**CQUniversity, Australia
Simon Dwyer**

**State Library of New South Wales; University of Newcastle, Australia
Rachel Franks**

**State Library of New South Wales
Monica Galassi and Kirsten Thorpe**

Editorial: the betwixt and between

Fig. 1. Ulrike Sturm, *Gum leaves*, linocut, 2016

Introduction

This Special Issue of *TEXT* presents writing at the betwixt and between: in a space that is an intimate act between a writer and their practice and is simultaneously the result of a shared space – a creative discussion between editors and fellow contributors. In April 2015, a diverse group of scholars – from those embarking on their research careers to very experienced academics, representing a range of disciplines and from many different countries including Australia, Canada, England, Fiji, Georgia, India, New Zealand, South Africa and the United States of America – met over three days for the inaugural conference of the Institute of Interdisciplinary Inquiry held at the State Library of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia. The main objective of the conference, and the overall mission of the Institute, was to promote multi, inter- and transdisciplinary research as part of a broader effort to connect different experiences, research fields and spheres of knowledge. This Special Issue looks at how the objectives of the conference were achieved through explorations of different types of storytelling.

The theme of the 2015 conference – ‘Re-visioning Space(s), Time and Bodies’ – allowed for these three elements to unfold in a way which encouraged deep exploration of the individual elements as well as how these relate to, and interact with, each other. Moreover, the conference sought to challenge some of the dominant ways of understanding space, time and bodies: categories that we each experience every day but that can impact upon us in quite different ways. This goal of challenging pervasive narratives was achieved through papers that facilitated explorations of the changing dimensions of time and movement, human/post/trans and/or non-humans, contested flows, ‘webs’ and networks as well as the connections between these concepts. Of particular note is how the papers pushed mainstream approaches, ideas and topics to the peripheries of traditional academic research practices – but all through the exploration of various forms of creative practice. This ensured that even the familiar was made new. The inspiring, though often underestimated, notion of interdisciplinarity and the multiple shades this concept assumes in different practices – and in the world around us – created a perfect milieu for a stimulating exchange of ideas and points of view. Such points of view are critical, as observed by Harvey Graff, who has noted:

In my view, interdisciplinarity is defined and constructed by questions and problems of theory or practice, knowledge or conditions of living, and the means developed to answer those questions in new and different ways. Interdisciplines are fashioned from elements of different disciplines to form distinct approaches, understandings, or contexts. Interdisciplines are themselves historical constructs (2015: 5).

This Special Issue represents a selection of the research papers presented at the conference, all of which have been considerably expanded for publication, and that offer an exciting journey around the three key issues that influence our everyday lives: space, time and the body. Each article simultaneously serves to unpack some of the processes that can support interdisciplinary research in these areas and works to extend some of the conversations that were started at the conference. These conversations can be seen in the way that many of the articles deliberately reference the work of contributions to this Special Issue. Ulrike Sturm’s reflective visualisations add another dimension to the Special Issue; demonstrating interdisciplinarity as a visually creative, as well as textually creative, pursuit. Readers will discover many more such overlaps and linkages through the articles, with each seeking to offer clear connections to other contributions within the Special Issue and enhance this idea of this issue as a narrative dialogue.

The primary purpose of this collection is to provide an overview of the potential of interdisciplinary research: in this way, we hope it will serve as a useful resource for those who wish to explore a variety of examples reflecting current interdisciplinary practice.

Examining interdisciplinarity

For many readers, interdisciplinarity will not be viewed as an unusual approach for resolving a research problem. Since the mid-1980s, research papers have increasingly cited work outside their own disciplines, with Richard van Noorden pointing out in his recent analysis of interdisciplinary effort, that the discourse around interdisciplinary research is increasing. Although the proportion of published papers that mention interdisciplinarity within their title has fluctuated, perhaps reflecting the priorities of funding bodies, the twenty-first century has seen the number of papers that not only present an interdisciplinary approach, but also clearly flag this approach to readers, reach an all-time high (van Noorden 2015: 306). Roberta Frank observes that numerous sources have reduced the term to a perfunctory characterisation of two or more disciplines working in concert on one activity, resulting in an interdisciplinary inquiry (1998). Yet, the nature of interdisciplinary inquiry goes beyond what many researchers would consider a mixed methods approach; that is to say the simple utilisation of multiple methods of data gathering and analysis. We argue that an interdisciplinary approach is one in which two or more disciplines are integrated at each stage of the research project: presenting a result that is in the betwixt and between – not exclusively one discipline or another, but a true hybrid activity that offers insight and knowledge beyond that which a single discipline framework is able to achieve.

So, why would a researcher deliberately choose to complicate a project – and one, without doubt, already constrained by various factors, most usually funding – by introducing an interdisciplinary approach to their research? Why would a researcher extend themselves beyond their own discipline-specific training and invest in another, not necessarily obviously complementary, field? Why would a researcher elect to hold themselves up to another set of criteria against which their work might be judged? Our case for this is simple – the world is an increasingly complex environment; one that demands answers to research problems that must frequently draw upon rich data sets with numerous variables as well as an extraordinary number of ethical conundrums involving humans, animals or the environment as subjects. Indeed:

A particularisation of subject matters and disciplines is increasing; the capacity to think in disciplinaries, that is, in larger units of science, is decreasing. The borders of subjects and disciplines, if they are still perceived as such at all, threaten to turn into limits not just of institutions, but also of *discovery*. Accordingly, the concept of interdisciplinarity, often used to oppose this development, is being viewed as a repair tool, which, as time goes by, is supposed to lead to a new scientific order (Mittelstrass 2011: 330, emphasis original).

Researchers often share the traits of Agatha Christie's fictional detective Hercule Poirot – a meticulous, tidy little man, always arranging things, liking things in pairs, and square instead of round (Christie [1977]2010: 256). Certainly an organised and methodical approach is critical to any research endeavour. Yet, established processes for the arranging of data in such neat little sets can see the nuances of such data lost or serendipitous discoveries missed. This neatness can also fail to acknowledge the complexity of the researcher's task. The role of

interdisciplinary inquiry, we argue, is to advocate academic rigour while, simultaneously, destabilising some of the processes for producing academic outcomes. This Special Issue examines this notion of destabilisation through a contribution to the debate on interdisciplinary research and its benefits through brief examinations of the main approaches to interdisciplinarity: beginning with multidisciplinary and moving through cross-disciplinary, trans-disciplinary and post-disciplinary before concluding with bricolage.

Interdisciplinarity: graduations of disciplinary integration

A first step in attempting to describe some of the attributes of interdisciplinarity is refining the notion of a discipline. The term ‘discipline’ can mean something or nothing – sometimes simultaneously. Historically, the term could be found in the Latin for pupil *discipulus*, teacher *disciplina* and, of course, related to religion in the term *disciple*. More recently, discipline has come to mean training, activities or drills to master a skill, a way of behaviour or conduct as well as punishment. Adapting these common usages into the academic context could result in practitioners who are drilled in their area of specialisation and understand the sensitivities of the subject matter which is demonstrated by their behaviour. Expanding upon this, Armin Krishnan ascribes a number of attributes and academic rigour with the following characteristics to define an academic discipline: there is a specific object of research; a body of specialised scholarship; there are accepted theories, concepts and research methods; specific technical language or terminologies are widely used, ‘maybe most crucially ... disciplines must have some institutional manifestation in the form of subjects taught at universities or colleges, respective academic departments and professional associations connected to it’ (2009: 9). These characteristics are our point of departure into interdisciplinarity.

A broad concept of interdisciplinarity could be simply two disciplines working in conversation to solve a particular research problem. These conversations take place using the approaches, methodologies and tools of two or more disciplines to investigate a single issue or answer a single question. This approach is similar Jacques Derrida’s definition: ‘interdisciplinarity implies that you have given, identifiable competencies – say a legal theorist, an architect, a philosopher, a literary critic – and that they work together on a specific, identifiable topic’ (1977: 7). For Roland Barthes, interdisciplinarity can serve as a general critique of an academic specialisation and an institution that perpetuates divisions into small enclaves of expertise. He maintains that it can create both a unified outcome and add something new (such as a new way of understanding or a new language) and does so in such a way that it is possible for a new discipline to evolve over time (1977: 155). Examples of this can be seen in the rise of both Cultural Studies and Feminist Studies. Liora Salter and Alison Hearn argue for a need to ‘view interdisciplinarity as reflecting any challenge to the limitations or premises of the prevailing organization of knowledge or its representation in an institutionally recognized form’ (1997: 43). They further differentiate between instrumental interdisciplinarity, in which scholars utilise or borrow the ideas or methods of another discipline to enhance problem solving within their home disciplines, and conceptual interdisciplinarity which critically examines assumptions of institutional and social power embedded in disciplinary work (1997: 43).

The snapshots contained herein are by no means intended to be canonical definitions. This area is still very young in academia, with fluid boundaries and constantly changing dimensions as

researchers probe and question every aspect of interdisciplinary inquiry. As Julie Klein observes, these meanings range ‘from simple borrowings and methodological thickening to theoretical enrichment’ (1996: 153). It is acknowledged that the editors’ definitions are focused on the praxis of the research and the real world application of interdisciplinarity to research problems rather than the inquiry of interdisciplinary epistemology.

Multidisciplinary

As the name suggests, a multidisciplinary inquiry is enacted when a collaborative research team is formed drawing on two or more diverse disciplines to examine, or redefine, problems outside the ‘normal’ boundaries of a single disciplinary investigation and reach solutions based on a new understanding of the research problem. One of the hallmarks of multidisciplinary research, which distinguishes it from other forms interdisciplinary inquiry, is that the contributions of the research team to the object of study are complementary rather than integrative (van den Besselaar and Heimeriks 2001: 2). There is little cross conversation outside the relevant disciplines and the creation of new knowledge or a new theory is not the primary research objective, thus the research process progresses as parallel disciplinary inquiry without integration but usually with the aim to compare, contrast or combine the results. There is a long history of this type of research in business, health and other applied sciences.

Cross-disciplinary

Cross-disciplinary research draws upon, and importantly extends, the notions associated with multidisciplinary research in several ways. One approach is that numerous multidisciplinary inquiries are combined through an external editorial process to bind the various outcomes of such inquiries in a cross-disciplinary study. Another approach is in the collaboration between researchers, where this collaborative framework is integrated into the approach designed to address a research problem with multiple researchers viewing the object of study from both their own disciplinary backgrounds as well as viewing the study through the positions of collaborators from other disciplines (Meeth 1978: 10). Cross-disciplinary research provides a platform for a dialogue between disciplines on specific research problems, as each discipline examines and conceptualises the object of study in relation to the other disciplines, particularly when examining issues that occur at the borders of, or overlaps between, disciplines.

Transdisciplinary

Manfred A Max-Neef has observed, in relation to trans-disciplinary approaches that, ‘transdisciplinarity, more than a new discipline or super-discipline is, actually, a different manner of seeing the world, more systemic and more holistic’ (2005: 15). With the origins of trans-disciplinary research dating back to the 1970s (Hirsch Hadorn et al. 2006: 120), growing from the works of scholars such as Erich Jantsch, Edgar Morin and Jean Piaget as a mode of inquiry that transgressed disciplinary boundaries, in an act that far surpassed multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches to research (Nicolescu 2002: 1), trans-disciplinary research takes place when researchers from different fields work together to create a shared framework with each contributor having equal input, to investigate a research problem that integrates and

transcends each of their separate disciplinary perspectives which results in the creation of new knowledge and theories that are not discipline specific. Transdisciplinarity is also used to signify a unity of knowledge that bounds disciplines through an overarching scholarship that transcends any single discipline. This ‘problem focused’ approach facilitates the input of non-academic stakeholders to embrace ‘local knowledge’ and multiple ways of knowing and engaging with the world to deliver a complex, yet rich, narrative.

Post-disciplinary

Post-disciplinary research occurs when the area of inquiry takes place at the boundaries of established disciplines using problem-focused, flexible modes of knowledge production, plurality, synthesis and synergy. The researcher uses multiple flexible and innovative approaches to examine their object of study, resulting in rich outcome in a liminal space, not able to be claimed by any particular discipline and mediating the intellectual freedom of the approach and academic rigour of the study. Jenny Wolmark and Eleanor Gates-Stuart have written that, ‘post disciplinary practices retain knowledge of the specificities of disciplines and of their histories, but they are also inherently transgressive and capable of operating outside the limitations imposed by those disciplines’ (2004: 1).

Bricolage

Bricolage has its origins in work by French anthropologist and ethnologist Claude Lévi-Strauss who first employed metaphor in his search for underlying structures that govern human meaning-making in his book *La Pensée Sauvage* (1962), which was translated into English as *The Savage Mind* in 1966. Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln have built upon Lévi-Strauss’ work noting the vagaries of the method, with the researcher using material tools of their craft, developing whatever strategies, methods and empirical materials are at hand (2011: 4). This results in a fluid rather than prescriptive method ‘which changes and takes new forms as different tools, methods, and techniques of representation and interpretation are added to the puzzle’, even if these tools, methods and techniques have to be invented (2011: 4). Joe Kincheloe notes that ‘bricolage, of course, signifies interdisciplinarity’ (2001: 680). The closest contemporary interpretation from the original French would be the expression ‘do it yourself’ as there is no direct English equivalent, thus bricolage is the creative melding of theoretical and philosophical notions in a research problem from a platform which acknowledges that any ‘social, cultural, psychological, or pedagogical object of inquiry is inseparable from its: context, the language used to describe it, its historical situatedness in a larger ongoing process and the socially, culturally constructed interpretations of its meaning(s) as an entity in the world’ (Kincheloe 2001: 682). This adoption of all methodological tools to hand should not be mistaken as a lesser approach to a research problem, as it is, in fact, quite the opposite. No matter how eclectic, fluid or flexible the approach, the drawing on multiple, and sometimes competing, theoretical and methodological perspectives can lead to a rich analysis of the object of study.

Special issue articles

The beginning of this special issue presents an overview of how interdisciplinary research projects do, and can, work together thus offering insights into the practice of this, often underestimated but very useful, research approach. Focusing on the craft of writing – covering many aspects of this craft from formal research report to fraudulent memoir – this section provides a gateway to readers who have not had opportunities to engage in such projects before. The article by Donna Lee Brien and Margaret McAllister provides some critical definitions and practical case studies, which present the ‘why’ and the ‘how’ of this style of, potentially very dynamic, research activity. This work presents a range of concrete examples of how two different areas, the clinical and the creative, can work effectively and productively together. Specifically, this article outlines successful practices employed by two experienced researchers from different knowledge fields (applied arts and applied science) who bring diverse research methodologies and approaches to work on, and to write up, social and cultural projects. Irene Waters’ article relocates the interdisciplinary framework from the professional to the personal and explores, through memoir, ideas of space, time and body. This work demonstrates how drawing on interdisciplinary studies when researching the personal can give a broader base for a creative work as well as offer an increased understanding of its purpose. This article examines aspects of writing the self in memoir – such as memory, truth, embodiment and identity – drawing on work from a range of disciplines. It concludes with a showing of the effects that these interdisciplinary studies can have on our creative selves and our research.

The next articles have in common that they both focus on politics and draw heavily on the theme of space. How we observe a space can change radically depending upon our point of view. These standpoints, how we position our physical and metaphysical selves, can change over time. (The issue of time is particularly important here and the editors have chosen to reflect the timeframes of conversations across textual works by deploying square brackets to indicate original publication dates of writing discussed; for consistency these brackets have been used throughout this issue.) New information is often a trigger for such shifts and can even allow a single observer to concurrently hold multiple points of view, as recognised by the article titles of this part which indicate the potential to observe – and go on to narrate – differently through (re)presenting, (de)humanisation and (in)justice.

Carla Lever reflects on the complex, hybrid identities of a changing South Africa and how the physical and political landscapes of this nation are contested spaces. This analysis teases out some of the important relationships between time, space and the body and how we tell stories to connect these three ideas. This article works to connect South Africa’s past and present through the lens of embodiment, taking six snapshots of South African narrativess that span time and place. Together, slowly, these bodies create a corporeal dialogue, a weaving in and around the issue of embodiment in space and time. Louise Harrington looks at another contested narrative space: those of religion. This work explores the real and abstract barriers across multiple spaces, and the ways writers can express violence in divided and politically unstable societies. This is done through an acknowledgement of the violent, ethnic conflicts that resonates in many places, in many forms. The narration of these conflicts by cultural products, such as fictional visual texts, offers audiences a range of representations of, and reactions to, the chaos of war. Harrington analyses two films, *'71* (2014) and *Paradise Now* (2005), to reveal the political potential of the screenwriter. Victoria Reeve looks at conflict in

war and post-war settings, offering a study of the privileging of subjectivity over identity and Aboriginality. Reeve examines identity, subjectivity and privilege in Richard Flanagan's *The Narrow Road to the Deep North* (2013) in terms of the central protagonist Dorrigo Evans, a hero shaped through Flanagan's father's experiences and physically modelled on 'Weary' Dunlop, a well-known Australian army surgeon. This is done through a review of Flanagan's writing and his efforts to document, through an epic literary work, issues of alienation, empathy, familial connections, social values and transcendence. Simon Dwyer then examines the world of storytelling in a different light; looking at the lighting designer's praxis for the illumination of a production of Reginald Rose's seminal, political text *Twelve Angry Men* (1955). The discussion explores the role light plays, as an intermediary in the presentation of a narrative and argues an interdisciplinary approach allows for the construction of a concert featuring the built environment, the imagined world of the play and the ephemeral nature of light. Thus asking the reader to consider light as a meaning-laden phenomenon and a critical component of theatre-based storytelling. Lisa Stafford and Kirsty Volz discuss body-space politics in the built environment and how the standardised body creates a spatial injustice for anyone outside these standards, the authors suggest that instead of designing the built environment for a single stereotypical body (a single story) that a suite of differing bodies (multiple narratives) should inform the design resulting in more equitable and inclusive surroundings for the community to enjoy. Stafford and Volz argue designers have to approach processes of spatial creation differently, using a plurality of inputs thus working towards a reflection of the multitude of stories society can tell, rather than the singular story of a stereotypical body.

The final section of the issue emphasises the body, tracing the evolution of the violation of the female body through gang rape and capital punishment until sex and violence have become so integrated that this is accepted within popular culture. These articles demonstrate how the body is written and the power of interdisciplinary studies to challenge what was once divergent and has, today, become normalised: asking questions and also offering investigative routes through increasingly complicated, and controversial, issues. In this way, these writings suggest how we might challenge abuse-motivated ownership of women's bodies. Rachel Franks investigates the body through two criminal cases presented in true crime literature: a gang rape victim and a woman hanged for murder. Franks asserts the female body is often positioned by writers as a contested space: a commodity, honoured as a site of self-expression, and visualised as a vehicle for reproduction. This facilitates the commandeering of the female body for many purposes. In this way, women who are central to this representation of true crime cases, whether in journalism or book-length investigations, can be objectified and marginalised, their circumstances re-imagined to tell a story other than their own. A. Andreas Wansbough takes up these issues, looking at how writers can explore controversies around the ownership of women's bodies and how storytelling is able to feed notions that the beaten body can provide a source for philosophical debate and entertainment. Wansbough looks at this through how Lars von Trier's film, *Nymphomaniac* (2013), explores the protagonist's, Joe's, bodily suffering and pleasure. Joe is found by Seligman who wants to hear her story. The story, of Joe's sexual journeys, has a strong metaphysical component that highlights the power of creative writing, for film and print, to take on difficult subject matter. Kristal Lowe takes these ideas further by removing the female body, as object, from legal and philosophical realms and placing these concepts within the realm of popular culture. Where, disturbingly, reading about

sex that threatens life is, at least vicariously, an acceptable leisure activity. As Lowe explains, popular fiction is an excellent mirror in which to read the reflection of the dominant concepts, beliefs and values of its society, including the enabling and disabling of the female gendered subject. This article is a critical reading of Stephenie Myer's *Twilight* saga, a subject we hope is of interest and use to writers and teachers and researchers of writing.

This Special Issue concludes with an article by Ulrike Sturm that reveals her research process in producing the visual works that accompany each article, and that serve as visual storytelling devices that accompany each of the written narratives. This article also includes a personal reflection on each illustration.

Conclusion

This Special Issue argues for the adoption of an interdisciplinary approach – multidisciplinary, cross-disciplinary, trans-disciplinary, post-disciplinary or bricolage – in both exploring the writing of others and in our own writing practices as we work to address research problems in an increasingly complex world. We suggest that engaging in the research process through frameworks that exist in the betwixt and between – not exclusively one discipline or another but a true hybrid of activity – can offer insight and knowledge to support those achieved through a single disciplinary framework. The articles presented within this issue offer an eclectic mix of research approach, subject matter and writing style. It is our hope that each of the contributions within this issue offer excellent examples of research on a broad range of topics. It is also our hope that, individually and as a suite, these contributions convey the benefits of interdisciplinarity and articulate the central role of creativity within this approach. All research efforts tell stories. This Special Issue explores how these stories can unfold and, critically, how such narratives can interact with each other to broaden that narrative dialogue.

Works cited

- Bathes, R 1977 S Heath (trans) *Image Music Text* London: Fontana Press
- Beyer, B (Producer) and H Abu-Assad (Director) 2005 *Paradise Now* United States: Augustus Films
- Christie, Agatha [1977]2010 *Agatha Christie: An Autobiography* London: Harper Collins
- Denzin, NK and YS Lincoln 2011 *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research* 4th ed Thousand Oaks: SAGE
- Derrida, J and JD Caputo 1997 *Deconstruction in a Nutshell: A Conversation with Jacques Derrida* New York: Fordham UP
- Flanagan, R 2013 *The Narrow Road to the Deep North* Sydney: Vintage
- Frank, R 1988 'Interdisciplinary: The First Half Century' EG Stanley & TF Hoad (eds) *Words: For Robert Burchfield's Sixty Fifth Birthday* Cambridge: DS Brewer, 91–101
- Graff, HJ 2015 *Undisciplining Knowledge. Interdisciplinarity in the Twentieth Century* Baltimore: John Hopkins UP
- Hegel, GWF 1977 AV Miller (trans) *Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit* Oxford: Oxford UP
- Hirsch Hado, G, D Bradley, C Pohl, S Rist and U Wiesmann 2006 'Implications of Transdisciplinarity for Sustainability Research' *Ecological Economics* 60(1): 119–28
- Kincheloe, J 2001 'Describing the Bricolage: Conceptualizing a New Rigor in Qualitative Research' *Qualitative Inquiry* (7)6: 679–92

- Klein, JT 1996 'Interdisciplinary Needs: The Current Context' *Library Trends* 45(2): 134–54
- Krishnan, A 2009 *What Are Academic Disciplines? Some Observations on the Disciplinarity vs. Interdisciplinarity Debate*. Southhampton: U of Southampton
- Lamont, A and R Gutch (Producers) and Y Demange (Director) 2014 *'71*. Britain: StudioCanal
- Lévi-Strauss, C 1962 *La Pensée Sauvage* Paris: Librarie Plon
- Lévi-Strauss, C 1966 G Weidenfield (ed) *The Savage Mind* Chicago: U of Chicago P
- Max-Neef, MA 2005 'Foundations of Transdisciplinarity' *Ecological Economics* 53(1): 5–16
- Meeth, LR 1978 'Interdisciplinary Studies: A Matter of Definition' *Change* 10(7): 10
- Meyer, S [2005]2008 *Twilight* London: Atom
- Mittelstrass, J 2009 'On Transdisciplinarity', *Trames: A Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences* 15(4): 329–38
- Nicolescu, B and KC Voss (Trans) 2002 *Manifesto of Transdisciplinarity* Albany: State U of New York P
- Rose, R 1955 *Twelve Angry Men* London: Samuel French
- Salter, L & A Hearn 1997 *Outside the Lines: Issues in Interdisciplinary Research* Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP
- van den Besselaar, P & G Heimeriks 2001 'Disciplinary, Multidisciplinary, Interdisciplinary: Concepts and Indicators' Paper Presented at the 8th Conference on *Scientometrics and Informetrics* Sydney
- van Noorden, R 2015 'Interdisciplinary Research by the Numbers: An Analysis Reveals the Extent and Impact of Research that Bridges Disciplines' *Nature* 525(7569): 306–7
- Vesth, L (Producer) and L von Trier (Director) 2013 *Nymphomaniac: Vol. I* Denmark: Zentropa Entertainments
- Vesth, L (Producer) and L von Trier (Director) 2013 *Nymphomaniac: Vol. II*. Denmark: Zentropa Entertainments
- Wolmark, J and E Gates-Stuart 2004 'Cultural Hybrids, Post-Disciplinary Digital Practices and New Research Frameworks: Testing the Limits' Paper Presented at *PixelRaiders 2* Sheffield, UK

Acknowledgements

The editors give their sincere thanks to Professor Donna Lee Brien for her mentorship and support. Thanks are also given to all of the contributors to this Special Issue as well as all those who participated in the inaugural conference of the Institute of Interdisciplinary Inquiry. The editors also wish to acknowledge the generous support of the State Library of New South Wales.

A note on the reviewing process for this Special Issue

Abstracts for the inaugural conference of the Institute of Interdisciplinary Inquiry (held in Sydney in April, 2016) were received and reviewed by the conference conveners and then double blind peer reviewed prior to acceptances (and the inevitable declines) being sent out. The idea of publishing content presented at the conference was raised early with the editorial team for this Special Issue forming in the days following the event. The editors carefully reviewed and curated material to form this collection. Invited papers were reviewed and then significantly expanded to discuss different aspects of storytelling, narrative and narrative construction as well as to tell – individually and together – a broader story of interdisciplinary research. We warmly thank all of the contributors and reviewers for their engagement in the multiple rounds of reviews that this process required. Each piece of work was then reviewed by the *TEXT* Special Issues Commissioning Editor resulting in a further round of refinements for each piece.

Fig. 2. Ulrike Sturm, *Space, time, body*, linocut, 2016

Simon Dwyer has over twenty years of experience working in many technical and production roles in the entertainment industry across Australia and New Zealand. He is currently a doctoral candidate at CQUniversity, Australia, examining the theatricality of the lighting of the Sydney Opera House. Simon has presented original research in the creative industries at numerous conferences and has written on a wide range of topics including architecture, education, facilities management, literature and the performing arts.

Rachel Franks is the Coordinator, Education & Scholarship, at the State Library of New South Wales, a Conjoint Fellow at the University of Newcastle, Australia, and is at The University of Sydney researching true crime. Rachel holds a PhD in Australian crime fiction and her research in the fields of crime fiction, true crime, food studies and information science has been presented at numerous conferences. An award-winning writer, her work can be found in a wide variety of books, journals and magazines.

Monica Galassi is the Project Officer, Indigenous Services at the State Library of New South Wales. Monica, with a background in anthropology, is passionate about finding International and Transnational links and connections to assist Indigenous people to reconnect with their cultural heritage.

Kirsten Thorpe is the Manager, Indigenous Services at the State Library of New South Wales and descendant of the Worimi people of Port Stephens, New South Wales. Kirsten, a qualified archivist, is passionate about creating spaces of engagement for Indigenous people to connect with library and archive sources documenting their culture and heritage.