3.1 Collaborative original theatre

Name: _____ Class: _____ Date: _____ **Total: 27 marks**

KEY WORDS starting point • ensemble

Collaborative original theatre

Objective

Interrogate a starting point into a performative intention, generate and shape material with the devising methods, structure the ensemble, and evaluate the performance against the intention with audience evidence (collaboratively creating original theatre).

1 Key knowledge and worked examples

Devising toolkit. Starting point: interrogated (contains, connects, demands), never illustrated. Intention: a performative aim ("make the audience feel a border in their bodies") – written, tested against every choice, revisable. Generating: image theatre, improvisation with rules, writing in the room, physical/vocal composition; accumulate, then shape into the piece's spine. Ensemble: rotating roles (facilitator, scribe, timekeeper), agreements, behavioural feedback. Failures: director-in-disguise, polite silence, workshop loop. Performance tests the intention; evaluation gathers audience evidence and owns the failures. Worked piece: the border-objects project.

2 Practice

2.1 State the three interrogation questions put to a starting point. [3]

2.2 Distinguish a theme from an intention, with one example of each. [2]

2.3 Name the four generating methods. [2]

2.4 What makes improvisation serve the intention rather than drift? [2]

2.5 Name the three classic collaborative failures. [3]

3 Exam-style questions

3.1 *(Interrogation style.)* A starting point is a pile of confiscated border-crossing objects (shoes, a child's drawing, a phone). Draft the interrogation and the performative intention. [6]

3.2 *(Devising style.)* For this intention, draft one generating session: the method, its rule, and the material it would produce. [4]

3.3 *(Evaluation style.)* The performance ends with every object held and put down. Draft the evaluation's three evidence moves: what the audience DID, what worked against the intention, what the process taught. [5]

Solutions

2.1 What does it contain (its facts, tensions, silences); what does it connect to (whose story, which structures, which audience); what does it demand of theatre (why staged, not essayed) (3).

2.2 A theme names subject matter ("migration"); an intention is a performative aim the staging executes and the audience undergoes ("make the audience feel a border in their bodies") (2).

2.3 Image theatre; improvisation (structured); writing in the room; physical/vocal composition (2 – 1 for three).

2.4 Rules that keep the intention in the room (any form: every improvisation ends with an object left behind) (1) – constraints direct generated material toward the intention instead of whatever the players find easiest (1).

2.5 The director-in-disguise; the polite silence; the workshop loop (3).

3.1 Contains: the objects are silent – their owners absent; presence-through-absence is the tension; the phone still works is a silence nobody mentions (2). Connects: the owners' crossing stories, the confiscating authority, an audience that carries phones daily (2). Demands: the audience must handle what the owners could not keep – staging makes absence touchable; an essay cannot. Intention: "the audience leaves having held something they could not keep" (2).

3.2 Method: image theatre (2). Rule: each image must contain one person touching an object no one is looking at (1). Material: "the line at the fence" (bodies as barrier, objects passed hand to hand over it), later re-sculpted against the intention – the fence dissolves and only the passing remains (1). (Accept any method + rule + material genuinely serving the intention.)

3.3 Audience evidence: they held the objects (the letters were taken and read), they put them down at the end – some put them down facing away; the door talk was about what they had held (2). Against the intention: the intention was having-held, and the final image made the putting-down public – that worked; the guard who apologised diluted it (laughter at the wrong moment) and is cut or rewritten (2). Process: the rotating facilitator kept the director-in-disguise out; the polite silence cost one week – named and repaired by the agreements; the lesson: feedback protocols are the piece's spine too (1).

Local review guidance: the interrogation must reach a DEMAND, not stop at content; (R1 3.2) the rule is the devise, not the method's name; (R1 3.3) evaluation cites what the audience DID, not what the ensemble felt. Authored guidance.