



Teacher's performance: the theater classroom as a space for creation

Performance docente: a sala de aula de teatro como espaço de criação

Gilberto Icle,
Marcia Dal Bello,

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil

Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers, Vol. 5 (1)

<http://www.ugr.es/~jett/index.php>

Fecha de recepción: 18 de septiembre de 2013

Fecha de revisión: 28 de octubre de 2013

Fecha de aceptación: 20 de diciembre de 2013

Icle, G. y Bello, M. (2013). Teacher's performance: the theater classroom as a space for creation. *Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers*, Vol. 5 (1), pp. 139–150.



Journal for Educators, Teachers and Trainers, Vol. 5 (1)
ISSN 1989 – 9572

<http://www.ugr.es/~jett/index.php>

Teacher's performance: the theater classroom as a space for creation

Performance docente: a sala de aula de teatro como espaço de criação

Gilberto Icle, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil
gilbertoicle@gmail.com

Marcia Dal Bello, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil
marciampdb@gmail.com

Resumo Este texto apresenta o conceito de condição criativa a partir da obra do diretor e pedagogo russo Konstantin Stanislavski, descrevendo-o e analisando-o no contexto original de sua aparição na Pedagogia do Ator. Essa noção é utilizada como ferramenta para pensar o trabalho do professor de teatro em sala de aula. Esse trabalho, pensado como performance docente, na qual o corpo tem papel preponderante, é analisado no interior das relações entre alunos e professores. Tal investigação partiu da observação das aulas de dez professores, em diferentes níveis de ensino, complementadas por entrevistas semiestruturadas com os professores. Os professores foram escolhidos a partir de suas experiências como atores, paralelas ao trabalho como professores de teatro. Essa escolha visou verificar os traços da performance artística contidos na performance docente. A noção de performance articula, nesta investigação, diferentes dimensões das relações entre professores e alunos, enfatizando o corpo como lócus das relações. A ideia de condição criativa faz emergir, portanto, no trabalho desses professores, as relações propícias para ensinar e aprender. Enfatizam-se duas condições criativas centrais no trabalho desses professores. A primeira diz respeito ao caráter coletivo das relações, mostrando como os papéis de professor e de aluno não são performados a partir de hierarquias. A segunda mostra como a transformação, seja na tarefa propriamente teatral de transformar-se, seja na tarefa docente de ensinar e aprender é uma constante na sala de aula desses professores, produzindo uma ética específica. Tal transformação como condição do trabalho teatral da sala de aula e como pressuposto, supõe um transbordamento do trabalho para além da dimensão profissional. A condição criativa é apresentada, assim, como construção de uma ética coletiva que transforma os sujeitos partícipes para além da dimensão profissional.

Abstract This text introduces the concept of inner creative state based on the work of the Russian director and pedagogue Konstantin Stanislavski, describing and analyzing it within the original context in which it appeared in the Actor's Pedagogy. This notion is used as a tool to think the work of theater teachers in classrooms. This work, considered as a teacher's performance, where the body has a leading role, is analyzed within the student/teacher relationships. The research was based on the observation of the classes of ten teachers, at different educational levels, complemented by semi-structured interviews with them. The teachers were chosen based on their experiences as actors, in parallel to their work as theater teachers. This choice aimed at identifying traces of artistic performances in their activities. The notion of performance articulates, in this research, different dimensions of teacher/student relationships, emphasizing the body as the locus for those relationships. Therefore, the idea of an inner creative state raises, in the work of those teachers, relationships conducive to education. We highlight two inner creative states that are central to their work. The first one refers to the collective character of the relationships, revealing how the roles of teacher and student are not performed based on hierarchies. The second one shows how the transformation, either in the actual theatrical task of transforming oneself, or in the educational tasks of teaching and learning, is a constant in the classrooms of those teachers, producing a specific ethic. This transformation as a condition for theatrical work in the classroom and as an assumption, presupposes an overflow of the work beyond the professional dimension. The inner creative state is presented, thus, as the construction of a collective ethics that transforms the subjects beyond the professional dimension.

Palabras- chave Pedagogia; Teatro; Performance; Educação; Criação

Keywords Pedagogy; Theater; Performance; Education; Creation

1. Introduction

This text assumes that we can understand the teaching work based on the notion of performance. From this, we address the teaching performances of a group of ten theater teachers¹, who also work (or had worked) as actors, intending to verify how their artistic performance pervades their teaching of *performatic* elements.

How do they work? Which aspects do they take from their work in the stage to the classroom? How these performances can implement creation moments in the classroom?

Indeed, teaching, the actual act of teaching, in its intrinsic relation with learning, is considered along this investigation as a performance. According to Goffman “[...] a performance may be defined as all the activity of a given participant on a given occasion which serves to influence in any way any of the other participants” (Goffman, 1959, p.15). He says that when an individual or a *performer* acts for the same audience, in different occasions, in general he establishes a social relationship. In this context, where the performance occurs, when the performer and other participants, listeners, observers or even co-participants are present, “[...] taking a particular participant and his performance as a basic point of reference, we may refer to those who contribute to the other performances as the audience observers, or co-participants” (Goffman, 1959, p. 16).

This way, the concept of performance is here assumed beyond its current meaning in the field of Arts, that is, in its application as performance in the quotidian. What it is called as teacher’s performance in this research refers to a way of being a teacher where the body is used as an essential element in the pedagogical practice, with the objective, among others, to communicate with the students, not always verbally, nor in a totally conscious way. Within the teaching work, the subjects of the research seem to use resources deriving from their theater education, such as body and facial expressions, voice timbre and intonation, and gestures, among others, performing a *performatic* behavior to constitute a creation space with the students.

Sarason (1999) considers that the characteristics of the artists can be, in all aspects, applicable to the teacher in the classroom. The author says that even though the place, the audience, the final objectives, and the curricula are different, they are not different: the teacher wants that the group of students finds what he/she teaches interesting, stimulating, and credible; and the students want to see in the figure of the teacher somebody who helps them to see themselves and to their world in a new and wide way, somebody who satisfies their needs for new experiences, who takes them outside of their common identities, “[...] someone they willingly come back to because they want to see the next act in a play about learning” (Sarason, 1999, p. 36).

This type of comparison between the artistic performance and the teacher’s performance is possible based on the notion of Richard Schechner, for whom the practices in general can be performances or can be studied “as”² performance.

Thus, when we say that these teachers perform their actions, or that they are *performatic* teachers, it is a research operation. It is our vision as researchers, interviewing these teachers and observing their classes, that makes us to assume their pedagogical practice “as” performances³.

In this way, it is not a matter of imagining them “*acting*”, since we do not localize them in an acting subsidized in the idea of a character. They do not play a character, they do not use artifices; however, they work to bring about the emergence of an inner creative state, they perform themselves. This condition makes it possible that the creation itself can be experienced by the students.

¹ They are teachers who work in the Basic Education as theater teachers in public schools; teachers who provide free theater courses in non-formal schools; and, also, university teachers who teach in courses of actors’ education.

² Richard Schechner differentiates these two possibilities of work with the performance notion, saying that “*Certain events are performances and others events less so. There are limits to what ‘is’ performance. But just about anything can be studied ‘as’ performance*” (2002, p.30). Therefore, “*Any behavior, event, action, or thing can be studied ‘as’ performance, can be analyzed in terms of doing, behaving, and showing*” (2002, p.32).

³ The research involved a significant set of observations and interviews with ten teachers. The dossier of the interviews and the notebook of the observations were analyzed, trying to find recurrences in the teachers’ speech, as well as in their teaching practice.

Thus, the central idea, in this article, is to show how these teachers, when performing their practice,⁴ circumscribe inner creative states in their classrooms, making it possible for them and the groups of students with whom they work to create in a collective way and, at the same time, in constant transformation. Second, thinking the notion of inner creative state avoids, in our course, the assumption of “creativity” in a naturalized way, as an operator that “would qualify” the teaching action. This possibility would assign a psychological aspect to the teaching action, impregnating it with a qualifying character. This is why, to avoid an analysis that would say or measure the creativity of the teaching action, we preferred to opt for questioning the inner creative states that the teacher’s performances engender.

Those teachers who were the subjects of this research use performing resources to catch the attention of the students, but only while it is necessary. We could not, thus, speak of character, but of performance that disrupts the borders between art and life, between acting and living, that calls into question the difference between reality and fiction. Teacher Lucimaura Rodrigues⁵ reveals that this attitude “[...] is not conscious.” (Rodrigues, 2012). She also says: “[...] not that one is playing a character when teaching. But the way one places him/herself in the space, the voice, the gestures, the look, and even the examples that one offers [him/herself], is incorporated to the actor.” (Rodrigues, 2012).

All this *performatic* apparatus is not simple, nor is a mechanic execution of exercises. It is a matter, then, to verify the conditions that make it possible that, in the classes of this group of teachers, a favorable environment is circumscribed. We call these conditions as “inner creative states”.

To deepen these questions, we have chosen to develop here two of these conditions: the collective character of teaching, and the constant transformation to which the subjects are immersed during the work. Before that, however, we are going to resume the concept of “inner creative state” as it appears in the work of the director-pedagogue Konstantin Stanislavski, given the possibility of operating this concept from another discursive place.

2. The inner creative state in Stanislavski's Pedagogy

Konstantin Stanislavski (1863-1938) was a Russian director responsible for one of the first pedagogical systems dedicated to the education of the actor. Even though his aesthetic work was located, mainly, in the realism of the end of the XIX century, his pedagogical legacy established many of the principles that the pedagogy of the theater still keeps today.

The concept of *inner creative state* refers, in his work, to the favorable conditions for the creative process (Guinsburg, 2006). He believed that the group of actors should find some conditions that not only would favor the creation, but also prevented that the most frequent obstacles were interposed to the creators. For him, it was not a matter of finding a creation method, but to know which would be the conditions that would allow to the actor-student to find the creation flow (Guinsburg, 2001).

In this sense, Ruffini (2004) reminds that the so-called *inner creative state*, was an objective insistently pursued by Stanislavski. For the Russian master, the creative process was not a single and definitive discovery, but it needed to be renewed each time.

Stanislavski used to say that renewing the creation would not be the same as repeating it without variations, even when doing it as if it were the first time. The repetition is, on the opposite, an enemy to fight against, since it is based on the muscle memory, so strong in the actors and indispensable for their work (Autant-Mathieu, 2007).

Since it is not possible to establish a precise, safe method and through which it would be possible to

⁴Schechner, Icle & Pereira states that the whole pedagogy can be considered as performance. He says that “[...] teaching does not constitute an artistic performance, but it certainly is a performance. When teaching, the teacher needs to define certain relationships with the students. The teacher needs to play the role of the teacher, and that can vary from circumstance to circumstance” (2010, p. 30). However, here, even though we consider such perspective together with the author, we refer to a unique way of teacher’s performance, which we qualify as “*performatic*” aiming to mark its uniqueness in relation to the teaching in a general way.

⁵ One of the ten teachers who participated in the research.

access the creation, Stanislavski believed that it was only possible *to control* the creation conditions. The inner creative state was, thus, delimited as being the ideal conditions that would favor a context for the creation. It was a matter of avoiding the blocking and identifying everything that overshadowed the creative process. In this search, he experienced many possibilities, including not to offer spectacles, but to remain enclosed in a kind of retreat with a group of actors to *experiment* and try to find the laws of the creation (Toporkov, 1979).

3. The inner creative state in the theater classroom

In order to think about the work of the theater teacher in the classroom, this text makes two interlaced theoretical operations. We have fostered the concept of inner creative state as practice by which the theater teachers perform the classroom and, at the same time, we thought about teaching from the possibility of the performance of their bodies and of their students' to provide a favorable environment for the creation.

Therefore, understanding the performance of the teacher in the context of an inner creative state is to reconfigure, at this point, the actual notion of performance that we usually assume⁶. The idea of inner creative state encompasses several aspects of the performance notion. It is not about thinking the performance of the teachers only as an action that is born in their bodies anymore, from their experience as artist of the scene, and goes towards the students (who, in this case, would be mere spectators). The actual idea of performance allows a widening of this model, hindering fixed categories of the traditional theater (actor, character, audience), since in this context the actor does not play a role, the audience is not a passive receiver, nor the creation forms are hierarchic.

In order to have the correct dimension of this widening caused by the performance in relation to the traditional theater, Fischer-Lichte (2008) makes a brief history that illustrates quite well the insertion of the studies of the performance as a legitimate discipline and acknowledged in the academy, which science would be important for the understanding of the widening of the conception of the traditional theater, resulting from of its closeness to the Studies of the Performance.

The author says that the establishment of the theater studies as an independent academic discipline in Germany, in the beginning of the 20th century, and its respective dissemination as an essential landmark in the discourse of the arts, represented a rupture with the notions, prevalent until then, imposed by the traditional theater. Since the 18th century the dramatic literature became the central concept of the theater in Germany, not only to serve to the moral of the time, but also to be perceived as a text-based art. "*By the end of the nineteenth century, the artistic value of theater seemed to be almost exclusively determined, even legitimized, by its reference to dramatic works, i.e. literary texts*" (Fischer-Lichte, 2008, p. 29).

Fischer-Lichte (2008) claims that the existence of disciplines that dealt exclusively with texts, and ignored the performances, led to the need of establishing a new discipline would fill such gap. "*Hence, theatre studies was founded in Germany as the discipline devoted to the performance*" (Fischer-Lichte, 2008, p. 30).

But even in the context of the performance - separate and distant of its literary character - there still is the distinction between the theatrical performance and the performance as its language. In this sense, Roach (2002) makes a distinction between the traditional theater and the performance in a more specific way. The author considers that we can think the performance when answering to three questions referring to: time (past and future), place (inside and outside), and action (usual and critical). For him, the following questions related to the above dimensions must be made: When does this occur? Where does this occur? What is happening?

"In drama the answers to those questions reside safely within the fiction of the play, and they may be answered by reading; in performance, they rudly spill out into the streets, and they must be answered by participation" (Roach, 2002, p. 35). Roach's statement underlines the possibility of the active participation of the spectators in the performance, who do not behave as passive receivers, as in the majority of the traditional theater spectacles. This specific trace of the performance can, thus, be assumed as the performances of the quotidian. In our case, the teacher's performance is not a

⁶ In the common sense, the performance is associated to the live, spectacular, and scenic forms of art. However, we deal here with the ordinary, daily life that, in the case of the studied teachers, is performed for a pedagogical-didactic purpose.

presentation for an audience, as in the traditional pedagogy, but an event of co-participation between students and teachers, such as the artistic events of the performance as language.

Indeed, the emergence of an inner creative state suggests a teacher's performance as an amalgam in which the action of the teacher is only one of the elements, but not necessarily the center around which all the other elements gravitate: students, action, contents, curriculum, and knowledge. Performing the teaching would be, in the studied context, a specific way of interaction and co-participation that suggests a deconstruction of the hierarchy of the roles.

This way, we start to see the performance of the theater teachers first from the incorporation of their experiences as artists of the scene; but, beyond that, as a non-hierarchical fusion of the elements of the classroom that can only take place in the emergence of an inner creative state.

The lecture of teacher Carlos Mödinger can exemplify this fusion, when he asked to a group of students to present the scene that he was preparing, which creation was a result of previous improvisation works. While the group was presenting, the teacher, together with the rest of the group, was directing it. When the scene was presented, the teacher observed that one of the girls was in a more quotidian posture, while the other two, more refined. He suggested that the actions should be more similar.

The other students offered many ideas for the work as, for example, that they should extend the movements, that they should detail more the scene. They suggested that they should play with the audience and express the intentions of the actions in an explicit way. The suggestions of the students and the teachers were mixed in a cohesive whole, where the teacher really wanted to value any and all notes of the students. The creative process was quite clear and they all wanted to contribute with the work of the colleagues, who placed themselves in a listening position, hearing and testing each one of the suggestions.

The teacher observed that they should explore more the space, since they had to think that there could be somebody at the right end, for example. The students who were watching, sometimes exchanged their role with those who were presenting the scene, to show some new possibility.

After the exercise, that fostered the participation and effort of all, the teacher requested that they should present their scenes simultaneously, a pair in each corner of the room. The students stayed for a while performing their scenes, without the interference of the teacher, who observed and made some notes. Next, the students took some props and the teacher suggested a sequence of presentations of the scenes. There were five groups. While they were presenting, the teacher asked to the students who were watching, who belonged to other groups, to interfere in the scene of the colleagues.

When observing this activity, accomplished by the students and the teacher, it was possible to evidence that all senses were in action, for those who were in the scene, and those who were looking from outside and offering suggestions to qualify the work. They really seemed to be in another tuning, as if they were in a trance, numb and available for that moment, totally aimed at the creation. Teachers and students were "*in performance*".

In this example, the exchange of roles was an element quite observable. The students assumed at many moments what traditionally we would understand as the task of the teacher. But it was not only a matter of giving their opinion, or presenting an idea that later would be evaluated as valid or not by the teacher. All the ideas that were raised by the students and the teacher had been tested in practice, and all the evaluations of these ideas that were put into practice had been analyzed by the group.

It was evident that the availability of the group could be taken only as a condition for this moment of creation. However, it seems pertinent to imagine that it is not only a prerequisite for the creation, but, also, the availability is the result of the performance. This amalgam between condition and consequence can be inferred, besides our observations, from what teacher Celina Alcântara (2012) says, when speaking about the question:

[...] Because this is the gap for you to relate with. Because if the person is enclosed, is locked, not only locked in the sense of being shy, but sometimes the person knows how to do, but she locks herself in that, in that way that she knows how to do it, and she does not leave it, she is locked in the form, what is also bad. Thus, the more permeable and

available the student is, the better it is for this work to really happen, because then one has this actual sense that the work reverberates. It is not that you are teaching somebody to do it, but what you are saying, doing, you see it reverberating in the body of the other, you see it happening in the body of the other, but also because of the will of the other. He wants to do that. Thus, one of the things that I consider as the most important is this availability for the creation, this readiness to experiment, that is conquered by the game (Alcântara, 2012a).

Availability is a word that is strongly emphasized in the context of the theater lessons that we took as object, as well as in the speech of the interviewed teachers. But what intrigues us in the work of these teachers is the extreme engagement of their students, the almost obsessive way with which they work in their classes, the extreme discipline of the work that is not imposed, apparently, from the teacher towards the students, but that it is agreed upon between the participants. This availability is not, according to our observations, only an ability or characteristic of the student, but, it also results from the favorable conditions for the creation engendered in a collective way by the observed groups. These are the conditions that foster a creation state, a *performatics* of the creation, a making in creative state, a making creation.

However, which would be these favorable conditions for the creation that the performance engenders in the classroom of these theater teachers? Apparently, we think of a duplication of the condition of artist of the scene. What it is the subject of the creation (and condition) in the context of the scene is, also, the support for the learning. It is teaching how to be creative, being creative and enabling moments of creation in the actual interior of the teaching-learning process.

Thus, among all the possibilities that we can think of in this research, we will focus on two elements that seem to be essential for the inner creative states of these classrooms: the need of a collective creation, and the transformation as condition of the creation.

4. The performance is creation only in the collective dimension

The collective dimension of the theatrical practice is a nodal element since a long time in the context of the theatrical practice. The pedagogy of the theater takes this element as the basis of the practice. This was already established in Stanislavski's pedagogy of the actor. The author highlighted that, for the spectacle to reach an accomplishment in its whole, for that a mutual behavior were to be established between the partners in scene, and for that each actor helped in the creative process, a solid ethical base was indispensable. This ethics defended by the author was mainly related to the importance assigned by him to the joint work. He emphasized that

[...] each member of the theatrical corporation must always feel as a part of a complicated gear. He/she must have a clear awareness of the damage that an incorrect act or a distraction or a detour from the line that was fixed can cause to the whole project. [...] the artistic ethics and the state that is established by its means are very important and necessary factors in our activity, due to the characteristics that distinguish us (Stanislavski, 1997, p. 236).

This way, when reading the canonic text of the Russian director, it supervenes in first plan a certain ethics that the notion of collective represents. For him, and in the persistent discourse of the pedagogy in the theatrical context, all serve to the essential end of the art and must be integrally subordinated to it. All, without exception, are participants of the spectacle. He warns that

[...] all those who, in one or another sense, make it difficult the accomplishment of the essential objective of the art and the theater, must be considered as undesirable members. If the doorman, the ticket agent, and the cashier welcome the spectator with hostility and, in this way, disturb his/her state of spirit, they cause a damage to the common project and to the artistic end, since they influence in a negative way. If the theater is disordered, if they delay in raising the curtain, if the ideas and feelings of the actor do not reach the audience, this one does not find a reason to go to the theater. The spectacle is lost and the artistic, and educational objective vanishes (Stanislavski, 1997, p. 258).

If the moment of the spectacle demands a joint commitment, it is not different in the creative process. A bad rehearsal impairs the performance of the actor and a rehearsal affected by the

excessive individuality, on the opposite, hinders the expression of the playwright's basic ideas (Stanislavski, 1997).

We can see that such ideas, despite historically marked at the time and according to the text-centered reasoning of the Russian director, still produce, in the context of the investigated classes, some expressive echoes. Alcântara (2012) says it literally, when claiming that Stanislavski and the so-called directors-pedagogues renovators of the theatrical scene of the 20th century, in which the author is also included, had searched for a spectacle that would result from a work in which what should be brought out was the group, and not the individual. At the same time, "[...] they demanded of their actors an operation on themselves able to constitute them as ethical subjects, committed to their work, to the collective of which they were part, and also to the audience to whom they addressed." (Alcântara, 2012b, p. 78).

This collective dimension was noticeable in the lecture of teacher Carlos Mödinger, when a group of students presented an improvisation work. They repeated the scene several times, always with the objective of exploring the suggestions offered by the colleagues and the teacher, who occasionally included himself in the scene to demonstrate some possibility, emphasizing that the scene had to make sense.

It was interesting to observe that it there was no kind of competition to impose his idea, since the co-authorship relation seemed to be consolidated. The single aim of everybody was one only: to qualify the work, so that it would be more organic and had a higher scenic quality. The group dimension visibly prevailed over the individual. It was perceivable that a favorable condition of creation was established, and the role of the teacher was essential to lead this process, since he equalized his position all the time. Sometimes in a more directive way, at other moments less directive, however, there was no hierarchy in that activity between the ideas of the teacher and the students'. The teacher, as well as the group of students who were performing, listened attentively to what each one was expressing.

Alcântara (2012b) points that Kastrup thinks a collective as "[...] a field of forces, kept by the power of affecting and being affected one by the others, so that each action is permeated and affected by the forces that form this field, that in turn constitute a network of relationships" (Alcântara, 2012b, p. 79). Kastrup complements her idea emphasizing that the picture of a field of forces would be a space in which the subjectivity can emerge, however, this subjectivity would be devoid of the picture of a subject. For her, the production of subjectivity is always implied with the collectivity, since she considers that all the subjectivity is collective, and a collective is formed by multiple vectors.

This way, we can recognize such synergy in the pedagogical practice in theater, both at the discourse of the teachers with whom we have worked, and in the classes we observed. Teacher Jezebel De Carli, when asked about what most attracted her in theater, says that "[...] it was this issue of the collective, of the group; it seems that the different ones are accepted. There is an aspect of sharing, of acceptance of the other." (De Carli, 2012). Her claim insists in this dimension of the collective that appears in the research. She complements it saying that "[...] we had that, affection, sharing, more than the technique itself. It is the space of the group, the collective, a place of meeting, conviviality, experience" (De Carli, 2012).

Alcântara (2012b) considers that it is mainly in the game that the relationships are established, because the individuals imply themselves mutually, as what is experienced is a sharing related not only to the objective of the game. This interaction happens mainly in the order of the happening, as it occurs according to certain circumstances, in a space of time of multiple implications. The author points that "[...] the idea of collective that appears in the game is supported by the multiple affections, that is, it is about the linking with what crosses the relationships, that composes them and inscribes them in a certain plan" (Alcântara, 2012b, p. 84).

This perspective is easy to understand based on some of the classes described here, in which the game is the tool used by the teachers, so that this relation of complicity, partnership and, mainly, activator of the creative process is installed in the group. "[...] The theater is an art of the collective because each relationship in theater ends up establishing, though temporarily, forms of associations, meetings, groupings, and sharing that result in a collective." (Alcântara, 2012b, P. 84).

Alcântara (2012b) observes that, for Alschitz "[...] the idea of a theatrical collective meeting is something constituted in a surface permeated by crossings, present in the image of something that has been woven" (Alcântara, 2012b, p. 85). This collective meeting mentioned by Alschitz seems to

be what teacher Lucimaura Rodrigues refers to, when asked on whether she considered that the theater principles constituted her in any measure. She thinks that, over all, she took something from the theater that taught her to look differently. She says: “[...] I started to be touched and to feel instigated to see the humanity, observing how people relate among themselves, how they behave, and how they produce some meaning from that” (Rodrigues, 2012).

Brook (2010) summarizes the question of the collective by claiming that “[...] the theater starts when two people meet.” (Brook, 2010, p. 12). He says that if a person stands and the other one observes, it is already a start. In order to have a development, a third person is necessary, so that there is a confrontation. The author defends that the relationship among these three elements is essential. This means that the theater is made in the relationship, in the game.

Teacher Lucimaura says: “[I] think that looking at the other one, seeing the other one, being tolerant are very important characteristics for the actor, helping in the creation process, because I am watching the experience of the other one and certainly this stays inside me” (Rodrigues, 2012). She complements her thoughts observing that “[...] it is always different at each stage production, mainly my relationship with the other one. In this sense, I believe that I transform myself” (Rodrigues, 2012).

In the classes, we observed that this exercise of relating with the group is constant. The games always make this relation possible. Conte and Pereira highlight that “[...] the performance is always a present and shared experience, a multiplicity of contrastive voices in the theatrical experience, a game of relationship with the otherness that modifies us and intensifies us as human beings, constituting the basis of our values” (Conte; Pereira, 2013, p. 108).

5. Performances in transformation

Thus, if the collective, the collectivity, the group work - that allows an emergent inner creative state in the classroom - is an aspect that stands out in our thesis, according to which the researched teachers perform the classroom as creation space, this aspect is, also, related to a second and decisive element for the inner creative state: the exercise of the transformation, by which students and teachers are submitted in the interior of the classroom work.

When observing the classes, it is evident that the exercises of theater improvisation develop, in the bodies in work, movements of transformation: to be what one is not, to be in little known states, to try differentiated effects of perception, to visit imaginary spaces and constitute them to the look of the others in the exercise of the corporality, among other possibilities of transformation.

Notwithstanding the concreteness of the bodily effects of transformation proper to the theatrical field, there is, for our research, the possibility to think that this bodily (and vocal) transformation, to which students and teachers are submitted in these exercises, constitute, still, an ethical transformation, by the adherence to the principles of discipline that these same bodily exercises demand to be carried through.

Therefore, there is, in our observations, the evidence that everything is mixed, either the body exercises with the creation, either the creation with the transformation of the subjects.

This idea of transformation seems to be already implied in the teacher's performance of the observed teachers, whose pedagogical practice is aimed towards the submission of the students to this process of transformation as they are inserted in this universe. Teacher Tatiana Cardoso expresses this idea when saying that: “[...] the characteristics that I most appreciate in a student are the will to shake his/her life, his/her environment, to transform him/herself.” (Cardoso, 2012).

When looking at the theater classes, we perceive that this transformation of the student (and the teachers) requires a great involvement of them. This involvement is, one could say, almost unconditional. However, so that it really happens, it is necessary the incorporation on part of the student of a position that makes him/her able to constitute his/her work. This position, in turn, seems to imply in a transformation, where it is not known whether it is this attitude that results in the transformation, or whether it is the transformation that ends up determining the new attitude.

Thus, it looks to us that this transformation does not happen naturally, since it demands an availability of the subject to guarantee that this process is triggered. Teacher Gina Tochetto says

that she values in the student “[...] *the positive, proactive attitude, be mature enough to want to win challenges, and having something that makes him/her to want to be transformed, to metamorphoses him/herself*” (Tochetto, 2012).

It looks clear to us that this transformation happens from the adoption, on the part of the subject, of the theatrical principles and the forms of relation that he/she establishes with him/herself, from the techniques and procedures that constitute the theatrical making. When elaborating this relationship, practicing the exercises as object of knowledge, the subject transforms his/her own being.

Thus, changing oneself would imply, in this context, in an ethical attitude, that is, the incorporation of specific values that are shared by a certain group. Icle and Alcântara (2005) claims that the transformations proposed by Stanislavski for the work of the actor were not restricted to technical procedures, but they searched for an ethical and aesthetic questioning in relation to the theatrical practice. He says that, for Stanislavski, “[...] *the actor creates because he transforms and something happens because he creates.*” (Icle; Alcântara, 2010, p.42).

Thus, necessarily, in the context of the observed theater classes, it seems to be a relationship between transformation and ethics. The favorable conditions for the creation are given, indeed, in the interrelationship of these elements. It is a matter of affirming the fact that “[...] *the work of the theater involves a great concern with the human being that is behind the actor, and this leads to the pedagogical situation of the theater*” (Icle, 2010, p. 51).

In this sense, Stanislavski (2008) believed that the theatrical activity demands that the entire nature of the actor is involved, so that he can dedicate himself to the role in body and soul. For him, each movement that the actor makes in scene, each word that he says, results from his imagination. Thus, he believed that nothing could be mechanically made, without the full understanding by the individual of who he is, where he comes from, what he wants, to where he goes, and what he will do upon arrival there. The author defended that this dimension demands that the actor surrenders to his role, compelling him to transform into the creative process to which he is submitted, almost as a transcendence of his individuality towards his character. Teacher Gabriela Greco says that she considers as very important:

[...] the moment when one hears the click, when the student goes from that blurring, from this easy distraction, and suddenly something activates him, attracts him to the point that he is able to be completely present there, focused on that game, that play, or that exercise of movement, that is, the moment of the turn, the transformation (Greco, 2012).

Stanislavski (2008) claimed that “[...] *the actor cannot run away from a complete transformation if he wants to adapt to the requirements of his art, since the acceptable flaws in the daily life, in the stage, cause an impression in the audience.*” (Stanislavski, 2008, p. 143). He used to say that this happens because life in the stage is shown inside of a reduced angle. For the author, no detail escapes to the spectators; therefore he considers as extremely important the transformation that the actor has to submit himself in the development of his process of education, always aiming at the search of the constant improvement of the theatrical practice. Teacher Jezebel believes that “[...] *the theater makes it possible for people to transcend the quotidian circumstances, not thinking that they are going to change the world [...]*” (De Carli, 2012), but she says: “[...] *I don't think that they are going to change, but a student changes and, mainly, we change. I have changed a lot, my goodness!*” (De Carli, 2012).

All this process of transformation, triggered by these unique teacher's performances, requires of the subject the continuous development of a sensitivity that results in his/her interior and exterior psychic and body self-knowledge. To think these performances as transforming ones means to say that they are not restricted to the profession, but overflows the actual life of the teachers-directors and students-actors. The teacher's performance is not a professional technique here, but it looks like a way of being that encompasses the totality of the individual in practices that are, in some dimension, shared in the collective; therefore, they are social ones.

Under this perspective, the studied teaching practice in theater reveals itself as a space where the transformation, proper of the creative process, seems to be a value and a strongly present element in all the activities. The proposals in class arouse and challenge the students to create, based on an environment that favors the creation. Not only the environment, but the activities developed in the ritual of the class are encouraging, and the students demonstrate to answer, most of the time, in a positive way. Icle and Alcântara (2005) highlight that the pedagogy of the theater of Stanislavski,

who established the figure of the pedagogue director, “[...] demanded on the actor a deep commitment, an ethical attitude that transforms him in the constitution of his artistic workmanship, as well as in his relationships with the human being of a certain time.” (Icle & Alcântara, 2005, p. 43).

The observed processes of transformation circumscribe, indeed, a close and constant way of care with regard to the actual acting of the teacher. This is already a fact, as the exercises encompass a continuous effort of appreciation of the activity of the other. By means of this appreciation, the teacher ends up by making to emerge the creative process, in the sense of repeatedly creating a state of personal doubt that leads to the necessity of considering other possibilities to make different forms of theater. Teacher Tatiana Cardoso translates a little of this universe of which we are talking about when she says: “[...] when I started to work in the theater, I remember the sensation that I had found a place where I could be myself, with all my fidgets and my emotions” (Cardoso, 2012).

It was possible to observe this state of constant doubt, for example, in the class of teacher Celina Alcântara, when the students tried to find their character, related to a work that they were developing. She guided them in the sense of experiencing the possibilities to develop a bodily action that characterized it. In the exercise that they accomplished, when they should walk through the room saying the lines of the text, the teacher suggested to them to express the characters with their body, testing several possibilities, to find the best performance. It was possible to perceive in this activity of appreciation of the staged movements, a great effort of the group converging to the same objective: to qualify the expressions so that they would achieve the best result.

For a student whose character was a nun, the teacher suggested that she should keep the back still, since the nuns use to have a lofty posture. To the other one, who would play a character expressing sensuality, the teacher requested that she made experimentations to search for the sensuality inside herself. She instigated them to think about how this person walked, spoke, whether she was introspective or extrovert, austere or kind, anyhow, she offered several suggestions so that the students could find their characters. They made several bodily exercises, testing each comment of the teacher.

At this moment of the class, the creative process showed as in its latent state, as the experiences resulting from this activity of appreciation created a space for them to create from the presented theme, considering the actions as possibilities for the work qualification.

Therefore, this embracement in the interior of the daily exercises fusions the collective ethics to the ways of transformation of the subjects. This *performatic* teaching, however break the chain of the knowledge transmission, it allows, in a stronger way, a collective and transforming space of creation.

6. References

- Alcântara, C.N. (2012a). *Formação Teatral como Criação: narrativas sobre modos de ficcionar a si mesma*. Tese de Doutorado. Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul-UFRGS-RS.
- Alcântara, C. N.(2012b). *Entrevista concedida para a pesquisa*. 11/04/2012.
- Authant-Mathieu, M.C. (2007) *La Ligne des Actions Physiques*. Montpellier: L' Entretemps.
- Brook, P. (2010). *A porta aberta: reflexões sobre a interpretação e o teatro*. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira.
- Cardoso, T. (2012). *Entrevista concedida para a pesquisa*. 28/09/2012.
- Conte, E. y Pereira, M.A. (2013). *Pedagogia da Performance: da arte da linguagem à linguagem da Arte*. In: PEREIRA, Marcelo de Andrade (Org.) *Performance e educação: (des) territorializações pedagógicas*. Santa Maria: Ed. da UFSM, p. 95-114.
- De Carli, J. (2012). *Entrevista concedida para a pesquisa*. 14/05/2012.
- Fischer-Lichte, E. (2008). *The transformative Power of Performance*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Doubleday.
- Greco, G. (2012). *Entrevista concedida para a pesquisa*. 10/03/2012.
- Icle, G. (2010). *Pedagogia Teatral como cuidado de si*. São Paulo: Hucitec.
- Icle, G. & Alcântara, C. N. (2005). *Formação docente em teatro: uma ética da tradição*. *Revista da FUNDARTE*, Montenegro: Fundação Municipal de Artes de Montenegro, 5 (10), p. 40-43.
- Guinsburg, J. (2006). *Stanislávski e o Teatro de Arte de Moscou*. São Paulo: Perspectiva.
- Guinsburg, J. (2001). *Stanislávski, Meierhold & Cia*. São Paulo: Perspectiva.
- Roach, J. (2002). *Theatre Studies/Cultural Studies/Performance Studies: the three unities*. In: STUCKY, Nathan; WIMMER, Cynthia (Org.). *Teaching Performance Studies*. Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, p.33-39.

- Rodrigues, L. (2012). *Entrevista concedida para a pesquisa*. 15/03/2012.
- Rufinni, F. (2004). *Stanislavkij. Dal lavoro dell'attore al lavoro su di sé*. Latrza, Roma-Bari.
- Sarason, S. B. (1999). *Teaching as a Performing Art*. London/New York: Columbia University.
- Schechner, R. (2002). *Performance Studies: an introduction*. New York: Routledge.
- Schechner, R., Icle, G. y Pereira, M. A. (2010). O que pode a Performance na Educação? Uma entrevista com Richard Schechner. *Educação & Realidade*. Porto Alegre, v.35, n.2, p. 23-35. Disponível em: <http://www.seer.ufrgs.br/educacaoerealidade/article/view/13502/7644>. Acessado em: 25 de setembro de 2013.
- Stanislavski, K. (2008). *An Actor's Work: A Student's Diary*. Londres: Routledge.
- Stanislavski, K. (1997). *Un actor se prepara*. Madrid: Editorial Constancia, S.A.
- Tochetto, G. (2012). *Entrevista concedida para a pesquisa*. 8/01/2012.
- Toporkov, V.O. (1979). *Stanislavski in Rehearsal: the final years*. New York: Theatre Arts Books.