

**‘The voice is the guide to the experience as well as the experience itself’: An interview
with non zero one**

Konstantinos Thomaidis

and

Sarah Butcher

Abstract

Since 2009, non zero one – a London-based collective of artists with a background and interest in theatre but working across media and performance disciplines – has devised a series of unexpected, challenging but also light-hearted and inviting experiences of immersion. Whilst embracing a variety of techniques and contemporary media, one of the key features of the company’s work is the exploration of audience interaction through the use of headphones, typically in promenade and/or site-specific performance contexts. Following a first section that questions the role of voice in (theatrical) sonic immersion, the text unfolds as a dialogue between practitioner-scholar Konstantinos Thomaidis and non zero one artist and theatre director Sarah Butcher. The interview lends an attentive ear to the role of voice in the company’s work, from pre-recorded instruction to live audio interaction.

Keywords

non zero one

headphones

immersion

intimacy

pre-recorded voice

microphone

live audio

Background sounds

Since their inception in 2009, non zero one, a London-based collective of artists with a background and interest in theatre but working across media and performance disciplines, has devised a series of unexpected, challenging but also light-hearted and inviting experiences of immersion.¹ Whilst embracing a variety of techniques and contemporary media, one of the key features of the company's work is the exploration of audience interaction through the use of headphones, typically in promenade and/or site-specific performance contexts.²

From a sound studies perspective, the conjunction of listening and peripatetic experience has called for a new hermeneutics of sonic immersion. As early as 1977, Canadian composer and environmentalist R. Murray Schafer suggested 'listening walks' as exercises in alertness to acoustic environments and 'soundwalks' as scoring devices that aid the acoustic exploration of specific geographies of place (Schafer 1977: 212–13). In a discussion more specifically attuned to *headphone* listening and walking, Japanese musicologist Shuhei Hosokawa produced a typology of *musica mobilis*, in association with the particular effects of miniaturization, singularization, autonomy and construction/deconstruction of meaning associated with the advent of the walkman; 'it enables our musical listening to be more occasional, more incidental, more contingent. Music can be taken wherever and whenever we go. The walkman produces or constitutes a musical *event* which is characterized as unique, mobile and singular' (Hosokawa 2012 [1984]: 107, original emphasis). Crucially, Hosokawa posits that a core element of this 'walkman effect' is its theatricalization of the urban environment; the fact that someone is listening to music through headphones produces

pedestrian spectators for whom this ‘secret theatre’ is inaudible (Hosokawa 2012 [1984]: 113–15). Janet Cardiff’s audio walks (Gorman 2003) or scenario-based mobile fitness applications such as *Zombies Run!* (Darby 2014) are explicitly performance-inclined iterations of such ‘secret theatres’, potentially implicating the passer-by as semi-excluded spectator/auditor while remapping geographical location in performative ways.

The works by non zero one rebrand and inventively dialogue with the walkman experience, the audio guide or walk, and the sonic exploration of the real. Their particular context, however, necessitates a distinct framework of reference when discussing aurality in their headphone *theatre*. Sound designer and theorist Ross Brown suggests that, despite (or perhaps precisely because of?) everyday immersion in sonic effects, sound in theatre can reorganize the audience’s acoustic perception.³

Post-industrial daily life seems increasingly to be lived in a sonic environment full of designed sound effects, but the overall environment, from my position of immersivity, seems random, without design or architecture.

Maybe it is for theatre, through its sonic practices, to present the audience with some critical distance; to try to make sense of the strange new world of designer sound [...]. Sonic magic that would once have drawn vast, astounded crowds to a street conjuror has become commonplace, and the ear grows blasé. Theatre ought to be able to give us some perspective on a world where miniscule disembodied voices seem to speak to me from everywhere and nowhere. (Brown 2010: 4)

Is it possible, however, to speak with certainty of theatre’s power to provide critical perspective (with its inescapable connotations of visuality) and distance, when a voice

whispers in your ear or when this intimacy is augmented through the use of headphones? Performance maker and eavesdropping researcher Johanna Linsley, writing on Hannah Hurtiz's *Blackmarket for Useful Knowledge and Nonknowledge* (2005 – ongoing), suggests that listening-in through headphones to other participants conversing is a way of being in proximity 'with' them and that the multilayered set-up of discussions and listening-ins produces a type of 'slippery and contingent knowledge' (Linsley 2015: 195). Experiencing voice in secret, albeit with a certain degree of permission, places particular demands on the listener, perhaps leaving no distance for critical perspective. Composer and theorist of the cinematic voice Michel Chion would agree: 'in the torrent of sounds our attention fastens first onto this other *us* that is the voice of another. Call this *vococentrism* if you will' (1999: 6, original emphasis). Might this mean that voice, on the one hand, participates in the theatrical reorganization of the sonic, while, on the other, it eradicates distance? Or is the interplay of intimacy and distancing the very organizing principle that makes voice performative, transient, an 'in-between' (see Thomaidis and Macpherson 2015: 3–4)?

In what follows, non zero one co-founder and artist Sarah Butcher extends a generous invitation to listen in to the company's understanding and practices of sound, immersion and, significantly, voice.⁴

Headphone voices

<INT>Konstantinos Thomaidis (KT): As a collective of artists, you met and worked together for the first time during your degree in Drama and Theatre. What role did voice (and also music and sound) play in your studies?

Sarah Butcher (SB): At Royal Holloway we were part of a multidisciplinary course and

therefore voice played a part in some modules of study more obviously than others. Across the course, however, there was an emphasis on preparation and presentation. Preparation in more practical modules took the form of vocal warm-ups, of which there were many: from exercises to open the diaphragm to enable the voice a more open passage to enunciation, to playing with the different sound achieved by exercising the muscles of the mouth. Presenting your ideas and findings was part of the module formula too; at the end of a period of study, students were required to present their research. I mention this because the act of communicating information in this format required considered content that was well delivered, in both meaning and clarity.

Music and sound played a role in our studies almost as much as we wanted them to. Movement classes were not necessarily taught to music, but we could choose to explore movement to music if it felt useful. We were exposed to a lot of different practitioners throughout our studies, from companies like Song of the Goat to Forced Entertainment; all of these had an approach to voice and sound that we were encouraged to explore in our devised practice.

KT: What type of formal or informal voice ‘trainings’ did you have outside the university before forming non zero one? What types of voices were you exposed to? Did anyone in the group bring in any particular experiences in relation to voice?

SB: The entire collective had some previous experience of performing using voice – ranging from performing in bands, to television roles and stage performances. Personally, I spent some time teaching LAMDA exams, encouraging my students to consider their diction, inviting them to acknowledge punctuation when reading, construct the active thought of the written text, and explore how their delivery can help imbue the subtext and context of a character, their situation and its physical expression. Thinking about that now, it seems really pertinent to how

I consider voice in my work with non zero one and, broadly, as a director and practitioner.

KT: As a company that very often uses headphones, recordings, music, sound, is there a particular way you approach voice? Or a specific way you *think* about voice; perhaps as text, language, sound, noise, anything or all or nothing of the above?

SB: Voice as text is an interesting thing for us to reflect on. All of our work to date has involved instruction, whereby a participating audience is expected to follow instructions after hearing them. This calls for the text to have a high degree of clarity and the delivery to allow enough space for the person hearing it to digest the information and then act upon it. It also gives significance to the tone of the delivery and the language that we use to form the invitation. A direct instruction delivered abruptly might not be conducive to the participant wanting to follow the instruction. Similarly, sentences like ‘I’d just like you to do this for me’ delivered in a more pleading way could seem manipulative and again not inspire a desire to want to follow the instruction. This also starts to bring in the question ‘who is the voice?’, something that we consider at great length when developing a new piece of work. ‘The Voice’ as we call the person that is speaking – be it recorded or live – often has a set of characteristics assigned to it. For example, ‘The Voice’, as we noted in *something you’ve already seen* (a pre-recorded audio journey through the Fine Art Society in London), was ‘cheeky, mischievous, knowledgeable, questioning and warm, a voice that knows the building and wants to show you something, inviting you to look at the building in a new way’ – therefore, both the language and the delivery of the voice needed to evoke those qualities.

KT: What is the difference, for you, between a live and a recorded voice? Is it important to mix and combine them or to focus on one of the two in each project?

SB: For us, the difference of a live and pre-recorded voice is its ability to respond to what is happening *during* the work. As our work is interactive, the audiences taking part respond differently as it unfolds; in a pre-recorded audio experience, perhaps when asked to speak into a microphone, what that audience member chose to say would live and die within that moment; however, in a live experience those words could later come back during the work, spoken by 'The Voice'. In more recent work, we have experimented with using both live and pre-recorded audio within the same piece, which allows us to address the problem of needing audience members to be hearing different audio from 'The Voice' at the same time, and then when everyone hears the same thing, we are back to live audio. Previous works have stuck more formally to either being live or pre-recorded, but without this combination.

Thoughts on vocal instruction: Guidance and freedom

KT: In *would like to meet* (Southwark Playhouse and Barbican, 2009/10), each audience member is guided through a unique journey following a voice heard via a set of headphones. Could you talk a little bit about the devising choices you made around this notion of a voice leading an individual audience member?

SB: The piece asked the question 'can you miss someone that you've never met?' It felt to us that the participant needed to be able to build a relationship with a character, or what this character represented (perhaps somebody who feels 'absent' to them), but to never meet them as they moved around the building. Thus, the character the participant was introduced to only existing as a voice allowed us to create a relationship without physical contact. We were intrigued by how people build relationships in chat rooms and how in the era of modern

communications, you can exchange so much information, *personal* information at that, without ever seeing the face of the person with whom you are having these exchanges.

KT: In the online description of the project, you mention that as the journey/project/performance unfolds, ‘the connection grows deeper between the participant and the voice and its trace in the voice in the space grows more vivid’ (non zero one 2015). This phrase – for me – brings together three intriguing ideas, namely that of the intimacy between speaker and listener, that of the spatial character of voice, and that of a dramaturgy of experience (connection, vividness) facilitated by voice. Could you first share your thoughts on how voice creates, imparts or takes part in the development of intimacy?

SB: A voice can become extremely familiar to the ear the more it is heard, the longer the duration of the experience with the voice is or depending on how frequently you tune into that particular voice – all affect your sense of knowing the voice. A relationship can be developed with the voice by means of it evoking that sense of familiarity. A private conversation in a public space can be intimate both in the words imparted and shared but also in the delivery. The tone is altered to suit only the person intended to hear it and unheard by the world around you; that world continues not knowing what you have heard and what has been said. ‘The Voice’ in *would like to meet* was delivered through headphones evoking that sense of a private imparting in a public space. The tone of the delivery of the voice and the topics the voice presented to the listener also lent themselves to the feeling of intimate conversation.

KT: Following from this, could you also discuss with me your approach to space and place through voice and sound? There is something to be said here about the fact that you create pieces about specific venues and sites, and Andrew Haydon, reflecting on headphone theatre,

has argued that it can grant ‘audiences a certain amount of ambulatory freedom’ (2013: 53).

How do you see voice being part of your use of space(s)?

SB: An instructional voice can invite a participant to ‘see’ the space it inhabits in a different way. The voice that instructed participants around the old Bush Theatre in *this is where we got to when you came in* (Bush Theatre, 2011) was written having specific knowledge of this particular space, acquired through conversations with other people who had a relationship with the space, but also from having spent time in the building. That voice, narrated by actor Justin Salinger, who had indeed performed at the Bush many times, offered participants an opportunity to look at the space in a new way. In terms of it granting participants ‘ambulatory freedom’, in some ways I am in agreement. The sense of roaming and exploring through a permissive voice is freeing, although often in our work the piece is on a trajectory; ‘The Voice’ will prompt you to direct your attention elsewhere, to move on or to pause for a moment, thus the freedom is found within those moments rather than a sprawling sense of endless freedoms.

KT: And in relation to the third concept, that of dramaturgy, it seems that you are really interested in structuring experience more than anything else. What role does voice play in this?

SB: As I began to mention earlier, ‘The Voice’ is often framing the experience in light of a question. Dramaturgically, we are interested in creating experiences that are exploring a very human question about the human experience of life. ‘The Voice’ poses reflections and questions to you, on your own life both now and in the past and in the future, in order to invite you to relate to the subject matter of the piece. So, in essence, the voice is the guide to the experience as well as the experience itself. One thing that we hope with our work is that the participants’ experience within the piece extends outside of the work itself back into the real

world – perhaps taking the voice with them, the questions asked and the moments explored.

KT: You have briefly touched on this but regarding *this is where we got to when you came in* (Bush Theatre, 2011), I am interested in how you worked with a well-known actor and experienced voice-over artist, Justin Salinger. You also ‘featured’ iconic voices such as Alan Rickman’s. Could you discuss the ways in which you devised around, orchestrated and collaborated with these voices?

Figure 1: *this is where we got to when you came in* (Bush Theatre, 2011). Credit: non zero one.

SB: Working with Justin Salinger was a choice specific to the work. What he was able to bring was both a personal experience of having worked in the building as an actor but also the technical delivery of a voice-over artist; the two combined were able to bring ‘The Voice’, and therefore the building, alive. We also collaborated with writer Elinor Cook whilst devising the piece, who was able to take the piece into a more descriptive language of experience that also still felt real to ‘The Voice’. We also used verbatim quotes within the text, and anecdotes we had heard from other people. We spent three days in a recording studio with Justin working through the text, piecing it together both in tone, but also working through the action – asking questions such as: where in the building would the participant be hearing this? How long did we feel they would need to digest the information before acting upon it? How do we mark the changes in the voice to work in line with the experience of the participant?

One thing that we felt very strongly about with this piece of work was that the real voices of people who had a relationship with the building should be represented audibly. That meant interviewing them and taking high-quality voice recordings at the same time. A voice as iconic as Alan Rickman’s is easily recognizable and therefore evokes that sense of familiarity

discussed earlier. Alan was able to talk personally about his experience of the Bush Theatre, so when the participant hears that recognizable voice, talking openly with fondness about the building the participant is stood in, hopefully they feel a connection in a similar way to the building.

KT: There is also a fascinating play with voiced identity in this project. Very often voice is articulated as announcing bodily presence or identity but what I found intriguing is that ‘The Voice’ we listen to announces itself by saying ‘I’m pre-recorded’. Does this make voice more or less present? How did audiences relate to a voice that, in a way, admitted that it was not with them, there and then, but persistently was?

SB: It was an artistic choice to have the voice acknowledge that it is pre-recorded whilst actions in the building were live – the buzzing into the building or the phone ringing, and the similar. As ‘The Voice’ could not respond to the participants’ actions, to set up the experience of liveness but then not be able to follow it through by interjecting with text material felt at odds with one another, therefore we chose to acknowledge the pre-recorded nature of ‘The Voice’. ‘The Voice’ wanted to show you something, and therefore it had to have been there before. It had existed, seen and heard things that now the voice wanted to impart with you. ‘The Voice’ gave a sense of being very present in the building, but at another time perhaps. One of the things we’ve learned using pre-recorded voice is that it’s really difficult, and perhaps pointless, to ‘fake it’ as live. We found this out early with *would like to meet*, when the recorded voice guided the participant outside and started to comment on how peaceful and picturesque the scene was. One participant was almost knocked over by a cyclist at this point, whilst the voice was continuing about the sun, the fountains, the peace and quiet. This disconnection between the reality and the voice’s inability to acknowledge it can be enough to

jar a participant out of the experience altogether. We started to feel that it makes more sense just to acknowledge what most people are probably already aware of – how it's working – to give us a little more leeway in moments like that.

Soundtracking (and seeing)

KT: You are also very interested in music or, perhaps even more so, in soundtrack. For example, *you'll see me [sailing in antarctica]* (National Theatre, 2012) included a one-off soundtrack for each performance through the use of live sampling. How much is voice part of your thinking around soundtrack?

SB: I would agree that soundtrack feels more appropriate a term when thinking about the role that music plays in our work. Often, we are trying to evoke a feeling or a space for participants to think more freely. We have noted the need for 'thinking music' during shows, for moments when 'The Voice' drops out, or is posing questions that require the participant to respond personally, if only in thought. In particular reference to *you'll see me [sailing in antarctica]* the soundtrack varied every night as James Bulley had created a generative score using symphonic elements – they could be combined live by an algorithm at random, remaining harmonious no matter what the combination. In a way, this feels like the answer to the problem of the audio being 'responsive but recorded' that I briefly alluded to in the previous question.

Figure 2: *you'll see me [sailing in antarctica]* (National Theatre, 2012). Credit: non zero one.

Each participant had a headset and a small microphone, enabling them to speak at a conversational volume whilst sat around a large table on the roof of the National Theatre. The

microphones were also able to record the participants' voices, which were then played back during the final moments of the show.

KT: In the same project, there is – I think – an engaging ‘friction’ between its key theme of, and concern with, vision and visuality and the significance of voice and sound in the audience’s experience (through the use of microphones and single earpieces). Did you think of that when devising but also during the performances?

SB: I personally had not thought of them as being in friction to each other; sight and what it means to see are both scientific and philosophical points to explore. The dialogue that we were able to open up with participants surrounding the points I just mentioned became an individual exploration for each person. The microphones and headsets were there firstly to enable a dialogue at a conversational tone and volume; if a participant was to speak, they would not need to shout across a five-metre table. They could speak and be heard without needing to feel that they had to present, or muster a performance. So, on that project, I think we were engaging with sight and seeing on a philosophical level, but really approaching sound in quite a pragmatic way. James approached the composition with a line of artistic inquiry – how do we make something responsive to this moment? – but a lot of the decisions were taken to enable people to feel close to one another, to avoid the need for anyone to ‘perform’ or ‘project’ or raise our voices.

Interacting vocally

KT: Voice is also a powerful metaphor and – if I am not mistaken – this is the first time you decided to (quite literally) ‘give voice’ to your audiences. Why was it important to do so? Does

this shift link to your work on *ground control* (Hijack Festival, 2014), in which the audience have to make decisions on how life will be set up on a new planet?

SB: Absolutely. There is quite a clear journey that we have made from pre-recorded audio to live audio. Live audio means that you can respond more freely to what is offered to you as a performer within the context of the moment in the script. What I mean by that is, we might ask – as in the case of *the time out* (Latitude Festival, 2011) – a question like: ‘tell me about something that you’ve lost?’ And whatever the answer, we are able to question audiences further and respond to what they have said and even bring those thoughts back later in the show. One thing that we found was flawed with *the time out* was that the script did not much allow for ‘failure’. We had set out to ask: can a group enter a room as strangers and leave feeling like a team? – to which sometimes the answer was simply ‘no’. Still, regardless of how the group of participating strangers were behaving in the show, the text and the delivery from the actor playing the coach were geared to one outcome, that they were going to leave as a team. In *you’ll see me [sailing in antarctica]*, it felt like we needed to capture a more honest dialogue and not pre-determine the outcome for the group, but to allow individuals to determine their own outcomes. For that, there had to be a dialogue and an opportunity for the participants’ voices and thoughts to be honoured in the show.

ground control builds on this one step further. In a sense, the entire language of the work is based on choice, albeit selected choice. It is also the first piece of work that we made for young people. From the feedback we’ve received from programmers (who do tend to be adults...), we’ve learned that it’s perhaps unusual for children aged 8–11 to be ‘given a voice’ or a platform in the way we do in the show. There are no adults – no ‘voices of authority’ present in the room – but rather a microphone into which anybody has the chance to speak. We’re really interested in handing this responsibility and freedom over to a younger audience,

and in seeing what happens.

KT: In *the time out*, twelve audience members are addressed by ‘the coach’ as a polo team ready to step into a significant match, but ‘The Voice’ comments on the situation in all sorts of subversive ways; it almost becomes the voice of the audience’s collective unconscious. If there was an element of the voice giving the instructions in previous performances, here it seems that the voice undermines – or at least, complements – the instructions. This is an even more complex, layered and playful way of using voice and I wonder whether you could share some of the challenges you were faced with when using voice in this way.

SB: I think the main challenge regarding ‘The Voice’ here was for it to become understood as the voice of ‘reality’, able to acknowledge what is actually happening and what the audience *might* be thinking. I emphasize the *might* because there is a danger here in assuming that you know exactly what an individual is thinking at any one time; when, for example, ‘The Voice’ is playful with generalizing that you, the participants, might all be out of your depth, before it even poses questions to find out whether or not that is true. Of course there might have been water polo players amongst the audience – and indeed there were a few times. ‘The Voice’ had to be able to be conversational, reactive and instructional, sometimes all three at once. It needed to be able to make sweeping statements and then work out if they were credible and resolve the previous generalization with the new knowledge ‘The Voice’ acquired.

KT: In *LIFE: a healthy game of chance and choice* (Science Museum, 2013), at the end of their journey participants are invited to reflect on their journey of choices. Why did you decide to include this final ‘station’ in the journey? I am also interested in your choice to use the Talkaoke Table in this instance.⁵

SB: We chose to offer a moment of reflection at the end of the journey as a way to encourage the audience to filter their experience, to think about what they had discovered, learnt, heard or been involved in. We learnt quite early on in our work that when you offer audiences different routes through an experience, often at the end they want to find out from other people what they experienced and, because the work centres around the individual within the group, what differences and similarities between themselves they might discover. The Talkaoke was interesting, as it allowed us to open up dialogue about all of the above, still within the framework of the event, rather than after the event had taken place. We made a point to encourage a variety of age groups to join us at the table so as to continually reflect all of the people taking part, whilst a performer with a handheld microphone sat in the centre and interviewed them, passing them the microphone when they spoke. The action at the Talkaoke was broadcast live on screens, and this created a sense of event that, along with the handheld microphone, enhanced the experience of speaking and being ‘heard’.

KT: A similar yet distinct approach to agency and responsibility over choices is encountered in *hold hands / lock horns* (BAC, 2009; Forest Fringe, 2010). This interplay is now mediated by an iconic voice figure, ‘The Interviewer’; could you elaborate on the interviewer’s role in vocal exchange in this particular case?

SB: In the first instance, ‘The Interviewer’ poses you questions, without comment; s/he offers you two options, the participant moves, and then the interviewer repeats the choice that you have made confirming it as correct. The exchange is understood – vocally it is relatively simple, the language is paired down to the necessities, and the delivery is into a microphone. However, the relationship between ‘The Interviewer’ and the participant takes an unexpected turn when

in a room, filmed, the participant is asked to *justify* the choices that they have made. This exchange is not on microphone and takes place in a closer proximity. It becomes conversational again, but ‘The Interviewer’ makes vocal choices to remain anonymous. The point here is not to identify with what the person is saying as to why they chose a certain route but to prompt them and then allow them to consider. The interviewer asks open-ended questions – and does not agree or disagree with any answer given.

New audiences?

KT: Looking at your latest projects, I wonder what impact the size of the audience has on vocal delivery or communication through sound? I have *mountaineering* (Roundhouse, 2015) and *everything unknown* (Fringeworld, Perth, Australia, 2015) in mind but this could be opened up to your different experiences throughout the years of working at non zero one.

SB: As I hope has become apparent in this interview, our work always aims to honour the individual, even when in a group. So within our work for larger audiences there are moments to be found where it feels like ‘The Voice’ is speaking directly to you. In *mountaineering*, the lone performer addresses the group from the stage, behind a gauze. There is a clear separation between the audience and the performer, so the relationship is understood as somewhat traditional, but then, the voice uses direct address to you, the group, and then you, the individual – the change being the choice of words, but also the way in which they are delivered. To the individual, there is softer, more focused emphasis on the words ‘and you’, which are often delivered under a different circumstance, when the participants have their eyes closed or are being asked to do an individual task, like write on a post-it note or choose a packet of crisps. In *everything unknown* the voice was speaking to one person listening on a beach through

headphones. In this instance, the audio was pre-recorded and ‘The Voice’ more personal, relaying anecdotes from childhood and musing at philosophical questions that remain unanswered. Theoretically, over enough time, infinite numbers of people could take part in *everything unknown* but, each time, the relationship will only ever be between one recorded voice and one listener. In *mountaineering*, the audience is as big as 94 because that’s how much equipment we can get together, but again we can imagine it could work for many more people at one time.

Figure 2: *mountaineering* (Roundhouse, 2015). Credit: non zero one.

KT: Back in 2010, Andy Field blogged for *The Stage* that ‘as headphones have become all-pervasive, we grow increasingly adept at utilizing this technology – hearing voices or music whispered in our ears is becoming as familiar as settling into a theatre or cinema seat’. After a period of six years working in this area, what are your thoughts on familiarity, expectations and intimacy-through-voice? Are these intimate voices still unfamiliar? Can a voice ‘whispered in our ears’ ever be either all-too-familiar or radically alternate and strange?

SB: My feeling is that it remains unfamiliar. The context of the voice that is ‘whispered in our ears’ brings so much to an audience’s understanding of the voice, shaping our perception of who they are and why they are speaking to us. Perhaps the form is more familiar, people might be more used to being asked to wear headphones throughout a performance or feel used to performances where there is an absence – physically – of a performer in the space. Expectation is a tricky one to grapple with; people often leave interactive experiences wanting to have been ‘pushed’ further. The space we inhabit is one based on an interaction where the end goal is to have spoken to everyone individually in some way and that those who took part have not felt

put upon but wrapped up in something together, that they can then choose how far they go with it. I do not feel like the form is radically alternate and strange anymore. In a world where we are so connected to devices and ways of being told information, we are used to adapting how we hear a voice. I think we are operating now in a space where people are more used to experiencing ‘voices’ in a variety of ways, through a variety of means, and it is our job to make something increasingly familiar even more surprising.</INT>

References

- Brown, R. (2010), *Sound: A Reader in Theatre Practice*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chion, M. (1999), *The Voice in Cinema* (trans. C. Gorbman), New York: Columbia University Press.
- Darby, K. (2014), ‘Our encore: Running from the zombie 2.0’, *Studies in Theatre and Performance*, 34: 3, pp. 229–35.
- Field, A. (2010), ‘In a world that’s wired for sound’, *The Stage*, 22 October, <https://www.thestage.co.uk/features/2010/in-a-world-thats-wired-for-sound/>. Accessed 23 June 2015.
- Gorman, S. (2003), ‘Wandering and wondering: Following Janet Cardiff’s Missing Voice’, *Performance Research*, 8: 1, pp. 83–92.
- Haydon, A. (2013), ‘Theatre in the 2000s’, in D. Rebellato (ed.), *Modern British Playwriting 2000–2009: Voices, Documents, New Interpretations*, London/New York: Bloomsbury Methuen Drama, pp. 40–98.
- Hosokawa, S. (2012 [1984]), ‘The walkman effect’, in J. Sterne (ed.), *The Sound Studies Reader*, Oxford/New York: Routledge, pp. 104–16.

Linsley, J. (2015), 'The eavesdropper: Listening-in and overhearing the voice in performance', in K. Thomaidis and B. Macpherson (eds), *Voice Studies: Critical Approaches to Process, Performance and Experience*, Oxford/New York: Routledge, pp. 188–200.

non zero one (2015), 'non zero one', <http://www.nonzeroone.com/home>. Accessed 23 June 2015.

Schafer, R. M. (1977), *The Soundscape: Our Sonic Environment and the Tuning of the World*, Rochester, VT: Destiny Books.

Talkaoke (2015), 'Talkaoke: The mobile talk show', <http://www.talkaoke.com/>. Accessed 23 June 2015.

Thomaidis, K. and Macpherson, B. (2015), 'Introduction: Voice(s) as a method and an in-between', in K. Thomaidis and B. Macpherson (eds.), *Voice Studies: Critical Approaches to Process, Performance and Experience*, Oxford/New York: Routledge, pp. 3-9.

¹ The company currently consists of John Hunter, Fran Miller, Cat Harrison, Alex Turner and Sarah Butcher (the original configuration also included Iván González). Responses to the interviewer's questions were composed by Sarah Butcher, in consultation with other members of the company.

² For further information on the company and a full list of productions, please visit <http://www.nonzeroone.com/home>.

³ Additionally, it is worth noting that Brown's example of sonic immersivity is a description of travelling on the London tube with his headphones on (Brown 2010: 3–4).

⁴ Initial discussions on the workings of voice and sound in non zero one's process and performances were had between Sarah Butcher and Konstantinos Thomaidis during a visiting lecture on the company's work at the University of Portsmouth, School of Media and

Performing Arts (January 2015). Further insights were generated through a series of e-mail exchanges over a three-month period following this event.

⁵ The Talkaoke Table is a form of audience-led chat show around a mobile table, involving a ‘neutral’ host, microphones and a documentation on a plasma screen. More details can be accessed here: <http://www.talkaoke.com/>.