative personality, that made me understand that each subject would require special examination. Throughout the analysis of CREATOUR's documentary and discussion of it, it became evident that creative people are composed by paradoxical traits (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996), bending and spanning the perception of creative personality. The participants showed an openness to experience, in terms of accepting both difficulty and joy during the learning process of the creative activity, they demonstrated the ability to combine playfulness and discipline, alternating between imagination and reality, being both humble and proud, innovative and conservative

about learning artistic skills and being able to produce an artistic object. Lastly, the participants also sparked my curiosity to further explore the influence of sexual orientation and bohemian lifestyle (Florida, 2002, 2012) in creativity of participants in creative tourism. I foresee that this path would unfold more information about behaviour, different types of motivations, meanings of self-expression, competition between genders, gender roles in creativity, creativity and gender fluidity, or even studying creativity in altered states of mind (by the consumption of alcohol, drugs, lack of sleep, among others). This seems to be an unexplored and rather taboo path interesting to examine, also because often creative types are frequently associated with these lifestyles.

According to the participants testimonials, knowledge, learning process, connection with nature and with the territory, human bonding, protecting cultural heritage skills and enjoyment seem to represent important values to them (Reber, 1995, Duxbury, 2019) in relation to their participation in the creative activity. Therefore, this could be studied by “zooming in” these values found in the skills and expressions taught in the creative workshops. There are also important aspects that stand out and cross these values together. For instance, most of the participants expressed their wish to move forward with their knowledge and learning competences (Reber, 1995), showing that by being exposed to failure and repetition they are able to learn and enjoy (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996) the end result. Both momentary successes and failures in connection with learning encouraged the participants to persist in active participation during the learning process and in achieving learning results. Another focal point found was that the participant knows how to seek appropriate assistance to do a task during the creative activities (Reber, 1995), as the relationship between master and apprentice in those contexts seemed to work out well for the participant in terms of receiving the “appropriate” help, with personalised learning and small group dynamics.

With this study I reaffirm my assumption that everyone has the potential to be creative, although this requires training, to provide the appropriate conditions of personal and social creativity development and environment. Creative people can be visual artists, event organisers, researchers, shepherds, welders, bakers, musicians, teachers, housewives, actors, engineers,

among many others. In this sense, this research reinforces the idea that creativity is something that can be cultivated and practiced (Lee, 2014). It is a “a process that unfolds over a lifetime” of a person (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996) and “creative personality traits allow for continued progress in society and research” (Kerr, 2009, p. 4). So, conducting research only based on gathering empirical data to build a profile of creative tourists, their motivations and behaviour, mainly through survey research seems to be a rather simplistic approach to understanding who these participants are. If the quantitative research approach's purpose is to inform the market about its audience to sharpening the creative product toward the “right” audience and make it prosper, by attempting to segment creative people it is firstly of all, perpetuating the assumption that creative people are a special group of gifted people, and second of all, it is constraining the opportunity and potential for creative development of a person, restricting this market with less people. With this I mean that if creativity would be encouraged and trained, perhaps creative tourism would become this collaborative platform of learning and interaction that it aims to be, with higher numbers of audience participating in creative activities. Creative tourism is extremely important for the development of places with a small population, because it demonstrates how one can create a new structure that is innovative for a place and its people, that might make visitors stay longer. As these visitors connect with the place and local communities, they build a different relationship with them, as well the locals shift their own mentality and their own relationship, with their own culture and heritage, wishing to protect and preserve it. Participating in creative tourism makes one question the way we relate to one another, and the way in which we accept others' differences as being a “good” thing. In this sense, art is an attempt to create alternatives and alternative ways of experiencing life. If art infiltrates our daily lives, it might provoke us to relate to each other in ways that we can express and create meaning together, working as a way to engage in the world and with others.

The usual thought that traditional activities (such as being a shepherd) are worthless and not interesting enough to be continued or shared, shifts with the practice of creative tourism activities, as they become a source of inspiration for artistic creation and value in terms of honouring the ones who perform these activities and see their hard work recognised. Ancient

arts and crafts tend to disappear, therefore it is important that the locals pass this knowledge on to their community peers and visitors, to revitalise local traditions. That is the connection that people look at in creative tourism: to feel like a person belongs wherever she/he is visiting and these local experiences feed the creative processes. Contrary to what one might think, creative tourism activities are not only about immersion in tradition and experiencing traditional arts and crafts. The viewer can confirm through the documentary that there is also a space for the contemporary, for the experimental. Space for being naive, but also smart, space for opening new parts of the brain and building up bizarre objects that challenge conformity of one's beliefs, one's actions and challenges reality as one perceives it as being "normal". Creativity defies the conventionalities about the meaning of reality, translating it as a subjective mental construct. In my perspective, the practice of creativity should be done as a continuous development and creative tourism could be worked as a long-life learning process platform instead of a recreational tourist activities platform for a specific group of visitors of a destination.

This might be far-fetched and hard to reach, as it implies progressive work with different levels of creativity to explore people's creative potential, along with an acceptance of fluidity and malleability of creative personality and a different approach in how to facilitate the creative activities.

My choice of using an arts-based approach is primarily connected with my concern to produce research that might be relevant, accessible, and useful. The documentary is an art form that expresses what is creative tourism and portrays the intricacies of what is being creative, while making meaning out of the creative experiences. Adding to this, this data is public - published on youtube - and accessible to anyone. This confirms that it publicly aims to communicate creative tourism, made visible by the art form of a documentary. By practising creative research as a form of knowledge production, this type of research – in terms of method, analysis/ discussion and outcome – as research in and through art practice is embedded in a specific artistic and academic context - creative tourism - where artistic research should contribute to the process of conveying and disseminating content that is enclosed in aesthetic experiences, enacted in creative practices and embodied in artistic products (Duxbury & Richards, 2019). I found that by using this type of

methodology I generated a deeper insight about creative individuals, by going beyond classical approaches of knowing to provide new perspectives of understanding people's creative experiences and views; and to centre the research in the people to potentially ignite a spark among different stakeholders that work within creative tourism to engage in further action of developing the activities around creativity and what it entails.

This aligns with the documentarists and director's aims for the making of CREATOUR documentary - to disseminate creative tourism activities in Portugal to directly involve different actors and to share their research findings with a broader non-academic audience. Hence, the documentarists' role was fundamental in framing and communicating the reality of creative tourism in Portugal, teaching the viewer what and how to see and think about creative tourism, while at the same time, generating public interest. By articulating the testimonials given in the instances of narration with footage of the activities, the documentarists constructed a site where meaning - including that of the participants' personalities - is being constructed. By answering the documentarists questions, the participants expressed their interpretations on the topic of creative tourism, so the testimonials work like a "glue" that brings the story of the documentary together. Furthermore, the documentarists voices gave a "thick body" to this study in terms of adding a human and social dimension to the process of conducting research. The purpose and impact of knowledge production in communities is a major concern.

In line with this, the screenwriting analysis was my contribution to develop a second stage of this research as a creative act of reflexivity. By recurring to a narrative mode of qualitative reporting data based on writing techniques such as creative writing, techniques of description and storytelling, I was able to deconstruct (with questioning) and piece together (with the answers coming from the documentary, interview and questionnaire) the sequencing of the 'actuality' (Grierson, 1933) of creative tourism in Portugal constructed in the documentary, while also allowing space for some fiction to entertain controversial perceptions about reality, to announce that it is flexible and under construction and therefore pointless to be enclosed in boxes of definition. Furthermore, the screenwriting as a mode of research works as an "invitation to

others to collaborate” (Schrader, cited by Hamilton 1990, p. 9), moving away from competitive authorship in academic writing. And in this sense, “the screenwriting also disrupts the idea that creativity is an internal and individual or solitary process” (Baker 2013a, p. 4), supporting my previous statement about how to approach creativity in people. I constructed and designed the screenplay in a way that it could work as a kind of an open working document, that allows multi-authorship and collaboration. Adding to this, it was also an individual opportunity to showcase my authorial ‘voice’ in its active form at the level of the text (Kara, 2015), that aims to challenge “the perceived neutrality of disembodied knowledge of tourism research” (Pritchard, 2007), emphasizing the presence of the researcher when analysing the results of tourism research (Palmer, 2012).

This analysis hopefully shows that the practice of creative tourism research would benefit from alternative methodologies and different inputs coming from different actors, since in my perspective, all voices matter and can contribute to a topic. Until now, creativity has been mainly used as a conceptual framework or tool for developing tourism from an economical perspective (Richards, 2013) and this has been hindering the relations between creativity and people at an individual and at a societal level. The constant focus on economics is inhibiting the potential of using this theoretical construct to encourage a more democratized knowledge practice in research, where the different participants can access, experiment and influence knowledge. In conclusion, a research is about solving problems, as is creativity and usually a research starts by attempting to resolve issues that emerge in communities, so the stress of this study is exactly here - to produce a research more centred on people, to foster a more horizontal collaboration and accessible communication between academy and society, which to some extent, is the aim of CREATOUR research-and-application project (Duxbury, Richards, 2019).

6.1 Recommendations for future work on the topic

This study calls attention to key aspects of creative personality, thinking and process put together in the literature review, accentuating the presence of a set of individual and social factors usually found in creative personalities. This set of features could be used in the future as a toolbox

analysis to better examine personality traits of creative people, identity malleability of the creative individual while experiencing this type of activities and doing so when interacting with others. By examining one's curiosity, complexity, imagination, risk-taking, motivation, fluency, flexibility, originality, elaboration, explorative behaviour, courage of exposition to failure and autonomy, the researcher could better understand who is the creative person. In addition, to further investigate the individual creativity happening in group dynamics, processes such as interaction, master-apprentice relationship, joint-thinking, problem solving, conversations, ideation conflicts, shared struggles, validation and also social aspects of personality traits such as being extravert or introvert, should also be taken into account to examine group-based creativity in relation to these working environments.

Since one of the biggest problems of the academy is not being able to communicate their research findings to society and/or having issues with practical application of them, the use of arts-based research as a paradigm could be further pursued in creative tourism research, especially applied in research projects that rely much in practice. This fits CREATOUR's case, since its pilot projects use different art mediums in their creative workshops and activities, and these seem to hold knowledge about their participants and about the different aspects of the cultural product they provide.

6.2 Limitations of this study

My understanding of the complexity of creative practice, with its double truths and paradoxical tendencies made me consider the validity of using the documentary as a method during the whole research process. Film is a medium that "draws on performance, draws on writing, image in movement" (Leavy, 2019) and raises a lot of arguments about its "actuality" (Grierson, 1933; Nichols, 1992, 2001; Cantine, Howard, and Lewis, 2000; Blanc, 2014).

In one hand, by recurring to arts-based research methods, one can add value when it comes to answering research questions that cannot fully be answered using more traditional research methods such as interviews or questionnaires (Cohenmiller, 2018; Dunn & Mellor, 2017; Franz,

2010; Kara, 2015). On the other hand, there are risks involved in using audiovisual methods, as for example, in this case, by using the documentary as secondary data (which was not done for the primary purpose of this study), I am limited to the documentary snapshots to gain deeper insight about the participants perceptions and personalities. Furthermore, the interpretation and reconstruction of the documentary can be misunderstood in the type of analysis I decided to construct. Hopefully these steps were well balanced with the documentarists' responses and my participation during the process (Vanoye; Goliot-Leté, 1994), to a point of perhaps being considered as a valuable add-on to the dissemination stage of CREATOUR research project.

Last but not least, since creative tourism is a recent multidisciplinary research field that includes different areas of knowledge, it requires the constant combination of different kinds of knowledge, calling for insights from areas such as sociology, psychology, anthropology, arts, education, philosophy of science, and many others, it was a very challenging puzzle to assemble in one piece, especially with what concerns division of topics by titles, since knowledge tended to cross and taking different shapes according to the angles in focus and therefore being extremely demanding to construct.

7 BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Al-Ababneh M. M. (2017).** Creative Tourism. *Journal of Tourism and Hospitality* 6 (2).
- Amabile, T. M. (1985).** Motivation and creativity: Effects of motivational orientation on creative writers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* (2). 393–397.
- Andreasen (2012).** Creativity In Art And Science: Are There Two Cultures?
- Andrews R. (2019).** Arts Entrepreneurship: Creating a New Venture in the Arts.
- Aston, J. & Gaudenzi, S. (2012)** Interactive documentary: setting the field. In: *Studies in Documentary Film*, 6: 2, pp. 125–139.
- Barnouw, E. (1993).** *Documentary: A History of the Non-Fiction Film*. New York, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bakas F. E., Duxbury N., Vinagre de Castro T. (2019).** Creative tourism: catalysing artisan entrepreneur networks in rural Portugal.
- Batty C., Baker D.J. (2010).** *The Screenplay : Authorship, Theory and Criticism*. Price, Steven.
- Batty C., Kerrigan S. (2018).** Screen Production Research: Screenwriting as a Mode of Research, and the Screenplay as a Research Artefact.
- Biggs, M.A.R. (2000).** Editorial: the foundations of practice-based research. *Working Papers in Art and Design*.
- Bresler L. (2007).** *International Handbook of Research in Arts Education*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Brown R.T. (1989).** Creativity. In: Glover J.A., Ronning R.R., Reynolds C.R. (eds) *Handbook of Creativity. Perspectives on Individual Differences*. Springer, Boston, MA.
- Bruzzi, S. (2000).** *New Documentary: A Critical Introduction*. London, England: Routledge.
- De Bromhead, T. (1996). *Looking Two Ways. Documentary Film’s Relationship with Reality and Cinema*. Aarhus: Intervention Press.
- Burbiel J. (2009).** Creativity in research and development environments: A practical review.
- Candlin, F.(2008).** A dual inheritance: the politics of educational reform and PhDs in Art and Design. In R. Hickman (Ed.), *Research in Art & Design Education*. Chicago: Intellect Books.

Carson, S. H., Peterson, J. B., & Higgins, D. M. (2003). Decreased latent inhibition is associated with increased creative achievement in high-functioning individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.

Carvalho, R., Costa, C. & Ferreira, A. (2019). Review of the theoretical underpinnings in the creative tourism research field. *Tourism & Management Studies*, 15(SI), 11-22.

Catt H. (1999). *Democracy in Practice*.

Chamorro-Premuzic, T. (2007). *Personality and individual differences*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Chamorro-Premuzic, T., & Furnham, A. (2005). *Personality and intellectual competence*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Chang L., Backman K., Huang Y.C (2014). Creative tourism: a preliminary examination of creative tourists' motivation, experience, perceived value and revisit intention. *International Journal of Culture, Tourism and Hospitality Research*.

Cohen, S. (2013). Reflections on reflexivity in leisure and tourism studies. *Leisure studies*.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. New York: Harper & Row.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1996). *Creativity: Flow and the psychology of discovery and invention*. New York: HarperCollins.

Dacy, J. S., Lennon, K. M. (1998). *Understanding creativity: The interplay of biological, psychological, and social factors*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Eysenck, H. J. (1993). Creativity and personality: Suggestions for a theory. *Psychological Inquiry*. 147–178.

Duxbury N., Richards G. (2019). *A Research Agenda for Creative Tourism*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

England, K. (1994). Getting personal: reflexivity, positionality and feminist research. *Professional Geographer*.

Feist, G. J. (1998). A meta-analysis of personality in scientific and artistic creativity. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*. 290–308.

Florida R. (2002). *The Rise of the Creative Class*.

Florida R. (2004). *Cities and the Creative Class*.

Florida R. (2012). The Rise of the Creative Class - Revisited: Revised and Expanded.

Gardner, H. (1993). Creating minds. New York: Basic Books.

Gazda E. K. (2002). Beyond Copying: Artistic Originality and Tradition. *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*. Vol. 1, The Ancient Art of Emulation: Studies in Artistic Originality and Tradition from the Present to Classical Antiquity, pp. 1-24.

Guilford, J. P. (1962). Factors that aid and hinder creativity. *Teachers College Record* (1962). 380–392. Martindale, C., Hines, D., Mitchell, L., & Covello, E. EEG alpha asymmetry and creativity. *Personality and Individual Differences* 5 (1) (1984). 77–86.

Gray, C. & Malins, J. (2004). Visualizing research: a guide to the research process in art and design. Hants: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Haller C.S., Courvoisier D.S. (2010). Personality and Thinking Style in Different Creative Domains. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*. American Psychological Association, Vol. 4, No. 3, 149–160

Hare D. (1965). The Myth of Originality in Contemporary Art. *Art Journal*, Vol. 24, No. 2, pp. 139-142.

Harris A.M. (2016). Video as a method. *Understanding Qualitative Research*. Oxford University Press.

Higgins-Desbiolles F., Carnicelli S., Krolkowski C., Wijesinghe G. & Boluk K. (2019). Degrowing tourism: rethinking tourism. *Journal of SustainableTourism*. DOI: 10.1080/09669582.2019.1601732

Ivcevic, Z., Mayer, J. D.(2006). Creative types and personality. *Imagination, Cognition and Personality*.

Kara H. (2015). Creative research methods in the social sciences: A Practical Guide.

Kerr B. (2009). Creativity, Gifted & Talented Education (general), *Sociology of Education*. Encyclopedia of Giftedness, Creativity, and Talent.

Landreman L. M. (2013). The Art of Effective Facilitation: Reflections From Social Justice Educators. Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Leavy, P. (2009). Method Meets Art: Arts-Based Research Practice. New York: The Guilford Press.

Leavy P. (2015). Method Meets Art, Second Edition: Arts-Based Research Practice.

Leavy P. (2019). Handbook of Arts-Based Research.

Lee K.H. (2014). Creativity Can Be Cultivated. In: Three Dimensional Creativity. KAIST Research Series. Springer, Dordrecht.

Marujo N., Borges M.R. (2020). The Creative Tourist Experience in the Alentejo region: A case study of the CREATOUR project in Portugal.

Matos O. P., Remoaldo P., Araújo Alves J., Ribeiro V., Gôja Carvalho R., Freitas I., Pereira M. (2018). Profile of creative tourist in north-western of Portugal: an exploratory approach to creative experiences. Conference paper - International Conference Cultural Tourism in Poznan.

Michelson, A. (Ed.) O'Brien, K. (Trans,) & Vertov, D. (1984) Kino-Eye: The Writings of Dziga Vertov. Berkeley & Los Angeles, California: University of California Press.

Nichols, B (2001). Introduction to Documentary. Bloomington & Indianapolis, Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Morellet, F. (2019). François Morellet. Dia Art Foundation.

Mumford, D. et al. (2010). Creativity and Ethics: The Relationship of Creative and Ethical Problem-Solving. Creativity Research Journal, 22:1, 74-89.

Nichols, B. (2001). Introduction to Documentary, 2nd Edition. USA: Indiana University Press.

Ord. T. (2014). Pushing deeper into other ways of knowing arts-based research.

Pearce, D.; Butler, R. (1993). Tourism Research – critiques and challenges. London, Routledge.

Prentice, R. (2008). Tourist Motivation and Typologies. (IN): A Companion to Tourism.

Rank, O., Atkinson, C. F. (1989). Art and artist: Creative urge and personality development. New York: W. W. Norton.

Ren C., Pritchard A., Morgan N. J. (2010). Constructing tourism research: A Critical Inquiry. Annals of Tourism Research 37(4):885-904.

Renzulli, J. S. (1986). The three-ring conception of giftedness: A developmental model for creative productivity. In R. J.Sternberg, & J. E.Davidson (Eds.), Conceptions of giftedness (pp. 53–92). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rhodes, M. (1961). An analysis of creativity. The Phi Delta Kappan, 42, 305-310.

Richards, G. (1996). Cultural Tourism in Europe. ATLAS, CABI, Wallingford: UK.

- Richards, G. (1999).** Developing and marketing crafts tourism. Tilburg: ATLAS.
- Richards, G. & Raymond, C. (2000).** Creative Tourism. ATLAS News, 23: 16-20.
- Richards, G.; Wilson, J. (2006).** Developing Creativity in Tourist Experiences: A Solution to the Serial Reproduction of Culture? *Tourism Management*, 27: 1209-1223.
- Richards, G.; Wilson, J. (2007).** *Tourism, Creativity and Development*. London: Routledge.
- Richards, G., Russo, A.P.; Grossman, M. (2008).** Cultural Corridors in South East Europe: Refinement of concept and development of pilot projects. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Richards, G. (2009).** Creative tourism and local development. Wurzbürger, R.; Pattakos, A.; Pratt, S. (eds). *Creative Tourism: A global conversation*. Santa Fe: SunstonePress.
- Richards, G. (2010).** Tourism Development Trajectories – From Culture to Creativity? *Revista Encontros Científicos – Tourism & Management Studies*, 6: 9-15.
- Richards, G. (2011).** Creativity and Tourism – The State of the Art. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(4): 1225-1253.
- Richards, G. (2012).** Tourism, Creativity and the Creative Industries. *Tourism Studies, Creative Cities, Cultural Tourism, Creative Industries, Creative Tourism*.
- Richards, G. (2012).** Tourism Development Trajectories - From Culture to Creativity? M. Smith; G. Richards (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Cultural Tourism*. London: Routledge.
- Richards, G.; Marques, L. (2012).** Exploring Creative Tourism: Editors Introduction. *Journal of Tourism Consumption and Practice*, 4(2), 1-11.
- Richards, G. (2014).** Development of experiences in creative tourism. C. E. Ong (Ed.), *Experiences & Environments*. Lecture conducted from Wageningen University, The Netherlands.
- Richards, G. (2014).** Creativity and tourism in the city. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 17(2): 119-144.
- Richards G. (2017).** The challenge of creative tourism. (in) *Ethnologies. Créativité et médiation en tourisme et en patrimoine*, Volume 38, Number 1-2, 2016, pp. 3-302.
- Rose, G. (1997).** Situating knowledges: positionality, reflexivities and other tactics. *Progress in Human Geography*.
- Ruby, J. (2005).** *The Image Mirrored: Reflexivity and the Documentary Film*. New Challenges for Documentary. Manchester, England: Manchester University Press.

Runco, M. A., & Albert, R. S. (Eds.). (1990). Theories of creativity. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Runco, M. A. (1996). Personal creativity: Definition and developmental issues. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, Vol.1996(72), pp.3-30.

Runco, M. A., & Pritzker, S. (Eds.). (1999). Encyclopedia of creativity. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Russ, S. W. (1993). Affect and creativity: The role of affect and play in the creative process. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Rydzik A., Pritchard A., Morgan N., Sedgley D. (2013). The potential of arts-based transformative research. *Annals of Tourism*, Volume 40, January 2013, Pages 283-305.

Selby, E. C., Shaw, E. J., & Houtz, J. C.V. (2006). The creative personality. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 300–313.

Smith, M.K. (2016). Creative Tourism. In Smith, M. K. *Issues in Cultural Tourism Studies*. 3rd edition. New York: Routledge. Pp.189-210.

Sternberg, R. J. (Ed.). (1988). The nature of creativity (pp. 325–339). Cambridge, UK, & New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sussex, E. (1972). Grierson on Documentary: The Last Interview. *Film Quarterly*. Vol. 26, 24-30.

Thomas K., Chan J. (2013). *Handbook of Research on Creativity*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Thomas R. Colin T.R. (2017). Analyzing Ambiguity in the Standard Definition of Creativity. *Avant: Journal of Philosophical-Interdisciplinary Vanguard*, Vol.8(S), pp.25-34.

Van den Akker W., Spaapen J., (2017). Productive interactions: Societal impact of academic research in the knowledge society.

Van der Vaart G., Van Hoven B., Huigen P.P. (2018). Creative and Arts-Based Research Methods in Academic Research. Lessons from a Participatory Research Project in the Netherlands.

Wallas, G. (1926). The art of thought. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Wang, Hongjian. (2016). “Documenting through Reenacting: Revisiting the Performative Mode in Chinese Independent Documentaries.” *Filming the Everyday: Independent Documentaries in Twenty-First-Century China*, ed. Paul Pickowicz and Yingjin Zhang, Rowman & Littlefield Publishers. pp. 153-165.

Wertheimer, M. (1945). Productive thinking. New York: Harper.

White A., Hillary E. (2009). Arts Development in Community Health: A Social Tonic.

Wilcox, A. C. et al. (2012). Storytelling in a digital age : digital storytelling as an emerging narrative method for preserving and promoting indigenous oral wisdom. *Qualitative Research*, 13:2, 127-147.

Worring M., Snoek C. (2009). Visual Content Analysis.