# FloodEvaluation

# Audience Focus Group Report

The following report summarises feedback from audience members who attended *Flood*.

Feedback was gathered via two focus groups facilitated by a Research Fellow from the University of Hull.

## Participant Profile

Both groups consisted of men and women, most living in Hull but some from outside the area. Most said they had been regular theatre-goers before 2017, and some commented that they would often travel to Leeds, Manchester or London to see performances.

There was universal support for the City of Culture programme and everyone, said their level of engagement with the arts had increased in 2017.

Everyone said they had seen all four episodes of *Flood*.

## Motivations

Participants had heard about *Flood* from a range of sources:

* Look North;
* Radio Humberside;
* Twitter;
* City of Culture website;
* Stumbling across the set being built at Victoria Dock.

There were also a variety of reasons why participants wanted to attend the live performance of *Flood*, the main one being their positive experience of watching *Part One: From The Sea*. Other motivations included:

* Curiosity after seeing the set being built;
* Twitter ‘buzz’;
* Auditioning to be part of it (unsuccessfully) and receiving free tickets as volunteers.

Some said they had been intrigued by the title *Flood*, because of their experience of the flooding in Hull a few years ago. Equally, some said they had initially been put off watching *Part One: From The Sea* because it brought back bad memories.

## Part One: From The Sea

*Part One: From The Sea* was received favourably by both groups. They felt it was dark and intriguing, and the short, simple narrative had grabbed their attention and left them wanting more.

“We just felt it really got our attention and drew us in the whole kind of mystery of it, lots of questions it posed and it sort of hinted at supernatural science fiction-y kind of thing. It was short and sharp, to the point, it didn't kind of drift about.”

Some said it had been a major reason why they’d booked tickets for the live performance elements.

“I saw the first film, the first part, and I booked straight away after that, I need to find out what part two is!”

The fact that it was available online, with the option of subtitles, made it easily accessible.

“We could watch it in our own time and place, which was good. It's a lot warmer than watching part two”

It was pointed out that *Part One: From The Sea* was only available online, although they recognised that the roadshow had been used as a way of reaching people without internet access.

## Parts Two (Abundance) and Four (New World)

The live performance elements were given mixed feedback from both groups. Interestingly, one group enjoyed *Part Two: Abundance* but were critical *of Part Four: New World*, whereas the other group were the opposite.

Those who liked *Part Two: Abundance* said it had been the most emotional and thought-provoking episode of *Flood*.

“It pulled it all together and you were just left there thinking this could be us and this is what we're doing to other people on our planet and I don't know. I was just completely immersed in the second one and really emotional and it just made me think for days afterwards”

The following elements were also singled out for praise:

* The *“absorbing”* plotline;
* The immersive theatre experience;
* The script, which contained words and phrases that resonated with audience members;
* The projections on the water;
* The spectacular visual experience.

The main criticisms of *Part Two: Abundance* were:

* Convoluted narrative – too many disparate storylines and themes crammed into one performance;

“There were bits of part two where I thought, if we’d cut bit of it out, like there was the guy with his wife and they split up, and if they’d cut that out, you’d knock half an hour off, it would have been a tighter, less distraction. It might have benefited from that.”

* Pretentious language;
* Lack of spotlighting (rectified in *Part Four: New World*) which made it difficult to see which characters were talking;
* A couple of people felt staging it at Victoria Dock was at odds with the intimacy of the performance.

Those who preferred *Part Four: New World* felt that it was more visually engaging and had a clearer narrative. There was a feeling that it was much more successful in exploring the main issues.

“There seemed to be a lot more coherent message with four.”

The main criticisms of *Part Four: New World* were:

* The florid, poetic language, which distracted from the narrative

“I found the language and dialogue so florid it was kind of difficult to take it all in, and I was really struggling to kind of get to the heart of what Part Four: New World was about really. I kind of had enough of the poetic-ness of it. I just really wanted to know a little bit more directly what was going on.”

* A couple of people felt there had been an unnecessary level of violence;
* The ambiguity of the ending, although some liked that it left the audience with questions.

“I expect an answer after 4 episodes.”

Both groups admired the technical aspects of the live performances.

“I think for me it was technically ground-breaking because I haven't seen quite a lot of the effects that they used ever before, when they were beaming video onto water. And the fact that it all went off and I didn’t notice anything go wrong, it might have done, but I didn’t see it, that was astonishing.”

A summary of the positives and negatives for the live performance elements are shown in the diagram below.

\*Some people felt, retrospectively, that the cold weather had actually contributed to the immersive theatre experience.

“If it had been a nice evening it probably wouldn’t have worked quite as well.”

## Part Three: To The Sea

*Part Three: To The Sea*, the televised performance broadcast on BBC2, was the most poorly-received episode. Despite the same location at Victoria Dock, there was a feeling that it lost the immersive theatre experience that had been so integral to forging the emotional connections that audiences had made with the performances in Parts Two and Four.

“I have to be honest. I switched it off. It just didn't engage me at all in the way that the live play had done. I felt that it kind of ... It was dealing with some really complex issues about morality and ethics and politics in the world, their migration, and in the play, I felt captivated by completely drawn in and moved and really emotional and really challenged as well like my own values. I just didn't get any of that sense in the TV thing.”

There was agreement that it didn’t work as a standalone piece; viewers would have been confused if they hadn’t seen Parts 1 and 2, and those who had seen the previous parts and missed *Part Three: To The Sea* would have been able to pick up the storyline immediately in *Part Four: New World*.

Participants also compared *Part Three: To The Sea* to *Part One: From The Sea*. Both had been produced for the small screen, but there was a feeling that *Part One: From The Sea* was much better suited to this medium.

“There was nothing actually added that you couldn't have got by just doing it live anyway.”

They also felt that *Part One: From The Sea* was far more mysterious and intriguing, and the use of the cabin made it feel much more claustrophobic, which again was suited to the small screen. On a practical level it was pointed out that the camera was too narrow, which prevented viewers from seeing the full scope of the production.

On a positive note, *Part Three: To The Sea* could be enjoyed in the warmth of people’s homes and its availability on iPlayer made it widely accessible.

Overall there was a sense of disappointment and frustration that the opportunity to reach such a large audience had been squandered.

“Anybody else watching it on the TV from any other part of the country would've thought, what's all the fuss about?”

## Flood Microsite

There was limited awareness of the *Flood* microsite. Those who hadn’t heard about it said they would have liked to use it, and a link should have been sent to all audience members when they booked tickets. Another suggestion was to promote it more widely on social media.

Those who had visited the site said they had found the content to be interesting and extensive. Some said it had helped to build the excitement and anticipation between each part, which was important given the length of time between each one.

## Overall

*Flood*, as a whole, was described in the following ways by participants:

* Different
* Unusual
* Perplexing
* Thought-provoking

A number of participants identified similarities with Noah’s Arc and Lord of the Flies.

There was agreement that, narratively speaking, none of the episodes worked as a standalone piece, although each one could be enjoyed as a spectacle.

On a practical level, there were a number of things would have improved the audience experience of the live performances:

* Offering the option to use monoculars in both parts;
* Encouraging certain performers to project more and spotlighting those who were talking;
* Allowing audience members to move around, which might have stopped them feeling so cold;
* Providing more places to lean;
* Trimming the length of the performance.

## Themes

The storyline was seen as slightly confusing because of the range of themes that had been shoehorned into it.

Participants felt that *Flood* dealt with the following issues:

* Environmental issues / climate change;
* Human behaviour / self-preservation;
* Fundamentals of political systems / society;
* Migration / refugees;
* Love and loss;
* Tolerance.

Some drew parallels with topical events such as Donald Trump’s attitude to climate change, and the European refugee crisis.

*Flood* was interpreted as an exploration of intrinsic human behaviour, which showed that social groups tend to form around the same, fundamental principles. This appeared to resonate most strongly with participants.

“It was more about the behaviours of people for me, it was more about if you were put in this situation, what would your behaviours be and thinking about that and about the refugee and all of that. That was what hooked me in I guess, it was less about the story but more about the underlying messages.”

As mentioned above, however, the general consensus was that *Flood* had attempted to address too many issues at once, which made it confusing and difficult to follow. This lack of focus, along with the structure of the performance, explains why no one said they had changed their opinion on any of the issues presented.

“I didn't think it was sufficiently well written to challenge, the ideas were there but I don't think the actual plot and the way the whole thing was structured and put across, you almost felt like it was a tick box exercise.”

# Summary

* *Part One: From The Sea* was given universal praise. Participants were engaged by its succinctness and its simple, engaging storyline, which acted as an effective ‘hook’ for audiences. They also enjoyed the dark, mysterious tone, and the claustrophobic setting of the ship’s cabin.
* *Part Two: Abundance* was given mixed feedback. Some felt the narrative was convoluted and the language was florid, which made it difficult to understand the issues that were being presented to the audience. This was compounded by poor projection and a lack of spotlighting on performers who were talking (addressed in Part Four). However, those who enjoyed it said it had been the most emotional and thought-provoking episode.
* *Part Three: To The Sea* was generally the least popular episode. There was a feeling that the production team had failed to capture the exciting, immersive nature of the live theatre that audiences had experienced in Parts Two and Four.
* *Part Four: New World* was also given mixed feedback. Some felt it had been more successful in presenting the main issues because the storyline was easier to follow, and there was a sense that it was the most visually spectacular episodes. The main criticisms were the level of violence, the florid language, and the ambiguity of the ending.
* With regard to both live performances, participants had never seen anything like it before. However, one of the overriding memories was feeling cold, and some audience members struggled to stand in one place for such a long period of time. The distance from the stage and the use of headphones also made audiences feel slightly disconnected from the performance.
* Despite limited usage amongst participants, the *Flood* microsite was given positive feedback for its interesting content. Those who’d used it said it had retained their interest in between episodes, which was important given the long periods of time between each episode. It was suggested the website could have been promoted more widely on social media and targeted at audience members at point of sale.
* None of the four episodes were seen as standalone pieces because the narrative was too firmly intertwined across them all. However there was agreement that they were all visually engaging in their own right.
* Participants felt the main theme was human behaviour in the face of adversity. Some said it had prompted them to consider how they would act in certain situations, and how they might treat others.
* Other themes and issues identified by participants included climate change, migration, democracy, love and tolerance. There was a strong feeling, however, that *Flood* had attempted to address too many issues, which made it difficult to explore each one effectively. As a result, the production hadn’t influenced how participants felt about the issues presented.

# Appendix: Focus Group Transcripts

## Group 1

Cat: Okay, so housekeeping, the toilets are if you come out of this room and turn left and walk to the middle of the building, and there on the left hand side. The men's unfortunately is out of order. So they're in exACTLY the same places either in the floor above or the floor below. We're not expecting any fire alarms this evening so if the alarm sounds, then we must leave in an orderly manner. And ... Yep. Please help yourselves to refreshments as we go along, so feel free to come and go as you please.

So yeah is there any questions or shall we get started? Okay, so if we go round and everybody sort of introduce yourselves. Just your first name, and we've got a little ice breaker question. So how would you describe your normal theater going activity. Not like in 2017, but before then. So I'll start. My name's Cat, and I love to ... Well Catherine, but I love to go to the theater, and I don't get the chance to go as much as I like to, so 2017's been great for encouraging me to get out and see things a bit more often. So who wants to go next?

Vicky: I'm Vicky and I don't really know how to answer that. I go to the theater quite a bit but I've certainly gone a lot more in 2017, and I've loved all the heritage fishing industry. The Triple Trawler [inaudible 00:01:48] blocker, all those kind of stories. So theaters and performances.

Brian: Yeah, I'm Brian and I'm quite a keen theater goer. I probably go about four or five, six times a year. Been doing that for quite a few years. Quite a bit in the West End, but also love the theaters like York and Leeds when I can.

Leanne: I'm Leanne. Again I really enjoy going to the theater. I go often, but I'm quite a safe theater goer, so I go to the more traditional theaters again rather than in the Guild Hall or on a floating platform.

Chris: I'm Chris. I go to the theater quite a lot. I also do drama myself, and I've loved fishing and concerts [inaudible 00:02:43] being lots of different kinds of drama that you don't see and like in the Guild Hall.

Rachel: Hi I'm Rachel and I like to go to musicals or plays at the theater and I've just been to see Hedda Gabler for the first time and I thought that was very good.

Kathlyn: I'm Kathlyn. I don't usually go to the theater particularly much, more because I'm not very good at going to places on my own and I don't have many people to go with but I've recently kind of fallen in with a group of people that like to go more often so this year I have been going more often, partly because I'm pushing myself to and partly just because I'm going with friends and one of my friends is an actress. So I'm seeing her shows as well.

Colin: I'm Colin. I tried going to the theater don't get ... Other than this year, I haven't been out in the theater a lot. Maybe three or four times a year, but would travel to say London, Leeds, Manchester, to see something specifically that I wanted to see.

Andy: Hi, I'm Andy, and I love live performance, so not just theater. I like performance whether it's music or ... I've just come from Land of Green Ginger sort of place in [inaudible 00:04:12], so anything involving live performance and not TV.

Sheila: I'm Sheila, and I love going to the theater and I go to a lot of music things as well. My daughter is a musician so both my kids have always loved the theater as well, so I've always been involved in level theater ... When I was in Coventry, I was a friend of the theater, and I started going to Hull [inaudible 00:04:42] when it was Hull Center for the Arts when I was at school. So, I have been involved with that all the way through. I've loved this year as well, except I've been spoilt for choice and I've not been able to go to everything I've wanted to go to 'cause I haven't been able to get tickets. I went to see The Hippocrate in Stratford because I couldn't get tickets to see it in Hull.

Chris: That's a shame. I didn't get tickets to that either.

Vicky: Well I did and it was fab.

Sheila: Well, it was worth going to Stratford.

Rachel: But you have to jump so early to get them.

Man: Isn't that great the fact that somebody [inaudible 00:05:18] subscribe-

Rachel: Oh yes, it's fantastic yeah. Yeah, it's brilliant, yeah.

Cat: Okay, great. So have we all seen all parts of Flood? Has anyone not seen any of it? Has anybody not seen all the parts of it?

Great, so we've all seen all of it. Brilliant. That makes the questions a little bit easier. So how did you first hear about Flood, anybody?

Sheila: It was social media.

Kathlyn: Look North.

Cat: Look North?

Andy: Via Twitter. The City and Culture. Twitter camp.

Woman: Hull City and Culture website, I think I saw it first.

Cat: And did it sort of stand out in comparison to some of the other things that they were advertising around that time?

Chris: Well it was Slung Low, and I quite often go to Slung Low.

Colin: I have been to a couple of some of the things before and they're so good. That caught my eye. So looking for that.

Andy: Yeah I saw the video on YouTube and it caught my attention straight away so ...

Cat: So how many people have seen something from Slung Low before?

Just two. And so you'd watched the video and that sort of introduced you to ...

Andy: Yeah.

Leanne: I think that was the same for me. I think I saw something on social media linked to the City Culture, and then I watched the youtube and it just looked so unusual and different so I managed to get a ticket.

Rachel: Yeah I watched that first and then I got a ticket and decided I wanted to see them all.

Kathlyn: I saw the article on Look North on the local news where they'd been talking about the first day that they took the caravan round and I thought that looks just really kooky. So that made me go look for the video and when I saw the video I just thought, there's something about that that clicks with me so I set my alarm to go look for tickets as soon as I could.

Man: Yeah and I frequently walk on Victoria Dock sides and seen them throughout the year like rehearsing etc, and building the set and everything. So definitely haven't seen that many half-sunken caravans in the city.

Leanne: The caravan story I'd forgotten about that 'cause I have a youngish son and he saw that and then he asked about that and what was in the caravan. So again, that was just quite a, gimmick's not the right word but I can't think of the right word. It kind of drew you in straight away and then he asked about that again so then it stuck in my-

Chris: It's like a hook isn't it?

Leanne: Yeah. It was.

Chris: Yeah. That's exactly the word.

Leanne: Yeah it probably was a hook, so yeah. It just stuck in.

Colin: That's a visual term for an [inaudible 00:07:57].

Leanne: Yeah.

Colin: I think there's certain things they've done very well this year where they've got people's attention, which is ... I mean there's no sign of the deep. Don't know if anybody's seen [crosstalk 00:08:13]-

Woman: Can't wait for that.

Colin: For the December's vision on the time of the Deep. Yeah. It looks- [crosstalk 00:08:19].

Kathlyn: But there's been a few things over the year like that.

Andy: I was attracted by the title.

Cat: The title?

Andy: Yeah. As someone that has been flooded it resonated I think with me so I was intrigued by it from that moment.

Kathlyn: Do you know I haven't clicked with that all till then but yeah. I think ... I mean I wasn't living in the city then but I know a lot of my friends extended ex in laws and such were. Yeah.

Cat: So what was it that made you buy a ticket then?

Kathlyn: Like I say, I went to watch the video after seeing the piece on local news, but there was something about the feel on the video. It just ... At the start of ... Well not the start of the year. At the end of last year, I sort of made a promise to myself because I'm really ... Back up a bit. I have quite severe ... Well, moderate to severe chronic depression and I find leaving the house at times very difficult. In fact, some weeks I find leaving the bedroom very difficult. And part of trying to push myself and trying to improve is just pushing myself to leave the house and I was determined not to let this year pass without taking part in whatever I can.

And so I made a promise to myself that I was gonna do something free everyone month and something ticketed every other month. And when each section of the program came out, I looked through it to see what resonated with me and what I really wanted to try and get tickets for. And this was something that just struck a chord.

Cat: Yeah. Yeah.

Rachel: It was slightly different for me because first of all, I was asked as a volunteer, it came up on my webpage and it asked whether I wanted to go and audition to be in Flood. So that's how I first heard about it. And I auditioned for that, but I wasn't chosen. And then later on, a lot of volunteers were offered free tickets to go and see it so that's how I came to see it.

Cat: Right.

Vicky: I was in part 2 as a volunteer. And we spent a full Saturday ... Now I'd not heard about it until then ... I'd skimmed over it. It had not really struck with me at all. And we went for a workshop, Costa workshop. We went to Part 2, and it was, right do you want to be involved in Part 2? The platforms weren't put out yet. They were in the process of building them, and that was really interesting so I then went back and watched Part 1 and thought yeah this is really exciting.

Cat: Okay, so you didn't watch it. You ...

Vicky: No. It was sore in. No my grandparents were flooded and it devastated them so I didn't want anything to do with flooding. It was not a memory I wanted. And that put me off, yeah. But it was just billed as a workshop on our volunteer profile page. So I went on to that and then I liked the whole story of migration and not fitting in and things like that really struck a chord with me and I thought, wow, yeah this is deeper than just like some flash flood. It's got a real hidden meaning. Slung Low were fantastic. They are amazing. They're such exciting and enigmatic people to work with that you can't turn an opportunity like that down. So I'd missed the first part. I'd missed that.

Chris: And you'd be disappointed not to be in it.

Sheila: Yeah. I didn't get offered it at the volunteer. I was wondering why I wasn't offered it. I would've done it if I'd been offered.

Cat: So how about when you'd seen the first part? What was it that sort of made you interested? What made you want to see Part 2?

Chris: No I saw Part 1. I saw the video. But then I saw Part 2, Part 3, Part 4 altogether because I couldn't get in to see ...

Cat: Oh okay.

Chris: Part 2. So I saw the whole lot apart from [crosstalk 00:12:44].

Rachel: Yeah I saw the video. Then Part 2, and then I went to the omnibus and saw them all through again, which was great to see them one after the other.

Chris: It was. Yes.

Woman: Whereas I did see it spread over the year.

Andy: Well I'm quite passionate about climate change. Recall doing about man-made climate change in geography back in the 1980s, and I still find it incredible that we have a president of the United States who actually denies climate change and we live here at sea level, and it literally is at sea level. At high tide the city is below sea level. So the idea that we literally live in a world and a society where people can actually deny that we're completely altering the climate of the planet is unbelievable.

Rachel: It frustrates the life out of me because I'm an ex-science teacher and it annoys the life out of me because people completely ignore evidence.

Andy: You mean physics and mathematics? That's your argument.

Rachel: Naturally.

Andy: But yeah, I actually feel very passionate about it as I have children, and hopefully one day I'll have grandchildren and it'd be nice if they have a world to live in.

Vicky: It's worrying when you think-

Andy: Although the planet will be fine, it's just humans might not be here.

Woman: We have lots of flood experts who live on higher ground outside of Hull which is worrying.

Andy: Yeah, that says it all.

Rachel: Which I kind of can't blame them for really but still.

Cat: So in addition to Flood there's been a special website that's been developed. Have any of you seen it?

Kathlyn: I had a poke around.

Group: No.

Woman: I had a look.

Cat: Have you heard about it or ...

Group: No.

Cat: So how did you hear about it?

Kathlyn: Via the web ... In between Part 3 being on the TV and waiting for the tickets to be released, Part 4, I was kind of poking around on the website on 2012 ... 2017, can't get my teeth working. 2017 website and I was just looking to see when the tickets were going to be released actually and it was sort of, oh and by the way, here's the gallery and here's the podcasts, and here's the link to this and here's the link to that. So I just had a poke through everything that was there.

Vicky: Oh yeah I've seen it. Yeah.

Cat: What do you think then? What did you-

Rachel: There was a lot of interesting extra stuff wasn't there?

Cat: 'Cause there's lots of backstories and sort of ...

Rachel: Behind the scenes things and it was just a lot of interesting extra things. Now it's been a while, a few months since I looked at it, don't get me wrong.

Cat: Did you visit it frequently or did you just have a little look and then that was it?

Rachel: I had a good look then, and then I had another look just after I bought the tickets 'cause I didn't really want to have a good look until I knew I'd got the tickets. In case I didn't get them and got crossed.

Cat: So for those of you who haven't seen it, what do you think would've been the best way to get the information to you that there was a website? How would you have found ... what would have been the best way to inform you about the website so that you were aware of it?

Woman: I'd say [inaudible 00:16:05] with tickets.

Group: Yeah. [crosstalk 00:16:07]

Woman: Or when you get your confirmation that there's [inaudible 00:16:08].

Man: Just relaying with confirmation, yeah.

Andy: And social media.

Group: Yeah.

Andy: I just found out so much this year from the Twitter account.

Rachel: I think some of it was actually on the ...

Woman: Main ...

Rachel: The monthly email.

Colin: Was it? I didn't see it.

Rachel: But it was kind of tucked away at the bottom a bit.

Cat: So if you'd been aware that the website existed, would you have had a little look into the backstory and yeah?

Colin: Oh yeah.

Woman: Yeah. I like there's a lot for you to see.

Cat: So it's flood ... 2017. And there's some really nice stuff on there actually. I was speaking to ... I don't know. Well you'll know Brett.

Woman: Yeah.

Cat: Yeah Brett recorded everything start to finish. He interviewed all the volunteers. One of the volunteers won a GoPro when we walked through it one time and he got a lot of footage.

But it's just amazing the sort of backstories like I say and ... so like one of our volunteers was chronically scared of water and in the last part drove a boat to get us all to the island.

Kathlyn: Oh wow. That's brave.

Cat: Yeah. He's been really supportive all year.

Woman: That's really [inaudible 00:17:38].

Rachel: Was it not on that Google page?

Woman: May be gone now.

Man: No, it's there.

Cat: There we go. So ... Thinking back to when you first looked at the online part which is Part 1, how would you describe ... Well, yeah, the whole of Flood, how would you describe it to someone else who hadn't heard it or seen it?

Rachel: Different. Unusual.

Colin: Perplexing.

Andy: Noah's Ark for the modern age.

Group: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah.

Andy: But it's biblical too. End of the world.

Woman: Eerie.

Sheila: I thought it was very much a story about migration though and about groups and survival, and how you get [inaudible 00:18:48] within groups and out groups and I've been teaching psychology for years and it fitted with loads of the different theories about what happens when people are in a crisis situation and ...

Vicky: What would you do?

Sheila: How different groups emerge and leaders emerge and conflicts and support and cults and all sorts of different things. So I thought it was incredibly thought provoking. It wasn't just about a flood. It was about what's happening now in the world with migrants. Floods of people.

Brian: What is it? 6 million migrants and refugees last year. By 2030s it's going to be about 700 million. Where are they going to go?

Sheila: And it was interesting to look at it from the perspective of northern Europeans traveling to another northern European country so not that much different to us but still ...

Kathlyn: Well no different by the end.

Sheila: Yeah, well, yeah. Just language, that's all.

Kathlyn: No I mean some of them were no different. They just had a different outlook.

Chris: I thought Part 2 was interesting in that it didn't give you an answer. It showed what would happen. It showed what different people thought about what was happening, but it didn't give you an answer. And I think that is much more thought provoking than a play that says this is [crosstalk 00:20:41].

Brian: This is the ...

Andy: Far too often we're told this is and answer and it's black and white and it's not.

Rachel: It raised an awful lot of questions and it's very thought provoking.

Kathlyn: The whole thing certainly made you think the whole time you're watching it. I mean you had to be on the ball.

Rachel: Personally I would've liked to know the answer. I don't like where it's left hanging.

Andy: I think I agree. It felt ... Well by Part 4, was that the last live feed? Yeah. If you're trying to explain to somebody else, I think I would explain it by saying that it seemed deliberately confusing and that frustrated me by the end of the sequence.

Kathlyn: And yet I found the end really quite uplifting and hopeful.

Colin: Well that's what climate change will bring. It will deliberately confusing. There is no answer, but there is.

Man: [crosstalk 00:21:35] absolutely.

Rachel: I expect an answer after four episodes.

Colin: I don't think that was just the central issue for me. I think there were more questions than just the climate change thing. I think it was more about the interaction of the people or tribes, let's call them.

Vicky: Yeah but it was meant to make you feel uncomfortable, wasn't it? To question your own morals and question what you would do in that situation.

Colin: I understand that. Yeah.

Vicky: So were asked, you know, would you let people in to your own home. Would you let the next person behind. At what stage do you stop and on what are you judging that person?

Colin: I wasn't expecting a Hollywood or Disney ending. I still believe that the piece didn't resolve anything for me.

Kathlyn: There were a lot of hanging loose ends, but I think there were also quite a few ... a lot of story lines tied up as well. For me, it felt like there was enough of the key parts tied up that it felt a complete piece, but there was enough hanging that you knew that these people had a future. So that's to me what made it feel hopeful, particularly with bright lights to the end. But that could just be my reading of it 'cause I got the feeling that a lot was in ... a lot of how you felt walking out was to do with how you read it.

Colin: Yeah I think what they were really showing was human beings actually just behave the same way every time, and every time you restart, social groups get together in pretty much the same way and for the same reasons. And virtually all of the choices they make are compromised so you have those, I think three groupings that are the touchy-feely's, the spiritual group, the hard-line fascist group and then this other group that's trying to be somewhere in the middle as a political system, almost like a democracy, but none of them were actually working better than what we've got. So I think in terms of getting an answer, you're expecting a lot because I don't think human beings are a species [crosstalk 00:23:47].

Woman: Not the answer yet. We're still looking.

Colin: We'll always be [inaudible 00:23:51]. So you're never going to get an answer like that. The answer is, carry on tomorrow and do your best. You look at what the options are and try and pick the best fit.

Cat: In terms of there not being an answer, it's interesting; each of the four parts was supposed to be a stand alone piece. So you were supposed to be able to see any of them without any of them. Do you think they worked as a stand alone piece? Any of them? All of them?

Colin: Yeah, I think so.

Andy: The one that disappointed me the most was the third part, BBC one. It didn't show the true scale of the whole production.

Woman: I agree.

Andy: I thought it was very narrow.

Colin: I can barely remember that one.

Andy: Yeah exactly.

Woman: I was going to say exactly the same thing.

Andy: Which just speaks volumes.

Woman: I can remember more about the others, but I can't remember-

Colin: Could've gone from two to four and not feel as though I've missed anything.

Kathlyn: My partner didn't come to any of these with me. I went with my uncle to the second one and my uncle and my aunt to the fourth so the only one she saw live was the last part. My partner, the only part he saw at all was Part 3 and he could pick up enough that he could see what was happening. It was a complete story for him, but there were enough questions there that he wanted to ask me what had happened in the other two parts, which I thought was an interesting mix. There wasn't enough that he wanted to come to the last part with me because it wasn't his kind of story or his kind of event, but he said that there was enough in that program that he could see what was going on.

Leanne: I have to be honest. I switched it off. It just didn't engage me at all in the way that the live play had done. I felt that it kind of ... It was dealing with some really complex issues about morality and ethics and politics in the world, their migration, and in the play, I felt captivated by completely drawn in and moved and really emotional and really challenged as well like my own values. I just didn't get any of that sense in the TV thing.

Woman: I did feel more immediate than other [crosstalk 00:26:23].

Leanne: Some of the really complex issues and I just felt that was a bit of a shame because it didn't translate to the screen. I mean I can't imagine how hard that must have been to try and do that, but it just didn't translate to screen the way the play's live audience. It's just you felt so moved and so part of something and I can't really explain it.

Andy: That's what I mean by enjoying live performance. I really find TV so dull now. I very rarely watch any TV at all now. It just doesn't interest me. I'd much rather go see a live performance, whether it's music, anything.

Cat: So did you watch Part 3?

Andy: Oh yes, yeah. I watched Part 3 and that's why I say I found it the most disappointing part of that.

Woman: And yet it was all done in the same basement.

Rachel: So we waited to watch that as a live performance.

Andy: But it didn't show the scale of the whole fold and that [crosstalk 00:27:24] the problem I had with it.

Vicky: I agree. We were looking for anyone in Part 2 went to see Part 3 actually in Victoria Dock so we saw it as live piece and it was beautiful and it totally lost it on the telly, I agree.

Andy: Anybody else watching it on the TV from any other part of the country would've thought, what's all the fuss about?

Vicky: Yeah. Yeah absolutely.

Andy: Is that it about City and Culture, yeah. Whatever.

Kathlyn: Is it strange to say that they almost had the camera too narrow? It was the difference between watching through the monocular to see just one person or watching the whole piece with your own eyes. They almost needed to zoom out and see that these people were just floating on a small platform a bit more.

Cat: Can't take away the wow factor of that [crosstalk 00:28:11].

Vicky: Yeah, and it made it safe, didn't it? Having a screen.

Andy: But how much was that to do with the TV production and them being told this is how it's going to be?

Kathlyn: Yeah, oh yeah. I'm not saying it has to do with them.

Andy: On TV, this is how we're doing it. You don't have any choice about it so ...

Kathlyn: Absolutely, I'm not saying it's their choice but that I think is what made it feel, not wrong, different. And yet it didn't feel like that with Part 1 because it was set in such a small space. Cabin trawler is supposed to be small.

Andy: Why did that work and the other, Part 3, live forms did not work?

Kathlyn: Because the cabin of a trawler is a smaller space. And they were only in that one set. And [crosstalk 00:28:50].

Woman: It was very short as well. And it was very mysterious and it really got you thinking and questioning and things.

Leanne: The hook back to the ...

Woman: So it was very ...

Kathlyn: But the third one, it was longer wasn't it and ...

Woman: And it had more people.

Kathlyn: A lot more going on, and it was less personal yeah.

Colin: I don't think you could've predicted the rest of two and three and four from one.

Group: No.

Colin: I actually thought it was [crosstalk 00:29:19] I know it was played up as an alien, but I thought it was going to be more sci-fi than natural disaster at that point.

Chris: I thought about Part 1 paranormal because there was hardly any dialogue in it at all and that I think made it more mysterious. That you know they were confronted by this woman and the fact that they didn't have a dialogue made it more mysterious, I think.

Kathlyn: Although those characters didn't really speak ad great deal anyway through the others. It's not like change the characters it's just by having that limited cast and that limited space in that limited time was almost a snapshot. So it didn't feel, I'm going to say role, but that's not what I mean. It didn't feel as out of step as Part 3 did compared to 2 and 4.

Cat: So those of you that have looked at the online content, did that help at all or did it, do you think that it added or did it take away from the experience or did it give you any extra insight into the story?

Rachel: What do you mean by the online content. Is it just this?

Cat: No it's ...

Rachel: Because I read that before I went to see it.

Cat: There are some interviews with people.

Rachel: Oh I see.

Cat: And things like that. Like [crosstalk 00:30:50] various soundbites and stuff, yeah.

Rachel: Oh. Oh yeah I can see. Yeah. It's ...

Cat: Yeah, so these are sort of.

Rachel: Yeah.

Cat: Do you think that it added anything?

Kathlyn: I found them really interesting. For me they certainly built up the excitement. Looking forward to seeing the last part kind of tide you over between parts. Yeah I really enjoyed looking through them.

Vicky: I liked it 'cause being on the stage you get a totally different feeling to like what you guys are seeing.

Kathlyn: You won't see what other people are doing.

Vicky: I'm the red at that end that isn't even looking towards it. Yeah.

Woman: I can see it.

Vicky: If I see it from another part is, yeah. It was nice to sort of see what other people were feeling about it.

Colin: Can I get your autograph.

Vicky: [crosstalk 00:31:53] Oh I'm published in a book and everything it was brilliant. But it was ... 'cause that's the part where I've been talking about how the migrants, they're white, every one of them. Everyone's like could you [inaudible 00:32:05] that. It was an odd experience being able to read through the script and things. It allowed you to really reflect on it and sort of question your own choices and what would I do in that situation and some bits really were shocking. Really were shocking.

Kathlyn: We were just saying before people came in because you've got a copy of the script with you and I brought a copy of the script on the night when I gone to see Part 4 and it's almost like you realize how much you missed when you go through the script again because there's so much to take in and so much with the music and ...

Vicky: Yeah you get emotionally involved don't you but then you maybe miss something that's said or a little comment that actually really gives detail.

Kathlyn: By the song.

Vicky: Yeah. Yeah.

Kathlyn: And there's just so much to take on board, but if you read through it again or you look through the gallery or the bits and pieces on here it gives you a chance to just take things in a bit slower.

Vicky: Yeah. Definitely. Definitely.

Cat: So now that it's ended, what was your most favorite thing about Flood?

Andy: You mean apart from the cat with a flame thrower?

Woman: Possibly on my Christmas list. I need one of those.

Oh yeah.

Andy: I actually preferred out of all the parts, Part 2. Just simply the interaction between characters and there was probably more of a storyline to Part 2. [crosstalk 00:33:37].

Woman: And the use of [crosstalk 00:33:38] as well.

Andy: Well its platform was more visual.

Chris: Yes I think having watched part 1, 2, 3 and 4 together, I [inaudible 00:33:52] Part 2 better.

Woman: Yeah.

Andy: Was the woman who played the ex British prime minister was that really supposed to be Tony Blair? Dragging us into a war in the Middle East. Maybe it was wasn't it? Even if it was Tony Blair.

Leanne: Yeah all that's coming back to me now. I remember being in Part 2 just being so absorbed in it all, trying to follow the plots and the ... but completely immersed in it and I found it quite emotional the second more so than the last one. I don't know it's a very unique kind of experience wasn't it that really ... I think it pushes [crosstalk 00:34:35] boundaries and I think it pushed you, if you're that kind of person think about stuff then I think it pushed you to really think about your own position. And some of it was so challenging, some of the stuff you were thinking about, you were kind of like, oh my word I might've done that or I might've [crosstalk 00:34:55].

Cat: My father was a refugee in the second world war so ...

Leanne: I know there was so many good hook lines as well, and I remember this one bit and they say about "my heart is abundant" or something like that, and I could not get that out of my head because ultimately it's about love as well isn't it so it's about love and about loss and it's about migration and displacement. What would we do if that was us and with all the ...

Woman: What will we do.

Leanne: Yeah. Yeah and then when the end of that one ... Sorry I'm going on a bit.

Cat: No it's great.

Leanne: The end of that one when the flood was in Hull it just brought it all to such ... It pulled it all together and you were just left there thinking this could be us and this is what we're doing to other people on our planet and I don't know. I was just completely immersed in the second one and really emotional and it just made me think for days afterwards, and I can remember the quotes that some of the characters had said. One of the actors I'd seen in a few other things. So the guy, the young man who has the relationship at the end ...

Chris: Yeah, he's in middle of [inaudible 00:36:10].

Leanne: Yeah he's in middle of [inaudible 00:36:10]. I've seen him in other things, but I don't know it really stuck with me for quite a time.

Vicky: When you said about Tony Blair and things, it made me stand there and think have I already watched this happen? Have I already ... Has this when they talk about choking people with phosphorus and bombing the desert and things. And I thought oh my god have I sat through this already.

Andy: Plus this is all taking place in the backdrop of a Syrian civil war.

Vicky: Have I already ignored this once? Is it just a go around again like when you said Bill start again and they're all in separate tribes but we're still all making the same mistakes. We were all like oh my god, we've sat through this once and we're playing it out in front of us. Are we gonna sit through again?

Kathlyn: And it echoing again with the videos in Part 4 and then her filming right at the end [crosstalk 00:36:57] with the same videos.

Vicky: From Part 2, so we finish with the same words from Part 2. He's filming [crosstalk 00:37:03] and they talk about the city in the sea.

Kathlyn: Then Part 3 echoing that. Yeah.

Vicky: Are the first words you hear in Part 2. They're pretty much the last words you hear in Part 4.

Kathlyn: Yeah. And the echoing with the poems from Part 3 and 4 and there was a lot of that. Foreshadowing and then repeating and motifs and stuff.

Rachel: None of them were things that you could go to sleep straight after.

Group: No.

Rachel: You need time to decompress after each one and a few days to process and none of them were things you could forget straight away.

Sheila: It was very political. So the person that I went with who isn't as political as me, and I don't mean in a sense like a political party, but the messages were very political. What's happening to the world on a global scale, so my friend that I went with said, "oh yeah, it's really good" and she enjoyed it, but I don't think it had the same impact on her that it had on me.

Rachel: Whereas I'm the other way. I went with people who have always been more political than me. Not to say I'm blind to it. It's just that they've always had stronger views and different views.

Sheila: But my husband all the love stories and was quite disappointed at the end because nobody got their love story because the fisherman and the prime minister should have been together. The two girls should have been together. Sam should have got his girlfriend-

Rachel: Everyone ended up with one half dead [crosstalk 00:38:31] or disappeared.

Sheila: And that was his sort of take on the whole thing. But then they got the happily after didn't they?

Rachel: [crosstalk 00:38:36] And you know, life.

Sheila: And another thing really kept the love and loss and life, which kind of is life isn't it.

Rachel: Yeah but you don't know how many other that weren't featured did get their happy endings.

Cat: Did it make an impact on anyone else? Is any other main impacts?

Chris: Yeah I think one of the main impacts was the wilderness. They put people in the wilderness and those kind of tent things were very very evocative of refugee camps. Of the Calais camp.

Kathlyn: It was very-

Chris: And it was very moving. And very evocative and the fact that these people thought that the girl from the sea was going to rescue them and you knew and she knew that she wasn't was very very moving. I think that's possibly the one thing that has stuck more than anything else from what I remember.

Brian: Was it the fact that they all had belief or that many people had belief in her as being their savior?

Chris: Possibly. Yes.

Brian: And it resonated because she knew herself and, as we knew her, said she was not able to do that.

Chris: Yeah and no one person can be a savior in that scenario. They were expecting too much because they were desperate. And this desperation came across really well, I thought. And the desperation of the people in the city, as well, that they knew it was going to happen to them and the two desperations, I thought, were very well done.

Brian: But when you are dispossessed in that way, it's very easy to see how people wanted, needed something to believe in or cling to or some belief, if you like, and that was the overriding message for me. I went away with I guess it isn't rocket science that we're all ... I'm not trying to get into a discussion having faith or anything of that nature but it was very easy to understand that people very quickly in their relative positions needed and wanted something to believe in, whether that was a savior or however else [inaudible 00:41:23].

Chris: There's a need for hope wasn't it?

Brian: In a sense. Optimism, yeah.

Woman: We're all kind of programmed that way.

Brian: We are. But when you have nothing and it's cold as we all were on the side of the ... It was freezing when I went both times but, yeah.

Woman: The wind'll go through you.

Brian: Yeah, but that was part of the experience. At least it was quite [inaudible 00:41:43].

Kathlyn: It was also the flip side that it must be her fault because you've got something's happening here we don't understand so we need some way to explain it.

Brian: Blame the refugee. Blame the migrants. [crosstalk 00:41:53].

Woman: Well yeah, or ... [crosstalk 00:41:57]

Brian: Yeah. Or the Jews. Or the muslims.

Woman: Or god must be punishing us.

Brian: Or the Irish.

Andy: Yeah. Yeah.

Rachel: You know, it's, again, a very human to look for some way to rationalize something that we can't understand.

Chris: Except that we as the audience could understand it because [inaudible 00:42:20] already been through it once and been flooded again so in a way we as the audience could understand it. We just don't want to think about it so we don't.

Woman: Yeah but there's also this kind of semi paranormal big wave and the rain that kept coming and the kind of [inaudible 00:42:45] flood.

Brian: But that was my experience. It was the second flood where I got hit.

Vicky: Yeah, my family, too.

Brian: Which was very different to the first experience, just going back to the actual floods in Hull. I'm not saying that either is better.

Chris: Oh no.

Brian: But I think that the thing for me along with everything else is the fact that within a few minutes your life can be in a very very different place, very very quickly. And I think that was the thing that kept coming back to me is that these people although they had nothing were working together in most instances, trying to create something. It was very quickly taken away, if you know what I mean. And that can happen to all of us right now. So that was a bit for me very moving. It's still difficult to think about.

Cat: Anyone else a main impact or anything else to say about?

Rachel: Well in Part 4, I didn't like the execution. I think there should've been some kind of disclaimer for anything violent because it was a show you couldn't bring your family to. But the good thing about having the head phones [crosstalk 00:44:01]-

Brian: It was pretty strong stuff. I was very surprised. Not too upset.

Andy: I think it was described as 12+, wasn't it?

Group: Yeah it was.

Woman: And at that time of night ...

Colin: [crosstalk 00:44:12] demands of a 12 year old.

Brian: Well it was very small [crosstalk 00:44:15] stuff.

Woman: Not really coming because it was bedtime.

Cat: Were you offended?

Rachel: I found it upsetting, but what would happen with the head phones you could take them off which is what I did so that was quite good to detach yourself for a bit.

Woman: If you needed to, yeah.

Cat: What did everybody else think? Was it too much or was it necessary? Was it ...

Colin: I think it was a necessary part of the storyline.

Sheila: I found it distressing but I think it was an important part

Rachel: It's supposed to be.

Sheila: of the whole message really.

Brian: Again it's really what human beings are capable of.

Sheila: Yeah.

Vicky: Could've been other allusions of death all the way through it whether it was death that we'd already caused ourselves or death of the migrants. It's just another form of death. And to me it was do you choose one death over another and is one more palatable than another?

Chris: I think so. The [inaudible 00:45:13] was more palatable.

Rachel: I found it really moving as well the loss of the baby and the fact that she thought that the girl from the sea was the reincarnation of her daughter that had died, and I thought that was incredibly moving because that feeling of loss and trying to recapture it, that relationship sort of is a thread all the way through, isn't it. For me.

Leanne: The one I found most distressing was, did the father kill the son?

Group: Mm-hmm (affirmative). Yes.

Leanne: Because he had been caught and ... So I agreed with what you had said about a family that's doing something quite distressing. I think some of us didn't care for it but necessary 'cause that's what we're doing to each other at the moment all over the world. But the father and the son on that, I don't know, that really got me.

Kathlyn: I almost understood. Well, not understood. I could see why the son was asking the father to do it. I thought it was very selfish of him, but I found him a selfish character for all of it.

Andy: It had been building for some time that, I think with the whole relationship between the father and the son.

Kathlyn: So I could see how that happened. I could see how it came about. I did think it was sad, but it came to that point, but I could see how it came to that point. It kind of made sense in the context.

Vicky: Complicated human relationships and the way they play and all ... yeah. Definitely. You're right, whoever just said that. Death, life and loss is the whole way through really, isn't it?

Cat: Is there anything else people didn't like? What was your least favorite part of it?

Rachel: The pain in my back from standing in the cold for so long. I really really struggled with that. I've had two hip replacements, but I don't qualify as being disabled, but I can't stand still for long periods of time and my husband was with me and I was trying to lean against him because we didn't get a place near the railing either so it was really difficult when we saw Flood 2. I was in a lot of pain by the time it finished. When I went to see Flood 4, my husband didn't come back for that reason because of ... But I went back for the omnibus thing and I said if I can't do it then I'll just go and sit in the marquee. We'll see how it goes, but one of the volunteers brought me a chair. She found a chair for me and so I sat near the railing. So I was okay. But I thought it was better when it was Flood 4 because they had that platform with the railing as well.

Brian: That's right. They probably should have learned from 2. Yeah.

Rachel: So they'd obviously learned from it. So it's much easier to stand because there were more places to lean, and the people that were on the platform could see over their heads and below them, so they weren't leaning in front of them. So I think that made it easier, but I mean I was sitting on the chair for the second one so it was better for me, but there were people standing close to me. Quite young people, and this young woman must have been in her 20s, said to her partner, "My back is killing me," and I thought yeah. I can empathize with that 'cause mine was too. It's a long time to stand still. And it would've been easier if we'd have been able to walk around and watch from a different side and then walk back and watch again so that we kept moving. But actually standing still for a long period of time is quite painful.

Woman: Yeah.

Brian: 30 Miles' other productions are what they call promenade.

Woman: Yes.

Rachel: I mean I went to Blood and Chocolate at York, and you're walking around the whole ... [crosstalk 00:49:07]. It's a lot easier having it like that.

Woman: Yeah, I've been to things that are like that where you move around and it's easier for me.

Rachel: But I really struggled with Flood 2, but Flood 4 turned out fine. And the omnibus because I was able to watch 2 again because I had the seat, so that was good.

Chris: Mine was just ... because it was cold we went for a drink and something to eat and so we missed a lot of Flood 3 in Market because they weren't getting the drinks and the food out as quickly as they could've done I think. So we actually missed quite a lot of the interlude and [crosstalk 00:50:02]. I was not mattered very much.

Sheila: I was lucky I was right at the front of the queue, but the pie stall, he hadn't opened up when we all came through, we were stood there queuing and he was still opening up so.

Chris: And then we can't ...

Sheila: He wasn't ready and he needed more staff as well.

Chris: They needed more staff.

Sheila: But the coffee was inside the marquee. I think they should've had the pies inside the marquee as well. It would've been a lot better because you could've watched while you were queuing.

Group: Yeah.

Kathlyn: I was going to say it would've been nice to have the monoculars again because I've got really quite poor distance eye sight and so being able to have the option to zoom in during the second part was great. I didn't use them all the time. It was nice to be able to see the whole piece. But to have the option to use that to ... I mean binoculars I'm no use with because I have one eye so different to the other, but to have that option to be able to see, but then they weren't there for Part 4 and while it was really good to see the whole piece, I know that it was certainly the middle of the three that I was furthest from, and I know there was a lot of action that I missed. I could hear it all, but I couldn't see what was happening a lot of the time because my eyesight's so poor.

Colin: Yeah, I'm inclined to agree. I think it goes beyond that for me though. I think particularly by the end of Part 4, I found the use of language and dialogue for the action that you are so remote from, I found the language and dialogue so florid it was kind of difficult to take it all in, and I was really struggling to kind of get to the heart of what Part 4 was about really. I kind of had enough of the poeticness of it. I just really wanted to know a little bit more directly what was going on. For me, that's what I was trying to say at the beginning. It was a bit perplexing and it felt it was almost too much and deliberately so.

Kathlyn: It's really hard work.

Colin: I found it towards the end of Part 4-

Kathlyn: You was almost ...

Colin: I was losing it because it was so far away from me. We couldn't see it very well, and I, like you, can't see that well far away. So, yeah. Anyway.

Kathlyn: And for that point I found the parts of the video that were projected in some ways more immediate even though they were supposed to be the parts from the past or the past that were remembered, in some ways were more immediate than the action because I could see them better. But I know what you mean. It was almost using the language to obfuscate the message at times.

Colin: It felt like that, but to me I may be alone in that thought, but ...

Kathlyn: No, I know what you mean.

Leanne: I was less connected to 4 than I was with 2.

Brian: I was.

Leanne: There was more of a, I can't describe it, but like a distance, I think. So I wasn't as immersed or I wasn't as emotional and you can look back and think, oh was that just how I felt on the day or I don't know, but there was more of a, yes I struggled to understand 4 compared to the overall message in 2. Still great, but there was a difference.

Vicky: Yeah, 4 was more graphic. When we nailed someone to a door and they put someone in a suit and flooded in and he drowned and then we-

Rachel: There were explosions and there was flame throwers, but ...

Leanne: I think you might have something right about the language.

Kathlyn: The language with some of it and not being able to see and not feeling like you were in it because with the monoculars in Part 2, if you saw Part 2. I don't know if you had them if you went to the omnibus or not.

Rachel: No.

Kathlyn: Oh right because when you went in the spring you had a monocular and you could use it to zoom in on whichever actor you wanted to see, and you could be there, but you could open your other eye or take it away and you could see the whole thing.

Cat: I think they decided to not use them second time round because so many people complained and didn't like using them.

Kathlyn: It was so brilliant. It would've been so nice to have the option if you wanted them.

Chris: I would've liked them.

Kathlyn: Because I felt, certainly for me, it helped feel a part of what was going on. I think i would've struggled feeling part of Part 2, had I not been able ... Had I had just my usual eyesight to rely on, but ...

Cat: So how do you think about the ending? How many people liked the ending?

Just one.

Woman: Yeah I liked it [crosstalk 00:55:02].

It gave me lots ...

I was thinking it's not pleasant.

I already comment which is why I put my hand down.

Colin: It's quite difficult after all that brutality to come away thinking, I like that. I thought it was satisfactory. I thought it was a reasonable ending. I mean a lot of people have had a crack at sort of portraying the end of the world and the end of civilization and how do you overcome it. There's been two or three television series along the same lines about how we would go with that, etc., and I think they did a pretty good job as well as putting in the fact that it's now about ecological disasters rather than something else. So I think they did a good job. You can't expect a playwright to come up with absolutely the answer to anything. I think it was quite good.

Kathlyn: Like I said earlier, I actually found it quite hopeful.

Sheila: Yeah I think I did. I like you I agreed that the use of the light was really good.

Kathlyn: Not just that but things like the girls recording and looking to the future by recording the history and things like the people who were most damaged by the events taking themselves together but just apart. Things like starting to see the seeds of society rebuilding. I found it ... I could see a future in it.

Sheila: I liked that it didn't come to an end. I liked that there was still some left to go [crosstalk 00:56:52]. If they had all died and that had been it, I'd have been really disappointed. I'd have been [crosstalk 00:57:01] fuming. Yeah.

Kathlyn: I hate that kind of thing.

Vicky: I liked that there was somewhere to grow with it and to see how different groups of people would've reacted in different ways. I liked that, yeah.

Cat: So now we've got an option to do an exercise about some of the themes that we've looked at so what it would be is to write down on a post it note. So if everyone can take a post it note and write down what you think is the most important theme, and don't share it with the person next to you.

Man: Just one single [inaudible 00:57:40].

Cat: Yeah. One single theme.

Brian: Champagne?

Chris: I find it quite difficult to choose one.

Woman: I know.

Whoops, sorry.

Cat: If anyone needs to use the facilities or please have more tea, coffee, cake.

Rachel: What happens if we write more than one?

Sheila: A shot. You get to have a shot.

Brian: Sorry what am I writing?

Cat: What do you think was the main or most important theme?

Brian: One.

Cat: You can write more than one, and then if nobody else mentions it then ...

And does anyone want to volunteer to be the scribe to write them down on a big piece of paper or shall I do that?

Rachel: I don't mind doing that.

Cat: Yeah, that will be wonderful. Did you want me to start off and tell us what your theme was?

Woman: Can I be really cheeky? Can you get me a piece of bread for me off the table?

Yeah.

Cat: I'll bring them over.

Woman: Bring me cake. Catherine, bring me cake.

Oh you saint.

Oh you good.

This woman needs to eat chocolate. Thank you

Kathlyn: Thank you. Tell you what. It's a good brownie.

Chris: Pop them on the [inaudible 00:59:16]. Look at carrot cake.

Colin: Turn that in. Oh sorry. Sorry.

[inaudible 00:59:35] yeah. I like the little flapjacks.

Kathlyn: I can't think of the word I'm looking for.

Vicky: I can't so I've put it in a really cumbersome kind of way.

Kathlyn: No. I've kind of got a feeling, but I can't get a word, and I do this sometimes and it drives me up the wall.

Cat: Do you want to start? Your theme is ...

Kathlyn: Well I've put tolerance.

Cat: Do you want to stick it on the ... Actually it's easier just to stick on the ... yeah.

And does other people agree?

Group: Yeah.

Brian: Tolerance or the lack of it. Yeah.

Colin: Lack of tolerance.

Rachel: I've actually put the in in brackets in front of that yeah.

Chris: I've put climate change.

Cat: Mm-hmm (affirmative).

Andy: Human interaction I've put.

Sheila: I haven't done mine. I can't get the word. Come back to me.

Kathlyn: Survival?

Cat: Survival, yeah.

Sheila: How society can quickly break down under stress.

Woman: Love, loss and displacement.

Vicky: I've put self-importance versus the collective.

Woman: Oh.

Vicky: But I can't figure out how to put into one word.

Woman: Yeah.

Sorry.

Rachel: End of civilization.

Woman: Can't get the right word.

Cat: So have your thoughts and feelings about any of these themes changed as a result of watching Flood?

Woman: Would you pass that down?

Brian: No, we treat other people like that anyway so ...

Sheila: I couldn't get the right, but that's the close as I could get.

Kathlyn: Otherness. Or outsiders, yeah. As in how we treat people that are not us.

Leanne: There's a part in Part 2 where the security guard talks about we'll feed ourselves and we'll send whatever food into the wilderness, and she goes, well we've run out. And he goes well it's them or us and that is a real real point that if anyone was ever in that situation there is a fine line where is it self preservation or ... how many other people can you look after before you stop being able to look after anybody. And that was a really tipping point for a lot of us was like, oh my god. What would you do in that situation? How many people can you realistically help before you're-

Kathlyn: You fall down.

Leanne: Putting your ... yeah.

Kathlyn: Is he being selfish or pragmatic?

Leanne: Yeah. Is it selfishness?

Kathlyn: And do you hate him or he's actually is he right?

Rachel: [crosstalk 01:02:29] It's actually a survival thing. You know those big plane crashes and things where people are in the wilderness [crosstalk 01:02:34] and you've got-

Vicky: Who's the one that's still there at the end? He is because he's looked after himself.

Andy: My father when he was in the merchant navy after the second world war, he sailed with one guy who'd been torpedoed three occasions. On the second occasion, there were two torpedoes, I think in fact the guy wrote a book about it. It was torpedoed off the coast of Africa, and they were in the life raft for a number of weeks and it came to the stage where one guy died, was he going to throw him over or was he going to eat him? So that shows you how quickly society can break down when people are literally driven to that limit.

Vicky: But he would've survived out of all of them because they were all busy being so nice to each other, they forgot to take care of themselves and he was still at the end of it with his life preserver on jumping in.

Kathlyn: And is it being practical or is it being self centered?

Vicky: But isn't it a horrible thing to have to weigh up?

Kathlyn: And at what point where is the line on that?

Brian: I think actually the point is where do you stop waiting for him to die before you start ... [crosstalk 01:03:34].

Woman: Start killing them.

Kathlyn: There's the line there really, isn't it? There's a lot of people ...

Brian: That's what we're trying to avoid.

Sheila: Parts of it remind of a book that I read while a teenager. I think Golding, Lord of the Flies.

Group: Yeah.

Kathlyn: There were a lot of similar kind of things.

Sheila: Kind of overtones of that. That is exactly and the otherness bit that sums it up.

Rachel: There's a lot of similar themes.

Kathlyn: I hated that book.

Cat: Okay. So we've got one more exercise we need to do. What I'm gonna do is split you into two [inaudible 01:04:12] and this one we don't need the big chart or so if I put you three together in a group and give you this one. And then maybe you three together in a group. And [crosstalk 01:04:28].

Woman: The others that are left?

We are the others.

Cat: So what I'm going to ask you to do is I've given you each a different part of Flood and I'd like you to, if you can, write down some of the positives and the negatives of each [crosstalk 01:04:47] production.

Chris: Different parts?

Group: [crosstalk 01:04:52]. So we've got Part 2 and Part 4. [crosstalk 01:04:58] performances. Takes place on purpose built set.

Production quality ...

Are there any pens rather that [inaudible 01:05:05].

Yeah I've got one. You can have mine. Have a borrow.

You can watch it on the wall in comfort.

Sheila: You're head phones to hear the dialogue and watch from various locations around the dock. Please write down what you felt was positives and negatives delivering Part 2 and 4 in [inaudible 01:05:21] to the outdoor theater if you saw one or more of these parts.

Group: So I think that's very [crosstalk 01:05:26] because I didn't understand [inaudible 01:05:30].

I don't mind [inaudible 01:05:32].

Colin: Negatives. [inaudible 01:05:37] me go to the social media, I guess.

Chris: I think it's so far away from you.

Colin: I don't think [crosstalk 01:05:46] watch the live.

Rachel: Distance from action.

Woman: Yeah.

Group: Negatives?

[crosstalk 01:05:50] Not everyone has the internet.

Interaction.

Personal.

I've got the internet.

Well my mum doesn't have it, but she's 90 [crosstalk 01:06:03].

Vicky: It's an immersive theater production when you're in it and the television element didn't translate to TV. Or the immersive theater didn't translate to TV at all.

Group: Yeah it lost that. [crosstalk 01:06:23].

Lost the immersive element [crosstalk 01:06:31].

Chris: Stage acting should be very big and some of the actors didn't do this. They didn't ... some of the actors they did really well.

Group: I suppose taking the caravan was [crosstalk 01:06:50].

Plus the development of the live performance.

Made the whole thing very big because they had to [crosstalk 01:07:01].

Body language enough ...

Someone will turn the negative into a positive.

Well of course. [crosstalk 01:07:12].

Feel good about the theme there.

The TV production because I don't think it's actually added anything [crosstalk 01:07:21].

Brian: Yeah I think one of the positives was just that. 'cause I know people that watched it perform live and then went into the caravan or vice versa, you know what I mean and ...

Group: Because it's filmed in one go, they didn't add anything for the day to day. They did it in one go.

Watching it [crosstalk 01:07:38]. So if you're gonna [crosstalk 01:07:39] basically.

Maybe [crosstalk 01:07:42].

That time my mum wasn't well and I found a carer so I'm very much [crosstalk 01:07:49] so it was nice because you could watch it in your own time.

Brian: Is that a negative though. They didn't really stop on YouTube [crosstalk 01:08:00].

Vicky: They just had their own approach and ...

Andy: I don't have any sets or any figures now if you [crosstalk 01:08:06] can quite easily go inside a week and not watch any TV. I feel better now.

Woman: We're eating biscuits. [crosstalk 01:08:16].

Brian: Actually found a way is that [crosstalk 01:08:18].

Andy: Shall we go through the [crosstalk 01:08:22] TV listings for a week and think there's actually nothing on. There's one [crosstalk 01:08:28].

Vicky: They didn't alter the way they [crosstalk 01:08:32] to fit with what the medium with TV.

Cat: Okay have we all got a couple of positives and negatives that we need to discuss. [crosstalk 01:08:43]. Do we need a bit more time or ... A couple more minutes, yeah.

Vicky: Sorry.

Brian: I'm still writing.

Kathlyn: Which very wordy people in trying to ...

Sheila: And you couldn't have done that in a small amphitheater. [crosstalk 01:08:57].

Brian: Does that sound right?

Vicky: Yeah. [crosstalk 01:09:04]. I was trying to think of something more positive. [crosstalk 01:09:11]. It was good, but it wasn't as good as the others. [crosstalk 01:09:15].

Rachel: Boats. I mean I just couldn't get over how many boats there was moving around.

Brian: I think it is [crosstalk 01:09:24].

Vicky: Part 3 and 4 were, but it was a shame that [inaudible 01:09:26].

Leanne: Thank you very much.

Woman: Sorry am I ...

No, no, no, no, no, it's-

Speaker 1: [crosstalk 00:00:01] Thank you.

Speaker 2: Shame that-

Speaker 4: Thank you very much. [crosstalk 00:00:23]

Speaker 2: Really all things...

Speaker 1: Not feeling, we haven't really got any more positively.

Moderator: No, no, no, no, no!

Speaker 4: Yeah.

Speaker 2: It couldn't happen, it couldn't be done.

Speaker 4: I feel quite mean about that 'cause it's [crosstalk 00:00:28]

Speaker 2: Yeah, and the [crosstalk 00:00:35] to me.

Moderator: [crosstalk 00:00:35] I don't [crosstalk 00:00:34] about me.

Speaker 2: Yeah! [crosstalk 00:00:40]

Speaker 4: They didn't ... you never got a ... it didn't pan out-

Speaker 2: You certainly wouldn't ask-

Speaker 4: The whole thing [crosstalk 00:00:46] with that, when we were live, when you saw the whole thing.

Speaker 5: [crosstalk 00:00:52] I never really stood actually [crosstalk 00:00:55]It's amazing ... So I was really excited to see it-[crosstalk 00:00:55] window. [crosstalk 00:00:58] and like watching the carver, like there was an actual actor in there like banging on the glass to get out. And like we were right in front of that, real person? It was really and a set TV, or anything like that. It was a real person, like [inaudible 00:01:20] in the car, when the car [inaudible 00:01:21] [crosstalk 00:01:29]

Speaker 2: [crosstalk 00:01:32] specific outdoor theater.

Speaker 5: Just wow...Just wow ... and like watching them jump in and things like that was just crazy 'cause we were being rained on, and it was horrible [crosstalk 00:01:37]

Speaker 2: I think that depending on [crosstalk 00:01:39] made a big difference to how much you saw. Because if you couldn't get ... if you were at [crosstalk 00:01:43] at the railing-

Moderator: So, we just about there? [crosstalk 00:01:51] We'll start with group one, and-

Speaker 1: [crosstalk 00:01:56] we'll be finished quick.

Moderator: Which part were you looking at?

Speaker 2: From the sea, they, YouTube it, on the caravan.

Moderator: So is that part one?

Speaker 2: Part one, yeah.

Positives, we said that it reached a larger audience and it created a hook. It was intriguing, so it got people involved. And then two of the negatives, we said that it missed people who didn't have firm access to the internet and excluded people who didn't do social media. But then we said the Caravan included those people who didn't have access to the internet or didn't do social media because the Caravan go around and showing it, meant that those people got the opportunity.

And another positive that we said was that we could watch it in our own time and place, which was good. It's a lot warmer than watching two.

Moderator: Anyone think any other positives or negatives for part 1?

Speaker 4: Being able to watch it again, and have the subtitles.

Speaker 5: Oh yes.

Speaker 4: For me subtitles, if I get a heavy cold I can't hear very well. So that, there wasn't a lot of dialogue in that, but, until you've keyed in on the strong accent because you can hear I'm not actually from Hook, until you've keyed in on a strong accent you sometimes just need a little bit of help.

Speaker 2: Didn't notice there was an accent. I'm from Hull.

Speaker 4: Don't get me wrong I'm not from far away so I am used to hearing it anyway.

Moderator: Anything else about part 1?

Okay that's great, thank you so much- [crosstalk 00:03:59]

That's right I should be transcribing for a long time after this, so every little helps.

Speaker 6: You transcribe the arrows. I didn't like, oh the positives [crosstalk 00:04:12]

Moderator: Oh okay. Yep. Okay that's great.

Okay so group two, I think you had part 2 and part 4 so the line [crosstalk 00:04:31]

Speaker 6: So the positives were the headphones. It gave you an immersive feeling, but seeing the entire set all the time, and seeing action on the water and in some cases in the water, and using the water, it was unique. Very different. All three of us had never seen anything like it before, and that included me who'd seen [inaudible 00:05:05]. The spectacle. The flames on the water, the flags, the explosions, the boats, the whole spectacle, the lights at the end couldn't have been done anywhere else than where it was done.

It couldn't have been done indoors anywhere and definitely couldn't have been done in a traditional theater. The negatives were feeling cold, and aching backs in seats, as we've said. The distance from the action. So, feeling distant because you were looking at it in the distance and also not being able to see because of the distance.

Some of the actors realized that they needed to have big projection and big bodily actions so that you could see it, and some of them weren't quite so good at that. And because if you weren't at the front and in the center, if you were at either side or you were at the back and there were people in front of you, you didn't have the experience that somebody who was right in the center.

I was lucky, I was right in the center on the front line. If you hadn't been, the experience wouldn't have been quite so good. So, that was it.

Speaker 7: Yeah I found we could get to a railing, but we were getting to a railing right off in a corner, which yeah there was nobody in front of me but it's an awful long way to the action on the far side. So, you know, finding a view that suited was not always a given.

Speaker 1: Yeah, a big screen if it were a performance on that scale again. [crosstalk 00:07:18] watching to and for, was at times felt big screen would be nice [crosstalk 00:07:30]

Speaker 6: I really liked the bits where they did the projection onto the water, the spray of water, that was amazing, more of that.

Speaker 7: Or just add a big screen [crosstakl 00:07:43] like concerts do, like festivals.

Moderator: Okay, plenty to think about. Anything else that you wanted to add about the positives and negatives of live action performance?

Okay, we'll move on to number three. I think we're all getting a bit fatigued, it's been, is everyone still okay for time.

Speaker 8: This one's actually not.

Moderator: Okay. Part three.

Speaker 8: Particularly of what was said in part three, not surprising [inaudible 00:08:22] three points. The positive is that you can watch it in comfort, and that was it.

The negatives, it lost the immersive element of a live performance [inaudible 00:08:38] didn't feel the cold. We also felt that it didn't really add anything of the effects possible, barring TV or film, so there was nothing actually added that you couldn't have got by just doing it live anyway.

Moderator: That's interesting.

Speaker 6: Both and then expanding the audience.

Moderator: Yeah, and one of things about that in general I thought with it being four parts, there's a lot of people who've seen one and three, and never seen two and four [crosstalk 00:09:12] have no idea what it's about.

Speaker 1: See the actual epic scale of the entire-

Speaker 8: I found that probably the most bizarre thing about the whole presentation, the way it was done, and with my attention span by the time it got to four I was struggling to remember what happened in two.

Moderator: Anything else to add to part three, positives, negatives?

Speaker 6: I only saw half of part three because we went [inaudible 00:09:43] and I don't think that I missed anything by not seeing the first half of part four.

Moderator: You still sort of knew what was happening in part four and could pick it up when you ...

Okay, so if we can just sort of share our thoughts about the experience of outdoor natural theater in comparison to more traditional theater experiences, what were the main differences, or what were the good parts of, generally, live action theater in comparison to ...

Speaker 1: I just think the space, it's almost like being in a more comfortable space instead of just sat in a chair in a theater. I love freedom festival, did anybody see Les Giraffes on Friday night? Absolutely superb. [crosstalk 00:10:46] I feel like this [inaudible 00:10:59] yeah, just an outdoor theater, and also the brand of [inaudible 00:11:08] which again [crosstalk 00:11:11] so the whole immersive experience of outdoor theater.

Speaker 6: And I think there are some people who won't go into a theater, they think that's not for me. But they would go there because they were more anonymous, and I guess you do have to get [crosstalk 00:11:43] so you don't have to get to dressed up into fancy, nice clothes and would be blown away by a theatrical experience.

Speaker 4: You guys are right there, this wouldn't have gone on the stage [crosstalk 00:12:01] it would not have the same presence if it was done in a traditional-

Speaker 1: I think you out to say, seeing some spectacular things on the stage.

Speaker 2: Yeah, but it wouldn't have had 10 boats buzzing around, and it certainly wouldn't have had a flamethrower on the front of it. [crosstalk 00:12:21]

Speaker 4: Because she really got the sense of being at sea, and the cold, and everything, and that was on a stage, that was a whole trope, so it can be done in the theater. It wouldn't be the same, but it can be done in the theater, but I think that the outdoor experience definitely added to it. Rained as well [crosstalk 00:12:48]

Speaker 2: I went dry days, but it was still blowing right through you.

Moderator: So, I don't think we're gonna get to the end of whether it can be on a theater or not. I just get conscious of time so thank you so much everybody for coming. Is there anything else that anyone wanted to mention or felt you've got a burning desire to say, if not.-

Speaker 4: I think it's a completely different experience. It's not as personal as when you go to the theater, like it was a very different personal experience than that. I think it's sort of halfway towards film really. Without you actually going into a cinema and seeing a film, it's halfway there, in the way that say suitcase is in [inaudible 00:13:52] was very much a new face, a new person, and it's just different.

Speaker 6: Maybe it's just because of the headphones but I found it felt way personal compared to some theater I've been to. [crosstalk 00:14:09] I don't have a massive experience so it could just be me.

Speaker 1: I think there was quite a lot to be said for the fact that the viewers, the audience were almost the fourth camp or tribe almost, and I felt that some of the cold and standing, and all of the things that we disliked, the suffering is part of the experience [crosstalk 00:14:37]

We needed to, it allowed you to share some of that emotional stress, discomfort all over, so that was important.

Speaker 7: No, I do know what you mean there.

Moderator: Okay, I'm so sorry to have to wrap it up there, but we've got another focus group coming in, thank you so much for coming. Bye everybody [crosstalk 00:15:07]

Speaker 4: I don't know whose pen this was, it's yours? [crosstalk 00:15:22]

Moderator: Putting their names on so, Colin, Leann, Victoria, Andrew, Rachael, Bruce [crosstalk 00:15:37] thank you so much, thank you. Does everybody know where they're going? [crosstalk 00:15:56] thank you for coming. [crosstalk 00:16:04]

Thank you, oh did you get your voucher? [crosstalk 00:16:20]

Thank you for everything take care. [crosstalk 00:16:25]

Good to meet you, and if you think of anything else, give me an email and let me know. [crosstalk 00:16:44] do you prefer not to sign the consent form? [crosstalk 00:16:54]

Okay, all right, thank you very much, take care. Do you know if they've got [inaudible 00:17:05] the doors are open still? Okay, thank you. Did we get more peaks? [crosstalk 00:17:16]

Speaker 9: Tidying up a bit and then you can take them.

Moderator: Put those on there.

Speaker 9: Whoops, well that was a complete mess.

Moderator: Thank you. So I assume they will come to get it at the end, so should I just.

## Group 2

Catherine: [inaudible 00:00:01] it should be able to [inaudible 00:00:03] everything up. Thank you.

Dave: [inaudible 00:00:06].

Catherine: I have [inaudible 00:00:11] university. I'm completely impartial so please be completely honest. We want to hear the good, the bad, the ugly. Hi.

Speaker 3: Hi, hello.

Catherine: Welcome.

Speaker 3: Hello.

Pauline: Hello.

Catherine: Do you want to grab ... There's a couple of seats here.

Dave: [inaudible 00:00:27].

Christine: [inaudible 00:00:38] the other room was bigger.

Catherine: So sorry about the condition. Please speak up and try not to interrupt each other. If anybody wants the recorder turned off at any time [inaudible 00:00:50] fine, just let me know. You'll be completely anonymous unless you want to be identifiable [inaudible 00:00:58] a different form of consent from you. Don't worry about being quoted on the record. Help yourself to refreshments, tea, coffee, herbal tea, biscuits, whatever you fancy. I'll just have to top up. The toilets are out this door, turn left and then you keep going until you come to like a central conveying area.

They're just on the right then. We're not expecting any fire alarms this evening. If the alarm goes off then we have to head to the hills. Does anyone have any questions or any ... Was ready to start. Brilliant, okay. We're here today to talk about [inaudible 00:01:50]. We thought we'd start off having a bit of an icebreaker. Just go round and introduce yourself and maybe sort of say what your usual theater going habits would be outside of the City of Culture year. I'm Catherine I was living in [inaudible 00:02:09] for the past 20 years. I came back especially to evaluate city of culture, at Hull university. It was exciting. I went to school here so I'm from the local area so it’s nice to come home.

My theater going habits are not as good as they should be. I love to go to the theater but I don't seem to have the time as much as I would like. So it’s been a great opportunity to see lots of different shows since I've been back in Hull. Who would like to ...

Pauline: My name is Pauline, I'm City of Culture volunteer like several of the other ones here. I've lived here all my life and my theatre preferences are musicals, I live and die musicals, I also love the ballet. It was a massive thrill to see the ballet here.

Catherine: You got tickets?

Pauline: I saw them in Queens Gardens. I was also working as well.

Catherine: Who'll go next?

Christine: I'm a volunteer as well, I’ve always enjoyed going to the theatre although film was my first love I must admit, we’ve always tried to support culture and I’ve just loved this year, the different kind of stuff that's going on really enjoyed it, One Day Maybe I loved, it was incredible. I've always gone to the theater but this year that's been so much more, it’s been hard fitting it all in really, it's been great.

Else: My name is Else, as in anything else. I've always been a theatre goer and I've lived in Hull for the past 40 years and I’ve actually been to the Hull Truck evaluation this afternoon

Catherine: What were you evaluating at Hull Truck?

Else: It was all the different things that have been on throughout the year.

Catherine: Wow.

Else: 3 hours of it!

Catherine: Thank you for coming, I bet you’re evaluated out!

Else: That's all right. Not quite but I've been talking about going Spring Street theatre street, and then of course new theater, and I’m into the ballet like you. I've gone to the theater this week to see ‘I’m sorry I haven’t a clue’.

Catherine: Thank you.

Pauline: I went to Newland next door, her husband was a lecturer.

Else: My daughter appeared on stage at Middleton Hall, when she was at school.

Jill: My name is Jill, I've lived in Hull all my life. I'm a city of culture volunteer as well.

Else: I think we all are aren’t we!

Jill: I've always loved the theater from going as a young girl with my mom and dad. I love all theater, Hull Truck, Hull New theater. We go to London theaters but I've seen so much this year that's maybe things I would have thought twice about going to see, but because it's been this year I've pushed the boat out and really thoroughly enjoyed everything I've seen. One day maybe was amazing. Flood was just unbelievable, it's just been great, it's been a great year, dance, everything.

Dave: I'm Dave, lived in Hull for 30 years, not a volunteer. My theater going habits are more intermittent than I’d like, I’m a sucker for anything that’s a bit out of the ordinary, so I really enjoyed recently Songs for the End of the World, largely because I’m a huge fan anyway. Anything slightly odd, anything off the wall, I go for.

Speaker 3: I’m Darren, I have lived in Hull all my life. My usual theater going is usually rocl operas, Vampires of Rock, War of the Worlds, that sort of thing, but like I said this year there's been so much on I’ve broadened my horizons.

Speaker 8: I'm Dave. I am a city of culture volunteer. Before this year I have never been to the theater to be honest. I've not really sort of engaged with it but this year I've decided that I wanted to throw myself into as much as I can. I think my favourite piece was the Lillian play at the Guildhall, it was the best piece of theatre I've ever seen. Absolutely mind blowing.

Speaker 9: My name is Elizabeth, I've lived in Hull for about 23 years I think. Theater going has been a bit sporadic since I left London. I lived in London before, this year I’ve made sure that I saw much as I possibly could, the stand out ones have been the Last Testament of Lillian Bolloca, and One Day Maybe for me. That's been absolutely fantastic being a volunteer as well and then I start seeing a very much wider variety of shows I think we've ever had in Hull, at least in the 23 years I've been here. It's been great.

Catherine: Thank you.

Lynn: I'm Lynn and I don't live in Hull, I live in Driffield and I do go to the theater quite a lot like you I used to go to the old Spring Street Theatre. I've really enjoyed that and since then we've just sort of, we go to the East Riding Theatre a lot in Beverley, because it's quite close to where we live. Like everybody else, yes we’ve spent quite a lot of time in Hull this year doing quite a lot of usual things that I didn't think I'd ever do and just had a really good year.

Tom: I am Tom, i have lived in Hull for 10 years now. I came off the university and I stayed to live in Cott now, I’ve been to see quite a lot, if it looks good, I'll go if it doesn’t look that good then I'm not that interested, I don’t have a type, I’ll watch anything really.

Pauline: Whatever takes your fancy.

Dorine: Well I'm Lynn. I'm enjoyed the diversity, all the different theaters this year like everybody is saying just trying something different , I used to go to Fruit when they had some plays on, they were really unusual and quirky, but they don’t do it any more.

Catherine: Could be something for next year.

Dorine: Yeah, it's a great little venue.

Catherine: We're going to be missing all this

Pauline: They're doing Cinderella there aren’t there.

Ted: My name is ted I'm a volunteer, Hull born and bred. I do my theater [inaudible 00:09:36]. One of the volunteers on One Day Maybe absolutely loved it, just made my acting debut at the age of 56 in the Lillian Bolloca play.

Catherine: Amazing, great. Okay, welcome everybody thank you for that. We’re here to talk about Flood, has everybody seen all the four parts?

Group Members: Yes.

Catherine: Has anybody not seen all the four parts? That's good, we're all on the same page, it's a great place to start from. Any ideas? How did you first hear about Flood? When did you first hear about Float? Can you remember, I know it will have been a while ago.

Dave: On the internet about two hours after all the tickets had sold for the first performance.

Pauline: [inaudible 00:10:33]. Just on the City of Culture website.

Dave: Saw it in the first city of culture guide that came out.

Catherine: Did it sort of stand out then?

Speaker 3: Yeah, the video did.

Christine: The image of the bridge and the flooding.

Speaker 3: I think for me because I hadn’t really heard anything about it, I just saw the poster, I’ve not heard or seen any hype, I just saw this poster and thought, wow, seeing the bridge got flooded like that.

Christine: I thought it was going to be there on the foreshore.

Dave: So I saw that and I thought yeah I need to find out more about this so I looked o 2017

Else: I saw the first film, the first part one, and I booked straight away after that, I need to find out what part two is!

Christine: And they were available to book?

Else: Yeah.

Catherine: What about anyone else, what made you book the tickets?

Speaker 8: I think I heard it on the radio, I think someone was interviewed. I think after the one I saw on the computer, I think I then sort of started thinking, right, when do tickets come out, when do tickets come out, and I made an effort to keep tuned in to try and find out and then I found out.

Catherine: Has anybody seen a different order then? Not like, one, two, three, four?

Ted: I saw one, three, two, four because I went for the omnibus.

Yeah I did.

Me too.

By it was cold!

Dave: Yeah that’s why I didn’t go to see four individually because they were more or less advertising they were doing them back to back sort of thing, so I didn’t go to see four on its own, I waited to see them both together, but yeah I agree it was cold!

Lynn: I think it was that image, now you mention it, I remember the girl standing in the water, and I though it was going to be at the bridge somewhere.

Catherine: It was quite striking wasn't it?

Tom: Yes.

Lynn: I follow everything on Twitte.r I'm a real Twitter addict and I kept seeing things about it and reading things about it and I just thought, "It just sounds so different and so unlike anything I've ever seen before. I've got to just go see it so that was really why I booked, just because it sounded so different."

Catherine: It was the early days wasn't it? We haven't really seen these other extraordinary things that have come since.

Lynn: Yeah I booked before I saw the first part on TV I booked pretty much, I booked pretty much when the tickets came out.

Else: [crosstalk 00:13:17].

Speaker 9: [inaudible 00:13:21].

Pauline: I think city of culture have put out a lot of really good images to entice you into things. Like they have the bridge and the one near Maybury like the robot hands, it really just grab your curiosity. For me it's a lot about what you seeing around the place and the thought what it could be and your imagination running wild, how they’re going to do it. Height of the Reeds as well.

Catherine: In addition to the full parts of Float, we have the special website which was created with digital content, how many of you have seen it? Were aware of it and engaged with it?

Dave: I clicked on it yeah.

Catherine: Just a couple?

Catherine: This is the website.

Jill: Is that what the individuals talk about?

Catherine: Yeah it’s interviews, podcasts, more about the story, the background, I lost it, back at this time I think it's decided it's ...

Christine: [inaudible 00:14:45].

Catherine: [crosstalk 00:14:47] for those of you ... Can you put your hand up if you have seen it or engaged in it or [inaudible 00:14:53]. Would you say that it enhanced, did it aid, did it make any difference in viewing the Flood?

Else: Can't remember really.

Pauline: Maybe, slightly.

Tom: I was curious from seeing the first video, the images from seeing the video. I just went as soon as the tickets were on sale I went online and bought one. The website made it a bit more intriguing I think, especially early days, but no, it took me in straight away to be honest.

Catherine: Anything else to add?

Ted: For me like I said I went there after I'd seen Parts 2 and 4 back to back, so it was good to be a bit more in depth about it and see if there's anything you miss because there's so much going on and you couldn’t look at everything at once on some occasions so it was good to look back and see if there was anything you’d missed.

Catherine: Well for those of you who haven't seen that, it's lots of photographs you might not have seen. You could have seen, but podcasts, interviews with the team, sort of behind the scenes, it is really interesting because it was such a remarkable sort of production. What could we have done to have got it to you to make you know about it? What would have been the best way to inform you about this website so that you were aware of it?

Dave: Had a link in the email because we had an email about it, you could have put the link in there.

Tom: I don't remember a link on the city of culture webpage when you booked it, I don’t recall.

Pauline: That would have been a better thing.

Tom: Because I probably would have followed it at the time.

Dave: When you book it as well, maybe there could have been a final page to say here it is, find out more.

Ted: Or even have it on the headphones at the end.

Tom: Yeah because there was announcements on the headphones.

Dave: I remember seeing fliers, I’m sure there were some that were credit card sized…

Else: I think sometimes there's too many fliers.

Christine: There’s a lot of information and sometimes it’s too much.

Catherine: Would you have accessed the website if you would have known about it or is it not something you’d be bothered about?

Group Members: Yes

Definitely.

Catherine: If we think back to when you watched Flood, if you were to describe it to someone who knows nothing about it, how would you describe it? How would you start?

Christine: Surreal.

Post-apocalytic.

Pauline: I'll describe it as obviously being on water which is very unusual I think for performances. I don't know how the actors managed to stay stable and do all the acting and not worrying, you could see it moving! I don't know how they managed to remember everything and concentrate on where they were when they're on the edge.

Christine: It was a spectacle as well wasn’t it.

Pauline: Yes, spectacle.

Christine: I thought the best part of it was the actual spectacle.

Lynn: I think for me it was technically groundbreaking because I haven't seen quite a lot of the effects that they used ever before, when they were beaming video onto water. And the fact that it all went off and I didn’t notice anything go wrong, it might have done, but I didn’t see it, that was astonishing. It was complicated.

Speaker 8: I think it was one of those things where you have to be there. I think there's been a lot of that this year. You're not just [crosstalk 00:19:18] you can't explain what it was like.

Tom: I think it was very site specific and to such an extent that had it been say a film, I don’t think it would have worked quite as well, I don’t think the story was that strong.

Lynn: Being cold and wearing headphones was part of it!

Speaker 8: People are saying, [inaudible 00:19:52]? Why would you want to do that?

Tom: Even though it was cold you didn't really notice how long you've been there, you were cold when it finished, but when it was going on…

Lynn: We had a different experience, we went to the first one, Part 2, and we must have gotten there a bit late or something so we didn't have a good view we were tucked round a bit. We had one of the monoculars which I just could not get on with at all, I couldn’t see with the monoculars.

Tom: [crosstalk 00:20:24] because people say they've been to the individual ones and they had little [inaudible 00:20:28].

Lynn: It was so cold we just couldn’t hold them even with gloves on so in the end we gave into it and we couldn't really see very well what was going on.

Tom: I think that was a general weakness anyway in that you’re about 50 yards from any of the performers, and so you're busy desperately trying to pick up who is speaking. I mean kudos to the sound guys, they did a fantastic job, but there were no cues, when they changed, so they were switching from one stage to another stage and you were like, ooh, who’s talking now.

To be fair in Part 4 they did light them up, it was easier to follow in part 4, part 2 was a bit less obvious.

Lynn: [crosstalk 00:21:17]. That's very different.

Tom: It was hard [crosstalk 00:21:22].

It might have been the learnings from 2 mightn’t it, to spotlight the main characters.

Dave: [inaudible 00:21:26].

Pauline: [inaudible 00:21:28] spotlight the characters.

Dave: I think when two was performed back in April.

Else: April.

Dave: A large part of it would have been in daylight, whereas…

No it wasn’t.

Goodness it was cold.

Christine: The night I went it was raining and then suddenly the poor people who were on it, because I had friends who were acting in it, it [inaudible 00:22:07].

Else: I think, for me, for the first one on the dock, we didn’t know where we were going because we’re not from Hull, we didn’t even know that area of Hull even existed, we knew it existed but we didn’t know what it was, so we sort of ended up from the Deep and wondering where we were going, so when we got there we were wet through anyway because we didn’t have a clue how long we had to walk, so I think there was something around that for that one, unless you knew where you were going, you know, if I had a difficulty walking or anything like that.

Tom: It's a long walk.

Else: I mean I was lucky because, that’s the only grumble I’ve got about city of culture, if you book a ticket through them and want disabled, if you go to any cinema and you book disabled and you get all that sorted out up front, you’ve got to go back to them and say, I’m disabled, this is what I need, so we were allowed to park in the pub car park area on Victoria Dock, then it was just a question of when the volunteers took us down, which wasn’t a great deal of a long walk, but if you didn’t know about this disabled thing, and there were limited parking anyway, it was a long walk from the Deep I would think.

Speaker 3: I mean it was fine for next time cos you knew, so you knew about the experience.

Tom: And there were wayfinders the next time as well.

Pauline: I didn't really mind the freezing cold. My big problem with Flood was the narrative. I just could not connect with the characters at all and most of the time I didn’t have a clue what was going on. I really didn't like the narrative, I'm afraid. I just thought it was all over the place.

Tom: I agree, the first one I thought was awful.

Pauline: I thought the second one was worse.

Tom: Sorry, the second one.

Christine: The dialogue.

Pauline: I thought both, the plots, the story. I just thought was all over the place.

Tom: It seemed like someone had tried to cram everything into one play, like they had a little tick box and they ticked them off in the storyline.

Pauline: The language, especially the second one. I thought the language was just pretentious and the scripting I just really couldn’t get on with either of them.

Catherine: What do other people think-

Dave: I struggled with it, I struggled to get to grips with it, I don’t know if it was because of the conditions or what, because like I said earlier on, you weren’t sure who was speaking when, so you struggled at the same time as well with the narrative to find out who it was that was speaking, what their role was and what part they're playing.

Pauline: The first one I thought ... Sorry-

Dave: [crosstalk 00:24:57].

Pauline: I thought it was some sort of great metaphor going on, I couldn't work out what it was. I couldn't work out what it was trying to say really.

Ted: I think following on from the first part which was absolutely intriguing, that five minute, it was probably the strongest thing of the whole lot.

Pauline: It was great.

Ted: It was intriguing, and then you went into the second part and you had all this happening, for me the issue there was less narrative but it was the nature of the performance, a lot of it was quite intimate for that and I felt that doing that one on the dock was a mistake. I think the whole thing would have worked better if they had four completely different locations. The first one on the internet, second one in the theatre, third one on TV, the fourth one on the dock, but then we got the spectacle with all the sea battles going down. It was sort of misplaced, so I found the second part dragged for me. I didn't have any problem with following the narrative or, I’ve read quite a lot of post-apocalyptic fiction, so I’ve seen a lot of this before, that dragged, but the fourth part actually went by quite quickly when there was actually very little plot happening, it was all sort of, you got three very distinct areas, you've got the ones who thought she was a Messiah, the ones who thought that she was Satan and the ones who were all pragmatic and let’s have a big fight between the two who think that she's a Messiah or Satan, bang! Let's go and join the pragmatic ones and we'll all live happy ever after. For me the plot was really simplistic.

Tom: [inaudible 00:26:50]

Catherine: Anybody disagree? Any ...

Pauline: I thought it was fairly easy to follow, I enjoyed the texts and narrative and everything. The only thing I had a problem with was that when there was something really fast and furious happening, I found that the actors spoke a bit too fast so you missed some of the words. I think that's probably just because of the headphones and the distance. You know, when they're just falling over themselves to speak all the lines, to me I didn't pick up some of what they were saying. To be fair, I probably understood it more because my husband was in it and he had a script and a book. I read the script and the book so I probably understood it a bit more, I don't think I would have had a problem following it if I hadn't done that.

Lynn: It wasn’t really following or understanding, I just didn't think it was well put together as a story.

Tom: I think it was a really interesting idea and then it just…

Speaker 3: I thought the narrative was fine but then we kept having branches off where there were little side stories for characters that weren't really necessary. It felt to me like part two was ... it felt like a three-act play on water but parts one and two were in part 2, and part four was quite well paced. There were bits of Part 2 where I thought, if we’d cut bit of it out, like there was the guy with his wife and they split up, and if they’d cut that out, you’d knock half an hour off, it would have been a tighter, less distraction. It might have benefited from that.

Christine: I thought that was unnecessary.

Lynn: It was. It was just like you say it wasn't necessary to the plot really. I didn't find it hard to follow but I did engage much more with part four. That just flew by and I was just engaged from beginning to end. I absolutely loved part four.

Ted: I think part four was just largely spectacle.

Lynn: It was that's probably why, simple folk and simple things!

Ted: That would have worked at the end of a set of different locations and finish there.

Catherine: No, I just find it so fascinating because the focus group I held before you said absolutely the opposite, they absolutely love part two. They thought it was the best part the whole thing. They liked it all but it's so funny isn't it? How ... That's why I was trying to say, does anyone disagree? Because I was thinking is it like a group mentality that we all just agree but you were very definite about knowing.

Ted: [crosstalk 00:29:25].

Pauline: Me too [crosstalk 00:29:31].

Ted: I thought the production of part two, the acting, and everything was amazing, the occasion of it I though the narrative was awful, there were too many side stories going on at once, it just didn’t gel, part three on the TV I just didn't get at all

It didn’t follow on from two, it was like a completely different thing.

Ted: So I really wasn’t sure to go to Part 4, and in the end I took the plunge and thought, well I’ve seen the first three so I may as well see it out.

Catherine: [crosstalk 00:29:59]?

Christine: After watching part three on the...we missed it on the TV but we watched on iplayer on the computer and then me and my partner looked at each other and were like, what’s all that about then! And he said, we’re not booking tickets for four, and I said we are, we’ve seen the other three, I want to make sure we see it through and see the end of it. And I’m glad I did cos I really enjoyed four.

Ted: [crosstalk 00:30:21] do know people who went to see two and didn't bother to finish it off.

Speaker 3: I think three.

Ted: No I think that was because he just didn't think that [crosstalk 00:30:38].

Christine: Cos four didn’t sell as well as two.

Ted: I think there was a lot of people.

Dave: You could see by the people there, part two was rammed the tickets went in a couple of days, part four, there were tickets still available on the day.

Ted: [crosstalk 00:30:49].

Dave: [inaudible 00:30:52].

Christine: Yeah there was loads.

Catherine: Somebody was saying that maybe they thought it was repeated because it was called the same thing, what did you think?

Group Members: [crosstalk 00:31:04].

Speaker 3: I went to see two and then saw three and then I said to my partner, can we go and see all three again, just to see the omnibus, get a feel for them all, and she said yeah I need to see them again too, cos two was so ambiguous, so seeing it a second time might clear it up and actually seeing it a second time made a big difference.

Catherine: In what way?

Speaker 3: It was easier to follow, I mean I’d seen it before but it was much easier to follow, but again the length of the previous time, the spotlights, you could see who was talking, it was much easier to follow, so you sort of knew what to expect, it helped to make more sense of the story.

Catherine: Just sort of moving on a bit, they designed it specifically so each of the four parts was supposed to be a standalone piece so you could dip in and out. How successful was that? Do you think that they were all standalone?

Group Members: Not at all.

Else: Because I think you needed some background.

Dave: I think the third piece was designed so you didn't have to have watched it but it didn't make any sense if you haven't seen the previous bits.

Tom: They tried to design it as two standalone pieces, the ones that were in the docks, and that was trying to connect the two together, I don’t think it was entirely successful.

Dave: You didn't really need it anyway to connect the two.

Christine: I don't think any of them would have made sense on their own really.

Pauline: No, I don't think you needed to have had the sequence.

Christine: [inaudible 00:32:41].

Ted: [crosstalk 00:32:43]. I think the first and second together would have made sense. That worked, it actually came to a…

Pauline: Yeah [crosstalk 00:32:54].

Lynn: It didn't need to continue after two did it?

Ted: You didn't have to have a continuation but the continuation was still interesting.

Lynn: Yeah you couldn't have then watched the continuation I don’t think without seeing the first two.

Ted: No, I don't think [crosstalk 00:33:11].

Catherine: Do you think the digital content could have helped in sort of tying it together?

Ted: I don't know. I think there's always an issue if you have to have a piece that explains what's going on.

Pauline: You shouldn't have to work that hard.

Ted: [crosstalk 00:33:30].

Catherine: What was your favourite bit about Flood?

Christine: The spectacle.

Dave: The spectacle in four.

And the space.

I think two!

Else: I thought [crosstalk 00:33:47].

Lynn: I think the being on the water, the explosions, just the boats, that stuff I think was the best bits.

Pauline: [crosstalk 00:33:55].

Jill: That really left me with a lasting impression four ... I really thought it was good..

Pauline: I like the [crosstalk 00:34:03] projections on. The fact that it was on water to me was really thrilling.

Dave: There seemed to be a lot more coherent message with four.

Catherine: It was very simplistic wasn’t it.

Dave: [crosstalk 00:34:21].

Tom: For a three and a half hour piece it was quite simple, simple plot.

Catherine: Would you have done anything more?

Else: How come four lasted so long?

Catherine: Could you have done anything more [crosstalk 00:34:39].

Christine: I don't know [crosstalk 00:34:40].

Pauline: I think there was too much talking for the nature of the event and I thought a lot of it was overdone for the event, the language was I thought too, it was almost Shakespearian at times, it didn't fit for me with the whole thing. It was wrong.

Speaker 9: I was there with my 17 year old son and I had the hardest job to get him to stay til the end, we were at the omnibus, he was cold, he was fed up, we didn't realize the food was behind the tent so we didn't get anything to eat and he was going, I’m going, I’m going, but I made him stick it out. We both agreed though, if we felt the plot was a bit derivative or in case it was seen it before and they’d brought bits together from lots of different places. He was of the opinion that there was too much, not that it was too simplistic, but there were too many different ... It was like everything that the young people are supposed to be concerned about was in it and a bit chaotic, so it didn't have a coherent message.

Pauline: [inaudible 00:36:00].

Speaker 9: He was glad that he’d seen it at the end, mostly for all the technicality because he is interested in and he wants to be a director and so on, whether he does or not it is a different matter, but he is interested in stage crafts so for him it was fascinating to see that level of skill and putting something together that’s so complicated. It's such an extraordinary setting and in the dark.

Pauline: The [crosstalk 00:36:31] were amazing [crosstalk 00:36:34].

Speaker 9: [inaudible 00:36:37].

Pauline: [crosstalk 00:36:42] is crashing around them.

Catherine: What was the worst thing about Flood, what was your least favourite?

Ted: Cold.

Christine: Something in the cold.

Lynn: For me it was the script. I really didn't like it.

Dave: I think the length of time between parts as well, between two, three and four, waiting all that time, you almost forgot what it was about.

Catherine: You were one of the people that looked at the digital content.

Dave: Yeah a little bit.

Catherine: That didn't bridge it for you.

Dave: No, I don't think so, no.

Ted: That's why I did the omnibus, like you said there was a big gap, so to refresh my memory I thought I’d go to the omnibus, that was perhaps why part four didn’t sell quite as well because people felt, because the omnibus was more or less advertised at the same time as part four, and like I say, I thought I’d go and do the omnibus and everything would be fresh.

Pauline: I just wish they could have had the islands a fraction closer to the land so you could just-

Christine: It's difficult to see.

Pauline: Yeah, it could make out everything but not as clear as you would like to have. If it could have just come a few feet further closer because when they got in the boats the end of the part four where they were zooming round and everything, I actually lost sight of a lot of that until they came back round and sort of got near the islands again because of where we stood. We missed them bits but if it could have just, I understand they need space round it so they can do the manoeuvre and things but if it could just have been a bit closer.

Tom: That was an issue with watching, particularly the second part with it being less action-orientated and much more intimate personal scenes and you've got at least three different stages where there was quite small intimate scene going on. One of them was sort of 100 yards away.

Pauline: Yeah, I couldn't [inaudible 00:38:44].

Tom: You were distanced from it.

Pauline: I just didn’t care about any of the characters, I wouldn’t have cared if they’d slipped off!

Tom: [inaudible 00:38:56].

Else: I don't know whether they thought about but in part four there was a particularly brutal killing. I was stood near two parents and their child and the child would be about eight or nine, and at that point, that very violent point where somebody kills somebody else, I think they strangled them didn’t they.

Tom: [crosstalk 00:39:26]. When he strangles him at the end.

Christine: Yeah when he strangles him.

Else: They've actually put the child and sort of hid the child's eye. I thought [inaudible 00:39:42].

Catherine: No, it should have been over 12.

Else: We had a child near us first time we went and small 12 year old.

Catherine: Well, someone can remove the child [crosstalk 00:39:50].

Tom: The language in the first one was quite strong at times.

Else: It was just that I had the child next to me, I wouldn’t have said they were over 12.

Tom: I’m sure it’s a guideline.

Dave: [inaudible 00:40:07].

Catherine: I think someone wanted the kids to come especially.

Speaker 3: [inaudible 00:40:14] kids younger than 12.

Catherine: What was the main impact would you say on you?

Christine: The venue.

Lynn: Yeah the venue.

Christine: I heard they could do something else on it.

Lynn: Yeah, same.

Pauline: The thought of the reality that it could actually happen.

Else: Yeah, I think that for people at home it's a very real thing. I don't know how many people went who suffered flooding. I don't know whether I would take my friend Judy to do it because she was flooded in 2007. I don't know whether she'd have coped with something like that.

Pauline: Yeah generally the way [crosstalk 00:40:50].

Dave: [crosstalk 00:40:49] 2007. [inaudible 00:40:54].

Else: For some people it can-

Dave: [inaudible 00:40:58].

Catherine: It's interesting because some people said that they were put off because it was too painful, they didn't want to ... and other people said that they didn't even associate it so it's ...

Pauline: I was thinking more of a worldwide catastrophe. Rather than the local flooding of Hull, I wasn't flooded but I I may have thought differently if I was, but I was thinking of the way the world’s going, this is a really possibility, we could end up like this.

Christine: Just what could happen, then if we have to rebuild and [inaudible 00:41:40] people.

Else: It reminded me, remember those programs you saw ... You need to go after a nuclear disaster. Survivors.

Christine: [crosstalk 00:41:53] specific in that context. I think that would have been better. For me it was too vague in that respect, it started off and I was thinking, oh we're talking about Hull here. Then after a few moments it wasn't Hull for me at all anymore.

Tom: I think that was-

Christine: It was very vague

Tom: That's the difference between part two and part four. With part two it was all character driven, however successfully. Part four was all big, broad brush strokes, about this island vs that island. I didn't like the way that they tied in the videos that were being broadcast on the water wall and you saw the young girls who got a video camera and didn't know whether anyone would ever see it.

Catherine: What did you think about the ending?

Christine: What happened? [crosstalk 00:42:44].

Dave: She went back into whatever come from.

Christine: We still never really knew where she'd come from did we, or what she was or anything.

Dave: [crosstalk 00:42:56].

Pauline: Still a mystery.

Christine: It needed more explanation.

Tom: [crosstalk 00:43:10].

Christine: We came away saying, I enjoyed that but what happened?

Tom: I think the whole point of that was that you don't know whether she was a force for good or a force for bad.

Christine: Not [crosstalk 00:43:19].

Tom: She was [crosstalk 00:43:21].

Christine: That's just mumbo jumbo for me, I need a solid ending.

Pauline: It was more about the behaviours of people for me, it was more about if you were put in this situation, what would your behaviors be and thinking about that and about the refugee and all of that. That was what hooked me in guess, it was less about the story but more about the underlying messages.

Pauline: To me it was like a mish mash, there was the environmental issue, there was the refugee issue, there was a supernatural aspect, there was the political systems.

Catherine: Can I interrupt you there? Because that's the next part [crosstalk 00:44:14]. Write down what you think could be the main theme, the main context, and as we've sort of touched on [crosstalk 00:44:32].

Pauline: What did you [crosstalk 00:44:46]?

Catherine: [crosstalk 00:44:45] main theme [crosstalk 00:44:49].

Christine: Wasn't it really?

Catherine: You can write down more than one if you have to.

Christine: [crosstalk 00:45:00].

Catherine: Let me know when you're all done.

Christine: [crosstalk 00:45:18].

Dave: Depression.

Catherine: Okay, does anyone want to start us off?

Christine: I’ve put the world in a catastrophe like the Flood.

Dave: Climate change in there.

Human behaviour.

There were so many themes but the underlying one was refugees.

Catherine: Environment, climate, the way the world is heading? Good work fully, the impact of disaster, politics, the need for scapegoats or saviours. Climate change is real, Mr Trump.

Dave: I nearly put that, I didn't-

Catherine: We can discuss. What was the main theme?

Christine: For me it was people's behavior. It was their treatment of refugees, the behaviour after the environmental disaster after the floods, things are good, things are bad, let's kill them. It's just quite frightening.

It was like the worst of human nature.

Dave: Different reactions to events.

Speaker 3: I couldn’t find a way of wording it but the other three different islands, they're all reacting definitely to the same thing.

Christine: Same thing.

Speaker 3: Whether they believe she was a saviour or not, there was still people that were, two sorts of people that were being good, whether that be through the religious image of it or pragmatism of saying right we need to get through this, or there's one that's just being awful. It's not really justified, whether she did cause the Flood, is irrelevant. You don't then go out murdering people. If she hasn't saved you, you need to still be good to people whether she saved you or not. I just think it was a bit of a ...

Christine: It's like the scapegoat thing which we see everyday in the news don’t we, people blame somebody for something-

Tom: I’d like to see something where the same figure being used as both the scapegoat and the saviour, seeing it from both sides.

Ted: [inaudible 00:48:55].

Tom: [inaudible 00:48:57] from both sides then you got the middle ground [inaudible 00:48:59] we've got to live somehow.

Ted: For me it became a political allegory of that point, you had that went down the religious route, one that was a dictator and then one who was like I said democratic, or pragmatic.

Catherine: [inaudible 00:49:14]. It was very political?

Group Members: Yes

Dave: Yes with the three islands.

Christine: Part four was definitely.

Catherine: Did you expect it to be political?

Tom: No

Ted: Talking about the way people start to behave in groups after a disaster, it’s the whole thing that dates back to Lord of the Flies, behavioural breakdown and all that.

Tom: I think-

Ted: [crosstalk 00:49:33].

Lynn: The walking dead, all these things, they all go the same way don’t they, they all end up with their own little social groups, their own little political systems.

Catherine: Did it make you sort of ... Did it challenge you a little or make you think anything differently or?

Ted: I didn't think it was sufficiently well written to challenge, the ideas were there but I don't think the actual plot and the way the whole thing was structured and put across, you almost felt like it was a tick box exercise.

Tom: [crosstalk 00:50:21].

Dave: There was the religious side of it, there was the lesbian gay angle, refugees, immigrants, climate change. It's just like [inaudible 00:50:39].

Pauline: Isn't that what we've actually got all that now, that's why it was in because that's the way things are going. Everything that was in it is actually happening all day every day.

Christine: [crosstalk 00:50:50].

Pauline: Is actually happening [crosstalk 00:50:51].

Tom: Everything is connected [crosstalk 00:50:55].

Christine: It can all be covered in that [crosstalk 00:50:58].

Dave: [inaudible 00:51:02] you could probably [inaudible 00:51:05] when everything [inaudible 00:51:08].

Pauline: When it comes to the Big Bang those are all the things that's going to be important. Everything that was covered in that play was ... When it comes to if we flood or if the atom bomb goes off, if the idiot in North Korea sets one off, those are all the things that will come into play.

Christine: You're not saying they're not important issues. It's just it was too much to cover in one piece of theatre, it’s like trying to write a book about all the issues in the world. You’ve got to try and concentrate.

Ted: What you got I think happening in part two is they were trying to set up the situation where you've got the three separate groups so if you thread it back from those, back through how people have responded you could see where they were. It wasn't clear while you were watching part two this is where it was going but once you sort of saw the islands and saw them pegged out in that very distinctive way which then became pure allegory because you would never have had set groups that were so like-minded all on the same island.

Pauline: You don't know how they got there in the first place, they may have got there because that's the way that they are. You don't know if they've heard from other people on boats or sailing ships that, go due north and that’s where safety is, you don’t know that because that didn’t actually come across in the play.

Ted: Safety is.

Ted: Yeah [inaudible 00:52:45] that big-

Else: [crosstalk 00:52:46] didn't they have somebody going out?

Ted: Yeah, they had a boat people going out looking for various people.

Catherine: Did it make you sort of think how you would react in that situation? What would you do?

Ted: I think-

Christine: [crosstalk 00:53:01].

Else: [crosstalk 00:53:05] back of my mind was [inaudible 00:53:05].

Dave: You do what you can to survive don’t you.

Pauline: Practicalities of where you are, fresh water and stuff.

Christine: Depending on sort of your background and who you are and what you read and all of that stuff, you start to unpick it don’t you around the imbalance of power, you work through that because you are who you are, you do that at whatever level ... For me I was doing that, it was more about the people for me and the [inaudible 00:53:40]. Because that's just what I do. That was important for me and I do get a lot out of that because I do that. I guess, my other half he's got something else, which is more we talk about the spectacle of it, because he’s an engineer.

Catherine: The violent scene, do you think it was necessary to make that sort of statement? To make that impact?

Tom: I think it worked in the story that was being told. I think it was ... For me the problem with that was I think ... I can't think of the guys name, the main bad guy, I think it was rushed. I think they said well ... Clearly the story said we have this bad guy in this island. We only really started going that way towards the end of part two. Then all of a sudden part three kind of covered it but all of a sudden he's the big, bad and he's murdering, I felt like they’d done it just to have, this is your bad guy, rather than it being...

Else: [inaudible 00:54:57].

Tom: Yeah, it was very sudden. I didn't think it had been built up to what deserved the big moment.

Ted: There was obviously some sort of obsession going on with it that drove whatever was going on in his head. I felt it was a bit simplistic but he was quite so.

Speaker 3: If part three had focused a bit more on him slowly going from I don't like her to…

Tom: Yeah, it's sort of how did the shift happen straight after the flood, it was her fault, so let's go out and kill them.

Catherine: Now, what I'm going to do is to split you into three rough groups. I don't know how best ... we say four and then maybe four and then four. Oh, that's worked out all right. [inaudible 00:55:58] humanity [inaudible 00:56:02] division, [inaudible 00:56:05]. If you guys take part two and part four. What I want you to do is to think about what were the positives and the negatives of the live experience. Somewhere if you guys take part three, you think about the television, televised part, what were the positives and what were the negatives. Including sort of the production, how to get the story across, all that kind of stuff.

Catherine: Ready? Okay, so we start with group one, they were looking at part one, we're talking about the positives and negatives of the production quality, how engaging it was getting the story across.

Christine: We just felt it really got our attention and drew us in the whole kind of mystery of it, lots of questions it posed and it sort of hinted at supernatural science fictiony kind of thing. It was short and sharp, to the point, it didn't kind of drift about, very vivid imagery of her eyes, the tattoos, the life jackets, which hinted at the refugee crisis. That was it on the positives, we got lots of positives, very intriguing, that you really, it asked lots of questions and you want to go on and see what comes next and find out more about it.

Catherine: Can I hold you there one second? Does anyone have any other positives from part one to add or disagree with anything? Negatives?

Christine: We struggled finding negatives really. The only thing we've said here was that you mentioned that it went out on buses, you didn’t have to watch it on the internet, and that maybe some people might have found it just a bit too weird or a bit too strange. It might not have been their cup of tea kind of thing but we all liked it but...

Else: That's amazing. You don't know because [crosstalk 01:04:43] not interested. [inaudible 01:04:49]. We were all caught in so it was very difficult finding a negative about that short, sharp film

Catherine: Well, that's brilliant, thank you [crosstalk 01:04:59] really thorough analysis there. We move on to parts two and part four. They were the live action plays. [crosstalk 01:05:12].

Lynn: Positives, it was very atmospheric, the specific location of the dock we thought was really added to the experience. The headphones as well it just felt like you were doing something different really that we haven't done before, the special effects, the projections on the water mist and things, the pyrotechnics in part four, all of that sort of thing. The lighting, staging and the staging on the water was a huge positive. Negatives, we've got a few, the cold and inclement weather obviously is the biggest one because those night when it was chucking it down with rain there was no shelter for anyone so that must have been awful, possible restricted view for some people as well, some people like you couldn’t see in part two. The distance the stages were from where we were standing made it a little bit hard sometimes to see what was going on.

Headphones again we've got them as positive but also as a negative because of the way it was staged, the necessity of wearing the headphones which also sometimes made you feel a little bit disconnected. It was a bit disconnected. The dialogue was a bit fast in places and hard to understand and also I think that kind of performance is limited to a certain demographic really. For instance, the elderly couldn't deal with standing all that time and out in the cold. Some people with certain disability certainly wouldn't be able to manage it. It is limited to a certain demographic I think. I think is that about it?

Pauline: Yeah.

Catherine: This is getting very thorough. Anything anyone can think of?

Speaker 8: The only think I would say is, I know this might sound really sad, the fact that you were wet and cold, having now experienced all the other things we’ve experienced, as part of year of culture, I'm actually thinking that that was probably part of it, I know you cant arrange for that to happen, but I actually felt, retrospectively…

Dave: Yeah, I think at the time I felt…if it had been a nice evening it probably wouldn’t have worked quite as well.

Pauline: No, it wasn't, you're quite right really.

Speaker 8: For me it was the first time that I’d done or seen anything like that but now as the years have gone on and I’ve done other things and taken part in other things, it feels okay, it fits with what else was to come.

Christine: It wouldn’t stop me doing it again.

Tom: But for some people it will there’s no doubt about it.

Christine: Some people it will, there's no doubt about seeing on social media some people saying, "Never will I go and stand outside and watch something like that again. It was freezing cold." If it was something I wanted to see and I was interested in it, it wouldn't stop me.

Lynn: Price of the tickets as well.

Tom: Yeah, if you paid a lot.

Christine: Yeah that's true, you wouldn’t pay £50 quid to stand in the cold and get rained on.

Catherine: Part three, the televised so part.

Ted: We haven't got a great deal, what we've got because we couldn’t really remember!

Christine: [crosstalk 01:08:47].

Pauline: [inaudible 01:08:49].

Ted: On the positive side it was an interesting approach. It was not like anything I've seen as a TV play, we were thrown straight into these people floating on this wreckage, that's it, you either swank or swam, you had to keep going with it and I like that. You got closer to the characters in that, you could see them there was a bit more intimacy than you got to be doing the second part where it should have been more intimate. It looked good, it didn't look like it was just a floating platform in Victoria dock. Even though you’re sat there thinking, I know that's just a floating dock.

On the negative side I think it was a more of a logistical thing, in the [inaudible 01:09:45] show if you haven't watched it before, it was quite confusing and I think people were going for food, missed great chunks of it and on its own it made practically no sense at all. If you're tuning on BBC to watch it and you had not known anything about it, and you wanted to see what city of culture like, it wouldn’t have made you want to find out more, it made you think that Hull’s always flooding!

Tom: [crosstalk 01:10:20].

Ted: I thought some of the plot elements were a bit contrived and the sort of thing that you see in virtually everything of that type, you got the chap who was trying to get onto the boat, and they were like, no there’s no room, get away, and sort of generally it wasn’t terribly memorable as a piece of television, it was sort of, well that was interesting, at best.

Christine: It was like a bridge wasn't it really?

Ted: We didn’t even think it looked very good.

Christine: When we watched it, we said, "All these girls [inaudible 01:11:26]." They just threw us off, I can't remember. We didn't know [crosstalk 01:11:29].

You’d not been introduced to them before, there was no lead into it.

Ted: You had to construct the society in your own head, that they were living in.

Tom: We were saying when we were watching it, who are these girls? Were they in part two, it was ages that we saw that, we can’t remember.

Ted: You weren't in that society, you weren't allowed to talk about what had happened [inaudible 01:11:46] with the event.

Catherine: Any other thoughts? Positives, negatives of part three? I thought it was quite short actually. I think it ended, more suddenly than I expected it to. Anyway, thinking about the site specific live performance, does that challenge your idea of theatre at all or so? Has any of you seen any live theatre before?

Dave: Yeah.

Christine: [crosstalk 01:12:26].

Catherine: [crosstalk 01:12:34].

Lynn: [crosstalk 01:12:36] torrential rain, got the pit where all the dead bodies fall into and it was just filling ... Including things like Seven Alleys and the parade, it would include those as [crosstalk 01:12:55].

Pauline: Yeah, before that I've never seen anything outside at all. When I think about that I'm quite shocked because basically my whole life has been around going to theater and participating and never ever seen anything outside.

Tom: It’s a big, modern thing isnt it, a lot of art is now site specific, you get different artworks, so they’re obviously branching it out into different things, music for example the opera, ballet and proms on their [inaudible 01:13:36]. It's new things, it's getting out there, getting [inaudible 01:13:43] specific [crosstalk 01:13:46].

Ted: [crosstalk 01:13:43].

Christine: [inaudible 01:13:48].

Ted: Unless you have a specific interest in something and you travel over the country, but for Hull it was something brand new.

Christine: Yeah, that's true.

Ted: [crosstalk 01:13:57]. It was a new experience.

Else: [crosstalk 01:14:04]. [inaudible 01:14:09].

Dave: That's different that's not site specific that’s just open air.

Ted: [crosstalk 01:14:14].

Dave: There's a difference between that and a site specific.

Lynn: Leeds do quite a lot. They've always done quite a lot within two there. They do things [inaudible 01:14:27] I don't know what it's called, [inaudible 01:14:28]. It's like a car park under the railway lines or something. It's stuff under there, my daughter was in it actually, under Leeds Town Hall.

Sounds like One Day Maybe.

Lynn: Yeah, it was a much better stream, yeah and [inaudible 01:14:47] or something [inaudible 01:14:49]. They do a lot of site specific ones there. Can't think of any at the moment but I've seen a few of those. I've not been aware of any Hull before this year

Pauline: This certainly would make me go to more things in the future probably more so than it would have done in past.

Christine: Have you seen any Slung Low things before?

Pauline: No.

Ted: No I looked it up though, they might have been doing stuff in Leeds.

Oh yes I might have seen them before without knowing it.

Catherine: Did any of you being to Victoria Dock before seeing Flood?

Ted: No.

Christine: Do you mean visit Victoria Dock? Yes.

Pauline: Yes.

Christine: [crosstalk 01:15:41].

Pauline: Me too.

Catherine: Did it change how you felt about Victoria Dock or change your opinion of it or?

Dave: Not really.

Pauline: No, because I knew what it was like.

Else: I did think it would be nice to have a flat there and be in the dry watching it! I don’t know how you’d cope with it every night with the fireworks going off.

Christine: I think it’s nice that they’re using different locations to scatter us around. It's not all west and all east out there. You’re going to see different parts of the city.

Pauline: It’s so imaginative isnt it, like the One Day Maybe, it’s incredible.

Catherine: Would you have liked to have the opportunity to have had a theatre company in residence in your neighborhood?

Christine: Oh yes. Yeah.

Dave: Yeah.

Catherine: Anybody not?

Else: We live in the avenues area and of course there was the kerfuffle about Depart which was in the cemetery that's not used.

Tom: Literally half people say no it was fantastic and the other half saying it was consecrated ground.

Ted: That cemetery hadn’t been used for about 80, 90 years.

Lynn: I’ve been to a few of the community ones and I think they've been received pretty well, I went to the Longhill Burn and the atmosphere there was just wonderful.

Christine: Yeah, [crosstalk 01:17:58] it's just wonderful.

Ted: [crosstalk 01:18:02].

Christine: [crosstalk 01:18:10].

Pauline: I think it's been really good to do things in different parts of the town. I think the local communities have been so lucky to have culture coming to them, and literally walking out your front door across the green and you’re there at these events.

Ted: [crosstalk 01:18:28].

Pauline: Because you feel included then don't you?

Ted: Yeah.

Pauline: If it’s coming somewhere near you feel as if you've not been forgotten, you've been thought about. You've been included.

Ted: That was the point of the Land of Green Ginger stuff wasn’t it.

Pauline: [crosstalk 01:18:44].

Ted: That’s been one of the greatest things to me.

Speaker 3: Yes they’ve made use of the city not just the city centre

We’ve rediscovered the city haven’t we, these corners that we didn’t know.

Tom: Back to Ours, has been a brilliant example [inaudible 01:19:08] schools in the local community.

Tom: It’s so cheap as well so they make sure everybody can get access to them they’re making sure everybody's got access to it.

Catherine: That brings us to the end of my questions. Does anyone have any questions themselves or thoughts? Anything that you thought I would ask that I haven't? Anything we've missed about Flood?

Christine: Do you think they’ll use that site again?

Catherine: I think they have used it, [inaudible 01:20:05] with the residents that live there and there's been some acrobatics. Some companies have come and sort of done ... I can't give you examples [inaudible 01:20:15].

Pauline: I've missed that.

Catherine: It will be used. [inaudible 01:20:19] I guess it's a matter of funding so [inaudible 01:20:22].

Else: [inaudible 01:20:25].

Catherine: They loved it. They haven't got [inaudible 01:20:30]. I tried so hard [crosstalk 01:20:34], it's like-

Christine: Because the audiences were quite small weren’t they, it wasn't a huge amount of people was it?

Pauline: No.

Christine: [crosstalk 01:20:39].

Pauline: There was a lot of traffic disruption [crosstalk 01:20:45].

Catherine: They were so suspicious at the beginning because when the fireworks and they have thousands of people come to watch the fireworks and it wasn't one of the ... Victoria Dock wasn't a site that was encouraged for people to come and view those. It was just ... They just made such a mess. They were so suspicious about a theatre company coming, and they were really worried and oh my goodness. Like Slung Low just went above and beyond with the community engagement I've never seen anything like it. They want a blue plaque dedicated to Slung Low.

Christine: I think it was so good as well the way we're all directed, look you park in the Depp or you come on public transport, you walk along that walkway, just total respect for the people that live there.

Pauline: Respect people.

Christine: You don't bring your cars and park where people live. Apart from those people that actually live facing the promenade on the river would have seen us all walking by. On the occasions that we went, everybody was quiet. People weren't making noise, we were chatting but it was like a little hum because you conscious that’s people's houses.

Catherine: I think at these events you all feel like you're a part of a club as well, being a volunteer anyway, you feel like that anyway but going to these events it’s like when you go to a concert you feel like you are all in the same club don’t you.

Christine: We went to see a film on the Marina, Follow the Fleet,

Pauline: [crosstalk 01:22:14].

Christine: [crosstalk 01:22:18] fishing and my family said, "[inaudible 01:22:25] boat." When we got there ... It was [inaudible 01:22:29] it's like [crosstalk 01:22:30].

Pauline: That's amazing.

Christine: It was really good and that was just a real nice spot on the Marina.

Pauline: On the Marina.

Tom: I think one question that hasn’t been asked about Flood was, do you think it was value for money? You got your money's worth?

Christine: Yeah [crosstalk 01:22:47].

Tom: In terms of the entertainment and was it worth what you paid.

Tom: I guess the Float itself, the individual performances of Float itself, not the rest of them, just the money that you paid for Float, was it worth?

Christine: No, I think it was worth it, I think it was a reasonable price.

Tom: I think it was a reasonable price.

Dave: Sometimes you can't put price on experience. I don't think it was overly priced.

Else: No, because if it was too high priced people just wouldn't go.

Dave: We aren’t used to seeing the amount of things we’ve seen in the places we’ve seen this year, so what’s a fair price? If you’d have been in London you can guarantee that that would have been double at least.

Else: More than double.

Christine: On the other hand we've seen so much this year that's free, and then you start actually to baulk a little bit at paying for things like this because you get used to it being free.

Tom: [inaudible 01:23:52].

Dave: I'm kind of the opposite. If something's worth paying for, I’ll pay for it, I wouldn’t shy away from it.

Pauline: Yeah, I [crosstalk 01:24:09].

Dave: I spent a year and a half putting money aside every month to make sure that if anything came up I can do it, and as a consequences. I did and anything that came up I bought a ticket but I didn't know what it was. 90% I enjoyed and 10% I didn’t but there was a pretty good ratio.

Ted: [crosstalk 01:24:32].

Else: Yeah but you could spend a fortune then you could go and see something in London and end up saying, oh this is dreadful!