

**ISSUES OF AUTEURSHIP IN PRODUCTIONS: A COMPARATIVE
ANALYSIS OF STAGE AND FILM PRODUCTIONS**

BY

AKAM, KINGSLEY OYONG

PG/MA/12/64434

**DEPARTMENT OF THEATRE AND FILMS STUDIES,
FACULTY OF ARTS,
UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIA, NSUKKA.**

AUGUST, 2013.

TITLE PAGE

Issues of Auteurship in Productions: A Comparative Analysis of Stage and Film Productions. A research submitted to the Department of Theatre and Film Studies, Faculty of Arts, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the degree of Master of Arts.

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that AKAM, KINGSLEY OYONG, a Postgraduate student of Theatre and Films Studies with Registration Number PG/MA/12/64434 has satisfactorily completed the requirements for the course and research work for Master of Arts Degree in Theatre and Film Studies, Faculty of Arts, University of Nigeria, Nsukka. The work embodies in his research is original and has not been, to the best of my knowledge submitted in part or full for any Diploma or Degree of this or other University.

DR. FELIX U. EGWUDA-UGBEDA
SUPERVISOR

PROF. EMEKA NWABUEZE
HEAD OF DEPARTMENT

DATE: _____

DATE: _____

PROF. EJS ILLAH.
EXTERNAL EXAMINER

DATE: _____

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to God the father, Son and Holy Spirit and in memory of my beloved ones: my mother, Mrs. Sarah Mbia EJOR Etta-Nee Takim, my cousin, Favour EJOR Odudu, my Aunty, Mrs. Patricia Odu Akombi and Sunday Bassey Eban (King Collins).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

With deep joy and happiness in my heart for the completion of this tedious but fulfilling bloodless intellectual battle, I wish to appreciate those who in one way or the other contributed to this success. It is my profound joy to acknowledge God Almighty for his infinite mercies upon my life. His guidance, protections and provisions from the first day I conceived this idea. Father, I have nothing to say than thank you. I appreciate the efforts, encouragement, commitment, inspirational criticism and supervision of my supervisor, Dr. Felix U. Egwuda-Ugbeda who was not just a supervisor to me but also a teacher and books provider. Sir, I say thank you. I am indebted to all my lecturers and non-academic staff in the Department of Theatre and Film Studies, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, especially the head of department, Professor Emeka Nwabueze whose advice, critical and intellectual discourses with postgraduate students built up my courage for the pursuit of this programme with vigor. Prof., I am grateful. I will not forget my lecturers, mostly those who taught me, and also those who allowed me access to their personal libraries, especially Mr. Domba Asomba, Dr. Ngozi Udengwu, Dr. Uche Nwaozuzu, Dr. Chineye Amaonyeze, Mr. Norbert Eze, Mr. Greg Mbajiorgu and the department secretary Lienn Ogechi Inya for her patience. I am also grateful to postgraduate students of Theatre and Film Studies for 2012/2013 session.

Let me in a special way express my endless appreciation to the effort of the one who was my earthly goddess, the one who loved and cherished me. My dearest and caring mother who would have been the happiest person for the completion of this programme. My sweet mother, I believed that even as you are not here physically with me to pour out your excitement in songs and dance, you are doing that wherever you are. Unfortunately, you would not be around to enjoy the fruits of your labour.

Mummy, I love you. I also appreciate my father Mr. Roses Akam Oyong, my beloved sister, Benedicta Kanor Akam and my other young ones; Emmanuel, Ojong, Rose, Michael, Ajijang, Bebiou, Akam, and Nkore Akam, others are; Dorathy, Blessing, Carrole, Martha, and Peniel Ejor Etta. I am also indebted to Mama Lucy Ebu, my uncles, Sunday B. Taken, Chief Raphael Tiku, Michael Ebu, my aunties, Evang. Virtue Eno Excellence, Beatrice Taken, Ms. Rose Oti, Mrs. Cecelia M.T. Eban, my cousins, Courage Odudu, Testimony Agbor Asu, Godswill Princewill, Douglas Bassey, Nicholas Banyo, and late Favour Odudu. My friends, Columbus Bessong, Christian Ochang, Tina Obah, Ameh Kenechukwu, Rosemary Etukudo, Patience E. Ojong, Henrietta Okoye, and Romeo Ojong. This list will not be complete without appreciating Chief Mike Abang T. Obi, *Otu Aninor 1 of Boki* and his wife, Chief (Mrs.) Roseline Abang, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Abang Achare, Dsp. Donald Akom Etta (Rtd.), his wife, Mrs. Alice Akom Etta, Dr. Donald B. Enu, Mr. Felix T. Akombi, Raymond Bessong and Mr. and Mrs. Prince Francis I.U. Bassey for their financial assistance. Let me also thank Mercy Sunday Bassey-Nee Obi, Mr. Amos Kajang, Mr. Raymond Obaji, Mrs. Geraldine Njong Obun, Mrs. Stella and Deborah Nkponu for your support, encouragements and prayers. Not getting Ngozi, Glory, Evelyn, and Lovina of Divine Favour Business Centre for typing this work for me.

Let me at this juncture acknowledge authors whose works I have cited for this research. Without your individual and collective scholarly ideas put together and made available at my disposal this study would have been a mirage. I say thank you to all of you. Even those whose names did not appear here, it is due to limited space, you are all appreciated. Thank you.

Kingsley Oyong Akam.

3rd August, 2013.

ABSTRACT

Based on the dimension of application and operational framework of the concept of auteurship, auteur directors in stage and film productions believe in the supposition of taking control and close monitoring of all aspects of a production in order to achieve or actualise the directorial vision of a production. This study is aimed at ascertaining the following objectives: importance and limitations of each collaborator in stage and film productions, effects of Auteurship in stage and film productions, actual right and prerequisites of a director as the author of a production, issues of Auteurship in each phase of production: preproduction, production and post production, Differences and similarities in stage and film productions, differences and similarities of interpretative and creative director and the distinctions and similarities in stage and film directing. The study was based on two methodologies-Sociological and Literary methods due to their usefulness in information gathering. The theoretical framework of this study was anchored on Auteurship and Collaborative Theories to examine how a director as auteur could succeed without the collaboration of other artists in the production. In view of this without effective collaborative efforts of different artistic experts no production will be successful if the director is left alone to do all the work in the pretext of maintaining or showing coherency in styles, motif, themes, and vision in a production.

CHAPTER THREE: ISSUES OF AUTEURSHIP IN PRODUCTIONS

3.1 Preamble	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	36
3.2 Production Script for Stage and Film	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	36
3.3 Approaches to Production Concept				-	-	-	-	-	39
3.3.1 Style	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	40
3.3.2 Period	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	42
3.3.3 Dramatic Metaphor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	42
3.3.4 Purpose	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	43
3.4 Auteurship in Stage Production				-	-	-	-	-	43
3.5 Auteurship in Film Production				-	-	-	-	-	47

CHAPTER FOUR: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF STAGE AND FILM DIRECTING

4.1 Preamble	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	53
4.2 Interpretative and Creative Director	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	53
4.3 Differences and Similarities between Stage and Film Directing				-	-	-	-	-	55
4.3.1 Preproduction				-	-	-	-	-	55
4.3.2 Production	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	56
4.3.3 Post production	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	62

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

5.1 Summary	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	64
5.2 Conclusion				-	-	-	-	-	65
5.3 Suggestions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	66
WORKS CITED				-	-	-	-	-	69

CHAPTER ONE

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The dynamism of collaboration in production where all artistic elements are blended together into a unified whole with a director as the chief collaborator, who supervises, coordinates and controls these elements: script, performers, designers, and other production crew members cannot be over emphasized.

However, the emergence of auteurship in France proclaiming that the director should be the auteur (author) of a production by imposing and implementing his/her vision/concept in a production at the expense of other collaborators, has ignited serious arguments on whose vision/concept or point of view should reflect or dominate in a production where various individual experts contribute their expertise to the final effect of a production.

Before the origination of the word auteur in production with its acclaimed functions mostly, in film, some notable theatre directors in the likes of Sir William Davenant, David Garrick, George Anton Benda and Vsevelod Meyerhold have been performing such functions. They were imposing, projecting and implementing their own vision/concepts in their productions and not the vision of those dramatists. They used to completely tempering with the structure or rewriting a playwright's script.

This supposition of auteurship phenomenon has held away for many decades leading to emergence of two schools of thoughts. These schools of thoughts are either in support or against the existence and relevance of auteurship in production. In view of these arguments, it seems none of these schools of thought have been able to establish reasonable prerequisites or criteria why a director should be seen or not to be seen as the auteur (author) of a production. Those who have attempted doing so either

ends up over flogging or under flogging the issue of auteurship without a clear balance.

Issues associated with auteurship phenomenon could affect the future of stage and film productions as collaborative media if better ways of enhancing this collaboration are not put in place; by stating clearly and categorically the relevance, importance and limitations of each collaborator in any production.

It is against this background that this study enunciates and proffers solutions to those pertinent issues of auteurship which are considered detrimental to production collaborations.

1.1 Statement of Problem

The issue of auteurship in production is so peculiar that it has sparked off serious arguments among theatre and film scholars. These arguments are whether the auteurship concept should be discarded or retained.

Issues associated with auteurship in production are problematic due to the domineering influence of the director over other collaborative artistic experts as well as every aspects of a production. The auteurship theory allows or permits the director to impose and implement his or her sole vision, concept and point of view with little or no regards to the playwright or screen writer's script. Rather, the director sees the script as a pretext for the activities of a production and the placement of emphasis on the spontaneous events that happen in front of the camera or before the audience and also undermining the contributions of other collaborators. This problem, however, could lead to poor quality of the final effect of a production.

1.2 Research Questions

The following are the research questions for this study:

- Should stage and film productions be seen as collaborative medium for personal artistic expression of the director's vision or concept as auteur?
- Does the issue of auteurship in stage have the same dimension as film production?
- Why is auteurship very strong in film than stage productions?
- To what extent does auteurship phenomenon affect stage productions?
- Does the issue of auteurship have any impact on the production process as a collaboration medium?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

By the end of this study, the following objectives would have been achieved:

- Importance and limitations of each collaborator in stage and film productions would have been ascertained.
- Effects of auteurship in productions would have been known.
- Actual right and prerequisites of a director as the author of a production would have been ascertained.
- Differences and similarities in stage and film productions would have been revealed.
- Issues of auteurship in each phase of production: preproduction, production and post production would have been made manifest.
- The distinctions and similarities in stage and film directing would have been known.
- Differences and similarities of interpretative and creative director would have been ascertained.

1.4 Significance of the Study

The study on issues of auteurship in productions is relevant and unique due to the following reasons:

The study determines the effect of auteurship in productions and reveals what qualifies a director as author. This research highlights the strengths and weaknesses of auteurship in productions and proffers possible solutions to harmonious working relationship among production collaborators.

Finally, the study no doubt instigates researchers on the subject of auteurship and also being useful and meaningful to lovers of knowledge, students, practitioners, scholars and researchers.

1.5 Delimitation/Scope of the Study

The research is confined to auteurship in stage and film production processes from the three stages of production: preproduction, production and postproduction. The study however, deals with sequential manifestation of auteurship issues at each phase of a production as well as a comparative analysis of stage and film directing. Differences and similarities of auteurship phenomenon in stage and film production and the idea of interpretative and creative director in production were also treated.

1.6 Limitation of Study

The study was affected by some factors such as: difficulties in accessing available materials on the subject Issues of Auteurship in Production from individual, public and institution libraries. Especially materials on auteurship in stage production where not much even from the internet.

Poor transportation system and security network in the country hinders the study because the researcher finds it difficult when traveling long distance for data collection from primary and secondary sources.

Time and financial constraints for collection of data limited the research because the researcher could not travel to some of the places intended to interview stage and film practitioners as well as scholars. Despite the limited time for the study

most interviewees kept rescheduling dates, times, and places for the interview due to their businesses and long-standing engagements. Inadequate finance to purchase books and journals relating to the subject of investigation affected the study also.

1.7 Research Methodology

The researcher adopts the Sociological and Literary methodologies for the collection of data for the study from primary and secondary sources.

The researcher relies on Sociological Methodology due to its relevance in the collection of data for the study. According to Sam Ukala, this method involves a high degree of the researcher's interaction with the society being studied (13). Since part of data collection of the research is through interviews, this method was considered very useful because it availed the researcher the opportunity of face-to-face interaction with the interviewees which Ukala posits that interview is one of the cardinal techniques of data collection in this methodology (13).

In collecting data for the study through this method the researcher equally relies on the purposive sampling technique which is one of the non-probability sample techniques where not every member of the population has a chance to be selected. The researcher focuses on purposive sampling techniques where a sample of theatre and film practitioners and scholars were selected within Nigeria for interview based on the subject of investigation using basic tools in the field such as note book, durable audio tape recorder and accessories and making sure that the atmosphere for the interviews was conducive.

In order to draw logical conclusion from collected data through Sociological method, the researcher made use of the Univariate method of analysis to establish the number of times a particular answer on a particular research questions were repeated from the data gathered.

The researcher also used Literary Methodology for the research because of its accuracy in information gathering from secondary sources which scholars have treated on various subjects relating to the topic of investigation. Ukala says that;

“The Literary Methodology is available to researchers of subjects about which or much has already been written and whom the researcher may be unable to personally observe or make physical contact with” (13).

In this case, the researcher made use of data from earlier scholarly views and opinions. In fact, the data collected for the study using this methodology were based on previous scholarly views and opinions from secondary sources such as books, journals, dissertations, newspapers, seminar, and conference papers, internet materials relating to the subject of investigation. Data collected from this method were “analyzed in relation to the research questions and objectives” (13).

The researcher utilized the comparative analysis approach through critical review, description, examination and evaluation of data collected from these materials to arrive at a logical conclusion.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Preamble

This review of related literature is a comprehensive examination, evaluation, and critical analysis of available data or materials related to the research. This review will be done under the following sub-headings: Directors and Directing, Stage directing, Film directing, Auteurship, and Theoretical Framework of the study.

2.2 Directors and Directing.

It could be said that the position of the directors in both stage and film productions is now unavoidable and indispensable, since its professional emergence in theatrical production in the late 19th century and in film production in early 20th century. Alan A. Armer is of the opinion that; ÷í most people believe that directors have always been with us. Not so. Through most of drama's long history, no one was minding the storeø(5). While Edwin Wilson states that;

It is sometimes argued that the theatre director did not exist before 1874, when a German noble man, George II (1826-1914), Duke of Saxe-Meiningen, began to supervise every element of the production in the theatreí this supervision included rehearsals, scene elements and other aspects-which he co-ordinated into an integrated whole. It is true that beginning with Saxe-Meiningen, the director emerged as a full-fledged, indispensable member of the theatrical team, taking place alongside the playwright, the performers, and the designers (146).

However, this does not mean that prior to late 19th century there was no theatrical directing, Alvin Schnupp posits that;

The role of director as a specialized artist is a relatively recent development in the evolution of theatre. Although the responsibilities of the director began to be defined nearly two hundred years ago, it was not until the late nineteenth century that directing was considered a unique art. This does not mean that director did not exist before this time. In the past many playwright, managers, and experience actors operated as directors. The playwrights Aeschylus and Moliere, for example, directed their own works. During the medieval times, priest or the head of trade guilds were responsible for organizing theatrical pageants. David Garrick, often considered England's greatest actor, coached the actors who belonged to the company he managed in eighteenth century. (29).

Going by the assertions, from the Greek era to late Renaissance period, responsibilities or functions of the director have existed in one way or the other in productions. It is believed that Thespis, Aeschylus, Livius Andronicus, Zeami Motokiyo, William Shakespeare, Moliere-Jean Baptiste Poquelin, Thomas Betterton, David Garrick and many others have functioned as directors in one way or the other. Wilson says that;

We know, for example, that the Greek playwright Aeschylus directed his own plays. At various times in theatre history, the leading performer or playwright of a company served as a director, though without the title. The French dramatist Moliere for instance was not only the playwright and the chief actor of his company but functioned as the director also (147).

In Lateef Olaitain Rasheed's view, "the theatre director is a 21st century addition to the list of the chains involved in theatrical performances" (311). This could not be so

all over the world and not even in Nigeria. Though he could not state the place or country that the theatre director was added or included in the list of theatrical collaborators in the 21st century. The 21st century began thirteen years ago, precisely in the year 2000. It could be argued that the art of contemporary directing in Nigeria started between 1960s and 1977, if one agrees with Bassey Effiong's argument. According to Effiong as cited in Solomon Ejeke;

It was not until 1960 that a director in a rough sense of the word emerged in Nigeria. Wole Soyinka wrote and directed *A Dance of the Forests* for Nigeria's independence celebration. It was also recorded that for the first time some modicum of realism such as flats and levels instead of symbolically painting boulders on baft were introduced. The return from abroad of Ola Rotimi and Dapo Adelugba in the mid sixties ushered in the era of the well made theatre director in Nigeria (57).

Before Wole Soyinka, John Pepper Clark (now John Peppe Clark Bekederemo), Ola Rotimi and Dapo Adelugba started directing in Nigeria, Hubert Ogunde, Ola Balogun and Duro Ladipo began directing theatrical productions in the early forties. According to Egun Clark; "Ogunde began his theatre career in 1944 when he produced his first opera, *The Garden of Eden and The Throne of God*" (195). One would now ask how then did the theatre director emerge in the 21st century, since Ogunde and others started directing since 1940s.

Unlike the emergence of professional stage directing in Europe, professional film directing seems to have come into being in the early 20th century through David Wark Griffith. But before this time directorial activities have been taking place in film productions. Based on the responsibilities and functions of a director, one could say that film directing started in the 19th century but it was improved in the 20th century.

Before this period George Melies a French magician and theatre practitioner was said to be the first artist of the camera. Stanley J. Baran postulates that;

French filmmaker George Melies began making narrative motion pictures, that is, movies that told a story. At the end of 1890s he was shooting and exhibiting one-scene, one-shot movie, but soon he began making stories based on sequential shots in different places. He simply took one shot, stopped the camera, movie it, took another shot, and so on. Melies is often called the "first artist of the camera" because he brought narrative to the medium in the form of imaginative tale such *A Trip to the Moon* (1902) (146).

It is believed that Melies produced and directed his film *A Trip to the Moon* where he brought in his creative skills into bare. Baran adds that;

A Trip to the Moon came to America in 1903, and United State moviemaker were quick not only to borrow the idea of using film to tell stories but also improved on it. Edwin S. Porter, an Edison Company camera operator, saw that film could be an even better storyteller with more artistic use of camera placement and editing. His 12-minute *The Great Train Robbery* (1903) was the first movie to use editing, intercutting of scenes and a mobile camera to tell a relatively sophisticated tale (147).

However, David Wark Griffith seems to be the man who perfected the art of film directing by infusing great innovative ideas and techniques in filmmaking in the early 20th century. Paul Rotha posits that; "Griffith may have his place as the first employer of the close-up, the dissolve, and the fade toí ø (94). These innovations

by Griffith to the improvement of film directing were largely experimented in his film *The Birth of a Nation* produced in 1915. Baran opines that;

Writer, actor and a camera operator D.W. Griffith perfected his craft in this environment. He was quickly recognized as a brilliant director. He introduced innovation such as scheduled rehearsals before final shooting and production based on closed adherence to a shooting script. He lavished attention on otherwise ignored aspects of a film's look-costume and lighting-and used of close-ups and other dramatic camera angles to transmit emotion (147).

But William K. Everson argues that;

í Before Griffith came along there was really no such thing as editing, or grammar, or even the art of film directioní There was really no such as a director before Griffith, the man who made the film was usually the cameraman, and he would photograph. And of course, give directioní A lot of people have claimed that Griffith invented the close-up, which of course is not true. It was there from the very beginning of film, but it was never used very creatively. People do not know what to do with this deviceí the director or the camera man did not realize they could be utilized in other contexts. When Griffith came along, he realized that all of this potentials existed. Of course, he developed many, ideals of his own. But he took all of these things together, and literally forms a language of film with them so from 1908 on, when he did made his first film, you gradually get a real language of film evolving from which all of today's films really come, in one sense or another (37-41).

In defining who the director is and what he or she does in both stage and film productions Milly Barranger states that the director is; "the controlling artist responsible for unifying the production elements, which often include the use of text, music, sound, and visuals" (248) while Wallace S. Sharps defines the director as; "the member of a film production unit who is in control of all actions, sound and its recording when the production is on the floor" (91). Sharps' definition seems too narrowed due to the exclusion of the director's control on the script and visual elements of the production. Emma-Owums Owuamalam declares that;

The director in a creative production is the artist responsible for the coordination of the artistic input of the other artists involved in an artistic presentation of a creative work of art. He is the controller of an artistic performance. He illuminates the script writer's purpose and intent, to the audience (151).

This means the director for both stage and film production is responsible for determining the final look of the production through the melting and blending of all artistic elements into a seamless whole. Oscar G. Brockett says that;

the director is the one most responsible for all artistic elements. He must decide how the script is to be interpreted and how he must coordinate the efforts of all other theatre artists in a unified performance. A good director therefore, is of primary importance in the success of any play (363).

It could be argued that the success of a production lies in the hands of the director as Michael Rabiger affirms that; "the director is responsible for nothing less than the quality and meaning of the final film" (86). This quality and meaning of a production

could only be achieved through effective collaboration of all elements into a unified form.

2.3 Stage Directing

Stage directing could be said to mean the director's practical approach to the coordinating, supervising and blending all elements and collaborator's ideas into a harmonious results. Solomon Ejeke posits that; "directing is a creative inter play and patterning of the elements of production, an interaction between the script and the world" (64). Though Ejeke did not clarify the type of world as used in his context. According to Robert Cohen and John Harrop as cited in Ejeke;

Play directing means the presentation of piece of drama on the stage for an audience, which the director interpreted both in terms of dramatic action and dramatic sound, and in term of the emotional and intellectual concept of the playwright's script (60).

Drawing from Cohen and Harrop's arguments, it seems directing is not only mean the presentation of a piece of drama on stage, but also in the projection and maintenance of the playwright's concept during the pre-production process and on the production day. In Jacque Copeau's view;

Directing is the sum total of artistic and technical operations which enables the play as conceived by the author to pass from the abstract, latent states, that of the written script to concrete and actual life on the stage (214).

Copeau's argument is on the director being able to translate the playwright's work by injecting life into a lifeless script and its lifeless characters; with the use of active human beings as representatives of the playwright's characters and every other visual and aural element on stage. According to Chris Nwamuo as cited in Ejeke;

Play directing is the blending of the visual and auditory stimuli of production into an artistic whole, encompassing the harmonization of acting, costumes, lighting and scenery as the total artistic expression of a production, with each bearing an artistic relation as well as being an artistic unit in itself (60).

Looking at Nwamuo's assertion, it means despite these separate elements involved in the art of theatrical production, all should be melted and blended together in a unified pattern through interpretation of the script. On this note, Rasheed declares that; ÷ the theatre director must be able to interpret the playwright's verbal composition into moving pictures, dead character to living and walking human beings (307). The director being able to give appropriate interpretation of the playwright's script could be based on in-depth understands of the script through script analysis during the preproduction stage of directing Emeka Nwabueze states that;

Before analyzing a play, a careful reading of the play is very important. Everything must be read-the introductory materials provided by the playwright, the description of the setting, the stage directions, the dialogue, the playwright's suggestions for the sets, costumes, props, lights and the technical details. The reader should image how these details relate to the overall effect of the play (149).

Through the process of play analysis as explained by Nwabueze, offers the director ample opportunity to find the motivational force of the play which Harold Clurman called 'spine' or line of action to inspire, motivate, and propel the overall action of the production Clurman says before a director starts;

Active directing, a formation in simplest terms must be found to state what general action motivates the play, of what fundamental drama or conflict the script's plot and people reveal, as the instruments (27).

Wilson in affirming Clurman's assertion opines that the first step in script analysis is to; "discover the spine of the play" (150). To buttress his point, Wilson in a concise note states that the director's concept derives from controlling idea, vision, or point of view of which the director feels is appropriate to the play (153) while Brockett and Ball maintain that the concept; "is the focus of the production by articulating what the director will try to realize on stage and communicate to the audience" (322). The director's concept is the inspiration for the interpretation of the play to the stage for a particular audience. It is directional concept that determines the interpretation and translation of the play script. Schnupp in his argument holds that the director embarking on critical analysis of the play will help in revealing;

Its cycles of acting, shifts in mood, and the flow of events. And overall scenes of the play, as well as a clear understanding of the progression of its plot, will enable the director to give the play shape (154).

From Schnupp's assertion, script analysis could avail a director the opportunity of coming to term with the theme, plot, mood, time/period, setting, geographical location of the play, biography of the characters as well as the technical aspects of the play. Brockett warns that;

Regardless of the length of time available, the director must familiarize himself as thorough as he can with the play if he is to cast and rehearse the actors intelligently, and if he is to guide the designers and technicians in their interpretation of the script (364).

This means, irrespective of the time frame or the duration of the production the director should study and analyze the play properly, Tyrone Guthrie states that; "If somebody does not decide at early stage what the play is about obviously the casting will be made for the wrong reason" (246). In other words, it is pertinent at the preproduction phase of the production for a director to have an in-depth knowledge of everything about the play he or she is to direct in order to do appropriate casting, motivating the performers and designers on overall performance vision of the director.

The next step in stage directing at the preproduction stage mostly after casting of talents for the production is the production meeting with cast and crew, George Kernodle et al says that;

The director's next step is to collaborate with the designers, usually a process of much give-and-take. A stimulating director's concept can fire the creative imagination of the designers, while their visual sensitivity and technical knowledge often enrich the director's vision in turn. Out of the collaboration comes the basic style of production (342).

The production conference therefore is to enable the director and his/her collaborators; performers, designers and the administrative personnel to work in a single director of the director's vision/concept for the production. Brockett in a different work advises that the director; "must be able to talk intelligently and persuasively with the designers and technicians about anything in his conception that depends on design" (467). The director will continuously work with the actors and actresses with the same vision during series of rehearsals: read-through, discussions, blocking, development/polishing, special, dry-run, run-through, technical, dress and preview rehearsals. Brockett adds that the director; "supervises rehearsals, explains his concept of the script, criticizes performance, and makes suggestions for

improvements (475) Owuamalam states that; rehearsal is a training session, designed to develop and improve artistic skills and capabilities required in audio-visual experience (206). This process of development and improvement of the actors and actresses skills in relation to the production vision, could be achieved through the inspiration derived from the play by a director and then transfer same to the actors and actresses. Once the director is convinced and satisfied with the performers mastering of their roles and blockings, the next stage is the main performance where all artistic elements are blended together in a seamless whole before an audience.

2.4 Film Directing

Film directing is an essential aspect in film making that runs through the three major phases of film production. Bruce Mamer says that; film is organized into three critical phases: preproduction, production and post production (27). It is the responsibility of the director to coordinate and supervise these phases or processes of film making which is a collaborative art. Augustine-Ufua Enahora posits that; film is a public art, a collaborative creation which is aimed at the audience (103). According to Armer; directors stand at the centre of the communication process, shaping and transmitting the message from its Sender (writer/originator) to its Receiver (audience) (3). Robert Kolker states that;

Collaboration is the core of cinematic creativity. From the most independent filmmaker to the largest studio production, people work together, divide the labor, contribute their particular expertise (67).

Irrespective of the size of production, the coordination, supervision and controlling of the filmatic elements are under taken by the director who is responsible for the final effect of the film. Bordwell and Thompson maintain that; the director coordinates the

staff to create the film, he or she is usually considered the person most responsible for the final look and sound of the film (18) Mamer argues that;

It is the director's choices that drive the rest of the crew's actions. The director is responsible for determining the look-The visual character-of the film, rehearsing and organizing the actors' performances, selecting the set ups and all attendant details and marshaling all of the forces toward the completion of the material (28).

These responsibilities of the director in film directing as captured by Mamer start from the preproduction to post production with the choice of a good script which seems to be the starting point for directing a good film. Nwabueze in interview with Nigeriafilm.com, he says that; "we know that without an adequate script, there would not be an adequate film. A good script is the first step to a good film" (2007).

That means the success or failure of a director starts from the selection of the scripts. It is imperative therefore, for a director to take great care in choosing a script, or a subject for a script for any production because he or she will live with his or her choice and its output. In choosing or accepting a script is like choosing a roommate which Michael Meyer as cited in Nwabueze in another material states that; "it is essential to make sure that you can live with your choice" (10). Once the director is with the script of his or her choice, the next step at the preproduction is in-depth studying and critical analysis of the screenplay which is a blue print that needs to be studied by the director. Through studying and analyzing the screenplay, the director would identify the theme, plot, characterization, setting, location, costume, lighting, sound effect, make-up, special effects as well as deciding on type of camera angles, shots, movements of the camera and overall directorial concept and visions. In Rabiger's view, the director concept; "should be non partisan, more embracing, and

holistic, a surrogate for the future audienceö (61). This implies that the directorö vision should be a unit of direction of all the elements involved in the film.

The next step in film directing after the directorö understanding of every detail about the screenplay is auditioning and casting which Rabiger argues that;

Good casting contributes massively to the success of any filmí the objectives of auditioning is to find outí much í about the physical, psychological, and emotional make-up of each potential cast member so you can commit yourself confidently to the best choice. Doing this mean initially putting many actors through a brief procedure that reveals the character of each, and indicates how he or she handles a representative situation (39).

Owuamalam affirms Rabiger assertion as he writes;

Casting is a selection process through which the best person, adjudged capable of playing an interpretative role in the clarification of meaning and signification of experience in an audio-visual productioní (202).

Drawing from the above assertions casting seems to be an essential ritual in film directing for the selection of the best talents based on credibility, competence and discipline and fairness on the part of both the talents and director towards good interpretation of the directorö vision. In Nwabuezeö view; öí the interpretation can be realized by a good director when he has in his cast, talented and gifted actors who are able to realize interpretation through simulation and dissimulationö (2007). Once the director is through with the casting, the next step is the production conference or meeting where according to Jonathan Desen Mbachaga and Chimezie Uwoama Nwazue the director should communicate his/her vision to the crew members and casts. In their words;

In Nollywood, examples abound where the director never communicated his vision to the key members only to arrive on the shooting day to call the shots. By this time, the designer must have interpreted and designed what he feels likewise other crew members. The resultant effect of this is always a discontinuity between the vision of the playwright and that of the interpreters (film makers). On the part of the actors, a disconnect between the script and their interpretation is very rampant hence the industry lacks the culture of rehearsals before shooting. Some popular faces who parade much confidence from their experience arrived at the location to force their personal interpretation on the director and his crew (495).

Therefore, the production conference becomes necessary for the director to unveil his/her vision of the production as derived from the screenplay and transferring same to the casts and crew members in order to form a link or bound for a unified production. It could also be deduced from Mbachaga and Nwazue's opinion that rehearsal is imperative in film making. Rabiger posits that;

To forgo rehearsal prior to film performance is often assured that film performance, unlike theatre needs little or no rehearsal, indeed, that rehearsal damages spontaneity. This belief may be a rationalization for minimizing cost (rehearsal greatly increase costs) or perhaps people think that theatre plays rehearse to overcome the problems of a continuous performance, such as mastering lines and movements. In truth, every piece of good theatre grows out of a radical and organic rehearsal process, even improvisatory theatre. So why not film? (49).

Rehearsals therefore are very important aspects in film making which should not be ignored for any reason. Avoiding rehearsal completely could be dangerous to the end product of the film. It is necessary to adhere to rehearsal with all seriousness and commitment for a good production despite the cost involved in it. Mamer states that;

Arranging as much time as possible for rehearsals is a good idea but in reality they are rarely afforded as much time as the talent and the director would desire. It is not uncommon for a project to have no rehearsal time at all, particularly for actors with smaller roles (47).

He concludes that at least a pre shooting rehearsal on location or set should be set aside to work through the entire scenes before commencing to shoot (47) Nicholas I. Proferes sees rehearsal as important aspect of a production as he writes;

It is important during this period that the director takes the pressure off the actor by creating an atmosphere that is conducive to exploration-that makes the actor feel secure and willing to take chances. Rehearsal is the time to try out the actor's ideas (127).

As the director is working on the actors and actresses during rehearsal, he/she will be overseeing other aspects of the production as well as developing the shooting script. Mamer opines that; "the shooting script is essentially an annotated version of the script, numbering the scenes for preparation and logging during shooting" (61). The shooting script could be said to mean another version of the script that director uses on location with detail of scenes numbering, type of shots, camera angle, sound, special effect and action. Owuamalam declares that;

In film production, the shooting script becomes an important mapping for audio-visual experience. The shooting script consists of shot

numbering, camera instruction, action to be formatted and the anticipated accompanying sound (141).

The shoot script will then serve as a guide to the shooting process to the director and his collaborators as he or she envisages the final look of the film. In film directing, the director also uses the story board, script break down and shot list to facilitate the process of directing on location or set. Mamer maintains that; "Shot list is a less format alternative to the story board. It lists brief written description of the intended shots" (61). In Rabiger's view, the story board could be called a floor plan which will help the director to consolidate his or her intention for; "blocking and to use the fewest and most effective camera angle" (113). It seems the essence of the story board like the shooting script is to give the director and his/her collaborator a preliminary view on how the final shots would look like. Once the director is satisfied with the pre production, the next stage of directing is the main production of shooting or filming the required elements for the film. The director at this point determines what should be acted and how it should be acted as well as what should be filmed and how it should be filmed. According to Kodak, the director in a production performs such functions as;

Not only oversees actors, but also advises the director of photograph, instructs the major technical people, administrates the flow of people, consults on budgets, and deals with outside pressures. The director is ultimately responsible for what happens on the set (83).

This could involve the framing of subjects and objects, camera movements, type of shots and camera angles. Joe King observes that; "the quality of a film relies on perfect translation of the subject to real film language and not just knowing the subject or topic" (64). To support King's observation, Adebola Ademeso states that;

Camera creates pictures in motion; therefore, motion picture's language is required in order to manipulate camera lenses for expressive pictures. The various visual elements of the optics and chemistry with the skills of instrument in filmmaking exemplified the aesthetics of shots, camera movements, angles and modes of transition (434).

From the forgoing, it could be said that the director should be able to explore the visual and sound elements in filmmaking while on set for appropriate communication. At the conclusion of shooting on location, the director continues with his/her directing at the post production during the editing and assembling of the different shots of the film, shot at different locations. Mbachaga and Nwazue postulate that; "it is pertinent to note here that, movie shooting is not done in chronology of scenes as they unfold. So the disjointed shots, shot out of order need to be given meaning in the editing of the film or video" (493) Rabiger is of the view that; "post production is that phase of filmmaking where the raw materials of sound and picture rushes are transformed into the film seen by the audience" (164). It could be said that, film directing at the post production editing stage is where the director determines or makes final decisions on the final look of the film from the vision he/she has envisaged in the preproduction phase.

2.5 Auteurship

Stage and film productions as art forms could only come to life through the collaborative effort of various artistic experts. In view of this collaboration, there have been issues affecting these collaborative medium; emanating from the auteurship phenomenon. The word auteur is derived from the French word meaning author. The first definition of auteur in *Merriam- Webster's Collegiate Dictionary* is; "a film director whose practice accords with the auteur theory" (77). While auteur

theory is defined by *Merriam-Webster's* as; "a view of filmmaking in which the director is considered the primary creative force in a motion picture" (77) *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* defines auteur as; "A film/movie director who plays such an important part in making their films/movies that they are considered to be the author" (83) The word *auteur* could be said to have first appeared in the filmatic lexicon in French by Francois Truffaut in 1954. Truffaut has argued that film is a great medium for expressing the personal ideas of the director. According to Warren Buckland;

The auteur policy emerged from the film criticism of the French Journal *Cashiers du cinema* in the 1950s. This policy was put into practice by a number of critics who became well-known film-makers of the French New Wave of the 1960s including Jean-Luc Goddard, François Truffaut, Jacques Rivette, Eric Rohmer and Claude Chabrol. The Manifesto of the *Cashiers du Cinema* critics is Truffaut's 1954 essay "A Certain Tendency of the French Cinema" Truffaut criticizes the dominant tendency in French cinema during the 1940s and 1950s which he calls the tradition of quality (76-77).

The auteurs have argued that the working tools available to the director were similar to the writer's pen. They compare a collaborative medium as film to painting and novel which, are created by an individual. According to Alvan Lovell and Gianluca Sergi the first project of auteurs;

It was to give the cinema cultural legitimacy, to put it on an equal footing with the traditional, high prestige arts such as painting, the novel and classical music. Their second project was to give the cinema destructiveness as an art form. They did this by arguing that a

film was much more than its script the director is the key figure, not the writer (9).

The idea of comparing the art of film-making to painting and other creative arts seems unnecessary because most painting or novel creators derives their inspiration solely without any collaborator but film cannot be completed without the collaboration of different artists. Even as a production script for stage or film performance is written by one or two persons it must become live on stage or screen through contributive efforts of many individuals. The concept of auteurship could be said to have generated serious debates among practitioners and scholars, mostly on the ground that it does not matter how many people that contribute to the success of a film. What matter is the director being in charge as a sole author in a production by presenting and influencing his or her vision and style with little or no regard to other contributors. Gillian Kelly postulates that;

Many debates have surrounded the controversial theory with the like of Andrew Sarris (1962) regarding it as a very significant development, and others such as Pauline Kael (1963) believing it is a highly flawed and unreliable theory (138).

In his argument on auteur theory Andrew Sarris acknowledged that the theory is also vague at the present time. Sarris believes that there is a misunderstanding about what the auteur theory actually argues, particularly since the theory itself is so vague at the present time (561). Sarris who championed the crusade of auteur theory in America in support of the directors as an auteur in a collaborative medium like film is of the view that film can be made without a director. He states that; "Marlon Brando has shown us that a film can be made without a director. Indeed "One-Eyed Jack" is more entertaining than many films with directors" (562). One will then ask how he

arrived at the conclusion that a film can be made without a director. It is on record that in theatre like in film even when the title director was not there in the classical age to the early 19th century the functions of a director have been in place. Even the said 'One-Eyed Jack' film was poorly directed by Marlon Brando who also doubled as actor and a producer of the film. In fact, the entire production was believed to have been characterised with production problems and misunderstanding among cast and crew members because of inadequate preproduction planning as a director. Jake Hinkson postulates that;

One-Eyed Jacks came out in 1961 and effectively ruined Marlon Brando. He came to the project as an actor and a producer, prepped it for six months with Stanley Kubrick, and took over the director's chair when, after a long souring of relations between the two men, Kubrick reportedly left the production. The film went through re-shoot and extensive editing before it was released to middling business. Brando never directed another film, and his performances after this one became increasingly scattershot (2012).

In driving home his argument on Auteur theory Sarris enumerates three premises of Auteurism;

1. The technical competence of a director as a criterion of value
 2. The distinguishable personality of the directors as a criterion of value over a group of film, a director must exhibit certain recurrent characteristics of style, which serves as his signature
 3. third and ultimate premise of the auteur theory is concerned with interior meaning (562).

With these three premises Sarris has expanded on Truffaut's ideas of 1954 and laid the ground work for more debate on the auteur theory as it is against the collaborative medium. In tracing the origin of auteur theory in film Wollen Peter argues that;

í the auteur theoryí was developed by the loosely kint group of critics who wrote for *Cahiers du Cinema* and made it the leading film magazine in the worldí different critics developed somewhat different methods within a loose frame work of common attitude (565).

It is believed that French critics came up with this theory as a policy to regulate the influx of American films into their country which was threatening their economy at that time. They believed American films were more quality than theirs, Kolker states that;

í auteur in film grew, indirectly, from political and economic issues between the United States and France after World War II, and it developed directly from the attempts of a group of post-World War II French intellectuals to account for American film and react to what they did not like in the film of their countryí France tried to solve the problem by creating a policy about how many American films could be shown in relation to the number of French filmsí French film makers hope to compete against the welcome deluge of American movies and meet their quota of French films by making a õhigh-classö production (83).

It could be deduced from the above postulation that the auteur theorists were concerned about the marketing and promotional reasons of their films to boast their economy. It seems they believed that once a director is given the mandate as a single creator of a film whose mark of identification is consistent in his styles, and themes quality films would be made. Kristin Thompson and David Bordwell declare that; ÷one of the most influential ideas in cinema history is the belief that the director is most centrally responsible for a filmø form, style and meaningø (381) It seems the

presupposition of auteurship based on consistency of styles and themes that must run across a director's films have led some scholars into believing that auteur director could checkmate indiscipline on the part of actors as well as improve the quality of films all over the world and in Nigeria in particular. Charles Okuowulu calls for adoption and implementation of the auteur theory in Nigerian Film Industry-Nollywood. He has argued that due to uncontrollable dominant influence of some star actors in the industry there is need for auteur directors to break that Jinx for good productivity. Like Andrew Sarris who use American film directors in the likes of David Wark Griffith, Arson Welles, Alfred Hitchcock, Charlie Chaplin and many others for the justification of the auteur theory. Okwuowulu uses Teco Benson as a model of auteur director. He believes that since some actors in the likes of Nkem Owoh and others are fond of dictating to directors as well as directing themselves on locations, there is need for auteur directors to put an end to such ugly trends in the industry. To him, the situation has led to the production of poor quality films in Nigeria ÷with stereotypic characters and predictable plot structuresö. He writes;

These have adversely affected the quality of our video films. However, we have a handful of auteurs in Nollywood who have broken the barrier of her film culture and distinguished themselves through their personal styles and signature in film production. They are considered auteurs because of reoccurring nature of a particular style in their works (335).

In his submission he adopts and advocates for the practice of auteurism model of David Taylor which according to him ÷sees the work of art as the product of one brain even when collectively doneö (336) Drawing from his claims, it seems once a director plays more than one role in film production, such acting, scripting, editing, producing and so on in the same film which he or she is directing, therefore such a person is an

auteur director. According to him, Tecu Benson should be seen as a good example of auteur director as he explains;

Every auteur has a peculiar seal or motif that distinguishes his work from the others. This is apt in Benson's works. His experience as an actor, script-writer and editor acquaints him with the quintessential skills that auteur practice requires. For instance, the revised screenplay in the credit of most of his video films shows that though he did not write the script, has adapted it to suit his filmic purpose. However, other offices he holds in his video films are; editor, casting director, producer and director. These afford him total control of film production (337).

It seems from the above assertion that the model of auteur theory Okwuowulu is advocating for Nollywood is still the same auteur theory against the collaborative nature of film product because according to Andrew Rix; "The director is generally not alone on a project but works alongside producers, designers, editors, cinematographers, composers, actors" (140) with the nature and processes involved in stage and film productions, it could be difficult for one person to assume successfully all these responsibilities of producing, directing, scripting, distributor, editing, cinematographing and so on. One could argue that assuming almost every responsibility in both stage and film production is due to lack of good budgeting and unprofessionalism which could lead to poor result because one person cannot function properly performing more than two functions in a production. Edward Gordon Craig states that; "it is against all nature that a man can be in two places at once" (134). Both stage and film production involve division of labour which Remigius Anayochi Anyanwu argues that it allows; "people to do jobs related to their areas of

specializationí .improve the quality off productionö (552). According to Udu Ewa and G. A. Agu as cited in Anyanwu; ÷í division of labour leads to greater productivity because the greater number of experts in the production process, the greater the achievementsøø (552). It could be said that a director must not do all the jobs alone in a collaborative medium before he/she could maintain or show consistency of styles and thematic quality as marks of identification in film or stage productions.

Going by the characteristics of auteur theory in film production in seeing the script as a pretext of the production or by rewriting it to suit the directorøø vision, it could be said that the practice of auteurism began in theatre before film. The auteur came into being in film-making with its presupposition features in 1954 after some renowned stage directors such as Sir William Davenant (1606-1668) David Garrick (1717-1779), George Anton Benda (1722-1795) and Vsevelod Meyerhold (1874-1940) have carried out similar functions of auteurship in their individual productions. According to Wikipedia;

Romeo and Juliet has been adapted numerous times for stage, film, musical and opera. During the English Restoration, it was revived and heavily revised by William Davenant. David Garrick's 18th-century version also modified several scenes, removing material then considered indecent, and George Benda's operatic adaptation omitted much of the action and added a happy ending (2013).

David Garrick for instance rewrote William Shakespeareøø plays to suit his concept especially *Hamlet* it is imperative to take a long quotation from Richard W. Schoch to illustrate this argument. Schoch posits that;

In 1758 when the *Rout* was about to open at Drury Lane, Murphy accused Garrick of having stolen his "little project." "I will not silently sink under acts of oppression," Murphy protested against the alleged of dramatic piracy; "I think I have a right to expect the managers of Drury Lane, that if they will do me no good they will at least refrain from doing me any harm." Murphy's play comically reworks the ghost scene from *Hamlet*, with the ghost transformed into that of the Bard himself Haunting the Board of Drury Lane, Shakespeare's ghost appears to Garrick and condemns him for daring to alter his immortal play. Murphy regularly applaud Garrick's efforts to rescue Shakespeare's plays from their perceived flaws and imperfection. He praised the rewritten "tomb scene" in Garrick's adaptation of *Romeo and Juliet* (1748), declaring it to be the scene that Shakespeare himself would have translation of his original Italian source. *Hamlet with Alteration* condemns Garrick for desecrating Shakespeare's texts through his vile adaptations. By depicting Shakespeare as a humble writer, misquoting the original Hamlet, Garrick urges that the "too, too, solid house, which Foote has in the Hay market, would melt at once, Thaw, and resolve itself into dew" (1-31).

This act of rewriting a dramatist's play is an act of auteurship. While Wilson argues that the term auteur has been in use in theatrical production before its emergence in the cinema. According to him;

"The term has since been applied to a type of stage director as well directors who make more drastic alterations or transformations in the material, taking responsibility for shaping every element in the

production, including the script – one of the most important auteur directors – was Vsevolod Meyerhold – he developed a type of theatre in which he controlled all the elements. He would rewrite or eliminate text in order to present his own vision of the materials (155).

They could be other theatre directors who might have rewritten dramatist(s)'s plays to suit their visions or concepts before Davenent, Garrick, Benda and Meyerhold but at the moment these four seem to be pioneer theatre auteur directors. However, after Meyerhold there is a long list of theatre auteur directors in the likes of Jerzy Grotowski, Robert Wilson, JoAnne Akalatis, Anne Bogart and many others. Wilson maintains that; "these directors, too, imposed their own visions rather than that of the playwrights on the material" (156). Brockett and Ball who classified directing into three approaches – literal, translation and auteur approaches – write thus;

A third approach to directing places less emphasis on the written play. Using this approach, directors may begin with the play but feel free to reshape it as they see fit. A director who treats the script as raw material to be reshaped for his own purposes is sometimes called an auteur because the director is considered the principal creative force; this approach to directing virtually eliminates the playwright (328).

In their submission, they declare that the auteur approach to directing is "the least common approach" (328). They mentioned Jerzy Grotowski and Robert Wilson as auteur directors (328). Auteurship therefore exists in both stage and film productions.

2.6 Theoretical Framework

Stage and film production abound with theories used by various scholars and practitioners for effective communication of their messages to their audiences. The

researcher adopts the Auteurship and Collaborative Theories for this study due to their uniqueness to the study. Auteurship Theory is derived from French word *auteur* meaning author. Therefore, auteurship means having ownership of an intellectual or creative work. The word auteur was first used as a cinematic term in 1954 by Francois Truffaut who argues that film is a great medium for the expression of the director's personal idea, vision, concept and point of view as the auteur (author) of the film. According to Buckland;

The auteur policy emerged from the film criticism of the French Journal *Cashiers du Cinema* in the 1950s. Truffaut's 1954 essay 'A certain Tendency of the French Cinema' Truffaut criticized the dominant tendency in French cinema during the 1940s and 1950s (76-77).

In James Monaco's observation; 'Truffaut developed the 'politique des auteurs,' which became the rally cry for the young French critics. Usually translated as 'auteur theory,' it was not a theory at all but a policy: a fairly arbitrary critical approach' (332). But in 1962, Andrew Sarris in America modified Truffaut's word 'auteur' by adding another word 'theory'. This gave rise to the auteur theory in 1962. The auteur theory holds that it does not matter the number of people who contribute to the success of a production, the director remain the supreme artist whose vision determines the final look of the production.

The Collaborative Theory however has no definite theorist (s) but it has been used by various scholars to establish a clear fact that stage and film productions are borne out of team work. The term Collaborative is an adjective of the verb collaborate which could be traced to Latin word *Collaboratus* meaning to labour together. *Collaboratus* was first used in 1871. *Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary* gives three definitions of the word collaborative but the one relevant to this study is; 'to

work jointly with others or together especially in an intellectual endeavour (224). While *Oxford Advanced Learners' Dictionary* defines collaborations as; 'the act of working with another person or group of people to create or produce something' (277). Therefore, collaborative involves many people working together to achieve a desire goal, objective and result.

Auteurship and Collaborative Theories are very important and relevant to this study because both stage and film productions can only come into being through efforts of many individual experts. According to Charles E. Nwadiwe;

The organic nature of theatre necessitates a collaboration of various artists working in harmony to produce an ensemble. This presupposes that someone must be in charge of the ensemble to pattern and coordinate the work all the artistes and personnel in the production process (1).

While Clurman states that; 'theatre is a collective art not only in the sense that many people contribute to it but in the subtler sense that each of the contributions to final result actually collaborates in his partner's function' (273) In Kolker's view;

Collaboration is the core of cinematic creativity. From the most independent filmmaker to the largest studio production, people work together, divide the labour, and contribute their particular expertise (67).

Among these collaborators, it is the director who is seen as the super artist whose responsibility is for the coordination of the overall look of a production. Giannetti and Leach state that; 'Film is a collaborative medium, and many individuals-producers, directors, screen writers, actors, technicians-contribute to the final effect' (10). The Auteur theory had argued that the director is the auteur (author) of a production whose vision or concept will determine the overall meaning of the production, but the

director alone cannot do this. This researcher uses Auteurship and Collaborative Theories to adjudge a director as the author of a production. Because, despite the proclamation of Auteur Theory in stage and film productions without effective collaboration, to a production, the director's concept vision, point of view and idea will be mere dreams.

CHAPTER THREE

ISSUES OF AUTEURSHIP IN PRODUCTIONS

3.1 Preamble

In this chapter the following sub-headings will be discussed: Production Script for Stage and Film, Approaches to Production Concept, Auteurship in Stage Production and Auteurship in Film Production.

3.2 Production Script for Stage and Film

The production scripts for both stage and film productions are blue prints that establish guidelines for the entire production casts and crew members to follow for the realisation of the ultimate idea of the production. They mark the beginning of artistic production, indicating how characters, actions, thoughts, feelings and direction as conceived by the writer will be interpreted or translated by the director and his or her collaborators into the final look of the production.

The production script is an essential element for both stage and film productions which serves as a foundation of a building which must be solid for the entire building to stand the test of time. This solidness of a script lies in its goodness. The production scripts for stage and film productions must be good as Nwabueze says that; òa good script is the first step to a good filmö (2007). For the production script to be good it must first and foremost have a good story that has beginning, middle and end with dramatic actions, conflict, and great significance to the artists and audience. The dramatic conflict in a production script is meant to be in a dual form: internal and external dramatic conflict. Internal dramatic conflict is within the character's mind and between the character and a situation. The external dramatic conflict is between two or more characters in the script. The significance of the script to the artists and audience lies in the character's interesting or sad history, needs, deeds and problems

as reasons for the character to be cared for, disliked, being identified with, attracted to or rejected by different audience in the same production. The production script is meant to have interesting subject matter(s) or issues with great suspense to arouse an audience curiosity and anxiety.

A stage play traditionally is written by a dramatist(s) to be performed on stage by actors/actresses before an audience. The dramatist or creator creates the utopian world in his or her script with its inhabitants or creatures from his or her imagination, inspiration or experience. The characters are given all attributes and features of human beings and other creatures like fishes, animals, birds, forest, tree, spirit, monsters, ghosts, rock and mountain in action, with or without dialogue. The playwright in his or her imagination creates the characters according to sex/gender, social status, personality as well as profession, physical, psychological state of mind; goal and objective for the character to pursue. The playwright creates human beings and other creatures lifeless on paper; these lifeless creatures can only have life to function properly on stage once impersonated by real human beings-actors/actresses. Nwabueze in an article states that; "drama, therefore, re-enacts the imaginary lives of characters on stage" (161). While Craig says that; "a drama is not to be read, but to be seen upon the stage" (114). Peter Brook as cited in Kernodle et al posits that; "if you just let a play speak, it may not make a sound. If what you want is for the play to be heard, then you must conjure its sound from it" (342) in corroborating the above assertions Marjorie Boulton explains further that;

A play is not really a piece of literature for reading. A true play is three dimensional; it is literature that walks and talks before our eyes. It is not intended that the eye shall perceive marks on paper and the imagination turn them into sights, sounds and action. The text of the

play is meant to be translated into sights sounds and action which occur literally and physically on stage (3).

Without a dramatic text being re-enacted by human beings into action and visual-aural elements of a production on stage the primary aim of drama to educate, entertain, inform and enlighten will be lost.

A screenplay for filmatic production is derived through original ideas, experience, and imagination of the writer or through adaptation of novel or play text or through stories from biographies or memoirs and through stories told to the writer by other people from their experiences. A screenplay like stage play is a filmatic blue print with visual-aural elements of the production: characters, actions, thoughts, feelings, emotions, dialogue, costume, make-up, scenery, props, lighting, and special effects written by a screen writer.

The genre of a production script such as tragedy, comedy, tragic-comedy, horror melodrama, science-fiction, fantasy, epic action and so on determines the production genre. In an ideal way the dramatist and screen writer's ideas and visions externalized on paper are meant to be re-externalized by the director as the chief translator or interpreter and his or her collaborators on stage or film to give it more meaning and life before an audience. However, to some extent, the place of a playwright or screen writer in theatrical and filmatic performances have been abused or undermined in some quarters mostly with issues relating to auteurship phenomenon paying little or no regard to playwright and screen writer's script by auteur director. Auteur director sees the script as a pretext of the production which should be rewritten or restructured in order to present the director's personal vision, idea, point of view, style and concept of a production. According to Buckland; "an auteur works his/her own vision by establishing a consistent style" usually works in opposition to the

demand of the script the script merely served as the pretext to the activity of filming (80). The vision or concept of a playwright to some extent is still being maintained by auteur director in stage production. Especially if the play is a published one; the director will be careful not to violet the dramatist's copyright. In a similarly development but worse than the playwright's case, the screen writer have been relegated almost completely by the auteurship concept in film production. The screen writer's vision or personal ideas hardly come to play in film production. An auteur director starts his/her directing from the selecting of the story or subject of the film. Sometimes the director could approach a screen writer with his/her idea or vision for the screen writer to write a screenplay to reflect the director's vision. Even if the screenwriter approach the director with his/her idea or vision already written in the screenplay and the vision does not suit that of the director, the screen writer or another screen writer or even the director would rewrite the screenplay to reflect the director's personal style, theme and vision. According to Bobker;

í The script is representative of the director's approach to film, not the writer's. Thus the director chooses the subject and the theme of the film. He influences the script writing and usually forces it to conform to his film. Ultimately, he selects the writer who can best execute the film he envisions (161).

The script however, is the genesis of theatrical and film productions written by a playwright, screenwriter or by a director.

3.3 Approaches to Production Concept

The term concept in the second definition in *Microsoft Encarta Dictionary* is;

í A broad abstract idea or a guiding general principle e.g. one that determines how a person or culture behaves, or how nature, reality, or events are perceived (2009).

The term concept could be traced to the 16th century in Italy where it was first used. Concept is derived from Italian word *conceptum* meaning to conceive something in the mind. In other words concept is an idea or vision conceived by someone about a certain project in his or her mind and how to accomplish it. In film or stage performance, a production concept is the vision, idea, and point of view of a director for the entire production and how he or she has envisaged the final look of a performance. The directorial concept is a guiding principle to the interpretation of the script in order to put the entire production in proper shape. Changes and additions in any aspect of production are always in line with the directorial concept. The concept, vision or idea is what differentiates one director from another director(s) as well as one production from another production(s). A production concept can only be achieved through the collaborative efforts of others.

Approach to a production concept is through the director deriving inspiration from the script during script analysis to establish a relationship with the playwright or screenwriter's vision. The concept is derived from a controlling idea, vision or point of view which the director feels is appropriate to the play or film production. It is a director's responsibility to find appropriate interpretation of the script in order to state a motivational statement to propel the overall action of a production. The directorial concept is meant to communicate to production collaborators in order to create a certain atmosphere to arouse the interest of the production based on the vision or concept of the production as initiated by the directors. The production concept is associated with style, period, dramatic metaphor (central image) and purpose of the productions.

3.3.1 Style

Style is the way the setting of stage and film production is created to invoke the

tone, mood and atmosphere of the entire production. The directional concept on the style of a production is shown or reflected in the acting, scenery, costume, make-up, sound, props and lighting. The production styles could be naturalism, realism and so on. The naturalism style of production is aimed at depicting or portraying the dramatic action and setting exactly as nature by bringing on set natural or ideal things or properties without pretension. The naturalism style is more accurate in film than in stage performance. Directorial concept based on realism style of production is representational or imitating life on stage in order to create the illusion of reality in a production. For example in naturalism setting real food like cooked yam could be brought on set, while in realism setting what looks like yam could be brought on set to represent the cooked yam.

Directorial style of a production is meant to reflect in the main subject matter of the script and across every visual-aural elements of the production such as movement, setting and sound. The directorial style in terms of movement involves the way an auteur director as the controlling force of a production wants the performers to move on set. The movement of the performers could be horizontal or vertical using various part of the body. The horizontal movement demands a performer crossing from one side of the set to another or by spreading his or her hands or legs. The vertical movement is applied when an actor or actress moves upward or downward. For example if a performer climbs a robe or ladder or lift-up his or her hand(s) that is vertical movement. The actor or actress style of acting must be in tandem with what the director wants. Bobker states that; "acting performances are coming more and more to reflect the style of the director rather than the style of the actor" (178). The director does not act but he or she is responsible for the kind of acting the actors or actresses act for both stage and film productions. An auteur director also dictates to

the cinematograph the movement of the camera while filming. With the aid of digital computer monitor, the director could clearly see how the images look on the screen before he or she can give final approval for each shot in a scene or scene in a sequence. The director determines the tempo and rhythm of every sound or movement of images in time and spaces.

3.3.2 Period

The directional concept could be derived from the period in which the dramatic or filmatic action is set. The dramatic and cinematic action could be in ancient days, pre-colonial, colonial or post-colonial era. The directorial concept on the period determines the setting, costume, make-up, acting, and props to depict the period of the dramatic action based on the vision of the director. According to Brockett; "the stage picture depends to a large degree upon the setting and costumes." (481). The costume and make-up must be appropriate to make a clear statement about the period in which the characters exist and to enhance the performance. According to Felix U. Egwuda-Ugbeda and Maryisabella Ada Ezeh;

Stage performance, screen play and film production are parts and parcel of human endeavours, each of these performances, the use of costume and application of make-up are indispensable. Costume is designed, produced and worn in order to enhance the performance, that is costume, not only enhance the performance, but accentuates the cultural and physical setting, production and also, delineates character on stage (91).

To achieve the above purposes of costume and make-up, the designers must design according to the director's vision.

3.3.3 Dramatic Metaphor

The directorial concept could be implemented based on his or her vision on the

dramatic metaphor or central image as the focal point of the production to make a thematic production statement of the overall production concept. Brockett maintains that; ÷a director may also seek to make a play more comprehensible by building his interpretation around a central visual image or symbolic deviceø (468) dramatic metaphor is could be seen as the creation and use of signs, icons, symbols and images to represent something, place or action that best explains the theme of the play text. It creates the focal point and the guiding principle of unity and emphasis in a given production. According to ABC Duruaku states that the dramatic metaphor; ÷í or master symbol is a kind of vivifying force for a play production, it becomes a guiding image that enhances total effect of the productionø(91).

3.3.4 Purpose

The directional concept of a production could be derived from the purpose of the script as envisage by the playwright or screen writers. The concept of the production on the script is for the director to sincerely translate the written words into stage action and visual-aural elements to create an exciting production by blending his or her concept with that of the playwright or screen writer.

3.4 Auteurship in Stage Production

The controversy on issues of auteurship in stage production arises from whose vision; concept and point of view should be presented or reflected in the final look of a production. The dramatist writes the script with certain vision in mind; but it is the responsibility of the director to interpret or translate the dramatistø vision from the script to the stage. With the characteristics of auteurship in general, issues of auteurship in stage production could be viewed in various forms: through rewriting, distorting, or reshaping a playwrightø work; undermining the playwrightø work and seeing a play text as a pretext for a production.

Also, the issue of playwright opting to directing his or her play in order to preserve his or her vision mostly for new or virgin script for the fear that auteur director might kill his or her vision or give the script a different view or interpretation in contrast to the dramatist's initial idea or vision is alarming. According to Copeau;

Let us hope for a dramatist who replaces or eliminates the director, and personally takes over the directing; rather than for professional directors who pretend to be dramatists (No matter how experienced a craftsman he may be, he is immediately too much the professional (224).

Copeau's statement could be interpreted to mean that, it is imperative for both dramatist and director in theatrical production to respect each other's professional right and creativity. However, the issue of who should be the auteur (author) in stage production has ignites serious controversial arguments. According to Adolph Appia in his argument; "if the director, actors, designers, electricians, technicians and so on do not enact the playwright's work on stage, it will end up in the bookshelves". He compares the script with orchestral score which is written like the dramatist's manuscript, as the conductor translates the orchestral score the way he or she likes in the same vein is the director in theatrical performance. He writes;

Once an author has completed his play, what element does he deem essential for its enactment? The actors, of course. Without actors there can be no action, thus no performance, thus no play-except on our bookshelves... (125).

Clurman in his argument on issues of auteurship maintains that the director should be the author of a theatrical production while the dramatist remains the author of the play he wrote. He accepts that theatrical production is a collaborative medium. According to him;

What we call a play in theatre is something radically different from a play on the page. The dramatist expresses himself mainly through words; the director through action which involves people amid the paraphernalia of the stage. The theatre is a collective art not only in the sense that many people contribute to it, but in the subtler sense that each of the contributors to final result actually collaborates in his partner's function. The playwright himself is the director when he writes his play: he does not simply set down what his characters have to say, he tries to visualize the effect of his scenes on stage. The handling of diverse materials of the theatre so that the parts-actor, stage space, properties, light, background, music, and even the text itself-become a coherent, meaningful whole is the director's job. The director, I repeat, is the author of the stage. The director must be a master of theatrical action as the dramatist is a master of the written concept of his play (273-75).

The above statement, means that the playwright language on paper must be translated on stage the way the director feels either to represent the exact dialogue and stage directions of the dramatist or not to follow exactly what the dramatist has written because Clurman maintains that in real sense;

if the playwright's text disappears the moment it reaches the stage, because on the stage, it becomes part of an action, every element of which is as pertinent to its meaning as the text itself. A change in gesture, inflection, movement, rhythm or in the physical background of speech may give it a new significance (276).

It could be said therefore, from the foregoing it was based on this ideology that most past and present theatre directors rewrote or reshaped playwrights' works in order to

present their own visions. But Jean Vilar disagrees with the auteurism proclamation of the director rewriting or shaping a dramatist's work to impose his or her professional vision. To him, it is dangerous for a director to give false meaning to a dramatist's play by rewriting it against the intention of the author rather, he writes; "the director must return to the author; listen to him; follow him. He must guard against those petty dictatorial faults which always lie as platinum in his path" (268). To Vilar, the director and his or her collaborators are interpreters of the created work of the playwright and not creators of the same work, so there is no need for a director to be seen as an author. He opines that;

I might add that if any director rehearsing a master piece feels that he is a creator, then so is the actor. And the audience too, why not? Remember the old actors' Sally: "the author writes one play, the actor performs another, and the audience sees a third," where then are the interpreters? (271).

Issues of auteurship in stage production according to Copeau arise the moment the director who is supposed to be the right hand-man of the playwright in helping in the interpretation of his or her work starts distorting or rewriting the dramatist's script. He explains that; "Trouble arises the moment he makes use of some of his professional skills to distort the playwright's work, to introduce into the fabric of that work into his own ideas, intention, fantasies and doctrines" (224). Auteurship in stage production cut across, all the departments. The auteur director idea or vision reflects on the scenery, costume, make-up, acting, lighting, props and sound. His or her vision or concept have to be accomplished through the collaborative efforts of other artists who must only do or follow the dictates or instructions of the director concerning his or her vision for the production.

3.5 Auteurship in Film Production

Auteurship in film production emanates from the director's influence in taking full control and close monitoring of all aspects of the production, mostly with little or no regard to the screenplay written by a screen writer once it does not reflect his personal vision. Auteur director sees any script that does not come from his or her ideas or vision as worthless to be used in his or her production. Unless such a script is rewritten by the director or someone else to infuse or include the director's vision or point of view the script could be discarded. According to Buckland; "the script is the mere pretext for the activity of film making and an auteur film is about the film making practices involves in filming a script, rather than being about the script itself" (79).

Issues of auteurship in film production are more peculiar with independent film directors who prefer freedom of expression of their concepts and visions by having total control of their film than when working in large scale or studio production where the producer will dictate what he or she wants. Even at studio production auteur director can have some control over the overall effect of the production with little or no adjustment to the script. Issues of auteurship could also be associated to low budgeting in film production by independent film makers where director could do almost everything, writing, producing, directing, editing and so on to minimize production cost. Auteur director belief in self expression and coherent in styles and themes across various films by the same director. The issue of consistency of styles and themes could be due to lack of creativity on the part of the director for not delving into different genres of film rather than maintain a certain style and theme across films. Issues of auteurship could affect the relationship among collaborators in a film

production for underminding or misunderstanding the importance of other crew members. Mamer queries that;

It would seem unnecessary to repeat the cliché that film making is collaborative art, except that few people outside of the industry truly understand what that means: every crew member is faced with decision large and small that contributes many elements to a film; if each person does not bring some measure of creativity to the decision the project as a whole will suffer (49).

Issues of auteurship in film has made most screen writers to write, produce and direct their own film as well as most directors instead of directing someone else's script, they opted into scripting writing in order to maintain their point of views, concepts or visions. In Rabiger's view;

The very attractive auteur theory of film authorship, emphasizing the integrity and control of one person's vision in filmmaking, influences many beginners to believe they should direct only from their own writing. This should certainly be a goal, but at the outset one needs the division of labor that is the strength of film as a collaborative medium, and one needs to avoid spreading oneself too thin. By writing, directing, and editing oneself, an individual is left vulnerable to some nasty traps. Another hazard is that if anyone, particularly an actor, questions the credibility or quality of the script, it becomes a disabling criticism of yourself (15-16).

Going by what Rabiger said above, it is important for auteur director not to indulge in doing everything by oneself rather a director should maintain the collaborative spirit by delegating duties to other individual experts while he/she supervises, coordinates

and controls all elements, hence the director will break down. But in offering advice to directors on issues of auteurship Proferes says that;

í I have encouraged you to assume responsibility in all the areas of encompassing distinct craft discipline, and now I would like to encourage you to at least entertain the idea of also inventing the stories you tell. Just as in editing, production design, lighting, music, or producing-where you most likely will rely on others to help you achieve your vision-your mightí collaborate with screen writers who can offer their skills and insight into fashioning your story into a evocative blue print for rendering into the screení you might choose to write the screen play yourself. Where will your stories come from? The most original source would be you (257).

Issues of auteurship in film production are based on the dominate influence of the director in charge of all elements of the production from the selection of the script to the distribution of the film. According to Bobker who see auteur as a contemporary director says; òthe contemporary director controls every aspects of productionö (169). The director besides choosing the script he or she chooses those who are to work with him or her in various departments. The director chooses the actors and actresses through audition and casting based on their talents, loyalty and readiness to work with him or her to accomplish director's vision or concept. However, the director could influence or impose his/her vision to the performers. The performers's vision for the production will be a re-enactment of the director's vision. The implication is that the performers will be restricted from expressing their feelings, thoughts and emotions the way they have envisaged the characters they are to impersonate. Bobker explains that;

The relationship between actors and director is highly complicated and varies greatly from director to director. Because the contemporary director is the only person who has a complete view of the film, he often imposes this view on the actors. Frequently, he asks actor to perform without understanding. Harriet Anderson, a popular Swedish actress who Ingmar Bergman has often used to good advantage, claims that she is simply instructed on her role from scene to scene and rarely has an idea of the deeper meaning of the film (166-67).

Although, some auteur director could spend time to explain to the performers and other collaborators the overall vision of the production so that they could have in-depth knowledge of the film and the characters the actors and actress will interpret or impersonate. Issues of auteurship in film production also affect the administrative department of the production. An auteur director has the mandate or right to select or recruit men and women who he or she considered capable, reliable and ready to contribute their quota to the accomplishment of the director's vision. The director influences, all aspects of design for the production. Every bit of the design must conform to the director's vision of the production. The cinematographer or director of photographs-DoP will only take approval of any shot from the director. Any shot, camera angle, movement of the camera, and colour balance that does not reflect the director's vision will be discarded. It is the responsibilities for the director to choose who handles the camera for the production in order to bring the director's envisioned idea or vision of the production to life. Bobker says that the director;

í chooses the artists who will assist in executing the film. The key choice is that of cameramaní The director must have in mind an image

of how the finished film will look and he must select the cameraman who is best able to match that image on film (161-62).

Issue of auteurship spreads from preproduction to the post production-editing phase where the fragmented shots of the film shot at different locations are assembled to form a coherent and harmonious film. Bobker states that;

Usually, he views the rushes with the editor and sets the mood and tone that will guide the editing process. He has already influenced the editing by printing only certain takes of each scene. Now he moves into the editing room and cast a large creative shadow. If the rough cut (first draft) of a film does not match the director's image, it will be re-cut until it conforms to that image. The great filmmakers of our time recreate a film in the editing room just as they created it on set-changing performances, adding ideas making the film (169).

Every bit of the post production at the editing stage must be in conformity with the director's vision; the way he or she has seen the finished film in his/her mind's eyes prior to the commencement of the production must reflect at final look of the film. An auteur director has the right to sack or fire any of his/her collaborator who refuses to abide to his or her vision of the production mostly those whose roles can be replaced or handled by another expert at the middle of the production, but rarely do they apply this force; mostly to the performers during production (when shooting is in progress).

Bobker postulates that;

The writer, cameraman, and editor can be controlled by the director simply by edict; if the director does not get what he wants, these artists can be replaced. But once shooting has begun, it is very costly to replace an actor (167).

An auteur director could also have the final say about the distribution of the film by so doing, he or she completely influence every facets of the production. Issues of auteurship in both film and stage productions seem to have cause the lack of professionalism in these collaborative media. This has also prevents other artistic experts from expressing, exploring and experimenting their own ideas and techniques because whatever they do must be determine by the director. This could lead to diminishing of creative ingenuity on the part of other collaborators.

The dimension of input and operational dynamism of the concept of auteurship in film production is stronger than that of stage production. In stage production, the directional authority of auteur starts from the preproduction and terminates at the preview rehearsal where final adjustment on the imposition of the director's concept can be made where necessary. The imposing and application of the directorial concept in film production begins from the preproduction stage and spill over to the production where the director would practically apply more force on influencing the directorial concept in every segment of the production. Auteur director does not take chances in making sure that the directional vision reflects in all facets of the production. It is a must that whatever the editor does in the editing both must be in consonance with the overall vision of the director for the production.

CHAPTER FOUR

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF STAGE AND FILM DIRECTING

4.1 preambles

The following sub-headings: Interpretative and Creative Director, Differences and Similarities between Stage and Film Directing.

4.2 Interpretative and Creative Director

Auteurists believe that there is difference between interpretative and creative director. The conception is that an interpretative or director is more or less a screen writer or playwright's worshipper who simply presents on stage or in film activities of the script exactly as written by the dramatist or screen writer without making any creative inputs, changes or contributions to the script in a theatrical performance or film production. While creative director is associated to auteurism concept with the view that the director can piece and re-assemble a script for both stage and film production. According to Giannetti and Leach;

On the stage, the director is essentially an interpretative artist. True, the stage director creates certain patterns of movement, appropriate gesture for actors, and spatial relationships, but all of these visual elements take second place to the language of the script, which is created by the playwright. The theatrical director's relation to text is similar to the stage actor's relation to the role. He or she can add much to what is written down, but what is contributed is usually secondary to the text itself. On the other hand, screen directors have a good deal more control over the final product. They too dominate the preproduction activities but unlike the stage director, the filmmaker controls virtually every aspect of the finished work as well (10-11).

In other words Giannetti and Leach are attributing interpretive director to stage production. But Brockett states that;

There are two basic conceptions of the director. One sees him as an interpretative artist whose purpose is to serve the playwright by translating the script as faithful as possible into theatrical form. The other views him as a creative artist who uses all the elements of theatre, of which the script is merely one, to fashion his own art work. Exponents of the latter view argue that the director may alter a play in any way he sees fit, just as he is free to shape scenery, costumes, lighting, and sound to suit his goal (465).

To these scholars the interpretative director is only there to interpret or translate the script with all honesty and sincerity in conformity with the dramatist's concept. He or she sees the script as a work of art on its own right by maintaining the playwright or screen writer's vision. While creative director is seen as the auteur-director with artistic liberty to choose how he or she wants the script to appear on stage or screen. The creative director only sees the script as part of production; therefore he or she could distort or rewrite the script to present his own vision on stage or in film.

On a general note, directing for both stage and film productions involve interpretative and creative ability for a director to be able to direct a production of any medium. The interpretative and creative skills are inseparable in directing because a director who lacks interpretative skill will not be able to analyse a script in order to give the production a good interpretation. In the same vein, a director with interpretative skill without creative skill will not be able to present his or her own vision on stage or film creatively.

Going by the definition of a director for both stage and film production, he or she is an interpretative and creative artist who supervises, coordinates, organizes and

controls all elements of a production into a seamless and harmonious whole. Therefore, a good director is one who has both interpretative and creative skills and he or she is able to implore or use these skills in the production for a unified results.

4.3 Differences and Similarities between Stage and Film Directing

Stage and film productions are both dramatic and narrative form of story telling using similar and different elements in telling their stories or communicating to the audience. The processes of telling these dramatic and narrative stories involve the collaboration of many artistic experts under the guidance of another artist-The director. The similarities and differences in stage and film directing cut across the three major stages of productions; preproduction, production and post production.

4.3.1 Preproduction

Both stage and film directing start from the preproduction process with the use of a production script. Directing for stage requires the studying and analysis of the script, auditioning, casting and rehearsal. The difference in stage concerning the script lies in the various versions of script associated in film directing. Stage performance needs a single script from a dramatist for a production; either a published play or a virgin script. In filmmaking, the first script written by a screen writer for a production is a spec script. A spec script is also known as speculative screen play. This screen play is written by a screen writer without camera directions, movements, angles and types of shots. Including camera directions like- PAN, ZOOM IN/OUT, TILT UP/DOWN, CLOSE UP-CU, MEDIUM SHOT-MS, ESTABLISHMENT SHOT-ES and many others is needless. It is the version of the script given to actors and actresses for studying of their roles. It is also the script which could be sold out by the writer. It is the director's responsibilities to interpret the screenplay the way he or she likes. So it is his or her duties to come up with the types of shots, camera movements, camera

angles, sound, lighting and special effect he or she wants to reflect his or her vision. Spec script is not numbered and it is subject to rewriting when the need arises. The numbering and inclusion of camera angles, types of shots, camera movements and other dramatic or narrative techniques in the spec script will be confusing to the actors and actresses when reading or studying their roles. The shooting script is another version of the script. It could be referred to as an offspring of the screen play by the screen writer (that is the spec script). The shooting script contains scenes numbering in front of the slug line or header. The shooting script has types of shots, camera angles, camera movements, sound, special effects and actions. With the shooting script, the director and crew members, mostly the director of photographs-DoP can envisage how everything will look like at the end of shooting.

Stage and film directing involve auditioning and casting of actors and actresses suitable for the roles in a production. Ordinarily, after casting, the director and casts proceed to rehearsals. Theatrical performance adheres strictly to the nine types of rehearsals; read-through, discussions, blocking, development/polishing, special, dry-run, run-through, technical, dress and preview rehearsals. The reverse is the case in film directing. Rehearsal is an aspect of film production which is given little or no attention. Rehearsal in film production is sometimes left till the first day of shooting. Most independent film makers usually ignore rehearsals in order to minimize cost of production. On stage performance they usually take actors and actresses on routine rehearsals. It is at the rehearsal that director shares his or her vision with the performers and other crew members of the production besides production meetings.

4.3.2 Production

Theatrical performance is usually performed in a single location (performance

venue) where the actions of the play are presented on stage with scene changes, that is, if the play has many scenes. Film making involves shooting from different locations at different days and time. Shooting film at various locations is similar to scene changes in stage production. In stage performance a scene is changed to another immediately the action ends in that scene. Stage performance is presented sequentially from the first scene to the last scene, while film is not shot chronologically. These fragmented shots of a film will be edited and assembled in a unified whole in the post production. Both stage and film involve the use of acting, scenery, costume, make-up, props, sound, special effects and lighting. However, the aesthetic elements appear more natural in film than on stage production, mostly the scenery. According to Robert Edmond Jones; "if nothing can be so photographic as a photography, especially when that photograph moves and speaks. Motion pictures naturally attract to themselves everything that is factual, Objective, explicit" (132-33). Directing actors and actresses for both stage and film production look similar but there are differences. The stage director needs actors and actresses to exaggerate and project using their bodies and voices for the message to be passed appropriately to the audience who come to the theatre to see and hear the performers clearly. The stage performers put emphasis on situations than film acting. In film production, acting does not need much exaggeration and projection unless for special effect or requested by the director for certain purpose. Most of these exaggerations and emphasis in film are done with the use of camera techniques such as the close up and tight shots. In film the actors and actresses performing in front of the camera need little or no projection because the camera and sound recorder gadgets are usually move closer to the performers. The boom microphone usually picks up every sound made by the performers. The dramatic diction is an important aspect of meaning in stage

production which needs vocal and variety of expressing for good rendition of lines. But too many techniques would seem as if the film performer(s) is over acting. The vocal flexibility of actors and actresses could be modified mechanically mostly in this age of digital audio equipment.

Directing on stage needs the actors and actresses to appear complete in their full view before the audience; unless the director decides to hide some parts of the performer's body for his/her reason(s). In film the camera is used to select what the audience sees, how they see it, when to see it, in part or in full. Stephen Heath asserts that; "Cinema never shows the body you want but the body you want from cinema; you too are finally present in cinema only in your absence" (189). The director employs the use of camera movements, angles and shots to restrict the audience from seeing some certain actions and part of the performer's body mostly with the use of close-up and other types of shots. The director in film has the final say on what the audience should watch. According to Giannetti and Leach;

The degree of precision a film director can achieve is impossible on the stage, for movie directors can re-photograph people and objects until they get exactly what they want. Films communicate primarily through moving image, and it's the director who determines most of the visual elements: the choice of shots, angles, lighting effect í (11).

However, the performers on stage appearing in full view could be compared to the film performers been shot using eye-level composition position or long shot. This technique of keeping the performer whole body in film could be compared to stage performers in a proscenium stage. Directing stage production stimulates audience imagination because not every bit of the actions or scenery is shown to the audience. Since it is believed that theatre is a slice of life so most of the props are

representational or symbolic in nature; for example a cross painted on a backdrop or flat could represent a church and a half moon and star could represent a mosque, leaving the audience to imagine. Jones declares that; ÷ the loveliest and most poignant of all stage pictures are those that are seen in the mind's eye a mere indication of place can send our imagination leaping (136). Also most of the actions, situation and places in stage performance are described or reported by the actors and actresses prompting the audience to imagine. In film a director may choose to show a complete church or mosque building. Therefore, film directing allows audience to see every detail of natural situations, actions, and places thereby dulling audience imagination.

Directing stage performance is closer to life than film due to performers-audience-relationship. The immediacy in terms of presentation and feedback from the audience's reaction. This immediate reaction is lacking in film production. The theatre remains alive because of the human contact which is missing in filmmaking. The human contact between the performer and audience is prominent on stage production and absent in film production. Wilson is of the view that;

The one thing missing from our instantaneous communication and the powerful image on television and film is human contact-two groups of people in presence of one another at the sometime: the performers and the audience (350).

This makes theatrical performance more involving by the continuous interaction through applauding, murmuring and sighing by audience will tell the performers how good or bad their acting are. According to Ola Rotimi; ÷the African audience is a *Polaroid* audience if you are good the African audience lets you know in the instant your acting by its reaction (ix). Rotimi's assertion could be applicable to every stage

audience irrespective of the continent. In film production, there is no immediate interaction or face to face communication with audience. Monaco opines that;

There is only one reality that cannot be denied in cinema-the reality of space. Contrariwise, on the stage space can easily be illusory; the one reality that cannot be denied there is the presence of the actors and spectator. There two reductions are the foundation of their respective arts (330).

The final actions audience see on screen are performed by recorded images. In fact, in film production, the only audience on set is the director and crew members who watch without making comments or suggestions unless the director ask for their opinions on performers performance which auteur direction rarely do. It is only the director who can react or comment on actors and actresses performance on location. Until the director gives approval or disapproval actors and actresses will not know how well or bad they have performed. Bobker observes;

An actor cannot evaluate his own performance on film. He is not acting in front of an audience and therefore cannot feel the rise and fall of emotion that enable him to evaluate his effectiveness. In addition, the actor is permitted little or no projection; instead, he is asked constantly to give less, for film is very unkind to overacting. Thus it is the great film director, not the actor, who fashions the performance and who alone is able to evaluate that performance (197).

Shooting or filming on location is like rehearsals in stage production. It is in rehearsals that a director in stage production can cut an action for a repeat but in the main production the action runs from start to finish without stoppage. In stage directing, during rehearsal, the director use terms like 'action' to call performers on

set to begin acting and *ōcutō* to abruptly stop performers if not satisfy with their performance. In starting up or beginning a scene in stage directing either director, stage manager (SM) or assistant director (AD) informs the performers to *ōstand byō* or be on *ōcueō*. Once they are on cue or stand by, then the director yells *ōactionō*. In film production, there is cutting and repeating of action on locations during shooting. Film directing procedure could run in this order: Once every artist is ready on receiving signal from the director the cinematographer or director of photographs-DoP yells *ōsetō* indicating that everything on set concerning cinematographic unit is ready. The director turns to sound operator(s) and boom microphone operator and confirm with a yell *ōRoll soundō*. If the sound operators are ready, they reply *ōsound rollingō* or *ōspeedingō*. The director turns to actors and actresses who at this point are aware of the scene to be shot and yells *ōbe on cueō*. He or she turns again to the cinematographer and yells *ōRoll cameraō*. The cinematographer replies *ōcamera rollingō*. At this point the first assistant director yells *ōslateō* and the slate operator will announce the scene to be shot after reconfirming from the continuity person or script supervisor. The director turns again to actors and actresses and yells *ōstand byō*. Once the slate operator closes the clapper stick with a loud sound for the camera to see and the audio tape recorder to record the sound signifying the beginning of a different scene. The director at this point informs the entire cast and crew with a yell *ōcamera rollingøø* and finally calls the actors and actresses into action as he/she yells *ōactionō*. While the actions is going on set if the director is not satisfy with any blocking or interpretation of any role by the performer(s) or if a particular shot is not properly taken or filmed by the camera operator, the will yells *ōcutō*, signaling abrupt stoppage of the entire action on set. At this point the director gives instruction while the action was stop. Once the error that led to the *ōcutō* is corrected, the action

resumes. If the director is satisfied with the performance of actors and actresses, the camera operator performance, the sound and lighting quality at the end of the scene, he or she yells "print" or "save" meaning it was a good shot. Then continuity person, sound person(s) and camera assistant encircle, mark, or tick the number of the shot or scene which the action was taken on a log note or book indicating that they are through with that scene as well as to facilitate the process of editing in postproduction. Once this information is recorded or taken down the director yells "next" signaling everyone to get ready for the next scene. This procedure will continue till the entire film is shot.

4.3.3 Post Production

Directing for stage production ends once the performance goes on stage. The post production activities that follow stage performance are, striking of the set which is dismantling or removing of the set pieces or units and taking those that can be useful in future productions to the scene dock which is a storage place where set pieces are kept. While the set pieces that could not be use again are discarded. Rarely does the director in stage performance take part in some activities of postproduction. In most cases the stage manager takes over from the director after preview rehearsal and oversees the main performance and the tidying up of the theatre. Film directing continues to the postproduction in the editing booth. Once shooting is wrapped up the director proceeds to the editing booth with the editor(s) for editing and assembling of the different shots shot at different locations at different times and days. The director at this point makes sure that whatever will appear in the final film remains his/her vision or concept. The director determines what the editor edits. Bobker states that; "the great filmmakers of our time re-create a film in the editing room just as they created it on set-changing performances, adding ideas, making the film" (169).

After the editing is done and the film is ready to be watch by the audience, then casts and crew members of the film can now watch the fragmented shots of action in a chronological order.

Auteur directors for both stage and film productions aimed at imposing and influencing their personal vision in production by controlling all elements of a production. Auteur director, on stage and film productions vary in their dimensions of operations. The auteurism is very influential and domineering in film production than in stage production. Auteur director on stage could only control every element of the production to infuse his or her vision in the production but not with strong emphasis as auteur director in film production. Auteur director on stage still allows other collaborators room to inject their own ideas into the director's vision but Auteur direction in film production rarely allows such chances. He or she controls all aspects of the production from the script to the editing booth and even organise for premier, exhibition or distribution of the film.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

5.1 Summary

This study on auteurship in production maintains that both stage and film productions are collaborative media. These media involve contributions of various artistic experts whose right should be respected and regarded by the supreme artist of a production-the director. The researcher used two research methodologies; Sociological and Literary methods for data collection for the research. Theoretical framework for this study was based on Auteurship and Collaborative Theories due to their relevance to the study. The evolution of directors and directing was traced from the classical period in Greek to early 19th century where the functions of a director were in place but without the title. The title, director emerged in the late 19th century between 1874 to 1890 through George II, Duke of Saxe-Meiningen. These directorial functions of coordinating, instructing, controlling, supervising and organizing that began in the late 19th century were later improved in early 20th century film director especially David Wark Griffith who introduced innovative techniques into film directing in between 1908 and 1915.

Issues of auteurship in production was said to have started in theatre with some renowned theatre directors like Sir William Davenant, George Anton, Benda David Garrick and Vsevelod Meyerhold but not with the term auteur. Rather its features. The term auteur came into usage in cinematic lexicon in 1954 by Francois Truffaut. The term auteur was later modified as auteur theory by Andrew Sarris in 1962. The concept of auteurship uphold that a director is the controlling force of all elements of production to impose and influence his or her personal vision to coherency of styles and themes across films as marks of recognition. Thus in doing this auteur director

uses his or her artistic supremacy to distort playwright or screen writer's script to impose his or her personal vision with little or no regard to the efforts of other artistic experts. In film production, auteur director takes delight in doing virtually everything in a production from script writing or rewriting, producing, designing, directing, and editing to maintain consistency in styles, theme and vision. However, collaboration is the core to successful stage and film productions. The director as the captain of a production is to oversee all elements of a production into a seamless form.

5.2 Conclusion

It is imperative to state here clearly that the current trend on issues of auteurship in stage and film productions is as the result of wrong application of auteurship (authorship) theory in collaborative medium. This has led scholars and practitioners into using the subject of auteur theory as a show of strength or skill in intellectual argument and as a license to directors to theoretically and practically abuse the collaborative nature of productions. As a matter of utmost importance, the belief or assumption that auteur director is meant to show self expression in maintaining coherency of style, theme, point of view and vision as marks of identification across various films directed by a director; which could result into a director doing everything by oneself should be discarded. This act doing almost everything without delegating duties to other experts should not be seen as sign of novelty rather an act of unprofessionalism. It is also as a result of lack of interpretative and creative prowess on the part of a director for not exploring various genres of production. This act of doing almost everything by a director in the pretext of imposing and influencing personal vision of the director is a gross abuse of the concept of division of labour and collaborative in concept.

For a director to be adjudged or christened as auteur (author) of stage or film production he or she must possess and exhibit interpretative and creative skills for actualization of the directorial vision for a production. The director as an auteur of a production is to inspire, prompt and spark his or her collaborators' interpretative and creative imagination with the directorial vision of the production. Production director should allow his collaborators to explore and come with their individual interpretative and creative ideas in relation or in consonance with the directorial vision. This would give them ample opportunity to experiment their own ideas in conformity with the overall directorial concept for a production. Therefore, director as an auteur (author) of a production should be seen as a pilot of an air craft or captain of a ship. The ultimate responsibilities of a pilot or captain is taking charge in the controlling, organizing, supervising and coordinating every activity of other crew members with the vision of safety for all crew members and passengers on board. This vision will be diverted once director takes responsibilities of doing other crew members jobs at the same time. A director with multiple talents is at liberty to experiment them but rarely should there be in the same production.

5.3 Suggestions

Based on the findings in the study, the following suggestions are relevant and unique:

- Dramatists and screenplay writers should write good scripts with good stories that have beginning, middle and end as well as exceptional suspense, conflict and dramatic actions.
- Directors should respect the artist liberties as well as interpretative and creative rights of other collaborators.

- Since an exceptional director can turn a bad script into exceptional production and a bad director can turn a good script into a bad production. Therefore, a director should be well grounded in both artist and technical aspect of production. The director should possess interpretative and creative skills; because the two skills or abilities cannot be detached from a director who wants to accomplish his or her vision in a production. In film production the director should be vest with cinematic language and techniques.
- Director should endeavour to first of all spend much time directing the play or film on paper through in-depth script analysis before taking actors and actresses in routine rehearsals. In doing so, less time will be spent in rehearsals because the director has already known what is involved in the script.
- Preproduction meetings should be taken seriously, where the directorial vision would be discussion and shared among production collaborators. However, the director should give room for suggestions to his/her cast and crew members before taking final decision. Their suggestions could make great in put to the overall vision of the production.
- Director should have artistic dignity to protect. In studios or theatre companies where the director is commissioned to direct, he or she should endeavour to know the producer(s) dos and don't as well as letting the producer(s) know his or her dos and don't before signing any contract.
- Directors especially Nollywood directors should ensure to sign serious contract with actresses, actors and crew members before commencing on directing. The signing of this agreement or contract would curtail issues of indiscipline and nonchalant attitude on location.

- Directors should take performers on intensive rehearsals, mostly in film production where this aspect of production is given little or no attention. Once actors and actresses are able to interpret their roles and master all blockings during rehearsals, issues of *ōcutō* and *repeatō* of action on set during shooting will be reduced and the members of shooting days on the schedule will be reduced as well thereby reducing the production cost.
- The government, private sector and rich individuals should support independent directors (film makers) so that they would have enough financial resources to hire experts in various areas of specialization for a production. Rather than the director doing almost everything in a production in the pretext of maintaining consistency of style, themes and vision which is due to poor budgeting or funding. The vision or style of a director can be highly accomplished more if there is division of labour and collaboration. Adequate funding will help in the paying of cast and crew members from rehearsals to the last day of shooting as well as getting the right equipment for the production.

WORKS CITED

- Ademeso, Adebola. "A Proposal for Quality Assurance in Film Production in Nigeria". In Gowon Ama Doki and Ted Anyebe (eds). *Quality Assurance: Theatre, Media and the Creative Enterprises. Journal of Society of Nigeria Theatre Artists* (SONTA). Makurdi: Trinity Media, 2013: 432-434.
- Anyanwu, Remigius Anayochi. "Neglect of Division of Labour: The Bane of Contemporary Theatre Practice". In Gowon Ama Doki and Ted Anyebe (eds). *Quality Assurance: Theatre, Media and the creative Enterprises, Journal of Society of Nigeria Theatre Artists* (SONTA). Makurdi: Trinity Media, 2013: 549-552.
- Appia, Adolphe. "Theatrical Production and Its Prospect for the Future". In Richard C. Beacham (ed). *Adolphe Appia: Texts on Theatre*. London: Routledge, 1993: 124.
- Arner, Alan A. *Directing Television and Film* (2nd ed). Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1986.
- Baran, Stanley J. *Introduction to Mass Communication: Media Literacy and Culture* (6th ed). New York: McGraw-Hill, 2010.
- Barranger, Milly. *Theatre: A Way of Seeing*. (5th ed). Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1985.
- Bobker, Lee R. *Elements of Film*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World Inc., 1969.
- Bordwell, David and Kristin Thompson. *Film Art: An Introduction* (9th ed). New York: McGraw-Hill, 2010.
- Boulton, Marjorie. *The Anatomy of Drama* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1960.

Brockett, Oscar G. *The Theatre: An Introduction*. New York: Holt, Rineharts and Winston Inc. 1964.

_____. *The Theatre: An Introduction* (3rd ed). New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston Inc., 1974.

Brockett, Oscar G. and Robert J. Ball. *The Essential Theatre* (10th ed). USA: Wadsworth, 2011.

Buchanan, Andrew, *Film-Making: From Script to Screen*. London: Phoenix House Limited, 1951.

Buckland, Warren. *Teach Yourself Film Studies*. London: Hodder Education, 2008.

Clark, Ebun òOgunde Theatre: The Rise of Contemporary Professional Theatre in Nigeria 1946 ó 72ö. In Yemi Ogunbiye (ed). *Drama and Theatre in Nigeria: A Critical Source Book*. Lagos: Nigeria Magazine, 1981: 295.

Clurman, Harold. òIn a Different Languageö. In Toby Cole and Helen Krich Chinoy (eds). *Directors on Directing*. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co. Inc, 1963: 273-276.

_____. *On Directing*. New York: Macmillian, 1972.

Copean, Jacques. òDramatic Economyö. In Toby Cole and Helen Krich Chinoy (eds.) *Directors on Directing*. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co. Inc., 1963: 214-225.

Craig, Edward Gordon. òThe Art of the Theatre: The first Dialogueö. In Erick Bentley (ed). *The Theory of Modern Stage: An Introduction* New York: Penguin Books Ltd., 1968: 134.

Dix, Andrew. *Beginning Film Studies*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008.

Duruaku, ABC. *A Hand Book on Drama and Theatre*. Owerri: Colon Concept. 1987.

- Egwuda-Ugbeda, Felix U. and Maryisabella Ada Ezeh. "Costume and Make-up Designs and Productions: Their Quintessence in Theatre Productions". In Gowon Ama Doki and Ted Anyebe (eds). *Quality Assurance Theatre, Media and The Creative Enterprises, Journal of society of Nigeria theatre Artists*, (SONTA). Makurdi: Trinity Media, 2013: 91.
- Ejeke, Solomon. "The Poetics of Theatre Directing," *Theatre Studies Review*: University of Calabar, 2003: 57-64.
- Enahora, Augustine-Ufua. "Film Makers and Film Making in Nigeria: Problems and Prospects" *African Media Review, vol.3, No.3*, 1989:103.
- Everson, William K. "The D.W. Griffith Years". In Donald E. Staples (ed). *The American Cinema* (3rd ed.). Washington, D.C: Forum Reader Series, 1991:37-41.
- Giannetti, Louis and Jim Leach. *Understanding Movies* (2nd ed). Toronto: Pearson Education Canada Inc., 2001.
- Guthrie, Tyrone. "An Audience of One" In Toby Cole and Helen Krich Chinoy (eds.). *Directors on Directing*. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1963: 245-247.
- Heath, Stephen. *Questions of Cinema*. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd., 1981.
- Hinkso, Jake "Westerns of the Sixties: One-Eyed Jacks" <http://www.criminalelement.com/blogs/2012/11/western-of-the-sixties-one-eyed-jacks-jake-hinkson-old-and-new-west-film>. Retrieved on Monday 20th May, 2013.
- Jones, Robert Edmond. *The Dramatic Imagination*. New York: Theatre Arts Books, 1941.
- Kelly, Gillian. "A Gene Kelly: The performing Auteur-Manifestations of the Kelly Perra". *Special Issue: Communicating Change. Representing Self and*

- Community in a Technological World*, esharp, 2010. Web. <http://www.gla.ac.uk/esharp>. Retrieved on Monday 20th May, 2013.
- Kernodle, George, Portia Kernodle and Edward Pixley. *Invitation to the Theatre* (3rd ed.). New York: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich Publishers, 1985.
- King, Joe. *A Producer's Guide to Radio, TV and Film: Production Techniques* (2nd ed.) Osogbo-Nigeria: Julicrown Ltd., 2005.
- Kodak Education Products. *The Essential Reference Guide for Film Makers*. Eastman Kodak Company. 2007. Web. http://motion.kodak.com/motion_uploadedFiles/Kodak/motion/Education/Publications/Essential_Reference_Guide/kodak_essential_reference_guide.pdf. Retrieved on Wednesday, 6th February, 2013.
- Kolker, Robert. *Film, Form and Culture* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 2002.
- Lovell, Alan and Gianluca Sergi. *Making Film in Contemporary Hollywood*. London: Hodder Education, 2005.
- Mamer, Bruce. *Film Production Techniques: Creating the Accomplished Image* (5th ed.). Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 2009.
- Mbachanga, Desen Jonathan and Uwoama Chimezie. "Continuity and Discontinuity: a challenge in Quality Representation and presentation in Nollywood." In Gowon Ama Doki and Ted Anyebe (eds.). *Quality Assurance: Theatre, Media and the Creative Enterprises*, *Journal of Society of Nigeria Theatre Artists*, (SONTA). Makurdi: Trinity Media, 2013: 493-495.
- Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary* (9th ed.). Massachusetts: Merriam-Webster, Incorporated, 1999.
- Monaco, James. *How to Read A Film* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.

- Nwabueze, Emeka. *Research Methods: An Integrated Approach*. Enugu: ABIC Books, 2009.
- _____. "Drama and National Consciousness". In *Visions and Re-Visions: Selected Discourses on Literary Criticism (2nd ed.)*. Enugu: ABIC Books, 2011: 161.
- _____. *Studies in Dramatic Literature*. Enugu: ABIC Books, 2011.
- _____. "A Good Script is the First Step to a Good Film". September, 2007. Web. www.nigeriafilm.com/content.asp. Retrieved on Wednesday, 6th February, 2013.
- Nwadiigwe, Charles E. "Ola Rotimi: The Techniques of An African Play Director". In Ojo Rasaki Bakare (ed). *Ola Rotimi: Issues and Perspectives*. Abuja: Roots Books and Journals Nigeria Ltd., 2007:1.
- Okwuowulu, Charles. "Auteur Imperatives as Panacea to Quality Assurance in Nollywood: A Study of Tecu Benson's Techniques". In Gowon Ama Doki and Ted Anyebe (eds.). *Quality Assurance Theatre, Media and The Creative Enterprises, Journal of society of Nigeria Theatre Artists*, (SONTA). Makurdi: Trinity Media, 2013:335-337.
- Owuamalam, Emma-Owums. *Film and Screen Directing*. Owerri: Top Class Agencies Ltd., 2007.
- Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (8th ed.). New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Proferes, Nicholas T. *Film Directing Fundamental: See Your Film Before Shooting* (3rd ed.). Waltham: Focal Press, 2008.
- Rabiger, Michael. *Directing: Film Techniques and Aesthetics*. London: Focal Press, 1989.

- Rasheed, Olaiten Lateef. "Script Interpretative and Religion: The Theatre Director in a Faith Based University". In Gowon Ama Doki and Ted Anyebe (eds.). *Quality Assurance: Theatre, Media and The Creative Enterprise. Journal of Society of Nigeria Artists*, (SONTA) Makurdi: Trinity Media, 2013:113.
- Rotha, Paul. *The Film Till Now: A Survey of World Cinema*. London: The Mayflower Publishing Co., Ltd., 1949.
- Rotimi, Ola. *Hopes of the Living Dead*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Ltd., 1988.
- Sarris, Andrew. "Notes on the Auteur Theory in 1962". In Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen (eds.). *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings* (6th ed.). New York: Oxford University Press, 2004: 561-564.
- Schoch, Richard W. "A Supplement to Public Laws: Arthur Murphy, David Garrick, and Hamlet, with Alterations." *Theatre Journal*, Vol. 57, 2005:1-31. www.muse.jhu.edu/content/crossref/journals/theatre_journal/vo57.57.1schoch.html. Retrieved on Monday 20th May, 2013.
- Schuupp, Alvin. *Theatre A Model of the World*. USA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, 1993.
- Sharps, Wallace S. *Dictionary of Cinematography and Sound Recording*. Oxford: Fountain Press Ltd, 1959.
- Thompson, Kristin and David Bordwell. *Film History: A Introduction* (3rd ed). New York: McGraw-Hill, 2010.
- Ukala, Sam. *Manual of Research and of Thesis Writing in Theatre Arts* (2nd ed.) Ibadan: Kraft-Books Limited, 2006.
- Vilar, Jean. "Theatre Without Pretensions". In Toby Cole and Helen Krich Chinoy (eds.). *Directors on Directing*. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1963: 268-271.

- Wilson, Edwin. *The Theatre Experience* (10th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill, 2007.
- Wollen, Peter. "From Signs and Meaning in the Cinema: The Auteur Theory." In Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen (eds.). *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings* (6th ed.). New York: Oxford University Press, 2004: 565-566.
- [www. Wikipedia.org/wiki/romeo_and_juliet/adapted/](http://www.Wikipedia.org/wiki/romeo_and_juliet/adapted/). Web. Retrieved on Monday 20th May, 2013.

