

# Laboratory on Feedback in Artistic Processes

17th -19th January 2014  
Uferstudios Berlin



LIFE LONG  
BURNING

## Overview

Introduction	5
Day 1: Lectures	12
Day 2: Methods	14
Day 3: Round Table	19
Short Biographies	38

Organised by Uferstudios GmbH and HZT as part of the project Life Long Burning / module teachback with the support of the Culture Programme of the European Union

**UFER STUDIOS**  
für zeitgenössischen Tanz



More information:

[www.uferstudios.com](http://www.uferstudios.com)

[www.hzt-berlin.de](http://www.hzt-berlin.de)

[www.lifelongburning.eu](http://www.lifelongburning.eu)

## Introduction: Feedback is everywhere!

Feedback culture in artistic circles and practices is increasingly growing and changing; many methods have been developed, adapted and modified in order to essentially support the creative process and realisation of a work. We are seeing ever more formats that open up the rehearsal process to receive feedback and communicate with audiences in a manner that goes beyond the known artist talk. Also within artistic education contexts, the desire is mounting for more quality-structured feedback that can guide students in both a critical and reflective way through their creative endeavours. Feedback is everywhere, and as a means to reflect, gather and share resources and methods on this expanding field the “Laboratory on Feedback in Artistic Processes” was initiated within the frame of “Teachback” – one of the modules of the project “Life Long Burning”<sup>1</sup> in collaboration with HZT Berlin (Interuniversity Centre for Dance) and Uferstudios Berlin.

The lab, held between 17th-19th January 2014, invited a group of people who shared an interest in the topic of feedback. Over the three days the group practiced, articulated and discussed different approaches, aims and experiences of existing methods of feedback. The idea was that a number of feedback-methods should be applied and tried out within the lab, as opposed to merely remaining on a theoretical discursive level.

---

<sup>1</sup> Life Long Burning is a project and network supported by the Cultural Programme of the European Union. It is comprised of the following dance organisations: 4Culture (RO), CCN Montpellier (FR), Cullberg Ballet (SE), danceWEB (AT), Het Veem Theater (NL), Lokomotiva (MK), Station (RS), Tala Dance Center (HR), Uferstudios (DE), Ultima Vez (BE), Workshop Foundation (HU), workspacebrussels (BE). The project is spread out over 10 different modules and formats that concentrate on the mobility and intercultural exchange of artists, with the intent to enhance their careers, expand dance audiences and advance the production of knowledge in the field.

In implementing this first hand experience as a basis for debate, several presentations were interwoven with performances and showings in which methods could be tried, tested and considered. Some of the questions that the meeting focused on were: What are the pitfalls of feedback? Where does it go wrong or become enforced? How to avoid feedback being a fashionable thing to do? How do we learn, improve and widen our means of giving and receiving feedback? How is this implemented in art practice and education today? How can the expertise and practise of feedback be passed on and grow? What difference does it make, giving and receiving feedback depending on the perspective you take: for example as an artist, as a student, as an educator or a curator?

This document functions as a summarized report on the feedback lab; it collates the remarks from the invited observers, who were Inge Koks and Frederik Le Roy. Through a chronological order the document mainly gives a brief summary on each participant's contribution with additional considerations and reflections on the proposed method or presentation. This short paper is written firstly as a documentation for those who partook in the lab and secondly, as a reference for those who will participate in a follow up format about feedback. In addition to this report an audio recording from each contribution is available on the HZT website: <http://www.hzt-berlin.de/?z=5&p=126&lan=en>



## Day 1: Friday 17th January 2014

### Lectures

In opening the “Laboratory on Feedback in Artistic Processes”, Siegmar Zacharias and Jörg Koslowsky were invited to give public lectures on the DasArts feedback methodology and on Design Thinking, these talks were also followed by a discussion.



### Contribution

Siegmar Zacharias

An introduction to the DasArts feedback methodology

DasArts, the Master study program of performing arts in Amsterdam, has developed a feedback methodology in response to the need for precise and productive feedback for their students during the process of creation. One of the crucial principles underpinning this feedback method is the idea of feedback as service; the feedback givers respond to specific questions from the artist about her/his own work. Giving and receiving feedback happens in a controlled environment, which means, it is in a set time frame, moderated and focused on the (personal) perspective of the feedback giver.

The DasArts feedback method has several stages: 1) the presenter explains the status of the work and formulates the artist's questions, 2) presentation of the work, 3) immediate responses are channelled in a 5-minute, one-on-one venting session between feedback givers, 4) three of the ten modules of the toolbox developed by DasArts are picked (agreed upon together with the artist) and used to give feedback. These range from 'Affirmative Feedback', 'Open Questions', 'Point Reflection', 'Gossip Rounds' and 'Alternative Perspectives'.

## Additional considerations and reflections

- The methodology works best if feedback givers are familiar with the methodology, knowing which aspects can be used to offer critical, supportive, or contextualising feedback.
- The method answers to specific questions rather than random criticism.
- The perspective of the person giving feedback is highlighted.
- Different forms of articulation in feedback supports in observing/seeing the work differently.
- For close working peers it might not be the best methodology with regard to objectivity and concurrence.
- This method implies that it works best when used as a regular practice.

## References

DasArts a film about feedback:  
[www.ahk.nl/theaterschool/opleidingen-theater/dasarts-master-of-theatre/study-programme/feedback/a-film-about-feedback/](http://www.ahk.nl/theaterschool/opleidingen-theater/dasarts-master-of-theatre/study-programme/feedback/a-film-about-feedback/)



## Contribution

Jörg Koslowsky  
On Design Thinking

Design Thinking is not a feedback method as such, but a working model to enhance creative and productive thinking for small, multi-disciplinary working groups who engage together on a specific problem. It strives for 'out-of-the-box thinking', including people from diverse backgrounds, introducing research, experimentation and the building of scale models in order to come up with creative and realisable projects. In Design Thinking constant feedback is important to find the best results, prototyping, testing and evaluating ideas generate an experimental feedback-loop. However, this feedback is primarily orientated on the 'product', i.e. the solution to a specific problem, rather than the maker or individual artist.

## Additional considerations and reflections

- A diversity of backgrounds in the group is an advantageous element.
- The constellation of a group (and personalities) is important.
- Collective processes can be stimulating but also time consuming and therefore irritating.
- The initial question is of great importance to the process.

## References

Design Thinking: [www.design-thinking.org](http://www.design-thinking.org)  
D-Colletive: [www.facebook.com/d.collective.space](https://www.facebook.com/d.collective.space)



## Day 2: Saturday 18th January 2014

### Methods

During the following days of the lab (Saturday and Sunday), the participants were asked to contribute their own methods and experiences of giving feedback. The formats in which people chose to present ranged from, informal lecture, movement/score-based games and to role reversal, being in the position of the one receiving feedback.



### Contribution

Eva Meyer-Keller

Eva Meyer-Keller is interested in implementing feedback early on in her artistic practice, making it an integrated and important part of the entire process itself. She regularly uses it as a tool in the concept development stage and incorporates it in several ways during the subsequent phases of the creation process. Eva Meyer-Keller found stimulus in the working methods of Susan Rethorst who, as a guest teacher at the SNDO, asked the students to create “a dance a day” to be performed for one another. This continual dance creation and the following showings acted as a form of intrinsic feedback, which created the possibility to work further from the responses, the daily dances played an actual function as feedback.

Based on this approach, she suggested two games:

1. Participants were invited to partner up, choose three personal items they have on them and, during a fixed time, place them between each other and in relation to the objects of their partner. Participants respond by changing the position of their items, thereby changing



the composition of the tableau. It is a nice and easy game in which you get inspired quickly by other people's suggestions, get to know them through their actions and choices, and forgo judgments about 'wrong' or 'failed' results. The emphasis is more on process and responsive observation than visual product.

2. Participants were given 10 minutes to create a short dance piece of maximum 2 minutes in length. The pieces were then shown and after each of the dances the dance maker was given feedback on what was seen, experienced and thought of. The aim was not to judge the value of the piece but to give feedback that should be helpful for the maker. It is an interesting way of giving/receiving feedback in a short amount of time, to get so many different opinions and suggestions; it demonstrates how different people look and experience things. Moreover, the exercise is enlightening for participants who are not makers themselves, (e.g. audience members, critics or other spectators) they experience what it means to make and immediately receive feedback. They experience how what they made is received and what (often unforeseen) meanings and ideas the work produced in the perception of the other spectators. It might be an interesting exercise that would give audience members a deeper understanding of the effect of the spectator's reactions (i.e. the role they usually fulfil) on/in creation processes.

## Additional considerations and reflections

- An element of unexpectedness or surprise in relation to feedback, does that challenge the way one gives feedback? Or if one creates short and quick processes (as above) how does that influence the feedback? It might be more first impressions rather than thoughtful, careful, precisely formulated feedback – what is its value?
- When working with 10 – 20 feedback givers it then interesting in designing this group, looking at each background and skills?

- How does the process of feedback change over time - for example when one gets to know one another and the feedback then seems to be less careful.

## References

Susan Rethorst, "A Choreographic Mind: Autobodygraphical Writings" (Publisher: Teatterikorkeakoulu (2012), ISBN number 978-952-9765-70-6)



## Contribution

Steve Purcell

In his capacity as Professor of International Cultural Development and formerly as Dean of Arts and Humanities of St. John University in York, Steve Purcell identified a current “culture of feedback”, especially in the UK arts and education system, and stresses that feedback needs to be carefully situated and managed if it is to be effective.

Care for the artist and an awareness of the power of feedback are crucial. Steve Purcell is especially interested in the role of feedback during the early phases of artistic practices, e.g. feedback on performance proposals, research preparations or the creation process when compositional strategies are put into motion to translate the proposal into a performance.

One key aspect of feedback at this point in the process is that it is used to surface the artist's intentions for the work and help to identify the artistic focus, not only for the artist her/himself but also in relation to the eventual audience that will be experiencing the work. What is also important in the feedback dialogue is to speculate

on the meaning potential of the work as it unfolds. The key is not to ask, ‘what does it mean?’ but rather, ‘what ways can the work be read?’.

Important questions, especially for students creating work are: what is the impulse to put the work out there? Where are you in relation to that impulse? What do you want the audience to experience? What might be the unintended consequences of the work? What are the workings of the work (i.e. its compositional strategies and methodologies)? Where are you in the process? What is the question you are working with? And is that question big enough? What has been thought already, what needs to be rethought and how can you go further? Dealing with those questions can also help in formulating the focus of feedback. What kind of feedback do you want to have and on which specific topics?

The rationale of feedback can be multifaceted. Often, feedback starts out of generosity towards the artist. This ‘humanistic’ approach is valuable, however, Steve Purcell argues, in the end, the aim of feedback should be that “better work enters into the public domain.” Hence it is important to always take into account the perspective of the eventual spectator. What kind of conditions do they need to produce meaningful context and what context does the work need? How can the audience itself, perhaps, articulate meaningful feedback?

## Additional considerations and reflections

- To consider the notion of spectatorship and how an artist could insert knowledge about this in her/his work is interesting.
- This seems to closely relate to possibilities in curation. Exchange and/or experiment might be a fruitful option in connecting audiences.

## References

Caravaggio, “The Incredulity of Saint Thomas” (1601–1602). Henry James.

## Contribution

Charlotte Vandevyver

Charlotte demonstrated how the DasArts method works in practice by using it to give feedback on the performative installation of HZT MA SoDA graduate Allison Peacock. Using the method showed its potential but also demonstrated that a certain level of experience or training in the method is necessary to optimally use it. Each of the methods from the toolbox not only foreground a different facet of the work, they also call for a different kind of articulation from the feedback givers. A certain kind of eloquence and accuracy in the articulation are important assets of this multifaceted methodology.

This element of training of feedback-givers came back in Charlotte's presentation of Workspacebrussels (WSB), a Brussels based organisation that supports young artists through an intensive residency program, co-productions and coaching of emerging creations and research projects. The daily practice of WSB shows the extent in which different forms of feedback are engrained in artistic practice; coaching, mentoring and feedback sessions each have a slightly different focus and role. During "Working Title Platform", (a presentation platform

of a selection of works-in-progress created while being in residence at WSB), feedback-sessions are organized for each artist using the DasArts-feedback method. The group of feedback-givers remains the same throughout a single platform and even over several different platforms, making this group a designated feedback community. WSB also develops more and more contexts and means to engage the audience differently with the artistic practice, e.g. through a magazine, after talks in which audience members can provide focused feedback, meetings between artist and programmers, association circles, feedback sessions, etc.

## Additional considerations and reflections

- Could feedback be a tool to create a community?
- Is it beneficial to specify the different roles in coaching, mentoring & feedbacking?

## References

[www.workspacebrussels.be/](http://www.workspacebrussels.be/)

## Contribution

Nik Haffner

Nik Haffner suggested a feedback method (referencing his HZT colleague Boyan Manchev) based on the first associations a work evokes. The method was tried out in response to an excerpt of work-in-progress of Kat Valastur's new work, which the lab participants had just seen in the studio. All participants in the group have a minute to write down words related to the work. Then, for the second round, each person slowly reads out her/his list of words. During the third round, each person has the possibility to ask about the words of the other if they couldn't relate with it or need further explanation. Finally, the artist who is present can ask more about certain associations that were mentioned.

Taking about 10 minutes, this method very quickly and easily provided an overview of how people perceived the work. It is nice to hear how some people see the work differently whilst others seem to look and phrase the same. Besides the fact that it helps the maker to get an inkling of what people see, it also shows, in a very accessible manner, how divergent perceptions can be even if there are also clear links. Both these diffe-

rences and these links can become important for the continuation of a making process. After this experiment the maker can also ask more questions to the individual 'feedbackers'.

## Additional considerations and reflections

- This could be a great exercise at the beginning of an after talk or other discursive event.
- The method ensures that every person is equally participating, avoiding that some voices are dominating the feedback and other not being heard at all.



## Contribution

Emma Tricard

Emma Tricard wanted to try a feedback method that is less based on the perception/feedback of the individual. She looked for a format, which would inspire the collective creation of feedback. This method was based on 'chain reactions'. Each participant had to use an element or a word of the preceding feedback giver in her/his own feedback. The exercise impels each to position oneself in relation to somebody else's feedback. Since the succeeding person will also be altering your own statements, the method indeed leads to less of an individual, personal expression about the work. When a statement is appropriated and transformed by others, undoing its function as a personal expression, it can become more productive for the process or the work. Emma Tricard was not referring to an existing method but tried this out with question and wish of collective feedback.

## Additional considerations and reflections

- It allows the feedback giver to affirm, deny but also to transform or specify previous statements made by others.
- A de-personalised approach to feedback comes more to the foreground as opposed to the initial and often highly individual reactions to a work, that might be very dependent on the individuals character, personal taste or ego.



## Contribution

Frank Bock

Frank Bock sees feedback as a process of clarification. Achieving this clarification he is more interested nowadays in the body's experience. He referred to Eugene Gendlin and his concept of 'felt sense' and 'focusing on the body' to become aware of the experiences one has. He feels it is very valuable to combine creative processes with living processes – not to make a sharp division between the work of an artist and the life of an artist (relational). One of the instruments or methodologies is the Pause, to make space for the felt sense. He also questions language and the focus the content of language gets, whilst he also wants to propagate the act of speaking, the making of an utterance or hearing of one. Also this specific act of speaking and hearing is already an experience. He is interested in creating tools for listening and talking in which listeners get more recognition than they do now. According to Frank Bock conversation is happening to us, and it is the word conversation that he repeats and looks at from different angles.

## Additional considerations and reflections

- How can the use of pause and bodily experience play more of a role in giving feedback?
- To give value and space to the role of listening in giving/receiving feedback.

## References

Hans-Georg Gadamer, Eugene T. Gendlin, Martin Heidegger



## Contribution

Dejan Srhoj

Dejan Srhoj invited all participants to partner up, one person would perform a two-minute improvisation interacting with the space, while the other took note. After that, the second person would re-perform this performance based on her/his notes while the other became the on-looker. Dejan Srhoj called this exercise "mapping" in which you can feedback the other through the doing and embodiment of the performed repetition and memory of the score. It is inspired by a workshop with Andrew de L Harwood.

The second part to Dejan Srhoj's presentation consisted of a slide show of pictures he had taken around Berlin of abandoned Christmas trees on the street. In giving feedback to this work he suggested the "Impersonation game" from Everybody's Toolbox. He asked three people to impersonate him as authors of the work, he would then interview these three, asking questions around the creation of the photographs and finally opening it up to the rest of the group.

## Additional considerations and reflections

- It is interesting to consider the body as a vehicle to give feedback, as opposed to just working with language.

## References

Everybody's toolbox:  
[www.everybodystoolbox.net](http://www.everybodystoolbox.net)



## Day 3: Sunday 19th January Round Table

The final day of the lab consisted of a contribution from Britta Wirthmüller and a round-table discussion, which was organised to address topics that 'lingered' after the three days .



### Contribution

Britta Wirthmüller

Britta Wirthmüller proposed a game to give feedback on Alexandre Achour's performance, "This isn't gonna end well" (which the lab group had visited on the Saturday evening), using the format of a 'relay interview' originating from Jacob Wren. Britta came in contact with this through a workshop with Thomas Plischke, in which he used it as a method to support thinking and discussion processes as a group. To use it as a tool to give feedback on a performance was an experiment to see if it could serve that also.

Each participant prepares questions about the performance; one of the participants becomes the interviewer, while somebody else becomes the interviewee. The interviewer asks one of her/his questions. The interviewee attempts to answer this question (though she/he is allowed to pass), upon which the interviewee becomes the interviewer asking her/his questions to another participant, who, upon answering becomes the interviewer, etc.



This form of feedback disconnects the performance from its author: the interviewee answers questions about the performance she/he has not made her/himself. The artist can participate in the game, but is just one interviewer/interviewee among the others. Instead of direct feedback to the artist, feedback is given indirectly to the artist, through a game of changing roles and perspectives. This creates a specific dynamic: while interviewer/interviewee are answering the question, the listeners can think of their own answers. As such it might be a good tool for other listeners to formulate their own questions or ideas about the performance.

## Additional considerations and reflections

- A difficult format if the artist desires more specific feedback on her/his work.
- It is difficult to follow the line of thinking as the next person might pick up a very different topic; good tool to give space and let people think of their own answers without having to say them.
- It can be used as a tool to observe and learn how to discuss and in that sense also how to feedback.
- It is maybe not the best tool as a first step in feedback (could be combined with Nik Haffner's proposal)

## References

Thomas Plischke:  
[www.artistwin.de/](http://www.artistwin.de/)  
 Jacob Wren:  
[www.youtube.com/watch?v=WkoLQCJpgSo](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WkoLQCJpgSo)



## Round Table Discussion

### 1. Emotion in Feedback

Most methods seem to try to obtain or display a certain distance to the work, without denying that it is your own personal perspective/opinion. This raises the question of how to deal with the emotional part of feedback? There seems to be strong recognition that emotion plays an important part in feedback. However, at the same time, one should be careful in the articulation of this emotion since the receiver can often not do something substantial with this expression of emotion. Emotions often seem absolute and non-negotiable. Several strategies to deal with emotion, stemming from the different backgrounds of the participants, were proposed:

- Using the expression “something in me felt like ...” to produce an expression of emotion that is less absolute.
- Using the “yes, and...” strategy from design thinking (rather than “yes, but...”).
- Description of what one went through whilst seeing the material.
- Being aware of WHY-questions (focus on the workings of the work).

- Point out the subjective speaking positions, e.g. using Ich-Botschaften from conflict resolution (subjective perspectives or I-messages):

1. Description of behaviour
2. Description of the consequences of behaviour on “I”
3. Description of the feeling one has
4. Provide an appeal, expectation, proposal for change

All in all, it is important to build trust within the context of feedbacking.

### 2. Feedback through other media

The question came up if feedback was possible in and through other media, for example feedback that is not (only) oral or descriptive. A few references and examples came up:

- Creative response: in response to an art work you do / make something else (cf. a method of Goat Island).
- Drawing / mapping / visualizing strategies.
- Digesting process and shared digesting: a shared process combining the intellectual with the emotional, e.g. when artists produce responses in a workshop-setting.
- Deufert&Plischke's method of reformulation: working together, collective making, adding strategies, thinking together, working with somebody else's material.
- Work together with the audience, e.g. Adva Zakai's performance work Regarding Yesterday in which the audience was invited to find another title for the piece together once the piece was finished.

### 3. Which feedback, when, why, how, and with whom?

A central recurring question was about, what method is the best at what moment in the creation process. There is a need to differentiate different formats, constellations of groups and conditions. For example 'formative feedback' (during the process) and 'summative feedback' (at the end of a process) have a different dynamic and aim. It is important for the artist to realise what one needs at which state in the process, what is important for which practice, how many times do you need feedback, etc. Also, pause, taking a step back, can be fruitful. As it the question: "what else?"

#### Final remarks

- The danger of using feedback as a 'slogan', a trendy thing: it needs its place and time to work and have an effect.
- Building a feedback culture – it is not something you only learn and know about, but something you chose to do (live) as an individual and as a community.
- What could be the next steps in the development

of feedback?

- Could it be interesting to think feedback as part of the art-work itself (process is the work)?
- How could the audience/spectators be more included/involved in the feedback?
- How could an exchange of feedback (methods) between different disciplines and professions become easier and more accessible?



Siegmar Zacharias works in theory and practice in the field of performance. Her works consist of performances, lectures, installations, discursive formats and sharing, dealing with questions of participation and activation. Recent interests are the ecology of practice and indoor natural phenomena. The works are situated between philosophy and sensuality, labour and humour, do-it-yourself low tech and high tech. They have been presented nationally and internationally in theatres, festivals, galleries, green houses, clubs, the woods, and up in the sky. Amongst others at: Documenta 13, re:act feminism, performance platform – body affect, artefact festival, PSI: how performance thinks, European Center for the arts Hellerau, as well as the theaters that SXS Enterprise regularly collaborates.

Siegmar has been part of the collaboration project between architects and performance artists International Festival: The Theatre, and co-curated the first edition of The Blackmarket for Useful Knowledge and Non-Knowledge. She co-initiated WOW-WE WORK HERE, an initiative of Berlin based artists, a research and exchange platform that works on modes and formats of communicating research and artistic practice. Wow - we work here parasitizes festivals in Berlin.

Siegmar has had guest professorships at DasArts, Amsterdam, DOCH, Stockholm and MA SODA HZT Berlin. Together with Sophia New she is developing an MA-programme on performance practice and research for the Folkwang University of the Arts, Essen. She also teaches rhetoric and communication skills to managers and workers-representatives within corporations.

E-mail: [sm.zach@gmx.de](mailto:sm.zach@gmx.de)

Web: [www.sxsenterprise.com](http://www.sxsenterprise.com)

[www.siegmarzacharias.com](http://www.siegmarzacharias.com)

## Jörg Koslowsky

After acting on the stages of the Hamburger Thalia Theatre and Basel Schauspielhaus for 7 years, Jörg decided to enhance his view of the world, as well as his skills. Beginning studies in economics, he found the perfect combination of business and creative work at the D-School in Potsdam.

Being severely excited about the spirit and inspiration coming from Design Thinking, he was looking for a means to keep working this way and empower sustainable businesses coming from great teams. So after graduating from the advanced track in 2012 he co-founded the d.collective, a community based Design Thinking co-working space, and got involved in a multiple start-ups.

E-mail: [joergky@gmail.com](mailto:joergky@gmail.com)

Web: <https://www.facebook.com/d.collective.space>

## Short Biographies



## Eva Meyer-Keller

Eva Meyer-Keller is working at the interface of performing and visual arts and has presented her work in the context of festivals, museums and theatres internationally. Before she graduated from the School for New Dance Development (SNDO) in Amsterdam she studied photography and visual art in Berlin (HdK) and London (Central St. Martins and Kings College).

40 Eva Meyer-Keller's work is versatile: she shows her performances internationally, develops projects with other artists, performs for other choreographers and realizes video works. She has collaborated with Uta Eisenreich, Kate McIntosh and Sybille Müller. In addition to her own work she was involved in projects of Bakruppen, Jérôme Bel and Christine de Smedt / Les Ballets C de la B.

E-mail: [e@evamk.de](mailto:e@evamk.de)

Web: [www.evamk.de](http://www.evamk.de)

## Steve Purcell

Steve Purcell is currently Professor of International Cultural Development at St John's University in York (UK). His work over the past 25 years has focused on designing programs of work that interlace creative research and development leading to the production of work in the public domain. He was Dean of Arts and Humanities for 11 years and was previously Head of Theatre Performance at Manchester Metropolitan University (UK).

He is particularly interested in how ideas emerge, transform and are made manifest in a performance context i.e. the workings of the imagination. In compositional terms he continues to be interested in the relationships between intricacies, patterns of contrast and recapitulation – the artwork as puzzle or 'wit-spell'.

E-mail: [s.purcell947@btinternet.com](mailto:s.purcell947@btinternet.com)

[s.purcell@yorks.ac.uk](mailto:s.purcell@yorks.ac.uk)

## Charlotte Vandevyver

Charlotte Vandevyver is the artistic coordinator of Workspacebrussels, which is an organization that supports young artist through an intensive residency programme, co-productions and coaching of emerging creations and research projects.

E-mail: [charlotte@workspacebrussels.be](mailto:charlotte@workspacebrussels.be)

Web: [www.workspacebrussels.be](http://www.workspacebrussels.be)

## Nik Haffner

Nik Haffner is Artistic Director of HZT Berlin, head of the committee Postgraduales Forum and Graduate School of the UdK - University of the Arts Berlin.

After studying dance at the Hochschule für Musik und Darstellende Kunst Frankfurt and the Australian Ballet School in Melbourne, he joined Ballet Frankfurt and worked there with William Forsythe from 1994 until 2000. He was co-creator of the media-publication "Improvisation Technologies" and "Times Lapes" and has worked regularly at the ZKM, Centre for Art and Media Technology in Karlsruhe. A freelance dancer and choreographer since 2000, he is making works for theatre, film and exhibitions. He has been working internationally as guest teacher and since November 2008 has been guest professor at the HZT Berlin. In November 2012 he has been appointed Artistic Director of the HZT Berlin.

E-mail: [n.haffner@hzt-berlin.de](mailto:n.haffner@hzt-berlin.de)

Web: [www.hzt-berlin.de](http://www.hzt-berlin.de)

<http://gs.udk-berlin.de>

## Emma Tricard

Emma Tricard born in 1990, studied contemporary dance and theatre in Bordeaux. She followed her education in Lyon where she graduated from the National Center of Choreography, directed by Maguy Marin. There she worked with several artists focusing on dance, drama and theory. She has been collaborating and working for others coming from different fields of art and developed her own work, which extends from personal video works and performances to collective creations. Since 2012 Emma is studying at the HZT in Berlin, developing her own practice, in which she questions the notion of perception and presence on stage, along with a reflection on the function of «space» today.

E-mail: [e.tricard@hzt-berlin.de](mailto:e.tricard@hzt-berlin.de)

## Frank Bock

Frank Bock was a founding member of The Featherstonehaughs in 1987, and co-artistic director of Bock and Vincenzi (1995-2007) a project-based company which created six productions. He was Education Officer with the Cholmondeleys (2003-2008), then Creative Associate from 2008-2011, producing creative projects and developing workshops on self-leadership. For many years he has been giving artist feedback for Talkback (The Place) and Draftworks (ROH) as well as independently.

Since 2006 Frank has been an Existential Psychotherapist (UKCP, BACP), working in private practice, at MIND, and as a clinical supervisor.

With Martin Hargreaves, the editor of Dance Theatre Journal, Frank has been exploring dialogue as a site for creative practice.

E-mail: frank@independentdance.co.uk

Web: www.frankbock.net

www.independentdance.co.uk

## Dejan Srhoj

Dejan Srhoj finished ballet school in Ljubljana and continued his studies at Heinz Bosl Stiftung – Ballet Academy in Munich. In 1998 he became a soloist at the Slovenian National Ballet and has danced principal roles. In the year 2000 he has co-created the dance theatre group Fico Balet and becoming a freelance artist. Since then Dejan has been performing and choreographing within the group and collaborated with others. As a performer he has toured all around the globe. Currently Dejan is mostly teaching and interested in practicing the idea of the Ignorant Schoolmaster. He is also invested in different kinds of mappings and discovering the possibility of everyday movement as a ready-made.

Dejan is co founder of the Nomad Dance Academy – NDA regional project that organizes educational, research and production activities in the context of performing arts in the Balkans. Within NDA Slovenia Dejan is curating the festival Pleskavica and also at Dance Theatre Ljubljana he curates the festival Ukrep. In 2008 Dejan finished the Open University, London course BA in Humanities.

E-mail: dejan\_srhoj@yahoo.com

Web: www.nomaddanceacademy.org

## Britta Wirthmüller

Britta Wirthmüller completed her diploma in Dance at the Palucca Schule Dresden, from 2006 - 2008 she studied at the University of Hamburg gaining her MA in "Performance Studies". In 2009 she received the Dance Research NRW scholarship for her research project Bodies on the borders of reality. She works as a performer, dancer and choreographer in different cooperations a.o. with Lilo Nein, deufert&plischke and Petra Zanki. Since 2007 the stage performances "Rekonstruktionsmaschine" (2007, in cooperation with Lilo Nein) and "Kissing Elisabeth" (2008) were created. Together with Petra Zanki she developed the performative guided city tour "The Silent Walk" (2010) and the cycle "Antibodies" with the pieces "Holding on to..." (2009), "Vierfüßer" (2010) and "Paces" (2011). 2009 she was a guest teacher at the Institute for Theatre Studies at the University of Leipzig. Since autumn 2011 she is artistic research associate at the BA program "Dance, Context, Choreography" at HZT Berlin.

E-mail: b.wirthmuller@hzt-berlin.de

Website: www.hzt-berlin.de

## Frederik Le Roy

Frederik Le Roy holds degrees in Philosophy (Catholic University of Leuven, 2003) and Performance Studies and Film (Ghent University, 2005) and was visiting research student at the Department of Theatre, Dance, and Performance Studies at UC Berkeley in 2006. In 2012 he obtained his doctoral degree at Ghent University with a dissertation entitled "„Verknoopte tijd, verfrommelde geschiedenis“ („Entangled Time, Crumpled History“). Inspired by the philosophy of history of Walter Benjamin, this research dealt with the politics of memory of performative strategies (re-enactment, historical montage, testimony) in historic and contemporary (cultural) performance. He publishes on these themes.

He is co-editor of a special issue of the journal Arcadia entitled Performing Cultural Trauma in Theatre and Film (Winter 2010), a book on Jan Lauwers' theatre work with Needcompany (Academia Press and IT&FB, 2007, with C. Stalpaert and S. Bousset) and of Tickle Your Catastrophe: Imagining Catastrophe in Art, Architecture and Philosophy (Academia Press, 2011). Besides his academic research, he was a theory coach at the dance school P.A.R.T.S. (Brussels, since 2012) and a freelance editor.

Frederik Le Roy is currently a doctoral-assistant at Studies in Performing Arts and Media at Ghent University and coordinator of the Master of Drama at KASK, School of the Arts in Ghent.

E-mail: Frederik.Leroy@UGent.be

# Inge Koks

Inge Koks finished her studies in cultural anthropology and switched to working in the field of arts in 1998, with a specific interest in dance and performance. Within this realm she has worked in different roles and capacities. As a project co-ordinator - with contemporary dance festival Springdance, dance re-enactment festival cover#2, the artist initiated workshop series We Live Here: An Academy (edition 2011) and for GHOST, a project by Berlin based choreographers Hyoung-Min Kim and Tommi Zeuggin. As an artist manager - with (Amsterdam based) dance and performance artists Ivana Müller, Nicole Beutler, Paz Rojo, David Weber-Krebs, André Gingras and tgSPACE. As a curator - with TANZTAGE BERLIN, (editions 2006 & 2007), more recently Theater Frascati in Amsterdam (2010 – 2012) and Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam (2012, 2013). She also curated the 2012 edition of TANZNACHT BERLIN, a 5 day festival in which the Berlin dance scene was being mapped out by it's interrelated and urban dimensions. At the moment Inge is collaborating with the Amsterdam based theatre Podium Mozaïek and with Uferstudios Berlin in the European dance network Life Long Burning.

An important element in Inge's work in the art field is the anthropological perspective, being interested in both the structuring forces in the art world as a whole and more specifically in themes like exchange, solidarity, public-ness and multiculturalism. It finds its translation in an ongoing involvement in projects in community building for which she founded her own organisation Stichting Publieke Werken. The first project 100% Amsterdam is a collaboration with artist label Rimini Protokoll (D), Stadsschouwburg Amsterdam and European Cultural Foundation and will take place in December 2014.

E-mail: [ingekoks@hotmail.com](mailto:ingekoks@hotmail.com)





## Credits

### Participants

Frank Bock  
Nik Haffner  
Jörg Koslowsky  
Eva Meyer-Keller  
Steve Purcell  
Dejan Srhoj  
Emma Tricard  
Charlotte Vandevyver  
Britta Wirthmüller  
Siegmar Zacharias

### Observers

Inge Koks  
Frederik Le Roy

### Text

Sheena McGrandles  
Nik Haffner  
Inge Koks  
Frederik Le Roy

### Photos, Layout and Editing

Sheena McGrandles





