

Reflections on an investigative experience with *capoeira*

Flávio Soares Alves*

Yara Maria de Carvalho**

Abstract: This paper aims to describe the movements of an investigative experience with *capoeira*. The description shows the deviations and transgressions that witness certain propensity to becoming in the methodological approach. We seek to map the ways in which procedures were deconstructed and transformed into field research. We intend to understand how the researcher's involvement with the field forces regulatory principles of action to their limits, keeping an investigative stance in the tension between the referential function – which points to the regular application of procedures – and the propensity for becoming. Thus, the introduction of intensity is shown in the research relationship. The record of that intensity feeds this description.

Keywords: Methods. Cartography. *Capoeira*.

1 INTRODUCTION

This text takes a reflective stance to present and discuss

*Department of Physical Education. Paulista State University (UNESP). Rio Claro, SP, Brazil. Email: flavio_salves@hotmail.com

**School of Physical Education and Sport. University of São Paulo (USP), São Paulo, SP, Brazil. Email: yaramc@usp.br

an investigative experience with *capoeira*.¹ The first step of this reflection exposes the research's purpose: to investigate *capoeira* practitioners' practices of creation/invention. Therefore, the proposal of this investigation was to approach *capoeira* and experience the movements of thought forged in this engaged visibility.

During field research, we engaged with the following *capoeira* groups: Capoeira Brasil, in Botucatu; Amukenguê, in Jaú; Projeto Liberdade, at USP São Paulo; Escola de Capoeira Raiz de Angola, in Piracicaba; Centro de Capoeira Angola Angoleiro Sim Sinhô; Associação de Capoeira Angola Senhor do Bonfim, and Grupo Capoeira Ginga-Brasília, in São Paulo.

After defining research subjects, we were able to develop procedures and it was precisely at this point that the propensity to becoming revealed his untimeliness by introducing the following challenge into the investigation: how can we conduct participant observation, interviews and daily research work without giving up on an exercise that is constructed in relationships and that goes beyond statutory application of previously established procedures?

The principle of cartography (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 1995) adjusted the investigative attitude, calling the researcher to the challenge of intervention-research.² Therefore, it was necessary to adjust the eye: instead of installing it on the subject in a downward projection that takes it by assault, we dared to reverse its angle of divergence, dissolving the observer's point of view – that supposedly neutral view that overflies the investigative field – in order to open up to the intensities of relations. Within this game, research was delineated and calibrated its trait and its singularities.

¹Data of that search: ALVES, 2011.

²According to Passos and Benevides de Barros, the challenge of intervention-research "is to achieve a reversal of the traditional meaning of the method – no longer a walk to achieve preset targets (*metahodos*), but rather the primacy of the walk that defines its goals en route" (2009, p. 17). This reversal gives visibility to the composition of a common plan between researcher and researched – the experience level as an intervention – among which the exercise of research ensures "the central role of the object and its active inclusion in the knowledge production process" (KASTRUP; PASSOS, 2013, p. 270).

2 AND THE GAME BEGINS...

today I met master Ananias. [...] people are already talking, saying that I'm a researcher. [...] Before I could set up the presentation, they take me to meet the master. I have *researcher* written on my forehead.

The master's black face stares at me, his eyes look at me askew. [...] No disguise, in a spontaneous and circumspect expression of oddness, he looks at Minhoca and challenges him, "Who's the guy?" I feel like an alien. [...] it's time to untie the knots and Minhoca helps me to do that, "It's Flávio, master." [...] I recover my breath ...

Master Ananias, however, does not waste his time; he enters the room and leaves me behind. He reaches a bench and sits down. [...].

I sit down by his side ... The master challenges me, "Do you practice *capoeira*?" I answer, still hesitant, "Yes, I came here to know you and everyone in here". Still suspicious, he goes right to the point that's bothering him: "You came here to do research, right?" And I answer: "No way, master, I came to loiter with you guys!" I feel courage revive my veins, but the master's reaction shows that he didn't even hear my answer. Soon he lets out an insolent grumble: "I don't know what those studies are good for... what do people do with them? They serve what? Don't they have better things to do?" Interestingly, I don't accept his provocation, on the contrary, I dissimulate, I change subject ... [...] The master starts asking me about my story with *capoeira*. When I tell him I've been with several masters due to the several times I moved from town to town in my life, because of the studies I've done, the master steps forward indignantly: "Went through several masters, right? That's no good". And he starts a confusing conversation that escapes my understanding: I didn't understand a single word.

From that point on we're both more relaxed. The

start of the talk untied the knots... [...]. (ALVES, 2011, p. 40-41).

The text above focused on apprehending in-act relations while the meeting was being untied, exposing the ways in which the encounter with the master was gradually established in the event. In the midst of those relationships, there were no previously set procedures to be dealt with, only problems and cases to solve, coming one after the other, as real events.

To continue the relations established there, it was necessary to engage with and be engaged by the encounter with the master, thus creating a field amidst which the meeting was structured. With that, relations followed, weaving a web of problems and cases observed in the constitution of the encounter.³

The writer who is enunciated in the text denies the oppositional or neutral stance in the dialogue, in order to open up to the meeting with the other and find the problems there, in the wake of the singularities that only emerge in the implications of field research.

As a development of this stance, the research is engendered as a learning exercise. Deleuze helps us to support this idea when he

³The passages underlined in the diary fragment above can be cited as examples of how the researcher gradually let himself be affected by that field of involvements established in the encounter with the master. The term “loiter” appeared in the first passage, when the researcher answered the master’s question about his research intentions. The action of “loitering” drives the researcher’s plunge into the existential territory of *capoeira*. In this regard, the researcher’s intention with that answer was to break away from the trend implicit in the master’s question to underscore the opposition and asymmetry between interlocutors, in the search for other relationships based on the action of loitering. Alvarez gives us this clue in stating that “cartographing is inhabiting an existential territory” (2007, p. 131), something only possible in *capoeira* when researchers slow themselves to use some time with *capoeira* in the experience of loitering. Therefore, the researcher’s answer is not a strategy to postpone his revelation as such in the territory he wants to study; on the contrary, it works as an strategy to dissolve the opposition between the parties to promote a common plan (plan of forces) amidst which the researcher inhabits the territory he engages with. Loitering, therefore, is an attitude that invites the parties to the adventure of movement, that is, the experimentation of the forces constituted in transversality, in the exercise of “being with”. The same applies to the following underlined passage. According to Alves (2011), malice and dissimulation are attitudes that are part of the exercise of loitering. Thus, when dissimulating and changing the subject in response to the master’s provocation, the researcher introduces forces in the conversation that help intensifying the encounter. According to Alvarez, this intensification, typical of loitering time, exposes the “ethics of *mandinga*” (deception in *capoeira*) (2007, p. 21), in which the living tradition of *capoeira* is in movement – something possible by the experience of the rites, in aesthetic expressions, rhythms, magic, the political aspects of resistance and negotiation with the opponent, the collective dimension, in dialogues between “capoeirists”, in the *capoeira* circle and the role played by the *capoeira* master.

points out that learning is constituting spaces for encounter in which “live acts” nest and pluck the thought from its stationing point – where what reigns is the image of a thought which presupposes itself – forcing it to think (DELEUZE, 2006, p. 2013).

Through this mobilization of thinking, learning only allows what affects it in its areas of sensitivity.⁴ Such areas do not admit predetermined targets, so researchers who dare to be moved by that exercise of learning will no longer show a previous target – on which they launch their investigation – but remain attentive to the unknown, building their path at every step towards dwelling in the territory they want to know.

The notion of rigor changes as an effect of such displacement of the eye: it is no longer associated with the notion of accuracy and precision to express commitment and interest (PASSOS *et al.*, 2009). In the field where that commitment and that interest move, the inquiry follows its path. As a result, the researcher learns, and in the course of learning, he researches.

Being part of it, joining the experience and intervening in it: that is the exercise by which the inquiry opened up to receive affects. It was necessary to cultivate an openness to experience. Alvarez (2007) had already warned us of that need. Availability takes time, interest and engagement with *capoeira*. Therefore, it was necessary to sneak in the unfathomable of an exercise in which, instead of researching about someone, we intend to research with someone. Thus, by being attentive to “researching with”, we mobilize to a multiple through loitering time.

3 LOITERING TIME AND THE INVITATION TO THE CIRCLE

Loitering time is that which dares to dodge chronological time, following the tracks of a dynamic in-process spacetime in

⁴This is a transcendent exercise in which sensitivity is freed from the constraints of conscience and, driven by imagination, ventures into involuntary thought, in which only “the fortuitous or the contingency of the encounter ensures the need for what it [sensitivity] forces one to think” (DELEUZE, 2006, p. 211).

the experience with *capoeira* (ALVES, 2011; ALVAREZ, 2007). Immersed in loitering time, the researcher is positioned as an apprentice and as such he lets himself to be soaked by intensities crossing about.

And those intensities teach a lot about *capoeira*, but they condition that teaching to the emergence of an experience that can be neither anticipated nor controlled, and therefore calls for cultivation of and disposition for “wasting time” with the practice of *capoeira*.

Such finding corroborates the studies of Alvarez (2007). According to the author, loitering cannot be trained. Only the loose life of capoeirists in their existential territory evokes it, what brings up its spontaneous character. Loitering forges a space for intimacy in which participants find themselves involved with *capoeira*. Aware of that intimate space, we accept the challenge of loitering and so we experience *capoeira* open to floating attention and groping and adventurous disposition, amidst which lived experience lets itself to be affected by the *capoeira* that was there. As an effect of this opening to affects, the research was forged as the movement of a visibility immersed in the territory studied.

Another practice is called to help in the constitution of implicated visibility. It is the *capoeira* circle, in which the contagion and provocation effect, forged in loitering, claims a more intense exercise, averse to the neutrality of a researcher who retires to passive observation. The courage to accept the invitation for the *capoeira* circle is the first step, but we must go beyond words! Thus, by accepting the invitation to the circle and the game of *capoeira*, the researcher accepts its status of an apprentice open to transit of affections that cross there. Therefore, the researcher/participant of the circle had in mind the words of Passos and Eirado:

[researchers] cannot be in a position of distant observers, neither can they situate their objects as something identical to themselves. Cartographers launch themselves to the experience, not being immune to it. They follow emergency procedures,

taking care of whatever comes. It is by dissolving their point of view that they guide their action (PASSOS et al., 2009, p. 129).

And so the possibility of writing was inscribed in this dissolution...

4 THE *CAPOEIRA* CIRCLE AND WRITING

The *capoeira* circle invited us to anchor in lived experience. Immersed in it, sensitivity emerged: it untied itself at the crossed feeling of goose bumps, at the furtive emergence of bravery, at the almost tactile density of provocation. Finally, in the midst of the inscription of these affections, we open ourselves to the *capoeira* circle and, engaged, we allow ourselves to follow what happened there, curiously feeling the performative experience that took over us.

According to Deleuze and Guattari (1995, p. 14-17), in the performative experience there is co-emergence of researcher, subject and reality studied. The forces that allow the emergence of that experience into reality cross amidst that co-emergence.

In the ritual space of the *capoeira* circle, the performative experience is achieved when the duality of its actors is dissolved due to the emergence of a reality where there are only forces in intense crossing. At the level where these forces are evident, the impression of affection emerges. The emergence of those affections does not store impressions on a personal level, which sustains the regular record of identity. When engaged, Deleuze would say, the unified subject, his or her own master, is absent and a subject larval acts instead – the only one able “to bear the traces, the landslides and rotations” that move through the intensive experience (2006, p. 308). That larval subject only emerges in the performative experience when he or she discovers a dynamic space and time – the so-called “spatiotemporal dynamics” – where:

[...] Spaces are dug, times are rushed or slowed

only at the expense of twists and dislocations that mobilize and commit the whole body. Bright points cross us, singularities make us bristle ... (DELEUZE, 2006, p. 308).

The *capoeira* circle and the loitering exercise were the times when we touched furtive dynamics, which situates and encourages the larval subject. The writing of diaries took that furtive dynamics to draft its lines, and it had to be anchored there: at the circle and in loitering.

Through the diaries, we were able to gather objective information and furtive impressions. Therefore, the account remained attentive to the description of what happened at the level of forces, launching the researcher back into the *capoeira* circle, and anchoring the writing's valency there. We inscribed what we considered important in the accounts, but as we surrendered to a spontaneous movement to make lived experiences explicit,⁵ we also inscribed something more precious: data that had hitherto remained at unconscious and pre-reflected level.

According to Barros and Kastrup (2009, p. 69-70), collecting those data demands certain retirement, "whose goal is to enable a return to the field experience, so that we can speak from within the experience and not from the outside, that is, about the experience".

Therefore the account demanded catching a breath, which takes us to the intensive field of forces where we soak in affections amid the course of events. Thus, before writing, we had to open up the several points of views that inhabited the same experience of reality. In that opening, we let ourselves to be affected by their movements without attachment. Thus, in the wake of an engaged visibility, the figure of the researcher as an external and neutral observer was dissolved.

⁵According to Kastrup and Barros (2009, p. 83), making something explicit means "bringing a pre-reflective dimension of action to consciousness".

5 THE DISSOLUTION OF THE OBSERVER'S POINT OF VIEW

I see the bodies in front of me, unleashing a malicious, circular, spiral body game. I concentrate my eye between the opponents. I set focus... I insist in the focus until I unfocus it and the image is disturbed. I keep my eye firm as if tuning to another perceptual channel on the image in front of me. I no longer see details, I see only moving blurs ... bodies ... and the ground and the space between bodies ... (ALVES, 2011, p. 50).

A first look at this diary refers the reader to one point of view in which an individualized identity allowed itself to express the case. However, the verbs in the first person singular do not contribute to outline authorship, but to dispersion, to operate the line of writing forged in a problematic field. How was this possible?

By “seeing”, “focusing”, “executing”, “insisting”, “keeping”, the writer “traveled”, that is, he allowed himself to write at a perceptual level where there are only “bodies... and the ground ... and the space between the bodies”, that is, relations in act. Verbs problematize, that is, they create an itinerary of observation oriented towards a dynamic space-time, around which the writer’s perception “travels” to other levels where the Dionysian presence of the larval subject’ prevails.

Writing overflows beyond the edges of authorship, giving way to multiple points of view that inhabit the same reality studied. Therefore, placing himself aside *capoeira*, the researcher also inhabits that reality and intervenes in it. As a result, the observer’s viewpoint is dissolved. The writing has no option but recording what insists on the case studied, as a movement, that is, a creative force.

It should be noted that we must not mix dissolving the observer’s point of view with cancelling observation. Dissolution involves dismantling value judgments and the linear and monotonous

existence of consciousness. The solvency of those judgments raises intervention to a collective level where, as Guattari would say (2004), a network of transversal communications traversed the researcher in his investigative act, tying up production of knowledge and production of reality.

In this sense, the use of first person when writing the diary, rather than enunciating the individualized identity of the researcher, puts into play the expression of a dissolved self that is open to the furtive encounter with other points of view. According to Lourau (1998), the writing experience under such dissolution takes the excess of personal character from text, allowing the author to compose the meaning at a collective level, where he experiences the limit of self-consciousness. In this dissolution, writing is operated under a kind of trance.

The experience with the *Capoeira* circle offered a way to achieve such trance. There, in the act, the writer was mobilized, meaning that he was far from the accommodation of a place. Thus, engaged, he turned writing into an experience that was no longer his, since it was woven at the border, at the limits of a self out of himself that points to the space of experience (SOUZA, 2008).

6 PLAYING AND CONVERSATION: CAPOEIRA IN THE INSTANT'S FURTIVE INSCRIPTION

sometimes people look and feel that *capoeira* is something set up, but it's not. It's something of the moment. [...] *Capoeira* is free, it releases you so you can create any other kind of movement at the circle, [...] of course we practice to be able to do it, but the circle [...] is what your spirit feels, your heart ... and you go and play, and you do it (ALVES, 2011, interview on Oct. 31, 2008).

This speech by submaster Buda makes us grapple with the level of sensations, since it emphasizes that performance in *capoeira* takes place at a different perceptual level, where trained

skills are extracted from the memory that accommodates them to mobilize the level of forces where *capoeira* is played. Similarly, we want to look at the verbal dialogue.

Master Brasília says:

[when playing *capoeira*] you have to realize ... it's like me talking to you here, then you tell me, "Oh, but you said something interesting there", then you keep that and you repeat it ... the same thing happens with playing ... I'm making a move and that's it! I made a move and then you come and [think:] "This is where I'm gonna get him", then I repeat the movement and if you come I go [and get you]! See? That's playing *capoeira*, you know? (ALVES, 2011, interview on Dec. 2, 2008).

The relationship between the parties explores the course of the conversation, and in the construction of that course, a certain flow is untied. Aware of that flow, we launch ourselves to the production of the interviews. That production was not a mere moment to gather information; it was a space for interaction in which researcher and subject plunged together to weave the threads of what was said.

It is strange to think of interviews as part of science without thinking about their catalytic role, after all, the search for research subjects only seems to be justified if the researcher wants to extract some information from them. In any case the information comes, of course, but collecting that information allowed approximation with the interviewee, generating a sort of contagion between the parties. The interview with master Ananias shows how the researcher and the group sneaked through in the threads of such contagion:

Master Ananias: [...] in this world, if you don't have knowledge, son, you're done! You're really done! Because the thing is not to get to the *capoeira* circle and extend your leg ... anyone can extend their leg, but how about understanding? Now, that takes a lot of work...

Interviewer: And what do I have to do to understand?

Master Ananias: You need to try to follow!! Follow the master's rules ... pay attention to what the master says, look at the way the master does it and explains everything ... you have to guide yourself by the master. Today there's a lot of *capoeira* masters out there Lots of silly *capoeira* masters around. I wouldn't trade my students for nothing! [emphatic] My students have no diploma. [...]

Student I: We were born with diplomas, master. [laughs]

Master Ananias: That must be it ... but nowadays it's got to be on paper ... Haven't you been to school to learn? Haven't you sat a bit on the bench of science? If you hadn't sat on the bench of science for a while, you'd be dumb now!

Student II: On the bench of science, master? [without understanding what the master meant]

Master Ananias: The bench of science is school. Where else could you have gotten a little more intelligence?

Student II: But master, my diploma is the street.

Master Ananias: How long have you been with me? [question directed to student]

Student III: It's been a few years already ...

Master Ananias: How about that one who has just left, how long has he been with me?

Student III: It's been some 15 years.

Master Ananias: And he hasn't learned nothing! He's unlearning everything he's learned.

Interviewer: Who has been with master Ananias here for the longest time?

Master Ananias: That one [points to teacher Minhoca], Rafaelzão ...

Interviewer: And what do these students need to know to be good masters in the future?

Master Ananias: They are like masters already, because they are able to be like masters. Especially this one [points to teacher Minhoca] ... and I wouldn't trade my students for no master ... (ALVES, 2011, interview on Aug. 31, 2009).

The point to be considered here are the signs of contagion. For that purpose, we should note the amount of interlocutors: they are five (which characterizes a group interview). Speech turns cross in the space of interaction. Ideas bent on each other, driven by curiosity. Meanwhile, the researcher follows the conversation. Thus, the eye that goes back and forth between speech turns lets itself to be infected by that spontaneous development. This finding corroborates the ideas of Tedesco, Sade and Caliman. According to these authors, "the interview follows the movement, and more specifically, moments of rupture, the changing movements present in speeches" (2013, p. 300).

What was the starting point of the conversation? It no longer matters. Contagion dissolved it. If there some alleged knowledge, it was stripped off in the engagement with the group. At the time of this interview, we recorded impressions about the exercise of group engagement constituted as follows:

[...] The word "interview" was awkward. [...] In the face of experience [...], the possibility of an interview seemed to have no credible value. [...] However, fears were being diluted with time and willingness to dialogue.

Entering the conversation without much thought about it and its previously planned purposes was an exercise of liberation.

The direction of the questions was totally unplanned and followed indications given along

the course of the conversation. Roles were reversed several times during the interaction and the interviewer became listener, because as the master spoke, students felt motivated to ask and learn more about *capoeira* and the master himself. [...] It was on the trail of this dialogue that the interview was constituted (ALVES, 2011, p. 56-57).

Therefore, shaken in the transit of in-act relations, the asymmetric opposition between the parties was dissolved, forging co-emergence of discourse. The game installed in the interaction intensified in order to move the interlocutors from the adversarial relationship that situated them. Thus, there were no longer opponents, there was no longer an interview, only forces in relation. The interview then takes place as a dialogue (TEDESCO, SADE; CALIMAN, 2013).

How was that possible? The reader expects a protocol list to unfold here to clarify the procedures by which this elevation to the level of forces was possible. Much can be said, but whatever it is, the procedure aligned to the light of consciousness – where the level of forms is engendered – dissolves in the act in which interaction is constituted. Thus, in the coming and going of speeches, the answers swing with the questions and intensive conversation takes place.

Faced with the prominent dissolution of a previous procedure put into act, master Zequinha's words seem to have more to say:

we need to make *capoeira* happen, so sometimes you need to dilute some conflict, start by relaxing, by letting the other swing, seeing the guy's responses and so watching how it happens ... (ALVES, 2011, interview on Mar. 20, 2009).

Swinging mobilizes dialogue, but how do we swing? By letting come what may.

7 THE DISSOLUTION OF THE INTERVIEW SCRIPT

At the time of the research project, an interview script was produced. Its formulation took into account the following question: how does the subject gradually inscribe for himself a *capoeira* way of being, by engaging with and being engaged by *capoeira*?

The script set the tone for the interlocution, but other shades came after that, opening way for improvisation – inscribed in escape words – but also for the performative line of authorship expressed by the watchwords.⁶ Thus, amid improvisations, we find ourselves lost in the waywardness of speech: vulnerable to the encounter with the other. There is an injunction here. After all, when we speak of interviews, we are supposed to apply a method. So, we are not lost at all, especially when we are in the midst of field research. The definition of procedures cannot leave room for doubt. And if there is no doubt, we do not give a chance to the elements that divert the researcher's perspective from the evidence trail. Nevertheless, the interviews got lost when speeches were untied.

The watchwords in the interview script gave an initial direction to the interlocution, but as the interlocutors engaged, the interview rose to the level of forces. For this to be possible, we provoked interlocutors to infect them with that interaction space. Simply by putting our listening at the disposal of the capoeirists we mobilized them to speak freely and generously about their lives with the practice of *capoeira*. According to Lourau (1996), this provocative move is what enables the emergence of the instituting dynamic that ties the interlocutors in the space of engagement.

In the domains of that space of engagement, the exercise of control was paradoxically sustained: it was constituted from

⁶The author who enunciates the performative act wants to assert his power of enunciation; therefore, he makes use of watchwords with which he signs his authorship. These watchwords, according to Deleuze and Guattari (1995b, p. 16-17), imprison reality in a given direction. The performative experience is built by watchwords, but escape words pass through its porous and solvent structures, as movements that open way for new realities to emerge. Opening to escape words allows dropping the phallic line of authorship, preventing the tendency to overengagement where the researcher calls for a truth revealed by him.

watchwords registered in the script, but also by the original action of those people who answered according to their own motivations, giving directions to the conversation that unfolded as hypertext.

Seen in this way, we found that a reply was not necessarily subject to the previous question – as its causal effect – but it was an emerging episodic expression at the time of the speech. The interlocutor's question often served as a stimulus for the emergence of a latent and pre-reflected expression that dismantled the control implicit in it, giving the conversation an unpredictable direction.

Note how the dialogue with master Plínio unfolded, following the course of speech in interaction:

Interviewer: I'd like to talk a little with you about *capoeira*... You feel free to say whatever you want... first, tell me: what's the meaning of *capoeira* for you? What's *capoeira* for you?

Master Plínio: Hmm... these more direct and simpler questions are more difficult to answer, right?

Interviewer: Yeah, *capoeira* seem to be so “ours” that there's nothing to say about it! [laughs].

Master Plínio: Right [pause] It's because *capoeira* for me is [pause] it's the structure, it's the basis of my whole life. [...] I'm in *capoeira* every day, then *capoeira* would be a mainspring of my life, it would be what I live for, it's my livelihood, my religion, my exercise, it's the way I found of finding myself ...

Capoeira is the connection between my inner and my outer selves... (ALVES, 2011, interview on Mar. 26, 2009).

At first, it is clear that the master's response goes beyond the limits implied by the question: “What is *capoeira* for you?”. On the first replica, the interlocutor already exposes the pointlessness of the question directed to him as if to say: “Can we reduce a practice of existence along the objective lines of this simple and direct interrogation?” Therefore, there is subtle loss of control here over the

implicit intention of the first question, which mobilizes the interlocutor towards an answer that develops as a problem.

However, the interviewer soon realizes the respondent's disturbance and dodges, anticipating the other's movements: "*Capoeira* seem to be so "ours" that there's nothing to say about it" Such dodging sounds like an induction that supposedly leads the respondent to a logic imposed on him.

The next reaction by the interlocutor is to accept that induction and go along with it, responding: "It's [pause] because, *capoeira*, for me is [pause] ...". This statement, however, does not sustain that induction because the response indicates the irreducibility of a subject who is not satisfied by simply affirming or denying, because if it were so, the interlocutor would be satisfied with "It's". What we saw, however, was a reaction to/creation of the alleged induction. Pauses – interspersed with hesitations of speech – show a time of organization of ideas where the interlocutor found himself instigated to creating his saying, according to his own motivations.

When access to that movement of creation is allowed, the conversation intensifies and induction itself ends up working as a provoking element that feeds the winding line of the game. As master Plínio says: "The good game is when one is trying to catch the other and the other won't let it happen" (ALVES, 2011, interview on Mar. 26, 2009). Induction is therefore part of good conversation, after all, a player only "catches" the other if he tries to bring him to his game, inducing him to his domains. The other, however, as a good player who dodges and does not let himself to be caught, deceiving the alleged induction. Thus the question does not necessarily control what is said, and it could not, because the answer escapes the interviewer's control, after all, it does not come from him, but rather from the interlocutor.⁷ So the conversation spreads, infecting the

⁷Pretension to control the conversation is based on the intention implicit in the question – where the watchwords are inscribed. By giving interrogative form to something that harasses, the interlocutor wants to know something. The concern here, in this to-be-known something, is not with supposed induction that is implicit in it, but with the need to let the untying of the speech create its own course, softening the researcher's certainties, according to a blind groping that makes interlocutors explore the conversation as if exploring the unknown full of curiosity (DELEUZE; GUATTARI, 1995a).

parties and producing the footing of the conversation. According to Goffman, footing is the frame, the climate of a conversation and is a “participant’s projected self in their relationship with the other, with him/herself and the discourse under construction” (2002b, p. 107). Such projection can be negotiated, ratified, maintained, co-sustained or modified depending on the directions triggered by the interlocutors. The events that unfold in the footing are to come in the relational dynamics. Thus, the conversation flows under forces that propagate, linking the interlocutors in a field of engagement (LOURAU, 1993; GOFFMAN, 2002b).

Who spoke? Who said it? These issues no longer matter, since the interviews allowed access to a communicational level at which the authors have shifted the focus from their own views, allowing access to other viewpoints. Attention to a speech made at these crossings shifted the focus of the interview, forging co-authorial discourse. To give visibility to that discourse, this text let itself to be soaked through the research movements, to map the route and the scope of the procedures constituted in the field.

8 FINAL REMARKS

By describing the constitution of procedures, we sought the movements that prevented the regular application of the method, forcing its reinvention. Thus, it was possible to understand that the constitution of procedures can also be a creative exercise that does not abandon the referential function of the procedures; it rather uses of the conditions of the experience to forge its real measure.

The concern with the synthesis of the process, so eagerly sought in positivistic research, tends to summarize the uniqueness of investigations, giving them a regular framing. It was definitely not the way we operated. In the midst of experience, planning was put in place and became cultivation together with *capoeira*. In the course of that cultivation, procedures were constituted, forging the research’s traces of transformation and invention.

What emerged there in the midst of the experience unfolds here, not to dictate new parameters for control and determination of field research, but to draw attention to a totally different principle moved by the propensity towards becoming. What propensity is that? It is one that does not give up the untimely and that alerts the researcher to the emergence of the qualitative in the investigative scene and to the potential for transgression that unfolds from that emergency.

REFERENCES

ALVAREZ, Johnny Menezes. **O aprendizado da capoeira angola como cultivo na e da tradição**. Rio de Janeiro. 230 folhas. Doctoral Thesis in Psychology: Instituto de Psicologia – Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, 2007.

ALVES, Flávio Soares. **O corpo em movimento na Capoeira**. São Paulo. 185 p. Doctoral Thesis in Sciences: Escola de Educação Física e Esporte – Universidade de São Paulo, 2011.

BARROS, Laura Pozzana de; KASTRUP, Virgínia. Cartografar é acompanhar processos. In: PASSOS, Eduardo; KASTRUP, Virgínia; ESCÓSSIA, Lílina (Eds.) **Pistas do método da Cartografia: pesquisa-intervenção e produção de subjetividade**. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2009. p. 52-75.

DELEUZE, Gilles **Diferença e Repetição**. 2. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Graal, 2006.

DELEUZE, Gilles ; GUATTARI, Félix. **Mil Platôs: capitalismo e esquizofrenia**. São Paulo: Ed. 34, 1995a. v. 1.

DELEUZE, Gilles ; GUATTARI, Félix. **Mil Platôs: capitalismo e esquizofrenia**. São Paulo: Ed. 34, 1995b. v. 2.

GARCEZ, Pedro. A perspectiva da análise da conversa etnometodológica sobre o uso da linguagem em interação social. In: LODER, Letícia Ludwig; JUNG, Neiva Maria (Eds.). **Fala-em-interação social: introdução à análise da conversa etnometodológica**. Campinas, SP: Mercado de Letras, 2008. p.17-38.

GOFFMAN, Erving. A situação negligenciada. In: RIBEIRO, Branca Telles; GARCEZ, Pedro (Eds). **Sociolinguística interacional**. São Paulo: Loyola, 2002a. p.13-20.

GOFFMAN, Erving. Footing. In. RIBEIRO, Branca Telles; GARCEZ, Pedro (Eds.) **Sociolinguística Interacional**. São Paulo: Loyola, 2002b. p.107-148.

GUATTARI, Felix A transversalidade. In: **Psicanálise e transversalidade: ensaios de análise institucional**. Aparecida, SP: Ideias e Letras, 2004. p.75-84.

KASTRUP, Virgínia. A aprendizagem da atenção na cognição inventiva. In: **Psicologia & Sociedade**, Belo Horizonte, v. 16, n. 3, 2004. p. 7-16.

KASTRUP, Virgínia ; TEDESCO, Silvia; PASSOS, Eduardo. **Políticas de cognição**. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2008.

KASTRUP, Virgínia; BENEVIDES DE BARROS, Regina Movimentos-funções do dispositivo na prática da cartografia. In: PASSOS, Eduardo; KASTRUP, Virgínia; ESCÓSSIA, Lílina (Eds.). **Pistas do método da Cartografia: pesquisa-intervenção e produção de subjetividade**. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2009. p. 76-91.

ESCÓSSIA, Lílina; PASSOS, Eduardo (Eds.). Cartografar é traçar um plano comum. In: **Fractal; Revista de Psicologia**, Niterói , v. 25, n. 2, p. 263-280, maio/ago. 2013.

LABAN, Rudolf. Dança educativa moderna. São Paulo: Ícone, 1990.

LOURAU, René. **Análise institucional práticas de pesquisa**. Rio de Janeiro: UERJ, 1993.

LOURAU, René. **A análise institucional**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1996.

LOURAU, René. L'écriture automatique: les Cahiers de l'implication. *In: Revue d'analyse Institutionnelle*, Saint-Denis, n. 2, p. 35-38, 1998.

NIETZSCHE, Friedrich. **A vontade de poder**. Rio de Janeiro: Contraponto, 2008.

PASSOS, Eduardo; KASTRUP, Virgínia; ESCÓSSIA, Lílana (Eds.) **Pistas do método da Cartografia**: pesquisa-intervenção e produção de subjetividade. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2009.

SOUZA, Pedro. O sujeito fora de si: movimentos híbridos de subjetivação na escrita foucaultiana. *In: RAGO, Margareth; VEIGA-NETO, Alfredo (Ed.) Figuras de Foucault*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2008. p.205-214.

TEDESCO, Sílvia Helena; SADE, Christian; CALIMAN, Luciana Vieira. A entrevista na pesquisa cartográfica. *In: Fractal: Revista de Psicologia*, Niterói, v. 25, n. 2, p. 299-322, May/Aug., 2013.

Correspondence address

Departamento de Educação Física – IB – Universidade Estadual Paulista – Campus de Rio Claro

Endereço: Avenida 24 A, 1515.

CEP: 13506-900

Rio Claro – SP.

Received on: August 19, 2013

Approved on: April 29, 2014