

A Kinesthetic Mode of Attention in Contemporary Dance Practice

Shantel Ehrenberg

The centrality of kinesthesia in contemporary dance discourse is evident in literature about contemporary dance practice, its lineage, and aesthetic (e.g., Albright 2011; Claid 2006; Copeland 1993; Dempster 2010; Foster 2010; Reynolds 2007; Sheets-Johnstone 1966; Sklar 2007; Warburton 2011).¹ Existing literature regarding kinesthesia charts an interdisciplinary territory, particularly because kinesthesia is related to both a physical experience—a private and personal feeling of one’s own body—and to a socially constructed concept used within and beyond dance studies, including in cognitive science, philosophy, sociology, and feminist theory (Foster 2011). A growing number of dance studies scholars (e.g., Parvianin 2002; Potter 2008; Ravn 2009; Rouhiainen 2003) describe the type of kinesthesia utilized in contemporary dance practice. This shift can be attributed, in large part, to what Mark Franko (2011) identifies as a resurgence of phenomenology, after the dominance of Michel Foucault’s concept of post-humanism in the late 1960s, and a moment in dance studies “in which the kinesthetic-visual pact of phenomenological description is under considerable pressure from new concepts of the subject, new theories of cognition, and new technologies in the performance field that alter the terms of the observer’s perception of movement” (1).²

Yet, the nuances of kinesthetic awareness that are valued in contemporary dance practice, from the dancer’s perspective, can still be further addressed to represent the breadth of this way of attending in dance, though the above cited literature begins to do this. For instance, Leena Rouhiainen (2003) describes a group of independent Finnish contemporary dancers’ “felt-sense of their bodies” (357) and various ways that they indicate, in their practice, “exploring [the] body through sensing” (331), and “concentrating on or centering upon the lived event of their own motion through differing perspectives” (308).³ Likewise, Susanne Ravn (2009) contrasts the experiences of a group of professional contemporary dancers with those of ballet and Butoh, and as such, identifies the dancers’ different lived experiences in each, indicating that contemporary dancers have a particular kinesthetically oriented way of attending to movement. Caroline Potter (2008) more directly specifies a “heightened sense of kinesthesia” in contemporary dance practice and what it is like, based on her experience with one year of training at a contemporary dance conservatoire in London. She states that “developing a heightened sense of kinesthesia (felt bodily movement) is a means of becoming socialized into the professional [contemporary] dance community” (444). However, the particular aspects of a “heightened sense in kinesthesia” by all accounts valued in contemporary dance, dotted across various texts and discussed in the practice, can still be brought together more explicitly.

Shantel Ehrenberg, PhD, is a dance practitioner, researcher, and academic. She is currently Lecturer in Dance & Theatre at the University of Surrey. She received her PhD from the University of Manchester, MSc from Trinity Laban, and her MFA in Dance from the University of California, Irvine. See also <http://shantelehrenberg.weebly.com>.

I argue for the centrality of kinesthetic awareness to contemporary dance practice by bringing together existing accounts and original interview material. Through dancer testimony, I offer a more comprehensive theorization of what this particular mode of attention feels like for dancers, in the phenomenological sense, than we have previously seen. Maurice Merleau-Ponty's (1945) phenomenology is central to my research, because ascertaining how a group of dancers makes meaning of "lived" dancing experiences, in terms of phenomenological concepts in language, is crucial (Creswell 2007; Ravn 2010; Van Manen 1990).

The interviews I have conducted provide a description of this particular mode of attention, which enables us to consider its stylistic function in contemporary dance, in the sociological sense—that is, to consider contemporary dance as a type of culture and the dancer as a participant in that culture (Crossley 2001b). Conceiving of contemporary dance as a type of culture is to adapt Cynthia Novack's (1990) argument for contact improvisation, conceived as a shared practice with "core movement values" that distinguish it, and in turn impact on those who train, rehearse, teach, and perform in the style (115).

The description of experience is important to both phenomenological and sociological approaches (Kvale and Brinkmann 2009; Manen 1990), and utilizing both means that language is not conceived as divorced from embodied experience in social domains. As Thomas Csordas (1994) argues: "Language gives access to a world of experience in so far as experience comes to, or is brought to, language" (11). Dancers' descriptions of experience are principally reflective, and experience in the moment of dancing is relative. Verbally articulated dancing knowledge, what Gilbert Ryle (1984) terms "knowing that," and physical dancing knowledge, "knowing how," are intertwined (Parviainen 2002, 22). However, this is not to claim that describing dance experience is entirely the same as the experience of dancing (see also Pakes 2009).⁴

Writing about the specificities of kinesthetic awareness from the dancer's perspective can continue to extend our understanding of dance expertise in order to substantiate dancers' unique intelligence. Indeed, Jaana Parviainen (2002) argues for more work to be done in the domain of "dance knowledge and our means of attaining and communicating it" (23). Casting a spotlight on dancers' descriptions of kinesthetic attention used in particular dance contexts helps validate the cognitive aspects distinct to dance and dancing. Additional descriptions provide evidence for the complexity, variety, and specialized skills that dancers gain and employ in dance, in a parallel way to how other forms of knowledge are (or have been) typically, and historically, validated (Montero 2010; Pakes 2009; Parviainen 2002).⁵

This is not to claim, however, that contemporary dancers can return to a more "natural" state of awareness—an ideology that has similarly been warned against for somatics discourses. Isabelle Ginot (2010) is of the persuasion that somatics *doxa* does "not pretend to restore a so-called natural or original body but rather [contributes] to the reorganization of the multiplicity and heterogeneity of that which we call the body" (25). To reiterate, the research informing this article indicates a predominant "kinesthetic mode," on a continuum, in consideration of the style of contemporary dance. This is not to support the argument for an ideology of wholeness, however, or as Ravn and Hansen (2013) state, that dancers can reach a "deeper layer of experience in a phenomenological sense"; rather it is to "present an approach to creating a different experience of what the body might feel like" in dance contexts (210).

In general, the term "kinesthetic mode of attention" refers to a mode of intentional consciousness while dancing, which includes a number of elements, such as listening to the body's movements, problem solving with the body, a curiosity about bodily feelings in conversation with different choreographic and performative contexts, and various types of embodied translation processes, such as a dancer translating verbal descriptions, which are heard from a choreographer, into kinesthetic sensations in the dancer's attempts to match what the choreographer describes. However, as mentioned earlier, this article precisely aims to elaborate on and explore further what a kinesthetic mode

of attention “is like” and how it is described by some contemporary dance practitioners today. The term I use is informed by similar terms used in the literature, explored further below, such as “a heightened sense of kinesthesia” (Potter 2008, 444) or the “pre-reflective performative body” (Legrand 2007). One term alone does not yet encapsulate the complexity and breadth of this aspect of contemporary dancers’ experiences when dancing; however, having one term aids clarity for the communication and presentation of ideas in this article.

Research Fieldwork: Theory, Practice, and Experience “in Conversation”

The research methods that inform this article are important to briefly contextualize, particularly because the methodology also reflects an epistemology. The methodology was designed, overall, to enable a triangulated “conversation” between original research, my own experience as a trained contemporary dancer, and theory from the relevant literature. I adopt the metaphor of conversation to specify that the research sits at the juncture of theory and practice and that practice and theory “communicate” with each other in this research, particularly in my attempts not to privilege theory over practice or vice versa. Aimee Purser (2008) succinctly describes the metaphor of conversation with dance practice and theory which is applicable here:

Neither party in the conversation is held to hold intellectual priority over the other. The project is therefore neither theory(philosophy)-driven nor data(practice)-driven, but is rather driven by the desire to open up a space where the connections and interaction between the two interlocutors can generate new depth and possibilities for our understanding of embodiment. (8)

The dancers’ interview-discussions serve as the primary fieldwork in the research that informs this article. Reflections on my own experience in dance practice and engagement with ideas in the literature serve as interlocutors, as Purser calls them, and offer opportunities to reflect on the dancers’ interview descriptions from other perspectives.

The main interview material is drawn from a series of qualitative, semistructured interview-discussions, conducted over a six-month period, with fourteen professional-level Western theater dancers, based in London. The interview-discussions were open-ended and exploratory, based on the premise that the researcher and dancer co-construct the meaning in the moment of the interviews (Green and Stinson 1999; Kvale and Brinkmann 2009; Mason 2002). The interpretive approach is important to interview design and analysis because the purpose is not to proclaim universality about dancer experience; instead it is to try to understand a group of dancers’ reflective processes in particular performance practice contexts. As Green and Stinson (1999) argue, “Interpretive research is most helpful in allowing us to understand how participants in dance are making sense of their experiences The interpretation offered by the researcher can give readers an opportunity to reflect, to pay attention to what they might otherwise miss in their own [dance] settings” (104). As mentioned above, regarding the sociological approach, the research is designed to consider, according to a small group of dancers, how meaning is made and how they are situated in the dance world (Aalten 2004; Csordas 1993).

The interview-discussion material was analyzed and separated into key themes aiming to develop, clarify, and expand on what was discussed (Kvale and Brinkmann 2009). The theme of “a kinesi-
thetic mode of attention” emerged after repeated reading of the transcribed discussions and several iterations of coding, as part of the analysis (Green 2015; Ravn and Hansen 2013).

As mentioned above, the researcher’s experience as a dancer informs the design, fieldwork, and analysis, in keeping with the work of other dance scholars (Albright 2011; Potter 2008; Ravn 2009, 2010; Rouhiainen 2003). A shared competence between the dancer-participants and researcher was

beneficial because it enabled a mutual understanding of language and lived dancing experience, which helped bring out certain issues in the interview-discussions. As Ravn and Hansen (2013) state, a shared competence can invite dancers to “forefront their overall sense of what their body feels like when moving and, not least, how they [use] this overall sense of their bodies in their dance technique” (210). However, as Ravn and Hansen also point out, to truly ground the accounts “in the flesh,” that is, for the interpretations to reflect as close to the dancers’ experiences as possible (i.e., not misrepresent the dancers’ descriptions), the analysis must include continual reflection on the researcher’s presumptions about others’ lived experiences, implicitly acknowledging the impact of her own experience on interview-discussions and analysis. Van Manen (1990), in his discussion of the phenomenological approach, calls this “interrogating assumptions”: “We try to come to terms with our assumptions, not in order to forget them again, but rather to hold them deliberately at bay and even to turn this knowledge against itself, as it were, thereby exposing its shallow or concealing character” (47). During analysis and writing up, it was important to “actively report [my] values and biases” and “position [myself]” as interpreter of this research (Creswell 2007, 18). I acknowledge that the methodology is “inductive, emerging, and shaped by [my] experience in collecting and analyzing the data” (Creswell 2007, 19). As stated, my previous experiences as a dancer unquestionably color my analysis. However, throughout the larger research project, I explicitly took critical distance from the field and the material, at times, to attempt to address this issue of bias (Green 2015; Sklar 1994). As Ravn and Hansen (2013) propose, following the phenomenological approach, I took a rigorous stance between writing about private first-person accounts and objective third-person analysis:

“Putting phenomenology to work” in relation to qualitative methodologies requires the researcher to actively cope with a direct involvement and a creative tension between first and second person perspectives of experiences throughout the inter-related phases of generating and analyzing the data. It requires the researcher to include and handle her first person and subjective experiences and the subjective experiences of the athlete and/or dancer constructively. Further on, it also challenges her ability to create both connection and differences between these first person perspectives and her second person perspective of sense experiences when interviewing and analyzing. (202)⁶

Contemporary Dancers’ “Kinesthetic Mode of Attention”

As mentioned above, a kinesthetic mode of attention is generally conceived as a directing of intentionality toward one’s own bodily sensations, and perceptions and maintaining a particular awareness of the ways the body moves and responds to movement—a sort of listening and openness to the body and its movements in a mode of discovery. The contemporary dancers’ descriptions from the interviews, particularly descriptions of their kinesthetic experiences of dancing, consistently indicate a predominant mode of attention toward “internal” and pre-reflective bodily experiences, although there is an element of attention and awareness of the environment too (e.g., the studio space, another dancer’s touch, the choreography, the music)—a particular kinesthetic awareness, sensitivity, and curiosity.⁷ Other descriptive verbs attributed to this mode of attention, evident in more detail below, are navigating, problem solving, experimenting, exploring, enmeshing, and attuning.

Erdem is one of the contemporary dancers whose descriptions exemplify a kinesthetic mode of attention. For example, just after doing a contemporary dance phrase, Erdem describes her kinesthetic experience of the phrase this way:

Shantel: Ok, so can you talk about what that was like to do the first piece ... kinesthetically let’s just focus on ...
Erdem: To do that phrase ...
Shantel: The first one, yeah.

Erdem: Specifically this time [pause] I think today, in my body I feel, there is a sense of, fluidity and things bleeding into every[thing], you know? It's a sense of thing, which is not necessarily always there in that phrase, but, I think, [because it comes] from a watery feel [that] has an effect on it [pause] I feel like, the phrase, it feels fragmented for me because I haven't done it for ages, and so my body feels a bit fragmented at the moment, in that kind of "tight hips" and stuff like that, so, what I'm trying to achieve, kind of doesn't follow through my whole body. I feel like there are sticky moments that don't quite, I don't quite achieve what I intend to [long pause] it's a nice sense of freedom and expansiveness, to just move in space and do whatever with a set structure, and it feels like quite a, I would say, privilege, but [that is] not quite the right word—kind of, luxury, to just be able to move in the studio, I appreciate that [pause] specifically [more to herself] yeah, I feel my sense of connection with the space and with the floor is quite fundamental to that phrase. I think because of the way we made it, it was very connected to the space, but even transferring it to a different space, this kind of sensation of a slide, a friction, openness or enclosure, within any given space. I have a reaction to that, with the piece, although I think it is quite internal. (Interview 2)

What is distinctive in Erdem's description, related to the idea of a kinesthetic mode of attention, is the overall sense of process and exploration expressed of her dancing experience. It is also the way in which she indicates that, while dancing, she maintains a mode of attention on what her body is doing and feeling as much as on the anticipation or imagination of her next movements. Erdem describes her experiences of the movement using exploratory and open-ended phrases, such as, "there is a sense of a fluidity . . ." or "things bleeding into . . .," indicating a metaphoric imagining in the moment of dancing. Her descriptions of her kinesthetic experience suggest constant flux and continual process, both in reflection and as a way she intentionally directs her movement while dancing.

Parviainen (1998) describes dance experience as "bodily knowledge" in a way that resonates with Erdem's description and a kinesthetic mode of attention. Parviainen writes: "Listening to bodily movements and the body's answers in a movement pattern, various dimensions emerge from the same movement" (52). Parviainen poses dance experience as having a pattern and structure that the dancer can navigate, explore, and "answer" with the body. Similarly, Erdem indicates a sense of listening to the patterns her body falls into, yet also an imagining of what her body can do in the space and in that moment—a sort of kinesthetic problem solving that makes up her dancing experience and knowledge. This is particularly evident when Erdem talks about the sensation of "tight hips" and utilizing this perception to move toward more smoothness with the phrase. She comments on feeling both the space and her body as part of this, or how her body transfers different feelings into different types of spaces. She indicates an enmeshment of memories of previous spaces/feelings her body has experienced with the present perceptions of current spaces/feelings. Knowledge also implies curiosity, and Erdem likewise indicates a curiosity in the moment of her dancing, exploring kinesthetically what she feels, as well as a curiosity in continually reflecting on that kinesthetic experience.

Descriptions from Potter (2008), likewise, resonate with Erdem's description. Although Potter foregrounds gravity, her descriptions also affirm the idea of a kinesthetic mode of attention. For example, Potter writes: "Phrases employed by contemporary dance instructors such as 'melt into the floor,' 'feel the weight of the head,' and 'anchor the [heavy] pelvis into the ground' prompted students to bring the body's relationship with gravity to explicit attention" (450). These metaphoric phrases, such as "melt into the floor," are both to be sensed, or attended to kinesthetically, and enacted by the dancers. Potter likewise provides evidence as to how contemporary dancers are instructed and learn to attend to bodily sensations by directing kinesthetic awareness in a particular way. However, contemporary dance is not just about sensing gravity. Potter also notes that she and

other students were directed to attend to “the center” and that “a contemporary dancer’s highly developed sense of motion” entails a keen, yet diffuse, sensing of and enacting the differences between tension and relaxation (450). What is consistent is that the issue of attention to one’s own movement sensations is continually foregrounded. In different ways, Potter’s description is similar to Erdem’s regarding the metaphors of listening and navigating the body’s movements, whether it is listening and/or navigating the weight of the body or the center as impetus. The basic premise is that this heightened kinesthetic perception is continually moving at the core of contemporary dancers’ experiential dancing knowledge. To be clear, this is not sensing in a solely passive way, but moving through this sensing, as Erdem and Parviainen (1998) also support with their descriptions. Or as Sklar (2000, 72) puts it, writing about dancer experience: “a doubled act of moving and feeling oneself moving.”

Rouhiainen (2003, 319) identifies “a bodily knowledge or a kinaesthetic intelligence” when writing about a central aspect of a group of independent Finnish dancers’ practices. Rouhiainen similarly describes this intelligence as being based around the felt experience of dancing and what she refers to as “a reflective and imaginative process” linked to kinesthetic awareness. She refers to this kinesthetic intelligence as “a detailed sense of the motional happening” and states that the dancers’ “rich sense of their bodily motion” is based on attending to their lived experience of motion (308). She alludes to the dancers “valuing a certain mode of dancing” and signals that a key part of this mode is a sensitivity to body awareness, or what she calls “the somatic state of being” (321).

One of the other dancers, Mads, particularly reiterates Rouhiainen’s (2003) description of a “rich kinesthetic exploration of motional happening.” He does so in discussion after his dancing experience in the interviews.

Shantel: Can you describe what that movement feels like for you, some general terms, nothing right or wrong, just, sort of, how you . . .

Mads: It feels really grounded, in a way. It feels, when I am doing it, it feels like everything gets stretched out, from some magnetic field or something like that; so it feels like everything is pulling you out from all fours, and gravity pulls you to the floor, and something else is pulling you out from the space—it makes you pull out through. [sighs; struggling to describe experience]. [It] pulls you into the movement, in a way, so there’s an initiating pull that makes you go aghhh, bum bum [he communicates a rhythm and moves at the same time as describing], yeah, and everything is quite stretched out [stretches at same time] [laugh]. The movement is open, really, for me, I feel really vulnerable in it, because it’s so “out there” instead of, what I’m used to, which is at the end [of the phrase], its more like movements that sequence close to the body. (Interview 2)

Like Erdem, Mads expresses a unique imaginative mode of attention in his dancing experience of this phrase that includes a particularly focused sensing and responding to his kinesthetic awareness, in a complex, highly self-reflective way. For instance, he indicates that he explores his kinesthetic range with the movements—stretching, pulling, sensing rhythms—and uses kinesthetic awareness as a central device to survey what he feels and imagines feeling with different aspects of the choreographic phrase. And he uses this sensing to make decisions as he performs the phrase.

Dorothee Legrand and Susanne Ravn (2009) write about the idea of listening and problem solving to describe another small group of contemporary dancers’ experiences of dancing in their fieldwork. They describe this aspect of contemporary dance experience as a “kinesthetic logic,” reiterating Parviainen’s (1998) analytically framed notion of “bodily knowledge” and Sklar’s (2000) proposition that “bodies become laboratories for experimentation with kinetic details in dance contexts” (72): “In different ways the [contemporary] dancers describe how they ‘listen’ to the ‘kinaesthetic logic’ of the musculoskeletal dimension of the body to perform movement and to use

movement to investigate corporeality” (Legrand and Ravn 2009, 403). Legrand and Ravn also suggest that contemporary dance is not so much about a mastery of steps but a particular way of approaching movement and the body, which foregrounds sensation and perception, and thus proprioception. As they describe from their fieldwork:

[The seven contemporary dancers’] sensing of muscles and joints [is] central to their descriptions of how they guide their movements. Their descriptions are in different ways related to the experience of proprioception, of gravity on body limbs and of the mechanics of the skeleton The aim of these contemporary dancers is to investigate and develop their experience of the body in movement. They experiment with bodily sensations in order to promote fresh attention to sensations that normally stay unnoticed. The training focuses on such investigations and the repetition of movements and warm-up routines [to move] “toward greater self-awareness,” as one of the contemporary dancers describes. (Legrand and Ravn 2009, 398–9)

Legrand and Ravn (2009) echo the ideas of exploration in sensation, investigating a range of kinesthetic sensations and increasing knowledge of the body by experimenting with what the body does and can do. Awareness and attention are described as central to the dancers’ experience in training and practice as well.

Jasper, during his interview, describes his dancing experience using the metaphor of conversation between his kinesthetic experience and the choreography, which highlights the listening and responding notions introduced above to describe a kinesthetic mode of attention. Jasper further demonstrates Legrand and Ravn’s (2009) discussion of experimentation, particularly because of how he uses the idea of discovery in his descriptions. In the excerpt below, Jasper describes his experience of the phrase he did in the interviews, by explaining how he helped another dancer execute the same choreographic phrase in a recent rehearsal.

Jasper: . . . just trying to find his spine, and his weight and, just trying to, yeah, discover, like discovery of, “oh ok, ok! Push up the floor, ok, reach, that’s nice, ohh, I’ve got weight, gravity, and all that stuff”—really being amazed by all those discoveries. (Interview 2)

Jasper mentions weight and gravity, echoing Ravn (2010) and Potter (2008) on this theme, and yet he also supports the argument for a kinesthetic mode of attention because of the way he encourages another dancer to explore the choreography, with a particular active perceiving of the spine and weight distribution (“find” where it is), and also to explore bodily responses when pushing and reaching out from the floor (and trying to be fascinated by the possibilities this acting and perceiving allows). His explanation to the dancer is useful here as he indicates that what he tells another dancer is similar to what he explores and feels when he does the phrase.

Following Ravn (2009, 2010), I also find Dorothee Legrand’s (2007) “performative pre-reflective body” concept useful to further investigate this specialized way of focusing kinesthetic attention indicated by the contemporary dancers, but specifically utilizing the concepts of reflective and pre-reflective consciousness from phenomenology. Indeed, Legrand states that, with this concept, she tries to clarify, in part, the experiential perspective around a broader phenomenological question, which is: “What are the different kinds of experience of one’s own body as one’s own?” (2007, 493). A kinesthetic mode of attention is likewise interested in this question, but specifically for the case of dancers in dance contexts. In sum, Legrand’s descriptions about self-consciousness are useful to further substantiate the kinesthetic intelligence that is unique to dancers’ perspective and practice, even though Legrand is concerned with broader philosophical questions. Legrand’s discussion is subtly different to philosopher Maxine Sheets-Johnstone’s (1966) seminal text, one of the first studies on the phenomenological experience of dance, primarily because Legrand re-interprets and

complicates the relationship between the pre-reflective and reflective for the case of dancers, in contrast to polarizing the pre-reflective with the reflective, which endorses an ideology of wholeness.

Legrand (2007) describes, in part of her essay, “one form of bodily pre-reflective consciousness,” which is the “performative body” or the pre-reflective experience of the body (in contrast to the pre-reflective experience of the world in which our body consciousness might be invisible), and uses body-expert dancers as being most concretely concerned with this type of consciousness (500).⁸ Legrand (2007) does not specify that she is writing about contemporary dance, but her concept resonates most with contemporary dancer descriptions in my research:

... body expertise like dance is associated with a particularly sharp pre-reflective experience of the “performative body.” Normal non-body expert people do not lack it all together but there is a noticeable difference between dancers’ experience and normal people’s experience: bodily pre-reflective experience is “at the front” of dancers’ experience, whereas it is mostly “in the world” in normal everyday life. Specifically, dancers mostly experience their body pre-reflectively, whereas normal people in normal circumstances mostly experience the world in a bodily way. The common point between these two forms of experience is that they are both pre-reflective in the sense that they both imply a specific form of experience where the body is not taken as an object of identification (Legrand 2006). It is also important to underline that these two forms of bodily pre-reflective experience are not incompatible with each other, since the dancer experiences both. (505)

Legrand argues that expert dancers, in particular (i.e., in contrast to beginning dancers), focus attention on those experiences of the body to which most non-dancers do not attend. For example, consider the case of walking. Dancers, especially in a contemporary dance context (i.e., technique class), I would argue, focus attention on the felt mechanics of walking and do not let the mechanics fall to the background of consciousness. In other words, contemporary dancers interrogate, in this instance of an exploration of walking (which has become very familiar movement to them since childhood), how the foot touches the floor; they sense detailed nuances of hip movements, notice the rhythmic pattern of the arm sway as they walk, and then respond to this sensing in their movement. They precisely interrogate those bodily experiences, sensations, perceptions, and habits that usually go “unnoticed” among non-dancers, and they simultaneously imagine and anticipate other ways of walking as they walk. (For examples of walking in contemporary dance contexts more specifically, see also Ehrenberg 2012a; H’Doubler 1921; Reynolds 2007.)

On this issue of interrogating bodily experience, sensations, and habits, one of the dancers’ discussions of “crash to create” is poignant. “Crash to create” is a concept that Jiles introduces, in his interview, to help describe his experience with improvisation in his contemporary dance practice. He states outright that, for him, this concept implies a broader value in contemporary dance for being self-reflective of movement “habits” and for utilizing kinesthetic awareness to find “new” ways of moving. In the excerpt below, Jiles talks about how, for him, “crash to create” supports the overarching value in the practice of mistakes versus perfection of form. In addition, his discussion of “crash to create” further supports the argument, as part of Legrand’s (2007) “performative pre-reflective body” discussed above, that dancers consciously reflect on bodily habits that might otherwise go unnoticed in the case of non-dancers.

Jiles: Well, yeah, I mean, in contemporary dance, there is often the phrase “crash to create”. You know that phrase, “crash to create”?

Shantel: No, crashed?

Jiles: Crash.

Shantel: Crash to create?

Jiles: Yeah, so, “crash to create” refers to times when you’re improvising, and

whatever, and, it's the mistake, or the time you go off balance, for instance, that is actually the "creatively interesting point," and it is how you resolve that. Certainly in a lot of contact improvisation, you know, you find yourself [pause] obviously, you have your various habits and stuff, which you try and get away from, but, if you find yourself in a position which is awkward, and you don't know what to do, then that's sort of a great place to be, because everything you do from that point on is going to be creatively "new" for you, and also, probably, unexpected for the person on top, or wherever they are, or whatever, you know? So "crash to create" is—it's something, you know, the mistakes are, sort of, heralded within contemporary dance, and because there is a freedom, in terms of form, you can do whatever, twitch around and stuff, you know, all that weird stuff. There's not—you're not striving for—a perfection of form. (Interview 1)⁹

Jiles' discussion of crash to create not only indicates the values of challenging habits and mistakes as part of contemporary dance practice, but also, that to challenge habits and mistakes a dancer needs to be kinesthetically aware, be open, and must "listen," through feeling, to "hear" those surprising moments. Jiles thus supports the argument for another way that pursuit of a particular kinesthetic sensitivity and intelligence—a kinesthetic mode of attention—is considered virtuosic in contemporary dance because this ability to listen and be open to the mistakes and surprises of the body while dancing (improvising in this case) is "heralded" as a way to find unexpected ways of moving in contemporary dance, versus attending to the mastery of a particular set vocabulary or, as he states, "perfection of form."

Legrand (2007) notes that it is not that dancers interrogate pre-reflective experience and movement habits all the time; dancers also have the capacity to "experience the world in a bodily way," as she states, and to let bodily actions "fall to the background." For instance, a dancer can walk down a street and not have to think about how to walk as well. Also, a dancer can learn choreography so well that attention to the movement becomes less necessary. For instance, a dancer can perform complex choreography and think about a grocery list at the same time. Legrand points out that the dancers' attention to pre-reflective experience is not completely alien to the non-dancer experience, but is a specialized skill that grows out of dance experience. What is most relevant to my discussion of a kinesthetic mode of attention is Legrand's suggestion that, in dancing contexts (although possibly at other sporadic times in "everyday" life too), dancers often experience their body pre-reflectively, which means the bodily, kinesthetic experience is foregrounded to the dancers' consciousness in the way the dancers and authors cited above express.

Another important aspect of Legrand's (2007) analysis related to a kinesthetic mode of attention in contemporary dance is her point that, following Merleau-Ponty's (1945) discussion of two hands touching, is that the touching hand is conceived as representing pre-reflective consciousness and, as such, is not about the "objective" hand being touched, but the "subjective" hand that is experiencing touching the other hand. Thus, directing consciousness to pre-reflectively conscious bodily experiences directs attention more toward the subjective end of the consciousness spectrum. She writes, "At [the pre-reflective] level, the body is not an object of experience, it is the subject of experience and it is experienced as such" (Legrand 2007, 499). This argument for directing attention toward the subjective end of the consciousness spectrum, related to a kinesthetic mode of attention, is problematized in performing situations where the dancer is aware of being the object of an audience's gaze (Bleeker 2008; Ehrenberg 2012a, 2012b). Nevertheless, for the purposes here, it is important to emphasize that Legrand's point supports the potential underlying purpose of directing attention to the pre-reflective for contemporary dancers, which would be to reinforce subjectivity and thus agency for dancers in their experiences in contemporary dance practice.

As stated, a kinesthetic mode of attention is important to help propose, and further consider, the various modes of conscious awareness that are employed in dance experience. However, how might

a kinesthetic mode of attention vary among different contemporary styles, such as release or Graham, or across dance styles such as ballet and be conceived as a continuum across dance forms? Although speculative, I want to address this question briefly below.

I find Legrand's (2007) concept of the "transparent body" (504) useful to explore the idea of a kinesthetic mode of attention on a continuum. Legrand theorizes the transparent body as a bodily state of being between sensing and acting in the world. It is bodily consciousness that is between the body being invisible (e.g., I attend to picking up my cup and do not have to think about every move to do so) and the body being opaque, or the object of conscious attention (e.g., I try to attend to every movement I make as I pick up the cup):

The body is transparent in the sense that one looks through it to the world. At this level, pre-reflective bodily experience is precisely the experience of the world as given through the "transparent body." The latter is not perceived as an object but experienced specifically as a subject perceiving and acting, that is, as in-the-world. (2007, 504)

For example, the transparent body might refer to those times when dancers have gained a certain capacity to consciously reflect on pre-reflective experience of very complex choreographic movement and thus be able to attend to something in addition to simply doing the movement and/or perceiving what the body is doing. It is to clarify a spectrum of experiencing and acting, related to a kinesthetic mode of attention, that refers to times when dancers are in a "sharp and physical state" (Hermans 2003, as cited in Legrand 2007, 501).

One of the dancers, Willow, supports the argument for how the kinesthetic mode of attention might sit on a continuum, and relates to Legrand's (2007) transparent body in her discussion of "inhabiting movement," "filling movement out," and "really living movement":

Willow: Yeah. I guess that's what I meant when I was referring to something being filled out before, it is that, it's becoming three-dimensional or more dimensional because it has extra layers.

Shantel: It's almost to me, in your explanation, and our talking about this phrase and performance, that in performance, you can direct your kinesthesia; you have some, you know, where you want to expand it, where you want to take it, and then you shift it to another place in your body, and when you are learning, it's more that you're being led in some ways, or . . .

Willow: Mmhmm. Yeah, I have a hard time immediately inhabiting something. For instance, I need to know where my body is going before I can fill it out. Before I can, really, "live in it." If that makes sense? Probably not. But, yeah, I think that has been a part of it, where I am finally starting to feel a little bit comfortable in our technique classes, because I am getting the general flow of the class, and the teacher's style, and all those things under my belt, so now I feel like, "ok, I'm kind of getting this way of moving, I can add a little bit there." It feels more like I'm inhabiting that movement, instead of just trying to imitate a movement, if that makes sense? (Willow, interview 2)

The point Willow brings out with her description is that there are varying aspects in which a kinesthetic mode of attention can be employed and felt as working optimally for Willow "as a subject perceiving and acting, that is, as in-the-world" (Legrand 2007, 504). In the above description, Willow indicates that she first needs to feel a certain competency with a style of moving before feeling more exploratory in her mode of kinesthetic attention, which then allows her to feel like she can "inhabit" and "really live" movements. In other words, Willow indicates that there is a need for a certain level of feeling of mastery, with the particular kinematic competency of the movement, environment, and/or choreography, for example, which impacts on her employing a kinesthetic mode of attention to varying degrees. This anecdote from Willow further supports the argument,

related also to Jiles' interview above, which is that the central pursuit of virtuosity for contemporary dancers is not so much a perfection of form; rather there is a kind of feeling of virtuosity that comes with a certain level of movement familiarity, that is, a certain level of movement competency that can allow a feeling of kinesthetic explorative attention when dancing.¹⁰

My use of the term virtuosity is in relation to the dancers' *feeling* of competence, since a kinesthetic mode of attention cannot be conceived in the same way as other types of technical virtuosity seen from the audience perspective (e.g., spectacular flips and jumps). The dancers' accounts above indicate a repeated use of a kinesthetic mode of attention that helps them feel virtuosic in the technique of contemporary dance (for instance, Willow's description above about her experience of "really living" the movement). There is another kind of feeling of virtuosity a dancer might experience when she executes a difficult technical move or step. However, this is not the same kind of feeling of virtuosity I am suggesting here, though there might be similarities in the feeling of self-competency and feeling a kind of "mastery" with a certain way of moving. This is not to suggest this mode of attention is a technique on its own either. As mentioned in the introduction, this article aims to elaborate on one important *part* of dancing intelligence, which is the particular way that dancers describe attending kinesthetically in the practice of contemporary dance. I am trying to establish how the research for this article suggests a kinesthetic mode of attention as crucial to the dancers' experience of this technique, and thus, examining it more explicitly to help better understand what it is like in order to more concretely value and critique this aspect of contemporary dancer knowledge and experience in the practice. However, more work is warranted to unpack whether a mode of attending constitutes a form of knowledge in itself. At the least, it is important to distinguish that the dancers indicate a kinesthetic mode of attention that has a variety of applications in practice, but that is not to then mistake a kinesthetic mode of attention as a fixed, graspable form of knowing, as might be the case for memorizing text or, indeed, memorizing choreography.

Practices and Values That Develop and Nurture This Mode

What about the broader social context, or thinking about dancer perception as it is impacted on by the social? What aspects of contemporary dance practice develop and nurture a kinesthetic mode of attention, and how might we address the argument one might raise, which is whether it is simply that the choreography in contemporary dance makes this way of attending possible, and even inevitable? How might the social context, as much as the movement itself, impact on the dancer and kinesthetic experiences? These questions address the broader function to this way of attending in contemporary dance, which relates to a particular valuing of the kinesthetic as an incorporated sociality of the culture of contemporary dance. It is beyond the scope of this article to fully address contemporary dance practice and values, and why dancers develop and nurture this way of attending. However I would like to touch on this issue briefly in the hope of taking it up in more detail in future work.

Delineating the shared practices, values, and ideas of contemporary dance, as it relates to a kinesthetic mode of attention, is thinking about contemporary dance as a type of culture in the way Novack (1990) argues for ballet and contact improvisation. One of her main premises is that there are shared practices, language, and behaviors in ballet and contact improvisation, which distinguish them and affect the people practicing them. Novak's argument in part follows Marcel Mauss's (1932) ideas of techniques of the body, but also follows a premise of Pierre Bourdieu's (1980) concept of habitus, which is based on the idea that social contexts have "[systems] of cognitive and motivating structures" and "procedures to follow" that impact on persons' behavior (53). As sociologist Nick Crossley (2001a) interprets, "... dispositions and forms of competence are acquired in structured social contexts whose pattern, purpose, and underlying principles they incorporate as both an inclination and a *modus operandi*" (83). The premise is that people incorporate

dispositions, or ways of behaving, from their social context to the extent that they can go unnoticed, even if these dispositions become fundamental to who they are, what they do, and indeed, how they move. However, as Cynthia Jean Cohen Bull¹¹ (1988) writes, conceiving of dancers' incorporation of a dance style (as a type of culture) "is not to say that dancers conspicuously plan these changes; like all participants in a culture (to paraphrase Marx), they make their own dances, but within a set of rules they do not always personally create" (412).

There are particular practices and values in contemporary dance that can be distinguished for how they develop and nurture a kinesthetic mode of attention and contribute to the motivations and knowledge acquisition of the intelligence explored above. Below I will discuss briefly the inclusion of somatics in dance training, the predominant educational contexts of contemporary dance, and the value of versatility to begin to suggest particular aspects of the practice that develop and nurture a kinesthetic mode of attention.

Somatics

Thomas Hanna (1988) describes somatics as "a way of perceiving oneself 'from the inside out, where one is aware of feelings, movements and intentions, rather than looking objectively from the outside in'" (as cited in Spohn and Prettyman 2012, 49). Although it can be argued that somatic practices and modern dance have a connection that goes back much further—both practices developed around the early 1900s in line with changing conceptions of body, attention, and movement—it is only within the last thirty to forty years that somatics and dance have become so intertwined (Eddy 2009). In turn, a kinesthetic mode of attention, as it is framed by the above descriptions, bears much resemblance to how kinesthetic experience in somatic practices are described, such as Hanna's descriptions above of perceiving predominantly from the "inside out" (Järvinen 2006). Eddy (2009) likewise defines somatics generally as: "Discovery through internalized and conscious exploration of a physical or emotional challenge . . . diving inward" (16). And Shusterman (2008) argues that the "third principal movement quality," central to all somatic methods, is an attention focused on the self, or awareness, that "permits us to address the nonconscious or automatic aspects of ongoing movements, in order to change their organization" (as cited in Ginot 2010, 20). Fortin, Long, and Lord (2002) advocate the use of somatics in dance education because it helps dancers "... [learn] to direct attention to movement on an incrementally fine level," implicitly supporting a value for kinaesthetic attention in contemporary dance similar to the way Eddy describes (166). A study by dance practitioner Louisa Figuerola (2009) similarly reports on two release-based and two somatics teachers interviewed who had analogous teaching strategies, particularly in their use of language, physical demonstration, and types of feedback, as well as teaching principles regarding space, imagery, sensation, breath, and process. Sensation, Figuerola writes, was emphasized by both, and expressed as the importance "to move from within, i.e., through an internal intention," or "the ability to move from the inside out" and self-discovery, via this internalized mode of attending, was posed as "an important learning process" (2009, 53). Process, and the idea that the self is always in a mode of discovery during internally directed movement exploration(s), were deemed important by both the release-based and somatics teachers that Figuerola encountered (56). Ravn (2009) similarly picks up on the impact that somatics has had on the kinesthetic approach in dance education in contrast to more codified dance styles, "... in general [aiming] at initiating a process of movement re-education of the dancer... [Somatics] tend to emphasize constant exploration by avoiding repetition of specific exercises as is characteristic for training in ballet, Graham, and Limon techniques" (102). Nevertheless, the kinesthetic mode of attention, described at length above, particularly related to internally directed sensing, does not seem to be the same as attention in somatic practices; the motivations by the practitioners in each are different, for instance. In addition, despite the variety and number of sources cited above, Ginot (2010) argues that more can still be established about the study of dance and emphasis on the

integration with somatics and a “more active and exploratory” attention for dancers versus emphasis on mirroring and reproduction of forms (12).

Educational Context

Related to the growing relationship between somatics and dance training is the issue that contemporary dance is often taught in a particular academic educational context, i.e., universities and conservatoires with undergraduate degree accreditation. This particular kind of educational context can be argued to also nurture and develop a kinesthetic mode of attention. That is to argue that being trained as a contemporary dancer in these particular academic contexts includes talking, writing, and reflecting on movement and dance practice in a particular way, which nurtures and develops an approach to movement that requires a “thinking through” kinesthetic awareness.¹² Albright (2011) evidences the crossing of the academic and the physical in contemporary dance training I am referring to here, particularly her description of the pleasure of teaching in a dance department where, she states, “. . . for the first time in my academic life, I could teach intellectual analysis and physical training in the space of one class session. Engaging students across the traditional mind/body divides of dance studio and academic classroom . . .” (7–8).

A key part of educational contexts is the issue of description and language. The contemporary dancers above talk about kinesthetic experience in a richly descriptive way in practice contexts (e.g., training, rehearsal, choreography). Again, being in an educational context that values verbal discourse (i.e., university) can help to develop and nurture this description. However, there is also the need for contemporary dancers to describe movement in detail, because contemporary dance is not a codified technique with set movements and terms, and so language is heavily relied on to help convey what movement should be like. Thus, verbal description becomes linked with the experience of movement from the contemporary dancers’ perspectives in a particular way—in a different way than it does in other dance styles (e.g., ballet). In learning and mastering contemporary dance, dancers often associate movement with a variety of descriptions, and the descriptions can sometimes be focused around the kinesthetic sensation of the movement. It can be argued that contemporary dancers are taught and use a particular movement–language relationship because of the lack of codification.

Versatility

Another part of dance practice that affirms the argument for an acquisition of a kinesthetic mode of attention, again more relevant today than for modern dance before the 1960s, is that many contemporary dancers are expected to be able to adapt to many different choreographers and teachers, and thus be highly versatile in the different styles they can do and pick up quickly. Indeed, most contemporary dancers today train in several different dance styles (e.g., release, Graham, improvisation, Cunningham, ballet) to support this pursuit of versatility.¹³ As Jasper said in his interview, for instance, contemporary dance is considered dance with the big “D”—any movement can fall under contemporary dance if framed in a particular way. Foster (1997) describes this valuing of versatility under the term of the “multitalented dancer,” wherein a “new cadre of dance makers, called ‘independent choreographers’ has emerged,” and as such they “encourage dancers to train in several existing techniques without adopting the aesthetic vision of any. They require a new kind of body, competent at many styles. The new multitalented body . . .” (253). Contemporary dancers are often required to adapt quickly just by the nature of the huge variation of movement styles in the field (Roche 2011). If the dancer can be keenly, kinesthetically aware and attentive, the dancer is more likely to be able to navigate new choreography quickly in practice, because the sensitivity enables greater skill in navigating and mastering different ways of moving. Instead of mastering a certain vocabulary, contemporary dancers’ skill with a

kinesthetic mode of attention can facilitate being agile and open to adapting to a variety of different ways of moving. In turn, learning and mastering a number of different ways of moving expands the dancers' physical capacity and thus expands their kinesthetic experience. That is to say that because contemporary dancers often explore a variety of different ways of moving, they are exposed to a variety of kinesthetic sensations and attentive possibilities, which likewise develops a varied kinesthetic capacity.

There is a lot more to unravel here to continue to understand the depth of kinesthetic intelligence in contemporary dance today and in dance practice more broadly. Nevertheless, at this point, I hope that a "kinesthetic mode of attention," which the contemporary dancers in the fieldwork and the theorists in the literature indicate, has a descriptive shape, and a beginning consideration offered for how this mode might be nurtured and developed in the style.

Conclusion

The concept of a kinesthetic mode of attention is presented to illustrate that dancers' dancing intelligence is more multilayered than sometimes conceived in theory and practice (i.e., not only internally or externally directed attention). The article builds on previous accounts that attempt to "consider a theory of knowledge that could explain a mode of knowing in terms of bodily movements" and "recognize the element of knowledge in a dancer's skill" (Parviainen 2002, 15). A discussion of how a kinesthetic mode of attention develops and is nurtured, through specific aspects of contemporary dance practice, such as somatics and versatility, begins to address how this mode of attention gets shaped, though more research is warranted.

A kinesthetic mode of attention is not the only mode that came up in the research informing this article to describe contemporary dancers' kinesthetic experiences in practice. Instead, it is a way of attending that often arose, across several dancer interviews, from reflecting on my own practice as a contemporary dancer, and from reviewing the performance studies literature. Previous authors have focused on other aspects of contemporary dancer attention when dancing, such as weight (Potter 2008; Ravn 2009), suspension and release (Potter 2008), or space (Figuerola 2009). Technical mastery, picking up choreography quickly, physical fitness, and pain (Rouhiainen 2003) are other important aspects of dancers' attention in practice that have been discussed in the literature. This article cannot encapsulate all aspects of kinesthetic awareness in contemporary dancer experience, but it focuses on an important overarching part of it, which is how these described ways of attending signal an overall approach in contemporary dance practice and, thus, a key facet of the discourse of contemporary dance (Potter 2008). It is a way of considering how aspects of the style, in this case the style of contemporary dance, "wash over the entire dance" in contrast to looking at the details of the vocabulary, in parts (Foster 1986, 91).

A kinesthetic mode of attention is conceived here primarily as the dancers' way of approaching movement as dancers, rather than as choreographers, although the distinction between the two is heavily blurred in contemporary dance (Gardner 2007). For instance, a dancer might be working with a choreographer who employs Cunningham's chance method. This choreographic approach has its own descriptive quality. However, the dancer might employ a kinesthetic mode of attention while using Cunningham's chance approach. In other words, even if a kinesthetic mode of attention is not the main focus for the choreographer, the dancer might still utilize it to execute the choreography. Or, on the other hand, a dancer/choreographer might utilize a kinesthetic mode of attention to choreograph a work. It is one of the predominant modes of contemporary dance, and this article focuses on it as one aspect of the technique that contemporary dancers use in learning, rehearsing, and performing. It is beyond the scope of this article to address both dancer and choreographer perspectives in full.

Conceiving of dancers' kinesthetic awareness in dance practice will help us further understand the different ways that what is valued in dance contexts can have a significant impact on how we individually (and seemingly privately) approach, imagine, and feel movement. Dancers' kinesthetic experiences can be conceived as both a private internal experience—no one can feel what a dancer feels—and yet, this seemingly private personal experience can simultaneously be affected and shaped according to outside contextual factors (Sklar 2000). As Csordas (1993) argues, “To attend to a bodily sensation is not to attend to the body as an isolated object, but to attend to the body's situation in the world” (138).

I want to end on one important point, which I only address briefly above, regarding Legrand's (2007) comment on subjectivity and attending to pre-reflective experience. There are important political reasons for valuing this way of attending in contemporary dance—for instance as a way to address feminist philosophers' questioning the predominance, or “power,” of visual image over kinesthetic experience of one's own body (Bartky 1990; Butler 1990). However, I believe it is necessary to first fully explore descriptions of the kinesthetic experience valued in contemporary dance today, and cover in more depth what it is like, before then tackling whether or not it fulfills a political aim of dancers valuing their body, sense of agency, and kinesthetic experience, above or equal to their performative and visual display.

Notes

The author would like to thank the dancers for their generous participation in the research informing this work (see also Ehrenberg 2012a). Thanks also to Mark Franko and two anonymous reviewers for their invaluable feedback. The author would like to express gratitude to Professors Dee Reynolds and Nick Crossley for their contributions during the PhD and development of some of the thinking in this article.

1. In this article, when I refer to kinesthetic awareness, I am referring to the dancer's practice in late-twentieth and twenty-first-century contemporary dance practice.

2. See also Albright (2011) and Ness (2011), in the same issue, which provide an excellent scope of related trends in dance studies, in relationship to philosophy and phenomenology, over the last twenty years, and Rothfield (2005) for a reconsideration of phenomenological investigation in dance “in light of postmodern and postcolonial critiques of universalism” (43).

3. Rouhiainen (2003) writes about the relationship between a group of dancers' introspective kinesthetic sensing of the body and the changing appearance of the body related to this sense. She writes about how the particular way of attending to and the look of the body transform over a career in contemporary dance (including how the dancers' imagined appearance, to an outside eye, transforms in relationship to the dancers' felt-sense of their bodies). She writes, “. . . these representations [of body image] are not something altogether different from the more introspective sense we have of our bodily positions” (357) and hints at the intertwined relationship between contemporary dance artists' use of a kinesthetic mode of attention and how they want to project their dancing images to an audience in a particular way. Although I touch on a similar point in a previous publication regarding a dancers' engagement with video reflection (Ehrenberg 2012b), the intertwining of body image and schema as it relates to a kinesthetic mode of attention is one to be taken up in future work.

4. In an effort to help address this gap between dancing and verbally articulating dancing knowledge, the interviews included dancing, recording, and watching videos of the dancers' own movement and thus, tried to incorporate the non-verbal aspects of dance practice, to a greater degree, than interview-discussions outside of the dance studio context might allow.

5. The type of kinesthetic attention valued in contemporary dance practice has changed across contemporary dance history. Foster's (2011) “brief and partial genealogy of the term kinesthesia” provides evidence for how the concept of kinesthesia has changed over the past hundred years in neurophysiology and dance history, primarily from the perspective of dance aesthetics. A

genealogy of kinesthesia, related to the perspective of contemporary dancers' experience, is beyond the scope of this article; nevertheless it is important to note that the nuances of dancer's kinesthetic awareness could likewise be traced historically. For instance, in the 1960s, the problematizing of spectacle (e.g., Rainer 1965) and of performance spaces (e.g., Merriman 2010) presumably also shifted the focus of kinesthetic awareness for contemporary dancers' experiences at that time, particularly because dancers were interrogating "everyday" movement in a way they had not done before, for instance, considering how walking down a street might be performed (or not "performed" per se, but how the "everyday" might be presented to challenge ideas of performance; Banes 1987; see also Morris 2006).

6. Though the publication quoted here came out when the interviews informing this article were completed, dance scholar and author Susanne Ravn's previous work (2009) and my attendance at two qualitative research methodology workshops, hosted by Ravn, occurred during the research and were important to analysis. I cite Ravn and Hansen (2013) here because it sums up an important part of the methodological approach, learned also at these workshops, in a particularly concise way.

7. By pre-reflective, I am referring to bodily experience that usually goes unnoticed, rather than being "unconscious," following the position that pre-reflective experiences "are initially like nothing for us, and that they only enter the realm of phenomenality when subjected to a reflective process that allows us to become aware of them" (Zahavi 2011).

8. See also Gallagher (2005) regarding "performative awareness" (as cited in Legrand 2007, 501). Legrand is most useful here because she addresses dance experience in greater detail.

9. A similar approach was expressed by choreographer William Forsythe, in a pre-show talk at Sadler's Wells, London, UK, in February 2011, in which he said he has a desire to interrupt and disrupt habits with his dancers when he is making new work. Forsythe said that he does not want the dancers to mimic him when creating a new work, but to originate their own choreography in a way that should surprise even the dancers themselves. For instance, for the piece *I don't believe in outer space*, he said he asked dancers to go home and physically trace the layout of their apartments blindfolded and then bring that material back into the studio. Then he used the material they generated to reconstruct the piece. The practice of using dancer-generated material is not unique to Forsythe, and Jiles's "crash to create." Several of the dancers, such as Willow, also talked about their experience with this type of choreographic approach (see also Roche 2011).

10. It is interesting to note that Sklar (2000) writes about "dropping down into the body," re-directing, as she says, "Csordas' phrase 'somatic mode of attention,'" which has some resonance with Willow's descriptions here as well (72).

11. Also known as Cynthia Novack.

12. I thank one of the reviewers for referring me to Margaret H'Doubler's (1921) work, one of the first practitioners to be asked to bring dance into a higher education environment in the U.S. Her book, *A Manual of Dancing: Suggestions and Bibliography for the Teacher of Dancing*, indicates ways that the shift to a university context might have impacted on a kinesthetic mode of attention.

13. See any of the number of dance degree programs and their technique offerings, available online, to support this claim.

Works Cited

- Aalten, Anna. 2004. "The Moment When It All Comes Together': Embodied Experiences in Ballet." *European Journal of Women's Studies* 11: 263–76.
- Albright, Ann Cooper. 2011. "Situated Dancing: Notes from Three Decades in Contact with Phenomenology." *Dance Research Journal* 43(2): 5–18.
- Banes, Sally. 1987. *Terpsichore in Sneakers: Post-Modern Dance*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Bartky, Sandra Lee. 1990. *Femininity and Domination: Studies in the Phenomenology of Oppression*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

- Bleeker, Maaïke. 2008. *Visuality in the Theatre: The Locus of Looking*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1980. *The Logic of Practice*. Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Bull, Cynthia Jean Cohen. 1988. "Looking at Movement as Culture: Contact Improvisation to Disco." In *Moving History/Dancing Cultures*, edited by Ann Dils and Ann Cooper Albright, 404–13. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Claïd, Emily. 2006. *Yes? No! Maybe: Seductive Ambiguity in Dance*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Copeland, Roger. 1993. "Dance, Feminism, and the Critique of the Visual." In *Dance, Gender and Culture*, edited by Helen Thomas, 139–50. London: Macmillan Press.
- Creswell, John W. 2007. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Crossley, Nick. 2001a. "The Phenomenological Habitus and Its Construction." *Theory and Society* 30: 81–120.
- . 2001b. *The Social Body: Habit, Identity and Desire*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Csordas, Thomas J. 1993. "Somatic Modes of Attention." *Cultural Anthropology* 8(2): 135–56.
- . 1994. *Embodiment and Experience: The Existential Ground of Culture and Self*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Dempster, Elizabeth. 2010. "Women Writing the Body: Let's Watch a Little How She Dances." In *The Routledge Dance Studies Reader*, edited by Alexandra Carter and Janet O'Shea, 229–35. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Eddy, Martha. 2009. "A Brief History of Somatic Practices and Dance: Historical Development of the Field of Somatic Education and Its Relationship to Dance." *Journal of Dance & Somatic Practices* 1(1): 5–27.
- Ehrenberg, Shantel. 2012a. "The Dancing Self/Other: Kinaesthesia and Visual Self-Reflection in Contemporary Dance." Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Manchester, School of Arts, Languages and Cultures, Manchester, UK.
- . 2012b. "A Contemporary Dancer's Kinaesthetic Experiences with Her Dancing Self-Image." In *Spacing Dance(S)—Dancing Space(S) Anthology*, edited by Susanne Ravn and Leena Rouhiainen, 193–213. Odense, Denmark: University Press of Southern Denmark.
- Figuerola, Luisa. 2009. "Release Based Dance Technique: A Systematic Investigation." Unpublished MSc thesis, Trinity Laban, London.
- Fortin, Sylvie, Warwick Long, and Madeleine Lord. 2002. "Three Voices: Researching How Somatic Education Informs Contemporary Dance Technique Classes." *Research in Dance Education* 3(2): 155–79.
- Foster, Susan Leigh. 1986. *Reading Dancing: Bodies and Subjects in Contemporary American Dance*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 1997. "Dancing Bodies." In *Meaning in Motion*, edited by J. C. Desmond, 235–57. Durham: Duke University Press.
- . 2011. *Choreographing Empathy: Kinesthesia in Performance*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Franko, Mark. 2011. "Editor's Note: What Is Dead and What Is Alive in Dance Phenomenology?" *Dance Research Journal* 43(2): 1–4.
- Gallagher, Shaun. 2005. *How the Body Shapes the Mind*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Gardner, Sally. 2007. "The Dancer, the Choreographer and Modern Dance Scholarship: A Critical Reading." *Dance Research* XXV(1): 35–53.
- Ginot, Isabelle. 2010. "From Shusterman's Somaesthetics to a Radical Epistemology of Somatics." *Dance Research Journal* 42(1): 12–29.
- Green, Jill. 2015. "Somatic Sensitivity and Reflexivity as Validity Tools in Qualitative Research." *Research in Dance Education* 16(1): 67–79.

- Green, Jill, and Susan W. Stinson. 1999. "Postpositivist Research in Dance." In *Researching Dance*, edited by Sondra Horton Fraleigh and Penelope Hanstein, 91–123. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- H'Doubler, Margaret Newell. 1921. *A Manual of Dancing: Suggestions and Bibliography for the Teacher of Dancing*. Madison, WI: Tracy & Kilgore.
- Järvinen, Hanna. 2006. "Kinesthesia, Synesthesia and Le Sacre Du Printemps: Responses to Dance Modernism." *Senses & Society* 1(1): 71–91.
- Kvale, Steinar, and Svend Brinkmann. 2009. *Interviews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*. London: Sage.
- Legrand, Dorothée. 2006. "The Bodily Self: The Sensori-Motor Roots of Pre-Reflective Self-Consciousness." *Phenomenology and Cognitive Science* 5: 89–118.
- . 2007. "Pre-Reflective Self-Consciousness: On Being Bodily in the World." *Janus Head, Special Issue: The Situated Body* 9(1): 493–519.
- Legrand, Dorothée, and Susanne Ravn. 2009. "Perceiving Subjectivity in Bodily Movement: The Case of Dancers." *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* 8(3): 389–408.
- Manen, Max van. 1990. *Researching Lived Experience: Human Science for an Action Sensitive Pedagogy*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Mason, Jennifer. 2002. *Qualitative Researching*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mauss, Marcel. 1934. "Techniques of the Body." In *Incorporations: Zone 6*, edited by Jonathan Crary and Sanford Kwinter, 455–77. New York: Urzone.
- Merriman, Peter. 2010. "Architecture/Dance: Choreographing and Inhabiting Spaces with Anna and Lawrence Halprin." *Cultural Geographies* 17(4): 427–49.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. 1945. *Phenomenology of Perception*. Translated by Colin Smith. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Montero, Barbara. 2010. "Does Bodily Awareness Interfere with Highly Skilled Movement?" *Inquiry* 53(2): 105–22.
- Morris, Gay. 2006. *A Game for Dancers*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Ness, Sally Ann. 2011. "Foucault's Turn from Phenomenology: Implications for Dance Studies." *Dance Research Journal* 43(2): 19–32.
- Novack, Cynthia J. 1990. *Sharing the Dance: Contact Improvisation and American Culture*. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Pakes, Anna. 2009. "Knowing Through Dance-Making: Choreography, Practical Knowledge and Practice-as-Research." In *Contemporary Choreography: A Critical Reader*, edited by Jo Butterworth and Liesbeth Wildschut, 10–22. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Parviainen, Jaana. 1998. *Bodies Moving and Moved*. Tampere, Finland: Tampere University Press.
- . 2002. "Bodily Knowledge: Epistemological Reflections on Dance." *Dance Research Journal* 34(1): 11–26.
- Potter, Caroline. 2008. "Sense of Motion, Senses of Self: Becoming a Dancer." *Ethnos* 73(4): 444–65.
- Purser, Aimie Christianne Elizabeth. 2008. "Exploring the Embodied Bases of Being Through Merleau-Ponty and Dance: A Conversation Between Philosophy and Practice." Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK.
- Rainer, Yvonne. 1965. "Some Retrospective Notes on a Dance for 10 People and 12 Mattresses Called 'Parts of Some Sextets.'" *The Tulane Drama Review* 10(2): 168–178.
- Ravn, Susanne. 2009. *Sensing Movement, Living Spaces: An Investigation of Movement Based on the Lived Experience of 13 Professional Dancers*. Saarbrücken, Germany: VDM Verlag.
- . 2010. "Sensing Weight in Movement." *Journal of Dance & Somatic Practices* 2(1): 21–34.
- Ravn, Susanne, and Helle Ploug Hansen. 2013. "How to Explore Dancers' Sense Experiences? A Study of How Multi-Sited Fieldwork and Phenomenology Can Be Combined." *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health* 5(2): 196–213.
- Reynolds, Dee. 2007. *Rhythmic Subjects*. London: Dance Books.
- Roche, Jenny. 2011. "Embodying Multiplicity: The Independent Contemporary Dancer's Moving Identity." *Research in Dance Education* 12(2): 105–18.

- Rouhiainen, Leena. 2003. *Living Transformative Lives: Finnish Freelance Dance Artists Brought into Dialogue with Merleau-Ponty's Phenomenology*. Helsinki, Finland: Acta Scenica.
- Sheets-Johnstone, Maxine. 1966. *The Phenomenology of Dance*. 1980 ed. London: Dance Books.
- Shusterman, Richard. 2008. *Body Consciousness: A Philosophy of Mindfulness and Somaesthetics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Sklar, Deidre. 2000. "Reprise: On Dance Ethnography." *Dance Research Journal* 32(1): 70–7.
- . 2007. "Unearthing Kinesthesia." In *The Senses in Performance*, edited by Sally Banes and André Lepecki, 38–46. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Spohn, Cydney, and Sandra Spickard Prettyman. 2012. "Moving Is Like Making Out: Developing Female University Dancers' Ballet Technique and Expression Through the Use of Metaphor." *Research in Dance Education* 13(1): 47–65.
- Warburton, Edward C. 2011. "Of Meanings and Movements: Re-Languaging Embodiment in Dance Phenomenology and Cognition." *Dance Research Journal* 43(2): 65–83.
- Zahavi, Dan. 2011. "Varieties of Reflection." *Journal of Consciousness Studies* 18(2): 9–19.

