

Collaborative process and the search for the horizontality of the relations between the functions of the scene: procedures, practices and strategies of creation

Processo colaborativo e a busca pela horizontalidade das relações entre as funções da cena: procedimentos, práticas e estratégias de criação

MARCIA BERSELLI¹

NATÁLIA PEROSA SOLDERA²

VANESSA CORSO BRESSAN³

JULIANA GEDOZ TIEPPO⁴

Abstract

In this article we seek to recognize performances practices centered on the horizontality between the different functions of the scene. It begins by presenting differences and approximations between the collaborative and the collective processes. Understanding the creation process in an artistic-pedagogical approach, practices, procedures and strategies of creation are presented as possible methodologies aiming processes that have an interest in the mobility of the functions of the scene, its knowledges, powers and abilities.

Keywords: Collaborative process. Creative procedures. Creation methodologies.

1. Professor of the Performing Arts Department of the Federal University of Santa Maria.
ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1616-8919>.
Contact: marcia.berselli@ufsm.br

2. Doctorate student in Performing Arts at Université Laval (Québec).
ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4343-9852>.
Contact: solderanatalia@gmail.com

3. Undergraduate student in Performing Arts (Certification in Theatre Acting) at the Federal University of Santa Maria, with a research scholarship (PEIPSM/PRPGP/UFSM-Projeto042825).
ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7515-5726>.
Contact: vanessa.ls.vaah@gmail.com

4. Undergraduate student in Performing Arts (Certification in Theatre Direction) at the Federal University of Santa Maria.
ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5252-0492>.
Contact: juliana.gtieppo@gmail.com

Submitted: 20/08/2017

Accepted: 25/08/2018

Resumo

No presente artigo busca-se reconhecer possibilidades de criação cênica centradas na horizontalidade das relações entre as funções da cena. Inicia-se apresentando diferenças e aproximações entre os processos colaborativos e os processos coletivos. Entendendo a criação cênica em uma abordagem artístico-pedagógica, práticas, procedimentos e estratégias de criação são apresentados enquanto possíveis metodologias para processos que têm interesse na mobilidade das funções da cena, seus saberes, poderes e habilidades.

Palavras-chave: *Processo colaborativo. Procedimentos criativos. Metodologias de criação.*

The interest in the investigation of creative procedures, that can flexibilize the hierarchies between the functions present in the theatrical event, is the main motivation of the research entitled “Procedures and practices of horizontal artistic collaboration: the four functions of the scene as a motto for the game”⁵. Such research seeks to develop ways to operate in theater creation that can recognize the feedback between the functions occupied by actors, directors, technicians and spectators. The functions of the scene are understood according to the Argentine theatre researcher Jorge Dubatti (2008), he states that: “We call conviviality or convivial event the meeting, of present body, of artists, technicians and spectators in a chronotopic territorial crossroads (unit of time and space)” (p.28). In the act of highlighting the four functions we intent to articulate points of view and mobilize the powers and (des) abilities of the functions present in the scenic game.

One of the objectives of the project is to recognize the relationships and possibilities of play between the participants in the different functions of the scene, in a collab-

5. Research developed at the Performing Arts Department in the Universidade Federal de Santa Maria, under Marcia Berselli coordination.

orative process that highlights the horizontality of the relations between the functions. Transit between areas, artistic repertoires built from the relationships established between the functions, the establishment of networks and communities and the posture of the collaborators are principles that we deem relevant to the contemporary theatrical performance. These principles are supported by the idea of a creative process as a practice of living together, promoting an environment for creation in which the focus is centered on the collective, not the individual.

During the development of the first stage of the research, focused on theoretical references, the research group composed by one teacher and two students identified characteristics of scenic procedures in which the collaborators operate in the collective and collaborative modes. From the recognition of the approximations and differences between the two modes, the group investigated and evaluated scenic creation procedures, practices and strategies.

Collective and collaborative processes: differences and approximations

The collaborative process is a way of organization of the artists that supposes the horizontal participation of the collaborators. Such horizontality is based on the idea of the absence of a figure who holds more power in the process. Collaborative creation expands in Brazil mainly from 1990 when theater groups are focused on this research (Barone, 2011). Social and political issues influence proposals in which there is an emphasis on collectivity, thus assuming a path opposite to a certain authoritarianism in traditional practices.

In the Brazilian context, as some confusions are made because of translations, there is still friction between the understandings about collaborative and collective pro-

cess. In this sense, it is worth mentioning some positions on the collective process, which develops in this context, primarily from the 1960s. Stela Fischer (2003), supported by the studies of Fernando Peixoto, highlights two operative modes in the process of collective creation. The first of these modes would extinguish the figure of a chief, either the author or director, in view of the assumption of equal participation in the process. The second mode does not exclude the existence of leadership functions (author, director). "The division of tasks, established according to the specialization and also the interest and abilities of the members, can suggest solutions in the different fields" (Fischer, 2003, p.16). Such an organization of the creative process, according to Fischer, would approach the operative mode we understand as a collaborative process. In the latter, the functions exist and are related to the interests and abilities of each artist. Such interests, however, do not remain on a level of individuality, but are reconfigured within the group's proposals, thus maintaining the character of the collectivity. In this way we recognize distinctions between the collective and the collaborative process.

It is understood that in collective creations the functions of the scene are not defined from the subjects that operate them, and all the participants assume or can assume all the functions, in a mode of organization of the creators in which everyone can do everything. In the collaborative creations, however, the functions are maintained, but the participants organize themselves in a way that seeks to horizontalize the relations and hierarchies between the functions, working in collaboration. What is required of the participants, regardless of their functions (or of the functions occupied), is an effective engagement that allows the contact between the functions. It identifies the need for a great responsibility on all aspects of the process, which does not fall on only one function or figure, but is pulverized among all participants.

The operative approaches to the functions in the collaborative process

The collaborative process concerns a way of developing the scenic creation through which diverse positions and questions can be presented by the collaborators, without the presence of a figure that validates such positions. The encounter of different perceptions, coming from the collaborators and put into practice in the process of creation, are thus the core of the collaborative process, which arises not from a theory or idea predetermined by a figure or function, but from the engagement of collaborators at the moment to put collective visions into practice.

Thus, the creative process, in a collaborative way, invests in the potential of the creators, which is summoned during the game, and is independent of a predetermined idea or text. Despite the apparent freedom of ideas that are not preconceived, the collaborative process is governed by rules, which are essential for the realization of proposals, but emerge from the game. The design of the collaborative process is linked to the action of mapping interests of the collaborators and possible structures for the process. In this, the different functions of the scene are in constant feedback. In this sense, in the acting function, the actor is a creator who plays with the other collaborators, no longer being a narrator of ready-made ideas and discourses, such as those that come from the text.

The assumption of play between the collaborators also includes the function occupied by the audience. When the process of creation is in the rehearsal room, the actor is in a sensitive relationship with the partners and, when it is in the stage for representation, the play also establishes itself with the audience members. The spectator, an active participant, is provoked to have an expanded perception when the scenic proposal raises questions without necessarily answering them, summoning his creative imaginary and making him, thus, collaborator of the process.

Concerning the role of staging, in the collaborative process, the director is in open dialogue with the other collaborators involved in the process, being no longer a single vision, but a look contaminated by the perceptions of the collective. However, the figure of the director continues to be responsible for certain directions and choices, that is, the function exists and is operated by a collaborator within the expected parameters of such function. The biggest difference is the negotiation aspect and affinity between the functions, the relational aspect⁶.

It is worth mentioning that in this dialogue between the different functions there is the encounter of languages, and that the figures that play in the technical functions are also recognized as artists, agents of creation. Whoever occupies these functions is a creator and not an operator (of sound, light); the elements available here are not subordinate to the actor or the text. This function and its elements operate in feedback in the creative process. In this way, for example, the light element influences and fosters the game and can also be influenced by it. Generally, in the process of creation, the figure of the light, costume, design creator is often understood as a service provider over an effective creator. In the present research, a transformation of this perspective is sought, indicating the subjects of the technique as collaborators / artists who build their repertoire thinking about the visualities of the scene. Thus, for a better understanding of the technical functions in the models explored here, other nomenclatures could be employed, such as scenic designer.

In the field of collaborative processes, different ways of organizing and developing scenic creations can be highlighted from different devices. It is worth noting here the creative procedure called *floating functions*. The proposal of floating functions is based on the spatial demarcation of the four primordial functions of the scene, understood as area of performance, area of staging, area

6. To learn more about the relational director: Fagundes, Patrícia. O diretor como artista relacional. *Cena* (Porto Alegre), n. 20, 2016, pp. 159-167.

of scenique design and area for the spectators. At the beginning of the game, each participant accommodates himself in a role, and it is possible that more than one participant occupies the same role. When developing the proposal, the participants are free to move from one function to another, and it is necessary to verbalize the displacement that will be performed (for example, indicating which function is moving). According to Berselli and Soldera (2014), researchers who created the proposal, the development of floating functions occurred from the observation of creative processes in which the researchers recognized hierarchies that were maintained or emphasized at the time of compositions. From the creation practices, in proposals that demanded delimited functions, the problems of the order of hierarchies already somehow solidified in some ways of conducting processes of creation. With the interest in practices that present more horizontal processes, in which hierarchies are diluted, the development of the creative-pedagogical procedure called floating functions occurred.

The collaborative process is born from the relationships between the different functions. Thus, the creative floating functions procedure can be recognized as a way to operate in a collaborative creation process that broadens the participants' performance to the various functions. However, it should be made clear that such a procedure does not propose that all participants necessarily perform all functions. However, it allows the exploitation of the different functions when in the interest of the creators. It should be noted that the floating functions was developed from a proposal of creative-pedagogical procedure, involving the development of technical skills related to each of the functions, in a teaching-learning process. And this factor distinguishes it from a collective process, because the functions are somehow isolated so that the participant understands their modes of operation and operation. That is, one has the interest

of understanding how to operate in acting, staging and scenic design, given their specificities. Floating functions can be a start-up practice for the exercise of mobility between roles by encouraging participants to broaden their knowledge about creation, their views on the creative process, and to provide feedback among the agents of the process.

It is thus identified that the research proposal developed tends to approach the model of collaborative creation, since there is an interest in maintaining the functions, and to stimulate the flow between them according to the interest and availability of the participants, but it is fundamental to maintain the proposition of a horizontality in the relations and the flexibilization of the hierarchies.

Following the theoretical research, the group developed a brief report on procedures, practices and strategies of creation that dialogue with the principles of the collaborative process and with the proposal of floating functions. In the file, in addition to a brief description of the proposal, its origin, its stages, the context in which the proposal was proposed and the role of the facilitator, the necessary competences and the relations observed in the exchange with the floating functions. Cycles Repère, RSVP Cycles, Scores, Tuning Scores, Contact Improvisation, Real-Time Editing and Real-Time Composition Method were investigated, which are presented in detail below. Such proposals, coming from the fields of theater and dance - in a perspective of feedback between areas that we deem appropriate in the creative process considering the hybrid characteristics of the contemporary scene - are identified as possible devices to be used in collaborative creation processes that have an interest in the mobility of scene functions. We chose to present them through subtopics in order to make specific consultation accessible to each of the strategies, practices and procedures.

Creation procedures, practices and strategies

RSVP Cycles

Brief description

The RSVP creation cycles were developed by Lawrence and Anna Halprin. They are focused on how to develop a composition through defined steps. The structure promotes the repetition of its steps without necessarily having to obtain a result at the end of a cycle. An important feature of this creation strategy is the broad visibility of each stage, which allows flexibility in hierarchies and powers over the process from the premise that everyone has the same level of knowledge about the paths of creation.

Who developed

Lawrence Halprin, in 1968, systematizes the RSVP methodology - responses cycles (*Répondez, s'il vous plait*), in a close relationship with Anna Halprin, performer and choreographer. This systematization involves four stages of development. Each one refers to one of the letters of the acronym that give the cycle its name.

Phases

R (Resources) - Evaluation of resources. This is the time for the group to evaluate what resources are available to start the work. These materials include the space, tools and means available, but also the objectives, motivations and needs of those involved.

S (Score) - Formulation of a plan or reason. They are the structures that support and supply improvisations and that can arise from them. In the structures we will find the description of the process that led to the performance. For example: in a grocery list, we will know the items to buy and where we will find them, and this is the plan. However, how it will be accomplished is not something predetermined, because we will have the structure with the steps of what will be accomplished, however, the way of its accomplishment will occur during the process.

V (Valuation) - Evaluation. It is time to analyze the results of the action and, if so desired by the group, make the selection of some of them and make decisions related to their execution. It is the point of the cycle in which resources will intersect with the hypotheses raised.

P (Performance) - Score results. This stage is understood both in its realization in the workshop and in the moment of sharing with spectators.

Context of development

In planning his classes, Lawrence Halprin, who was working with architecture and town planning groups, begins some studies and develops the RSVP cycle to support groups in their creation processes, instructing them how to operate, focused on planning for a flexible participation.

Context in which it can be developed

Because it is a cyclical model of creation that seeks to emphasize the process and therefore is divided into stages, which may or may not be used in full, depending on the need of the participant group, it can be applied in different contexts. It is from those involved (with or without experience), its propositions and particularities, that it will develop.

Role of the facilitator

The facilitator is a guide, who can indicate the steps in cycles without rigidly directing the proposal.

Previous skills required

Due to the flexible nature of the proposal, no prior skills are required. However, it is best for everyone to be knowledgeable about the rules that determine the creation structure in cycles, so that everyone has the necessary information and can appropriate the process in an egalitarian way.

Relation with floating functions

By being a cyclical model of creation and emphasizing the process, the RSVP creation procedure can dialogue with the floating functions, understood as provisional and open to all participants.

Cycles Repère

Brief description

Creation strategy developed by Jacques Lessard from the collective creation cycle RSVP. Adapting the principles of RSVP, Lessard presented a creative procedure in which emotion is more important than ideas (BEAUCHAMP; LARRUE, 1990). At the center of the procedure is the proposal of improvisation driven by a “sensitive source,” a resource that mobilizes the creative subject.

Who developed

Jacques Lessard developed the proposal. In 1980 Lessard, Irène Roy, Denis Bernard, Michel Nadeau and Bernard Bonnier founded the Théâtre Repère (Quebec), interested in creating a theater in which the actors were creators.

Phases

There are four cycles that constitute the acronym Repère, so they are organized into four stages of creation that operate in interaction.

RE - Resource / Ressource (cycle 1): When the group is ready and defined its objectives, each participant presents suggestions, their resources, the “sensitive sources”. It is a resource that touches the creator, which drives him to creation. Features can be of very different natures, such as an object, a sound, a book, a performance, a text, a poem.

p - exploration / partition (cycle 2): exploitation of the resource from improvisations. Starts with the exploratory score (whether or not on paper). At this stage resources are understood as starting points for creations, which are

free and can take different paths. During creative exploration much material can be developed, and participants take brief notes of what was created, giving rise to the synthetic score.

è - evaluation / évaluation (cycle 3): moment to evaluate and choose what remains of everything that was created. A collective evaluation. Each participant points out what he kept from the improvised material, what he found interesting, what caught his attention. From this evaluation a more complete score takes shape. At this moment it may be that some participant, interested in operating as a director, for example, exercises in that role. This exercise holds true for the actor, or musician, or playwright.

re - representation / representation (cycle 4): the three previous cycles are phases that precede the representation. In the fourth cycle, sharing with viewers occurs. Understanding this sharing as a moment of exchange with viewers, the work is open to modifications, to new elements that can be inserted into creation. The idea is precisely that the cycles interact with each other; thus, the fourth phase reconnects with the former from the collaborations resulting from the exchange with the spectators, which can generate new resources.

Context of development

Jacques Lessard met Anna and Lawrence Halprin in classes at the San Francisco Dancer's Workshop. The Halprin couple had developed the RSVP creation cycles, which sparked interest in Lessard. Thus, Lessard adapts them and begins to use the cycles in the Théâtre Repère, in Québec.

Context in which it can be developed

By the flexibility of the stages, which serve more as a malleable structure than a rigid method, the development of the creation process depends on the interest of those involved. Thus, it is possible to be used in several

contexts, according to the propositions of the group of creators. With the concrete structure that guides the creation process, even inexperienced people can join a work from Cycles Repère.

Role of the facilitator

The facilitator has the task of making a presentation of the cycles, if the group or part of it does not know the creation procedure. In addition, it can aid in the passage or resumption of one cycle to another, if necessary.

Previous skills required

Due to the flexible nature of the proposal, no prior skills are required.

Relation with floating functions

According to the proposal that, at some point after the evaluation, certain functions are occupied by participants who have a specific interest (greater interest in the role of the director, the technician, etc.), this creative strategy can easily be related to the functions.

Scores

Brief description

The Scores are part of the RSVP build structure. The scores are simple structures capable of putting in relation the resources of the process, and serving as a motto for the development of improvisations and actions (WORTH; POYNOR, 2004). We can understand scores as core tasks, that can function as a skeleton (solid and flexible), which allows the proposals to be sustained without making them rigid. From the 1960s Anna Halprin began to use the scores more strongly. The visibility of each step, as well as the RSVP proposal, is also present in the scores, providing that all participants have the same level of knowledge about the creation trajectory.

Who developed

Part of the RSVP creation structure, developed by Anna and Lawrence Halprin, the scores, somehow isolated from the total structure of the RSVP cycles, were more widely used and systematized in practices and researches by Anna Halprin.

Phases

According to each proposal for creation, the scores are organized in order to serve as a trajectory for creation. The nature of a score can be varied. Thus, the score can be in the format of text, drawings, images, graphics, blends of words and images, activities etc.

We cite, for example, the creation scores of The Planetary Dance event, first performed in 1987 by Anna Halprin and recovered annually. The event is based on the Earth Run score, and is organized into a sequence of eleven scores.

The scores can range from 1 to 10, in which 1 represents the most open score and 10 the most closed score. A closed score is one in which the actions are defined previously, counting on a small space for improvisation. An open score, however, contains instructions that encourage free-moving exploration.

Another example to be mentioned are the scores used in the creation “Os Quintais de Porto Alegre”⁷. The scores determined for this process of creation were denominated “convivial scores”, activities realized in communitarian spaces stimulating the establishment of convivial environments. The “convivial scores” are: unconventional and regional sport (“taco”, “bocha”...), mateada, sunbathing, birthday party, picnic, pet walk, photographic book.

Context of development

Developed in the context of RSVP creation structures, the scores became an active part of Anna Halprin’s creation processes from the 1960s. Halprin’s proposal is intended to promote creations in which everyone can participate,

7. The piece “Os Quintais de Porto Alegre” was developed in 2015 by young artists in the city of Porto Alegre, Brazil. The project was funded by the award Funarte Artes na Rua 2014 (Funarte, MinC e Federal Government of Brazil). To no more about the project, check : Berselli, M; Soldera, N; Cora, C. Os Quintais de Porto Alegre: uma experiência de jogo entre as funções de ator e espectador. In: *Aspas*. São Paulo, v.6, n. 1, 2016, p. 73-86.

leading participants to a greater awareness of the movement and its actions in relation to space.

Context in which it can be developed

Scores are a powerful creative strategy as part of creative processes that seek the horizontality of hierarchies and equity in the relationship between participants within the process. Serving as structures, each participant is encouraged to participate from their real possibilities, creating freely in the relationship with others, but can always return to the structure if need be. In this way, the participant finds freedom to create, but a solid base to return to if at any time there is discomfort. The proposal allows for freedom without too many risks, which can discourage the participant, in addition to encouraging the free exploitation of movements.

Role of the facilitator

The facilitator can determine the nature of the scores, as well as present more defined structures for the score. However, such a choice can also be made with the collective, depending on the proposals and internal organizations. The facilitator can also be a support to the participants in the remembrance of the scores, in the preparation of a guide or manual. However, the role of the facilitator is very flexible and can be defined and adjusted according to the group's own propositions, interests and intentions.

Previous skills required

No prior skills are required. Each participant participates in the creation from their possibilities, finding with the group the rhythm of each score until the finalization of the proposal. Perhaps the only demand is for listening, that is, full attention and openness to the group.

Relation with floating functions

In the scores the functions do not have to be named, however the scores can dialog with the floating functions

as far as the structure promotes a certain autonomy in relation to the result, that can find differentiated formats according to the organization of each group.

Tuning Scores

Brief description

Tuning Scores is a procedure of organization and composition of movement. It is a “score of tuning” developed by Lisa Nelson. The explorations from this instrument allow the participants to perceive that what they see is directly connected to the way they see (NELSON, 2003). Thus, they move through the perception and understanding of the time-space they inhabit, organizing maps of the movement before making it visible. It is a mapping of the practitioner’s attention. The proposal is also characterized as a strategy for understanding the patterns and modes of organization of each practitioner’s movements.

Who developed

The research, named Tuning Scores, arised through the interest of American performer Lisa Nelson in various approaches to improvisation in dance, which in the 1970s led her to develop this instrument for the composition of movements.

Phases

In general, there are no defined steps. It is more about an approach to movement focused on seeing and attention of each practitioner on their own way of moving.

Context of development

Lisa Nelson participated in the revolutionary dance movement that took place in the 1960s and 1970s. The performer develops the Tuning Scores approach by highlighting the focus on movement motivated by her interest in self-observation.

Context in which it can be developed

Because it is an approach to movement, it can be developed in varied contexts. Because of the characteristics of the proposal to lead the practitioner to self-observation and recognition of their movement patterns, the practice is interesting for initial moments of group creation.

Role of the facilitator

The facilitator can organize proposals that lead practitioners to self-observation. Without rigidly directing activities, the facilitator here acts as a subtle guide, with small and punctual interventions in order to highlight the importance of the attention of each one to the trajectory of his own movement.

Previous skills required

No prior skills are required. Each participant develops the proposal in its own rhythm, within its possibilities.

Relation with floating functions

The approach can be used the moment before playing with the floating functions, attracting the attention of each participant to their movement patterns and reading what it involves.

Real-time Editing

Brief description

Proposition of Lisa Nelson, linked to his research Tuning Scores. Nelson understands Real-Time Editing as the composition that occurs at the present moment, preferring this nomenclature to the idea of composition in real time. For Nelson, the composition is already in space; what the performer does is to edit it from his gaze, that is, from the focus he places on what is in space, both in reading the composition as a spectator and in the proposition as agent of the process. Thus, the two movements, whether

as public or as the actor / performer are born of the ways of reading the elements in space. Lisa Nelson compares the look to the lens of a camera, mapping, focusing, and enlarging the images.

Who developed

Lisa Nelson, from the research and practice of Tuning Scores.

Phases

There are no phases.

Context of development

In the last years of the Tuning Scores research, Lisa Nelson became interested in the editing proposition. At some point, Nelson realizes that the elements are already in space, and the practitioner's action resembles the lens of a camera or a focus of light, highlighting and thus editing something that is already composed in space.

Context in which it can be developed

Because it is a compositional approach, there is no way to define specific contexts. However, it should be noted that the approach dialogues with real-time creation proposals.

Role of the facilitator

The existence or non existence of the facilitator will depend on the process and the participants. However, there is no such figure requirement.

Previous skills required

No prior skills are required, just the readiness to create in the present tense.

Relation with floating functions

From the floating functions, the development of the creation proposal promotes a composition that can be understood as a real-time editing approach.

Real-Time Composition Method

Brief description

The procedure of João Fiadeiro allows the participant to exercise his state of presence, being in favor of the composition and not of his individual impulses, thus working on their contentions. In the method, the gaze begins to compose the scene, to edit it, ceasing to be just a locator of space. In addition, the creative gesture must be the result of an encounter, being this with the other, with space, with time, with an affection.

Who developed

The Portuguese artist João Fiadeiro begins the systematization of the Method of Composition in Real Time from 1995.

Phases

There is an operating mode of the Real-Time Composition Method which determines the steps for the development of the procedure. It begins by making a space marking, marking the ground with tape and convening a space “inside” and an “outside”. All participants begin “outside”, focusing on the interior of the space created (“inside”). Without prior combinations or planning, a person enters space by interfering with it. From this first interference, another person advances acting on the space. According to the system directions, when the third person acts a standard is established, creating a place common to the group. The sequence of actions is interrupted at moments of feedback.

Context of development

João Fiadeiro belongs to the generation of choreographers that emerged in the late 1980s giving rise to the New Portuguese Dance. The method of Real Time Composition was initially developed to support the choreographic and dramaturgical writing of his works, evolving to a collaborative proposal in order to think the decision and action in the creative process.

Context in which it can be developed

Considering the interest in the participants not to act on impulse, but find the ideal moment to act, the method is provocative for creative processes interested in working with the proposition of creations in real time, with emphasis on quality and attention to the proposed actions.

Role of the facilitator

The facilitator can be responsible for explaining the rules at the beginning of the process. However, once the proposal is initiated, there is no need to maintain the figure of the facilitator.

Previous skills required

No prior skills are required; the method of real-time composition involves the practices of improvisation and composition and the interest of the participants in those is enough.

Relation with floating functions

There are no functions established.

Contact Improvisation

Brief description

Dance form developed by Steve Paxton collectively with other artists in the 1970s in the United States. The Contact Improvisation involves the interaction between bodies and improvisation, through technical elements like bearings, weight sharing, falls, support and decision making together. Thus, it is possible to list as basic principles for this form of dance: to follow the points of contact, to share the weight, to become disoriented, to relax, to fall, to roll, to perceive the other and the space. Without hierarchies, everyone can participate.

Who developed

Steve Paxton along with other artists.

Phases

There are no phases. However, the facilitator can propose to start the practice with massages and manipulations or technical movements before the moment of improvisation.

Context of development

In a postmodernist context of dance, Contact Improvisation questions various assumptions of dance, such as hierarchies between bodies and powers over dance, dance for appreciation, the specific place to dance, a particular school or choreography to follow, effort and bodily ability. It was the first improvisational format based on the meeting of bodies in space and not on previous indications.

Context in which it can be developed

Contact Improvisation, through its technical exercises or improvisation, can be present in creation processes in order to develop technical skills for the actor / player, as well as serve as a stimulus and impetus for the creation of compositions (Berselli, 2016). The improvised dance itself is recognized as a real-time composition.

Role of the facilitator

The Improvisation Contact facilitator can act by selecting and conducting some exercises, proposing certain practices and indicating points of attention to practitioners, without, however, directing the process rigidly. Generally, the facilitator also participates in the practices, not acting in a space differentiated from the other practitioners.

Previous skills required

Prior skills are not required for the experimentation of Contact Improvisation, but the participant's willingness to share the moment.

Relation with floating functions

The Contact Improvisation can dialogue with floating func-

tions based on the principle of flexible hierarchies promoted by the assumption that everyone can participate, and that the adjustments are due to the needs inherent to the meetings of the bodies. However, in Contact Improvisation there are no defined functions.

Final considerations

We present practices, procedures and strategies of creation as possible methodologies to be used in processes that are interested in the mobility of the functions of the scene, and in questioning their knowledges, powers and abilities. We seek to highlight the way of operating in the process of creation in an artistic-pedagogical approach, which takes as a presupposition the development of creative processes based on the reflection on how one does and who does, distancing oneself from reaching a final form as first objective, privileging the path, the path traced by the participants. In formulating methodologies for the development of a collaborative process, we understand that it is not necessary for all participants to engage in the same way, this is not a requirement and the visibility inherent in the collaborative process eliminates the existence (and necessity) of a figure to control and charge each collaborator. However, it is necessary and essential that each participant develops a position of agency in the process, with responsibility and rigor, regardless of the functions occupied. In this sense, recognizing the specificities of each function in the process allows the participants to deepen in practice such definitions, and engage in the horizontal relationship between the different areas. The collaborator, occupying a certain function by his greater interest and affinity, but possessing the knowledge of what is specific in the others, delves into ways of operating in such a function by promoting creative powers that reverberate in the creative partners. The functions, demarcated and defined, become a useful and

provocative element to the process, not an obstacle to the exchanges and relationships between participants with different skills and competencies.

Identifying the different functions of the scene, and recognizing methodologies based on strategies and procedures that privilege horizontality in the relations between the functions, causes collaborators to reflect on their creative processes. From this perspective, participants can be invited to evaluate the ways in which their processes are developed, their priorities as individuals or collectives, and how these aspects reverberate in their creations led to sharing with viewers. These elements may also indicate the criteria for creative agents to evaluate the impact of their practices, as well as the approximations or distances between the practices developed and the discourses on those practices.

References

BARONE, Luciana. Processo colaborativo: origens, procedimentos e confluências interamericanas. In: CERQUEDA, S. B.; SOUZA, L. S.; RAMOS, A. N.; SANTOS, E. **20 anos de interfaces Brasil-Canadá**. Organizadores: Sérgio Barbosa de Cerqueda, Lícia Soares de Souza, Ana Rosa Neves Ramos, Elmo José dos Santos. Salvador: EDUFBA: ABECAN, 2011. ISBN: 978-85-60667-97-0. Disponível em <<http://www.anaisabecan2011.ufba.br/Arquivos/Barone-Luciana.pdf>>. Acesso em 19 ago. 2017.

BEAUCHAMP, Hélène; LARRUE, Jean-Marc. Les cycles Repère: entrevue avec Jacques Lessard, directeur artistique du Théâtre Repère. In: **L'Annuaire théâtral**: revue québécoise d'études théâtrales, Numéro 8, automne 1990, p. 131-143.

BERSELLI, Marcia. Procedimentos criativo-pedagógicos: a prática do Contato Improvisação no processo de criação do ator. **Lamparina** – Revista de Ensino de Teatro, Belo Horizonte, n. 07, 2016. Disponível em <<https://www.eba.ufmg.br/lamparina/index.php/revista/article/view/129>>. Acesso em 15 ago. 2017.

BERSELLI, Marcia; SOLDERA, Natália. Funções flutuantes e o artista multidisciplinar. In: Salão de Ensino UFRGS, 10., 2014, Porto Alegre. **Anais do X Salão de Ensino UFRGS**. Porto Alegre: Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, 2014.

DUBATTI, Jorge. **Cartografía Teatral**: introducción al Teatro Comparado. Buenos Aires: Atuel, 2008. 224 p. ISBN: 9789871155491.

FISCHER, Stela Regina. **Processo Colaborativo**: experiências de companhias teatrais brasileiras nos anos 90. 2003. Dissertação (Mestrado em Artes) – Instituto de Artes, Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Campinas, 2003.

NELSON, Lisa. Before your Eyes: seeds of a dance practice. **Contact Quarterly Dance Journal**, New York, v. 29, n. 1, p. 1-5, Winter/Spring, 2003.

WORTH, L.; POYNOR, H. **Anna Halprin**. London: Routledge performance practitioners, 2004. 196 p. ISBN: 0-203-30792-5.