University of South Australia

Nat Texler

"Is it theft if you steal it from yourself?" – artistic audits for mapping the development of new theatrical work from old influences

Abstract:

When investigating the process of developing new work, it is important to examine where ideas can come from to directly inform performative output. This paper details how three previous scripts written by a practitioner influenced the creation of a new work titled *Lifeline*. The aim of this paper is to show how ideas and concepts can evolve not just within a singular project, but through various iterations from the same creator—an examination of 'self-sustainable' conceptualisation. The mapping is undertaken through what Brad Haseman refers to as an Artistic Audit—the examination of previous work to provide contextualisation for a practitioner within their field, and to investigate the original source of concepts. This paper seeks to define this 'self-theft' as a necessary element of the creative process, and provide an insider's account of how such process can be examined. The plays chosen are *Slumway* (2010), *Tick-Tock* (2011), and *Pistol* (2011)—three projects that the writer has worked on prior to beginning the development of *Lifeline*. Following Haseman's 'Audit' method, this paper provides a quick synopsis of each project, before detailing a theme or concept that is further evolved through practice and seen in *Lifeline*. By attempting to understand the constant evolution and modification of core issues and themes, the process of Audit provides creative practitioners insight into the importance of new work, and where it fits within the context of their field, as well as creating a better sense of an artist's evolution and examination of concept.

Biographical Note:

Currently based at the University of South Australia, Nat Texler is an emerging researcher in the field of creative writing, focussing on playwrighting and practice as research. Most recently, she has produced her short play Lifeline in the 2016 Adelaide Fringe Festival and is currently working on an accompanying exegesis for submission in 2017.

The development of new work is currently a key interest to practice-based researchers in creative fields. Particularly in creative writing practice, attempting to understand the evolution of ideas and concepts from original genesis to fully fledged artefact informs not just what it is that is created, but how it functions to commentate on various issues and themes. Part of this kind of research is the investigation of how previous work from practitioners directly influences proceeding outputs, and how one can track their development as an artist and a researcher through their work. This paper does not seek to provide explication on the performative research method—rather it examines the outputs of practice as a way of creating new knowledges from old through the 'recycling' of themes and elements found within work. The concept of 'theft' is central—how ideas are 'refurbished' through their various iterations through different creative contexts. The argument within this paper details an example: a short thriller play titled *Lifeline* that was developed by the researcher and is currently the subject of an upcoming dissertation.

Firstly, it is important to clarify that this paper does not seek to discount other philosophical methodologies, nor to discredit or critique any chosen approaches of other academics when it comes to examination of practice and creative work. Rather, it seeks to study practice utilising current academic thought on the relationship between practitioner and researcher, as well as explorations of writerly technique and decisions made within *Lifeline*. To do so, the content of the play must be examined - the themes, issues, and ideas of concern for the creative. In the case of this paper, examination is kept to how previous work influences *Lifeline*. It seeks to illuminate how concepts and ideas are 'stolen' from previous work and 'recycled' through different contexts, characters, and perspectives.

It is critical to note that this paper approaches research from 'within' the professional field of playwrighting, which, according to performance analyst Gay McAuley, provides an insider's account that is 'inestimable'. She states:

> … those (accounts) that have been published are rapidly coming to constitute the canon of classic texts in the developing discipline of rehearsal studies.[1]

While the paper in no way asserts that the examination of *Lifeline* is a 'rehearsal study', the core sentiment of McAuley's statement still rings true—an insider account of the processes of developmental practice is inestimable and opens a dialogue about the nature of practice through examining the information attained by the undertaking of creative enterprise from a subjective perspective. Furthermore, researcher Graeme Harper has this to say about examining process:

> A concentration on 'process or processes'—which is a more common way of describing the events of writing creatively, and incorporates what is called here, alternatively, 'acts' and 'actions'—is one of the most fundamental of re-orientations for anyone undertaking creative writing research. A re-orientation because, up until relatively recently, process was a concentration mostly found in creative writing teaching, rather than informing creative writing research.[2]

It provides opportunity for researchers and practitioners to examine the raw ingredients that go into creation of 'new work', and where these elements may have originated, in a space where such discussion is valued for the elements of practice evident in the artefact.

As such origins of concept can swell to become unwieldy, the paper refrains by restricting

examination to the previous work of the paper's author. A consistent backbone of central themes and concepts can be traced back through many practitioners' previous work. Common writerly practice during the development of new work often acknowledges these foundational constructs and recognising how they directly inform the new work in question. For example, British playwright Sarah Kane, when asked about the development of her fourth play *Crave* revealed that the nature of *Crave* was influenced by T.S. Eliot's *The Wasteland*[3]. Kane gives credit to her influences and the genus of her concepts and ideas as part of a grander path to the outcomes of her practice. This is not an isolated incident. It can also be seen with Australian playwrights' work, such as Jack Hibberd's call for a theatre of 'myths and mores' and preoccupation with Australian 'mateship' rituals[4], Stephen Sewell's preoccupation with 'the decline in idealism in Western society, the greed, corruption and rank materialism in our own, the power of the multinational corporations, and the threat to individual freedom posed by the forces of the right'[5], and Daniel Keene's focus on the 'side of the battler and the underdog'[6]. The comprehensive understanding of where these kinds of concepts may be birthed is deeply engrained in the early stages of development.

Theorist Brad Haseman finds further parallels in this practice as research tool. He states:

> As researchers 'practice' and make … work, it is essential they reach beyond their own labours to connect with both earlier and contemporaneous productions which contribute to the overall research context for their work.[7]

The act of reaching beyond the current state of practice to previous influences, both within and outside of the playwright's own works, is vital to provide a foundation upon which new work can be developed. Writer's drawing on the world around them for inspiration and reacting not only to societal concerns, but also their own development—a form of 'research' that writers undertake to provide basis for new perspectives. This is supported by Graeme Harper's *creative writing: words as practice-led research*, where he states that the act of 're-examination of the writer's own previous works and projection of similar or alternative approaches to subjects or themes' is as much a useful method of creative writing as other techniques such as 'writing and redrafting' and 'workshopping'[8]. Both these theorists provide a basis for the approach of the audit in this paper—allowing for discussion of the evolution and recontextualization of themes/ideas in new work.

However, to contain the vast possibilities for influences, this paper restricts itself to the concept of 'self-theft'—an idea that previous work had elements that remain unexplored within the context of work produced, but is then recycled and reused in new work. A method that assists in examining this kind of cycle is a process that Haseman refers to as an 'artistic audit'—the description of the influences and concepts behind the ideas that are soon to be put into practice, and 'is explicitly designed to transform 'the literature review' into a more layered and rich analysis of the contexts of practice within which the performative researcher operates'[9]. The techniques used for this examination come under the conceptual framework of practice as research—also defined as *performative research*. A field of interest to researchers such as Carole Gray[10], Linda Candy[11], and Baz Kershaw[12], practice as research explores the nature of the practitioner-researcher, and seeks to provide insight into the developmental influences of new work. It seeks to create space for the development of work to act as a research method, and to examine the various intersections between the researcher as an analyst and as a creator. In the case of this paper, this methodological framework will

be applied to examination of *Lifeline* - a play that was developed through 2014-2015 and underwent a short production during the 2016 Adelaide Fringe season, with a run of four successful shows at the Wheatsheaf Pub in Thebarton, Adelaide, positive reviews, and decent ticket sales[13].

A story of human manipulation and psychological tension, *Lifeline* begins with Guy—a man on the cusp of committing suicide - receiving a telephone call from Lewis, a telemarketer. Lewis first convinces Guy to confirm his date of birth, before asking a set of questions that become more and more invasive until Guy realises that Lewis has access to all his personal information, including bank account details, telephone and internet history, and various personal histories. Lewis then 'makes Guy a deal'—either he does exactly what Lewis tells him to, or Guy's wife (who has recently left him for another man) will be killed. If Guy does as Lewis asks, Lewis will give him details of where his wife is, while implying that the man Guy's wife is with is domestically violent and unstable.

Guy refuses to believe that Lewis can do anything and threatens to call the police. Lewis shows his power by blowing up Guy's car with a computer-triggered bomb that had been planted previously. With Lewis's access to Guy's personal accounts—through a verified email address and use of various software - and the threat of his wife's life on the line, Guy realises the only way out of the situation is to play by Lewis's rules. The following tasks are intercut with conversations about Guy's personal life, with Lewis gradually breaking down his resistance through a combination of taunts and false comfort.

The first task is a threatening phone-call that Lewis forces Guy to make to a private number. He undertakes this task reluctantly and is rewarded with the name of the man that his wife left him for—Sam. This is followed up by Guy being forced to choose between purchasing a child sex slave, or an execution on the Darkweb. Guy, after much confusion and despair, chooses to hire a hitman to kill someone., After finalising the details, Lewis informs him that just because he 'purchased' a slave, it didn't mean the child had to remain a slave, and that now Guy was responsible for not one but two lives being ruined. His 'reward' for this task is the street name of where Sam and his wife are. He attempts to leave but is stopped when Lewis reminds him of what is at stake—if he leaves the call or the location he is in (pinpointed by his mobile phone's GPS locator), his wife's life will be forfeit.

Finally, Guy is forced to call the hitman to ensure he is on track to his target, only to find out that the target is Sam—and that his wife is about to see someone die in front of her. It is then revealed that Lewis lied about Sam's abusive tendencies. The revelation is the whole scenario was set up by Lewis to dispose of Sam—a person connected to Lewis in some form that Lewis refuses to clarify[14], and Guy and his wife were just a means to an end. The play concludes with Guy leaving to find his wife, while Lewis begins a new phone call with a member of the audience.

To begin the process of audit, this paper will investigate previous work of the researcher's field to inform the basis for creative decisions that were made within *Lifeline*'s development. For example, a trend of themes, and investigation of those themes through creative enterprise serves to directly inform the original genesis of the concept that evolved into a performable text. This paper will examine three pieces of work undertaken by the researcher: *Slumway* (2010)*, Tick-Tock* (2011), and *Pistol* (2011), and detail the various concepts that have evolved and matured through practice to become key components of *Lifeline*. It will seek to

investigate the ramifications of such 'recycling'—and how the 'self-theft' has reinforced the practitioner's understanding of differing perspectives on the same themes

Slumway

Slumway[15] began its development in late 2009, when the researcher was approached by composer Richard Chew, and tasked with developing an adaptation of Oscar Wilde's *Salome* (1893). The idea was to present a libretto for a rock opera, with space for compositions by performance students at the University of South Australia that would result in a production season in late 2010. The show ran for a week, with over 500 attendees and a cast including fourteen principle actors, plus ensemble and band.

Firstly, the incorporation of an underground setting led the researcher to discovering a book by Jennifer Toth titled *The Mole People: Life in the Tunnels Beneath New York City* (1995). This book details the legends and mythology surrounding the homeless people in New York City, the societies they have developed and their relationship with people 'topside'. This book provided not just an aesthetic leaning to the project, but also a language that was utilised in the creation of new characters and their relationships within the society governed by greed and power, such as the various belief systems in place from the 'mole people', and their mistrust of outsiders.

The resulting play follows the journey of the character Evol, and her rebellion against the malevolent He-Rod, ruler of an underground society who believe the world above is a nuclear wasteland. She is given hope by a mis-adventuring police officer John, who states that he comes from the 'world above' and tries to convince the denizens of 'Slumway' that there's a better place for them than the court of the He-Rod, She-Rod, and Salome. While *Slumway* does still feature a similar ending, in that Salome demands the head of John once he rejects her, there is an uplifting note as the denizens of Slumway rise up against their megalomaniacal rulers, and Evol escapes from the world underground and finds her way to a subway tunnel, where she realises there is hope in a different life.

It is interesting to note there is a clear relationship between *Slumway*, and *Lifeline*, namely with suicide as a preoccupation for a character that has been rejected by the one they love. In the case of *Slumway*, the character Plague electrocutes himself once he is spurned by Salome. This death is what inspires Evol to rebel against the world of Slumway, and incites her to investigate John's claims of the world above. The rejection of love is a key foundational concept to *Lifeline*, as it is what drives Guy to continue to cooperate with Lewis, even in spite of the horrific acts he is forced to undertake. He does these things because he wants to save his wife—as well as his own desire to be a 'good person'. As a further exploration on the theme introduced here, *Lifeline* takes the path not travelled—in that Guy's story begins with suicide, as opposed to Plague's ending. The parallel between the two men is not obvious from the outset, until it becomes clear that both men share the same action a preoccupation with being the 'hero' and saving the ones they love. In both cases, this ends in tragedy—Plague's death by electrocution and the manipulation of Guy into performing horrible acts.

Further creative investigation through writing results in the character of Guy becoming the protagonist of *Lifeline*, and the central figure, a status Plague merely dreams about. Plague's constant need for the validation of the person he loves most (Salome) is his undoing, much as

Guy becomes victim to his own desire to 'be a hero' and save his wife from a situation that in actuality is not real. Both plays explore the levels that both men go to in order to 'prove themselves worthy' and both plays show that the results are not as desirable as once thought. This kind of reiteration of 'love or die' is the core moral action of each character, but the reusing of the suicidal lover concept is more deeply explored in *Lifeline*. While Plague's death in *Slumway* was a turning point for the actions of Evol and given almost no more thought in the core narrative, Guy's preoccupation with his own demise opens the play. It is almost immediately forgotten once Lewis implies the object Guy desires—his estranged wife—is in danger. The evolution of the character becomes complete once he realises his actions have caused her more pain than he knew. While he woefully wishes he had killed himself[16], his final motion in the play is to go searching for the one he loves in order to make sure she is safe—a far cry from Plague's impulsive act of self-destruction.

However, what is interesting to note is the similarities between the two characters in two plays written for two different purposes, with two different settings, created years apart. The development of both characters comes from the same source—a preoccupation with twisted romantic affliction, but the resulting outcome has been shifted. The 'theft' becomes complete in the slight alteration of Guy from Plague—while both outcomes are bleak, Guy's desire to be a good man overcomes his suicidal indentation, an example of the 'refurbishment' of the idea, whereas Plague refuses the fight in order to martyr himself for Salome, who doesn't even notice. A stretch of metaphor, perhaps, but it cannot be denied that there is a circular nature to the iteration of both men, both united by an obsession with a woman they love, both betrayed by their own desires.

Tick-Tock

The development of *Tick-Tock*[17] once again began with adaptation, in this case of *Momo* by Michael Ende (1973). Originally commissioned to write the script as part of another music theatre production by composer Jessica Monck, the decision was made to deviate from the source material dramatically due to both difficulties with the adaptation process, and rights issues with the holders of Ende's material. The result was to move towards more of a steampunk theme, and create a story based around a triplicate of characters representing the Creation, Maintenance, and Destruction of Time—due in no small part to a conversation between the researcher and composer about the triplicate sense of stories which tend to have a beginning, middle, and end.

In the world of *Tick-Tock*, time is represented by cogs and is converted by the GnoMen, who cannot survive without a constant supply. In order to gain cogs, they 'pitch' their services to people, promising to 'free up' their time, when in reality, they steal it and use it to sustain their own unnatural existence. This has created an unbalance in time, with the creator of the cogs Jocelyn unable to maintain production. In order to stop the GnoMen from taking over the world, Tocki (the daughter of Jocelyn, and the Destroyer of Time Dorian—also the head of the GnoMen) must become the Maintainer of Time and restore the balance.

With a sci-fi setting in nature and complications of the passage of time as a central narrative, *Tick-Tock* may seem worlds away from the reality-based *Lifeline*. However, there is one necessary piece of the puzzle of *Lifeline* that was first explored in *Tick-Tock*. The antagonists of the play (the four GnoMen) function as tempters and 'salesmen'. They are written to be

witty and intelligent, with a focus on persuasion and snaring people's consent in unethical ways. Furthermore, their art of 'the sale' serves as their primary weapon against the protagonists, in much the same way as Lewis's persuasive skills are his primary power over Guy. In *Tick-Tock*, Tocki is repeatedly propositioned by the GnoMen, either by being told that her time is meaningless, or by being seduced into becoming one of them. It is only through her resistance to their advances that she overcomes them and resolves the imbalance in time.

Unfortunately for Guy in *Lifeline*, he finds himself in a position where such resistance is merely a token gesture—his desire to be the saviour for his wife is doubled down against Lewis's capacity for maliciousness and innate talent as a salesman. Furthermore, Lewis's language—unlike the GnoMen—is based in actual telemarketing scripture. A clear example is his use of 'Feel, Felt, Found'[18] in *Lifeline*[19], a tactic used by telemarketers in order to deal with 'objections' from customers who may be reluctant to either purchase what the marketer is selling, or engage in conversation. Again, this shows an evolution of the idea: the GnoMen present the first iteration of an evil salesman in the writer's work, and Lewis provides a clear evolution in language with added structure. The wordplay and subtext of the GnoMen was the first attempt of the researcher in writing antagonists who fit the salesman mold, and commentate on the nature of persuasion as not just a tool for communication, but a weapon for misdeeds. The use of language—puns, subtext, and pitch behaviour—is the core of the GnoMen as antagonists, but also belies interest in the meta of the play's context. It is only through their words that they both gain and lose power over the various 'victims' of their schemes. This is echoed by Lewis, who has the added edge of reality drawn from actual sales techniques, as opposed to the GnoMen's mimicry. Another theft from previous work distilled with experience that can be traced through examination of previous work. However successful the presentation of the 'evil salesman' in either iteration is up for debate, but there can be no denying the preoccupation with the concept.

Pistol

Pistol is a short play that deals with the consequences of an incident of child abuse, told from the perspectives of the perpetrator, victim, mother, and witness. The script was created by a group of writers[20] during late 2011 and has its origins in a news story the researcher heard on *Hack*, an Australian youth news program on triple J. The story states that a childcare worker became obsessed with preventing instances of abuse, to the point where he began exhibiting the same behavioural characteristics of a paedophile in order to 'protect' children from 'evil'—in turn becoming an assaulter himself. This incident provided the basis for the perpetrator, a child care worker whose psychological dissonance is a focal tension point in *Pistol*. Furthermore, the use of dialogue as the pure vehicle for action—the incident of child abuse is spoke of, but not shown—creates a heightened sense of reality, as the truth of the situation is never fully revealed to the audience in their role of investigator/counsellor. While *Lifeline* does not make use of this convention, the sense of tension is still there with the psychological warfare between Lewis and Guy. The actions undertaken by Guy are not shown, just reported on through dialogue. Furthermore, trust in both *Pistol* and *Lifeline* is fragile—characters often lie, mostly to attain their goals. In *Pistol*, this is left open ended but *Lifeline* provides a devastating resolution for the protagonist.

Much like *Pistol*, the use of real world 'information' to create tension is a common device in *Lifeline*. Information about the dark web and metadata laws was combined with the form of a playscript, and use of a sense of unreality and mistrust between characters. This technique, mimicking intertextuality and intervention, stems from adaptive practices in *Slumway*, but uses information researched from current issues that the researcher has engaged with and explored. Using the concept of the dark web—the unindexed parts of the internet where criminal and illegal actions are often arranged, or purchased—provided a realistic means to manipulate Guy. The information Lewis utilises in order to blackmail Guy into performing the actions he undertakes is common information available through not just metadata but social networks.

Building on this kind of research, the 'everyday' fears explored in *Pistol* (child abuse, powerlessness, deception, psychological dysfunction) present the audience with the concept that no one is fully separate and protected from the evils of society. Again, this is a message echoed in *Lifeline*, with the role of a telemarketer—an everyday occurrence for some—being used as a vessel for malevolence. This situation is made worse by the fact that all occurrences of violence and terrorism (both psychological and physical) in *Lifeline* are possible, albeit not within the timeframe in which they occur. Like *Pistol*, *Lifeline* is preoccupied with the inherent manipulation of people in order to achieve something horrible. In *Pistol*, the implication is of a continual abuse by a different character, whereas *Lifeline* finishes with the beginning of another phonecall, this time directed at the audience.

The consideration of ethical and unethical behaviour in both *Pistol* and *Lifeline* show a clear relationship—both feature horrible crimes perpetrated by people in a position of power. While the childcare worker in *Pistol* is given the chance to espouse himself, Lewis is not afforded such an opportunity—and it would be doubtful that he would take it if offered. The preoccupation with the 'evils' of agency—and the capacity for everyday things to become malicious—is recycled over and over in *Lifeline* and *Pistol*. Tension is created in both plays by drawing on real-world examples and the writer's responses to them. While *Slumway* and *Tick-Tock* may provide the basis for the protagonist and antagonist of *Lifeline*, *Pistol* provides the pathos and creeping tension that underlies every turning point in the play. It is a theft of pathos—a heightened reality that both *Lifeline* and *Pistol* share—that ties together the cerebral concepts present in both pieces.

Pistol is currently unproduced, due to difficulty in adapting controversial material to stage and the ethics of casting a child to the role of the victim. However, it was shortlisted for the Flinders Young Playwright Award[21], and has had a major production discussed by various parties in Adelaide. For now, *Pistol* exists as the first instance of 'real world' theatre for the researcher—a play of which events are possible and based in contemporary society.

While *Lifeline* is inherently more than a culmination of the plays that have preceded it, there can be no doubt of the influences previous creative work has on its existence. Themes of mistrust, suicide, protagonists and antagonists, manipulation, violence, and reality are all present in various forms. Guy in *Lifeline* is the natural evolution of Plague from *Slumway*, whereas Lewis features aspects of the GnoMen from *Tick-Tock* combined with the underlying malevolence present in the perpetrator in *Pistol*. The success of these attempts to ratify the themes is varied, with flaws structurally within all of the plays discussed. However, the reuse of concepts, and the evolution of those same ideas has a key impact on the thematic success

of *Lifeline*. Developing an understanding through the practice of writing creatively about these concepts provides the outcome with firmer, more stringent and overall 'better' presentations of the core concepts. This can be seen not just by the financial successes of *Lifeline* as a show—positive reviews and profit from the box office—but also by tracing how much more interesting and complex the presentation of ideas has become. In other words: how much better is the writer at discussing the same core information?

By examination of the various elements of 'self-theft' common in all the plays through the lenses of an artistic audit, it provides a basis for analysis of the development of this new work. More importantly, it reflects on the process of creative writing as a place to draw new knowledges from old, to evolute understanding through practice or—to use another perspective—to steal from one's previous work concepts that, with some further thought, consideration, and polish, become newly refurbished iterations that impact on the creative contexts in a different fashion. These creative processes may seem unconscious, or part of one's 'process', but they are important and do provide valuable insight into the developmental techniques behind creative work from the perspective of the practitioner.

It is vital to acknowledge that this paper has merely scratched the surface of the influences present in *Lifeline* and further research into the various other influences on *Lifeline* will be found in a dissertation set for submission in May 2017. However, it is important to realise how much evolution ideas and concepts go under not just within the process of writing one new work, but through a variety of very different creative outputs. It is only through understanding where ideas come from that creators can realise the impact their work has on the world around them. Such constant flow between concepts across various iterations of work does beg the question of whether such new productions are 'original' or merely a rehash of the same concepts. But the evolution of these ideas, seen from *Slumway*'s use of the 'suicidal lover' concept, the 'evil salesman' in *Tick-Tock*, and the tension and fear created by using real-world issues in *Pistol* all becoming referenced and distilled by the creation of *Lifeline* show that such concepts are in a state of flux—that attempting to segment these into homogenous constructs misses the point of creating new work. Part of the role of the creator is to rise to the challenge of making these experiences and idea work theatrically and structurally. Much like the constant engagement with themes seen in Hibberd's, Sewell's, and Keene's work, different perspectives on the same concepts create different levels of engagement, and the acknowledgement of this 'common thread' of ideas that stem from project to project provides a valuable 'insider account' of the processes required to create such pieces.

So, in answer to the question posed by the title of the paper: yes, such refurbishment of prior creative productions is a theft of sorts but thematically, the use of the same preoccupations grant a greater understanding of the ideas at hand. It allows for a body of work that creates a dialogue between artist and audience, and between previous works, current iterations and future endeavours. By examining *how* things have been altered, writers can begin to uncover *what* the changes mean in the grander context, and *why* the decisions were made—insights useful for any practitioner interested in the genesis of their craft. By examining the patchwork make-up of *Lifeline* and looking for what has been used before, the beginnings of conceptual arrangement can begin to be uncovered.

List of works cited

2011 *Young Playwrights Award Winners Announced 2011*, Australian Stage, at http://www.australianstage.com.au/201107074538/news/industry-news/2011-young-playwrights-award-winners-announced.html (accessed 21 March 2016)

Gray, C 1996 'Inquiry through Practice: Developing Appropriate Research Strategies', *No Guru, No Method?*, Helsinki: UIAH

Harper, G 2008 'Creative Writing: Words as Practice-Led Research', *Journal of Visual Art Practice* 7:2, 161-171

Haseman, B 2006 'A Manifesto for Performative Research', *Media International Australia incorporating Culture and Policy* 118, 98-106

Kershaw, B & A Piccini 2004 'Practice as Research in Performance: From Epistemology to Evaluation', *Digital Creativity* 15:2, 86-92

McAuley, G 2006 'The Emerging Field of Rehearsal Studies', *About Performance: Rehearsal and Performance Making Process* 1:6, 1-8

McGillick, P 1988 *Jack Hibberd*, Amsterdam: Rodopi

Putten, 2016 *How to Handle Sales Objections with the 'Feel, Felt, Found' Method,* at http://www.provensalestraining.com/how-to-handle-sales-objections-with-the-feel-felt-found-technique.html (accessed 22 March 2016)

Radic, L 2006 *Contemporary Australian Drama*, Blackheath: Brandl & Schlesinger

Saunders, G 2002 *'Love Me or Kill Me': Sarah Kane and the Theatre of Extremes*, Manchester: Manchester University Press

Tick-Tock 2011 at https://balanceoftime.wordpress.com/ (accessed 27 July 2016)

Texler, N 2016 *Lifeline*, Adelaide: University of South Australia

Toth, J 1993 *The Mole People: Life in the Tunnels Beneath New York City*, Chicago: Chicago Review Press

Endnotes

[1] See McAuley, 2006, p.9
[2] See Harper, 2008, p.166
[3] See Saunders, 2002, p.104.
[4] See Radic, 2006, p.42 and McGillick, 1988, p.50
[5] See Radic, 2006, pp.161-162.
[6] See Radic, 2006, p.216.
[7] See Haseman, 2006, p.8.
[8] See Harper, 2008, p.165
[9] See Haseman, 2006, p.8
[10] See Gray, 1996
[11] See Candy, 2006
[12] See Piccini and Kershaw, 2004
[13] See https://fringewithbenefits.com.au/talkfringe-events/lifeline. Also see http://www.stagewhispers.com.au/reviews/lifeline, http://fringereview.co.uk/review/adelaide-fringe/2016/lifeline/, and http://www.theatreguide.com.au/current_site/reviews/reviews_detail.php?ShowID=lifeline&ShowYear=2016 for reviews of *Lifeline*

---

[14] "Lewis: See, if I was his son, that'd be such cliché. But maybe I am. Or I'm a past jilted lover. Maybe I'm his brother, his friend, his worst enemy. Maybe I am all of these things and none of them. You'll never know. Maybe I'm just a man trying to make some money doing whatever it is my company needs me to do." (Texler, 2016, p.35)

[15] See https://www.facebook.com/Slumway-148569055179174/ for the production of *Slumway*, as well as the cast, crew, and publicity

[16] "**Guy:** I'm ruined. I should have just killed myself." (Texler, 2016, p.35)

[17] See https://balanceoftime.wordpress.com/ for more information on the production of *Tick-Tock*, including images, media, cast and crew.

[18] See Putten, 2016, http://www.provensalestraining.com/how-to-handle-sales-objections-with-the-feel-felt-found-technique.html.

[19] "**Lewis:** I know you're feeling apprehensive. Other people in your situation I have spoken with have also confided in me their apprehension. But I've found that, after being reminded of the consequences of their actions and the benefits with following the directives I give, their lives change for the better. (beat) Mostly." (Texler, 2016, p.26)

[20] Jennifer Barry, Tara Wylie, and Emma Wotzke, under direction from Sheila Duncan.

[21] See *2011 Young Playwrights Award Winners Announced* 2011, Australian Stage, viewed 21 March 2016, <http://www.australianstage.com.au/201107074538/news/industry-news/2011-young-playwrights-award-winners-announced.html>.