OBJECT.MIRROR.TEMPO

Marie Lykkemark

ABSTRACT

This article is an exploration using practice-based research in which I investigated a question: *How can I, as a dance practitioner and facilitator, collaborate with a differently abled person on compositional work?*

I explored how to be open to various ways of communicating and collaborating, not only as verbally, but also by letting disabled bodies and minds' expertise communicate in their own ways to allow for questioning and challenging normative perspectives.

This research was conducted in Denmark at the participants' group residence. The institutional context was logistically convenient and served as familiar surroundings for the participants. It also was a foundation on which to explore dance research within other institutional spaces. I collaborated with three participants with disabilities in one-on-one sessions, creating a shared physical practice. Together with each participant, I was curious about finding our common interests within the field of dance, and how we could explore them with our individualised bodily expertise. It later became:

The Object practice

The Mirror practice

The Tempo practice

By proposing a quadruple loop structure as the methodological framework, I discuss the findings while taking a hermeneutic phenomenological approach. The empirical data were collected through video documentation of the sessions, observations and interviews. The four central topics of this shared experience entailed an examination and discussion of how to comprehend education, uncovering the validity of bodily feedback, exploring Crip time as a tool to question a normative understanding of time, and acknowledging the importance of showing. To get the full experience while reading this article, the reader is asked to ensure Internet access is available so that they can shift back and forth between the text and video excerpts.

ABSTRACT

Denne artikel er en undersøgelse baseret på en practice-based research, hvor jeg spurgte: *Hvordan kan jeg, som danser og danseformidler, samarbejde med en person med et handicap omkring koreografisk arbejde?* Jeg undersøgte hvordan man kan være tilgængelig overfor forskellige måder at kommunikere og samarbejde på, ikke kun som en verbal udveksling, men at lade ekspertisen fra andre-evnede kroppe og sind åbne op for at stille spørgsmål og udfordre normative perspektiver.

Denne undersøgelse blev lavet i Danmark på et bosted, hvor deltagerne boede. Den institionelle ramme var både logistisk praktisk, men fungerede også som et trygt sted for deltagerne at være i. Derudover var det en mulighed for at undersøge danseresearch i en anden institutionel rammesætning. Jeg samarbejdede med tre deltagere med forskellige handicaps i en en-til-en situation, hvor vi sammen skabte en fælles fysisk praksis. Jeg var nysgerrig på at finde vores fælles interesse, sammen med hver deltager, inden for dansefeltet og hvordan vi kunne udforske dette emne med vores forskellige kropslige ekspertise. Det blev senere til,

The Object practice

The Mirror practice

The Tempo practice

Som metodisk rammesætning bygger jeg artiklen op gennem en spiral struktur med fire *loops*. Jeg vil diskutere de forskellige temaere på baggrund af en hermeneutisk fænomenologisk tilgang. Det empiriske data blev indsamlet via video dokumentation, observationer og interviews. De fire centrale emner fra dette projekt er en uddybelse og diskussion af: hvordan man kan forstå *uddannelse,* gøre opmærksom på vigtigheden af *kropslig feedback,* undersøge *Crip Time* som et værktøj til at udfordre den normative forståelse af tid, og anerkende det vigtige i at *præsentere for hinanden.*

For at få den fulde oplevelse af denne artikel vil læseren blive bedt om at have adgang til internettet for at kunne veksle mellem teksten og video eksempler.

OBJECT.MIRROR.TEMPO

Marie Lykkemark

OBJECT.MIRROR.TEMPO

Throughout my dance education and professional life, I have been confronted with highly able-bodied approaches and environments. I was introduced to an *ideal* type of body, a body celebrated as the perfect dancing body. I remember trying to fit i nto t hat category and found that for me, it was not possible to fulfil c ompletely. W e a ll h ave d ifferent b odies, and that is a quality in itself. As a dance practitioner and facilitator, I am interested in how we can share knowledge and learn from other peoples' experiences, movements and bodies. To collaborate with other bodies, I have been interested in working with dance as an art form outside of dance institutions and highly able-bodied dancing environments. I believe that by exposing myself to different learning situations, and collaborating with different bodies, we can produce new knowledge and enhance body sensitivity.

In this article, I share the experiences I had working individually with Thomas, Sara and Nanna.[1] They live at a group residence in Fuglebakken, Denmark, and they all have different mental and physical capacities. I worked with each of them in three one-on-one sessions over two weeks in March 2018.

I wanted to research my function as a dance facilitator and our collaborations through lived experiences. Therefore, my research question is

How can I, as a dance practitioner and facilitator, collaborate with a differently abled person on compositional work?

Research Approach

The core of this research lies within the meetings and collaborations between the study participants, with different mental or physical abilities, and I. Before detailing how I approached this collaboration, I wish to clarify two overall considerations in using the term *differently abled* and the institutional context within which this research works.

I deliberately chose to use *different* to describe people with different needs, instead of the more commonly used term *disabled.* In *Disability and Contemporary Performance—Bodies on Edge*, Petra Kuppers states that labelling someone *disabled* undermines any ability to answer back, thereby depriving that person of agency (2003, p. 5). I believe that using *disabled* underestimates people's skills and abilities, conveying a connotation that they have no abilities at all. Using *different* implies that the person deviates from the norm but preserves that person's agency.

The participants live at a group residence that assists them with everyday activities. The institutionalisation of those with different needs aids these individuals with everyday tasks, while different staff members offer personalised care. Kuppers works in a mental-health setting and noted a certain connection between the physical and the representational among residents. She argues that in Western culture, specifically in Britain, people with mental-health problems are excluded from self-representation, as the clinical categories define their conditions for them. Her observations about restricted personal space led her to this conclusion: 'This lack of physical and mental privacy had undermined many

people's ability to be confident in their use of space' (2003, p. 125). My short visit within the institutional context did not allow me to observe any links between the physical and the representational. Furthermore, the foundation of this research was not tied to participants' history or diagnoses, but rather on our momentary meetings and collaborations. However, it is a relevant observation worth being aware of when working in an institutional setting.

I am interested in the relationship between each participant and myself, and how I, as a dance practitioner and facilitator, can guide the working space and introduce a creative process to be developed throughout the collaborations. My research approach is based on Robin Nelson's principle of *practice as research* (PaR), in which practice is central, and this article is a medium for sharing practical knowledge. The practical work is submitted as significant evidence of the research (2013).

Among several ethical considerations that I had before beginning this practical research, one was very important to me: I did not want to investigate 'the other'. It was not my interest to dissect and evaluate the differently abled body, but rather to understand the learning experiences generated between us. I wanted to research my function as the dance facilitator, as well as our collaboration through lived experiences.

This research will be explored through a hermeneutic phenomenological approach, using a human science that studies personal experience. In *Researching Lived Experience*, Max Van Manen defines *phenomenology* as the descriptive study of lived experience that, in this case, is the collaborations between myself and the participants, and my role as the facilitator. *Phenomenology* is understood as an approach to enrich and uncover the meaning of lived experience. I complemented phenomenology with a *hermeneutic* approach, which is the interpretive study of the expressions and objectifications of lived experience (1990, p. 38), i.e., a spiralling working method that attempts to determine the meaning embodied within experience by shifting reflectively between lived experiences and theory. According to Van Manen, a real understanding of phenomenology can be achieved only through 'actively doing it' (1990, pp. 6–8). It is relevant to acknowledge my own presence as a facilitator actively taking part in these experiences. I am not interested in bracketing myself out of this context because my presence, as well as that of the people with whom I shared space, took part in creating this particular lived experience.

Nelson defines this process in *Practice as Research in the Arts* (2013) as a *praxis*, in which theory is embedded within practice in a form of *doing-reflecting-reading-articulating-doing* (2013, p. 32). In other words, *praxis* is an intertwining working method of theory and practice that seeks to gain a better understanding of my own role as a dance facilitator, as well as of the interactions that unfolded between the participants and myself. Incorporating notions from Crip theory is necessary for this paper to explore some aspects of resisting the norm and how to challenge facilitative and artistic practices. Certainly, the use of Crip theory[2] by Robert McRuer is not a way to justify the practice, as Nelson warns, but rather provides support within the process of *doing-reflecting-reading-articulating-doing*.

The theorists with whom I chose to work are all notable Western scholars[3]. In one way, this resembles the Western (Danish) context on which this article is built, in which cultural understandings fundamentally resemble those of scholars whom I examined. Therefore, the paper embraces a perspective from a very specific part of the world. Due to the criteria of this research, I restricted theoretical input, and I am aware of the consequences of taking a very specific Western approach.

Using a hermeneutic phenomenological approach, I strived to communicate shared experiences throughout the sessions with Thomas, Sara and

Nanna. I utilised a quadruple loop structure as the methodological framework for this paper's organisation. Each of the four loops represents an important topic that arose during the collaborative process by analysing the empirical data, guided by the research question. The findings, through the loop structure, were not a linear path, but rather a circular investigation that encouraged new topics to reach the surface.

Research Methods in Practice

For this phenomenological research, the empirical data were collected through observations, video analysis and interviews. I had three sessions of thirty to sixty minutes each with each participant[4], and on the third day, we shared our practice, as we found appropriate, with the other residents and staff.

Observation is a subject tied to the bias of the researcher's perceptions, interpretations and analysis. During the practical period, my research role was *full immersion* (Vanderstoep & Johnston, 2009, p. 238–240), which was a rather natural consequence of holding one-on-one meetings within a space, constantly facilitating and partaking in activities together. Being fully immersed within these situations allowed me to engage with and connect with participants. However, one risk of being fully immersed is that it prevents awareness of other processes occurring simultaneously. For that reason, I chose to film every session to facilitate analysis of interactions from another perspective.

To get the full experience of reading this article, the reader is asked to shift between the text and the video excerpts referred to in various chapters to get an inside impression of specific moments. These can be found at *https://vimeo.com/303725536*.

The required password is 'object'.

Crip

As mentioned earlier, I integrated Crip theory quite early in the process as part of the process of *doing-reflecting-reading-articulating-doing*. In this process, I found a specific theory by Robert McRuer, *compulsory able-bodiedness,* which describes a system that produces disability in some way (2006, p. 2). *Compulsory,* as I understand it in this context, is the notion of being obligated to fit into most acknowledged bodies. Focusing on able bodies potentially could elicit the effect of stigmatising difference, as bodies relate and correspond to each other. Creating a norm for the body, or as McRuer calls it, *compulsory able-bodiedness*, will produce 'other' bodies.

Crip arose as an empowering term, reclaiming the right to be different, similar to the term *queer,* which the majority has used to repress and stigmatise people who deviated from heterosexuality. As a stigmatised group, an efficient method to respond to stigmatising behaviour is to reclaim stigmatising words. *Reclaiming* is the practice of re-evaluating a word and using it actively as a self-reference. Crip theory could function like the term *queer* itself:

> *'(…) Oppositionally and relationally, but not necessarily substantively, not as a positivity, but as a positionality, not as a thing, but as a resistance to the norm'*
>
> *(Halperin, cited in McRuer, 2006, p. 31)*

McRuer further challenges the notion of a normative body, claiming that everyone is virtually disabled—first, by pointing out the impossibility of fulfilling able-bodied norms, and second, by considering the abled body as having an ephemeral status, i.e., everybody who lives long enough will experience being disabled (2006, p. 30). So, if we all are disabled, why are we focusing mostly on the abled-bodied? Several questions arising from the concept of *Crip* guided me in my work: How can we learn from *Crip?* How can we challenge the compulsion to avoid differences and consciously choose Crip as an applied method to function in the world?

Overview

It takes two to tango

The first loop of the spiral focuses on shared learning experiences and what education means in this context.

Bodily feedback

In the second loop of the spiral, the exposure and validity of bodily communication are presented.

Crip time

In the third loop of the spiral, the understanding of time is analysed and discussed, and further developed as a tool to question the normative understanding of time.

The art of showing

In the fourth loop of the spiral, the importance of showing is examined.

One-on-one

Before diving into specific moments from the practical period, I quickly want to introduce the three participants and the shared practices that we developed by exploring common interests.

Object.

Thomas and I developed this practice by exploring compositional work with objects and with our bodies.

Mirror.

Sara and I found our common interest in mirroring each other's movements, playing with giving and receiving roles, and developing various scores[5] to investigate movement.

Tempo.

Space, rhythm and relations became the keywords for the work between Nanna and I. We explored how to compose pathways in the space by creating a relational score.

It takes two to tango

> *'Just as it takes two to tango, it takes (at least) two for education to happen'.*
>
> *(Biesta, 2004)*

In developing these practices, I see myself alternating among the roles of facilitator, researcher and dance practitioner, which at times overlap each other's functions. Producing knowledge by developing a practice together made it clear that I needed to investigate the essence of education. Gert Biesta argues that education entails interaction between the (activities of the) educator and the (activities of the) one being educated. Just as in the art of dancing the tango, both dancers need to be sensitive to each other—to listen, propose and act. In the traditional tango, the man leads, and the woman follows, with the art lying in both being responsive and alert to the dance and each other. I do not necessarily applaud the hetero-normative structure, and if we look beyond the gender roles and follow Biesta's metaphor of dance as education, it illustrates a constant, mutual give-and-take. The exciting part for me lies within the negotiation. Along this line of thought, Biesta emphasises *interaction* as the essence of education, pointing out that the word *interaction* itself conveys mutual participatory activity (2004, p. 13). The location of learning lies *in between* the individuals, in the gap, which only exists in social practice. The gap is an essential condition for communication—and, thus, necessary for education to occur.

Interaction with the *object practice*[6], which Thomas and I developed, becomes a metaphor for the gap. Biesta claims that no relation exists in education without the separation that the gap creates. Neither partner can control the gap, although it is exactly where learning is situated (2004, p. 21). I argue that both parts contain a certain potential to influence the gap. An example of this can be found in the facilitative role that I took in shaping the space between Thomas and I.[7] The online video provides an excerpt from the first session. I want to point out a specific moment when I, as the facilitator, non-verbally introduced

an element from a previous exercise: shaping the other. I did not plan for this to be part of *the object practice,* but I sensed a certain responsiveness, focus and curiosity from Thomas that made me explore this idea. My pause just before touching his arm indicates an evaluation of the situation and a decision-making process. I then touched his arm and began to shape it. It seems like he physically remembers the exercise, and due to the rigidness in his arm, the shape I proposed is being held. I understand this as an active influence of the gap between us. By non-verbally suggesting changes to the agreements for the practice, I influenced, but did not control, the gap.

As the facilitator, I took a certain risk in not knowing how he would respond to the change. The risk is clear; the gap is, in a very fundamental and practical sense, unpredictable (Biesta, 2004, p. 22). Thomas is also taking a risk, being in this unknown situation with an unfamiliar person, and in this moment, he is faced with the uncertainty of having understood/misunderstood the score. With a staccato movement, he brings his hand close to his head. In the moment after introducing a new element, thereby breaking the rules, an exciting tension is created, and the interplay between us is negotiable. I interpret Thomas' staccato movement as uncertainty as to whether this action is part of the game because the original task did not cover any bodily compositional instructions. Certainly, I cannot know whether this was how he felt, but in watching the video, his reaction is visibly slower than it was previously throughout the task. He then chooses to introduce the task of composing one's own body, thereby expanding the rules by placing his hand near his head. In this moment, we have both influenced the gap. However, it was a momentary situation and not a continuous act of equality, since I, as the facilitator, had the professional oversight and responsibility for each session. Therefore, the gap between the participant and I needs to be acknowledged, but this is not necessarily a negative aspect if we wish to believe that we can learn from our differences.

I argue that we, at times, did create a space in which neither had total control, but both had total responsibility to interact with each other. We both had the possibility and responsibility to develop the gap and, therefore, the learning. The inputs that we offered could be conscious choices by actively introducing another element as *shaping the body,* daring to take a risk by changing the content and thereby influencing the gap. As a facilitator, this requires curiosity in the risk-taking process, which, without a doubt, at times will move the learning focus in different directions. Thus, one should be ready for this to occur.

Bodily Feedback

At the end of my first session with Sara, I proposed an interview set-up, and I chose to develop and adapt the interview in relation to the person I was with, and how our relation had been established. The mirroring exercise originally was intended to 'tune in' on each other, rather than become the topic that later would lead to the *mirror practice*[8]. During the interview, I asked Sara what we had been doing, and she responded in a short phrase with a lowered voice, 'It was some funny exercises'. She seemed shy and hesitant, and as the interviewer, I realised that perhaps this was not the optimal set-up for her. Kafer quotes Margaret Price about her notion of Crip time: '(…) It might also mean recognising that people are processing language at various rates and adjusting the pace of a conversation' (2013, p. 27). Perhaps, it is not only a question of pace, but also the communication format that is needed for an exchange to happen.

I then shared my experience of the session and expressed how I enjoyed a specific action when we mirrored each other. I used my hands to illustrate the specific situation, and Sara responded by lifting her hands to mirror my movements. I was surprised by her engagement, as she even let her beloved teddy bear drop into her lap, which indicated that the communication between our bodies superseded the

words. As shown in the video excerpt[9], one can see the bodies' postures mirror each other. A big change within postures and body language is visible, a phenomenon that I would call *bodily feedback*, in which responds to the other person. By straightening and curving our backs, it shows the effect of mirroring each other, with both making an effort to copy the other. Both are negotiating and adapting bodily expressions to correspond within the communication.

Another description about this immediate feedback could be found in the *sensibility* concept of Merleau-Ponty:

> *'(…) The sensible appearance of the sensible, the silent persuasion of the sensible in Being's unique way of manifesting itself without becoming positivity, without ceasing to be ambiguous and transcendent… The sensible is that: this possibility to be evident in silence, to be understood implicitly'.*
>
> *(cited in Van Manen, 1990, p. 36)*

This non-verbal situation arose when the words were missing. It was a moment when it took us both back to our common experience, an immediate bodily feedback, which was understood implicitly. Both bodies were open to the sensitive work of communication. Highlighting this moment during the interview shows the relevance of integrating non-verbal communication forms. I would argue that this interaction was a mutual learning situation in which sensitive bodies were in focus. The already-shared physical and creative experiences during the session created a foundation for sensitive and non-verbal communication.

The ability to articulate verbally one's experience or sensations is acknowledged explicitly and appreciated by society, perhaps because of its more accessible character. One could argue that a system of compulsory verbalisation exists—a way to rank words higher than other communication forms, such as movement (gestures, expressions, physicality), very much like the *system of compulsory able-bodiedness*. Crip theory challenges that system and provides space and opportunities in which other bodies can exert influence (McRuer, 2006, p. 32). Likewise, I insist that the non-verbal would be considered a channel of expression and as a valid platform for

educational exchange. The interview setting, based on words, became *cripped* as we transformed it into a non-verbal interview setting. In other words, the *system of compulsory verbalisation* produced a *cripped* approach—a perhaps unconscious resistance to the normative interview's restrictions.

Crip Time

Time: How do we perceive it? When do we get the urge to continue or pause? The perception of time can change according to situations, locations, social interactions, the place we are in our lives and the emotional states in which we find ourselves. In the sessions with Nanna, the notion of time became a very important part of the practice that we developed. Nanna's movements are spastic, and we developed a mirroring score with a focus on tempo, rather than details. It became the *tempo practice,* which comprised a basic principle that resembled the tango—one guiding the movements, and the other following. We were not in physical contact, instead moving separately from each other, and the task was to sense the proposed tempo. We created three tasks. First, she guided, and I followed, then I guided, and she followed, then finally, we each moved as we wanted, though still having an awareness of each other's bodies in the space. An important part of the practice was to rely constantly on the partner and remain alert to act upon the other's guidance.

I often found myself challenged by our different understandings of time, in which I often wanted to proceed more quickly than Nanna did. Alison Kafer explains the concept of Crip time as the following:

> *'Crip time is flex time, not just expanded, but exploded; it requires reimagining our notions of what can and should happen in time, or recognising how expectations of 'how long things take' are based on very particular minds and bodies (…) Rather than bend disabled bodies and minds to meet the clock, crip time bends the clock to meet disabled bodies and minds'.*
>
> *(2013, p. 27)*

I found myself confronted with my own idea of time, in Kafer's words, perhaps even a normalising expectation of time. Crip time is to be understood as a flexible time—not just *extra* time, but somehow a time that can expand the notion of the norm. Being dependent on Nanna to move before I could move myself elicited visible unease with the situation. In the video excerpt[10], I clearly pause, and I remember feeling uncomfortable during the pause—which my insecure smile reveals—although it might not appear to be a long pause in the video. Furthermore, I verbalise the tension created from this 'long' pause as a way to release my feelings and control the situation. By interrupting the tension, we, or rather I, lost the chance to discover what Crip time could be, i.e., how Crip time could be a method to bend the clock, and how thinking/doing in Crip time could open up new perspectives. Another example of bending the clock can be found in historical accounts on Paris during the 1840s, when it was briefly fashionable for *flaneurs* to take turtles for walks. They wanted the turtles to set the pace for moving in urban spaces to subvert the city's rhythms using the turtles' presence (Kuppers, 2003, pp. 1–2). By submitting to another time regime, one continuously challenges one's perceptions. In some sense, Nanna represents the turtles that subverted the rhythms of Paris—in this case, my body's normative perceptions of time.

Kafer's use of the concept of *compulsory able-bodiedness/compulsory able-mindedness* has a specific normative understanding of the body, and she translates it into a specific mindset that promotes a certain perception of time (2013, p. 27). Furthermore, one similarly could use the argument that *compulsory able-mindedness* produces Crip time, and moreover, perhaps even deride Crip time as not being capable

of reaching 'the standard'. What if we begin striving to learn from Crip time and understand its potential, instead of pushing it into the frame of a normative understanding of time? What would happen if we consciously submitted to another time regime?

During the sessions with Nanna, another time element was introduced. She developed our tempo practice from a non-verbal to a verbal practice. She actively would partake in the tempo practice, and both while moving and pausing, questions or statements would appear.[11] Her time shifting again challenged me, as I assumed this practice would be non-verbal and be in what I perceive as the 'present' time. Van Manen defines *lived time* as being one of the four existentials, which he believes are fundamental life worlds for human beings: *lived space* (spatiality), *lived body* (corporeality), *lived time* (temporality) and *lived human relations* (relationality or communality) (1990, pp. 101–106). Lived time is understood as subjective time, as opposed to clock time or objective time. Lived time is changeable due to the environment in which we find ourselves: Time speeds up when we enjoy ourselves and slows down when we are bored. My understanding of *present time* might differ from Nanna's understanding, since she introduced thoughts about future events. Introducing this element made me realise that it was her way of transforming the practice, and I had no reason to resist it. Unfortunately, I did not manage to explore it myself during the sessions. I responded to her questions, but never posed one myself. Given more time, this would have been wonderful to explore more consciously.

Learning from this situation, I would like to develop the idea of time and apply Crip time in a continuous artistic practice*, i.e., bending the clock to meet disabled bodies and minds*, as Kafer puts it. In this case, I want to think of it as a method not only *to meet,* but also to learn from and exchange with differently abled bodies and minds. Perhaps Nanna did not articulate this in words, but her body language, her

choice of actions and her immediate shared thoughts conveyed an urge to transmit her knowledge and expertise on Crip time.

The Art of Showing

From the beginning of this research, 'the process' was very essential. I was not interested in producing a performance for two reasons: the limited time we would spend together and the potential for unnecessary pressure that it might elicit. However, I did introduce informal sharing, in which we would agree on a format through which to share our process with the rest of the residents and staff. When talking about process-driven and goal-oriented research processes, Robin Nelson refers to Smith and Dean,[12] stating that 'the two ways of working are by no means entirely separate from each other and often interact' (Nelson, 2013, p. 45). I went into the sessions with a strong opinion about how the 'process' should be at the centre of the work and very much separate from the showing, but as the sessions evolved, I realised the impact that showing had on the participants, residents, staff and myself.

The institutional context provided a specific framework for the sessions. After entering this well-established community, it was clear that the effect that I had on the participants—who were able to work individually with *somebody* who was not a staff member—was quite evident. They were able to interact with somebody with a different approach and motivation than the pedagogues, physiotherapists and ergotherapists[13] with whom the residents are familiar. The interest in the work that I had done in collaborating with residents impacted people. In my field journal, I described an encounter right after showing residents the video of Sara and I[14] as follows:

> *'After the showing, several people came up to me and also wanted to partake. One commented that he didn't think that this was dance. Another came to me and explained why he thought it was good. By only showing parts of the body, it challenged him to understand and interpret the song and the movements together. I was happy that he got that involved with the video and that he did a lot of thought about what dance is and what it does to him when he watches it'.*

I was moved by the impact that the showing had on this person, and I realised that I neglected the importance of showing. I only can speculate, but perhaps this person was more affected by the showing because he knew one of the dancers. The first persons' feedback is very relevant and shows that, as a member of the audience, he evaluated whether it was dance or not, and one could tell that he was both provoked when I called it *dance* and was open to share and discuss his opinions. Introducing art and creative practice in institutions is not a new and innovative concept, but this feedback underlines the impact of having an artist disrupt everyday routines.

That brings me back to my initial motivation: to develop dance in environments other than within dance education or in highly able-bodied dancing environments. My exploration in developing a practice with people outside the field of dance created three new practices: object practice, mirror practice and tempo practice. All developed practices were formed by the exchange of our individualized bodily expertise and required letting learning appear within the gap.

Notes

1 All participants' names and the institution have been anonymised to respect participants' privacy

2 Further description of Crip theory and how I wish to apply the theory will be examined later in the text.

3 Van Manen (Dutch), Biesta (Dutch), Merleau-Ponty (French), McRuer (American), Kuppers (German) and Kafer (American).

4 The pedagogues selected the three participants randomly from a group who were all interested in the collaboration.

5 Commonly used terminology within the field of contemporary dance to describe a set of rules that frames an improvisational exploration. One could say that *a score* is a method of limiting the endless possibilities of movement, then shaping it into something more concrete.

6 See page 56

7 Please watch 'It takes two to tango': *https://vimeo.com/303725536*

8 See page 56

9 Please watch 'Bodily feedback': *https://vimeo.com/303725536*

10 Please watch 'Crip time': *https://vimeo.com/303725536*

11 Please watch the second clip on 'Crip time': *https://vimeo.com/303725536*

12 The authors of 'Practice-led Research, Research-led Practice in the creative arts' (2009)

13 The Danish term *Ergoterapeut* describes a person who works with a nuanced approach toward rehabilitation and introduces necessary assistance equipment, then uses them to enhance the functionality of everyday life.

14 Please watch 'The art of showing': *https://vimeo.com/303725536*

References

Biesta, Gert. ' «Mind the gap!» Communication and the educational relation.' In *No Education Without Relation*, edited by C. Bingham & A. Sidorkin, 1–22. Peter Lang Publishing, 2004.

Kafer, Alison. *Feminist Queer Crip.* Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2013.

Kuppers, Petra. *Disability and Contemporary Performance—Bodies on Edge.* New York and London: Routledge (pp. 1–31), 2003.

McRuer, Robert. *Crip Theory—Cultural Signs of Queerness and Disability.* New York and London: New York University Press, 2006.

Nelson, Robin. *Practice as Research in the Arts—Principles, Protocols, Pedagogies, Resistances.* New York and London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Vanderstoep, Scott W., and Deirdre D. Johnston. *Research Methods for Everyday Life, Blending Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass (pp. 222–240), 2009.

Van Manen, Max. *Researching Lived Experience: Human Science for an Action-Sensitive Pedagogy.* New York: State University of New York Press, 1990.

BIOGRAPHY

Marie Lykkemark is a dance artist, facilitator and researcher based in Copenhagen, Denmark. She has been working as a freelance dance artist in Germany, mostly in Munich and Berlin, since earning her bachelor's degree in 2013. She continued her educational path with a two-year post-graduate programme, *Dance Partnership,* at the Danish National School of Performing Arts in Copenhagen, which she completed during the summer of 2018. She has performed works by Marina Abramovic, Reckless Sleepers, Caroline Finn, Stefan Dreher and Ellen Kilsgaard.

marielykkemark90@gmail.com