THE THREE DEMONS OF CREATION: FEAR OF RIDICULE, SHAME, AND FEAR OF THE UNKNOWN. PSYCHOLOGICAL OBSTACLES IN ACTOR TRAINING AND PEDAGOGICAL STRATEGIES FOR OVERCOMING THEM

Florin TOMA

"Dunarea de Jos" University of Galați

Abstract

This article explores the impact of three fundamental psychological obstacles in the actor's training process: fear of ridicule, shame, and fear of the unknown. Drawing on pedagogical experience with first- and second-year students, the paper examines these "blocking emotions" not as absolute hindrances, but as elements that can be integrated and transformed into creative resources. It includes theoretical perspectives, concrete examples, pedagogical applications, and transdisciplinary reflections, aiming to provide a framework for both educators and students to understand and engage with these challenges.

Keywords: *fear, shame, ridicule, acting, theatre pedagogy, vulnerability, creativity, exposure, training process*

1. Introduction

The actor's training process, especially in the early years of university education, involves an inevitable confrontation with personal limitations, defense mechanisms, and deeply rooted fears. Pedagogical observations from working directly with first- and second-year students reveal that the transition from exploratory exercises to working with dramatic text generates not only an artistic challenge but also a significant emotional impact. Frequent reactions such as *"I feel ashamed," "This feels ridiculous," "I can't do this"* reflect an inner discomfort, indicating the emergence of psychological blockages.

This article examines three of the most common emotional obstacles that negatively affect artistic learning: fear of ridicule, shame, and fear of the unknown. These emotions are not addressed as mere hindrances but as zones of tension with creative potential, which—once understood and integrated—can become authentic sources of expressivity. The study combines theoretical insight with pedagogical reflection, incorporating both concepts from the specialized literature and examples from studio practice.

A central focus of the analysis is the actor's specific vulnerability, constantly exposed to the gaze of the other and at risk of being judged or rejected. For the student at the beginning of this journey, this exposure is often perceived not as an opening but as a

threat. The first step, therefore, involves confronting the fear of being seen "as one truly is."

Viola Spolin emphasized that "there are no mistakes, only opportunities to learn" (Spolin, 2008)—a crucial perspective in theatre pedagogy, as it fosters a safe emotional environment. Similarly, Peter Brook speaks about the necessity of an "empty space" free from constraints, in which the actor can explore without fear. Declan Donnellan draws attention to the imaginary blockage triggered by fear of judgment, which can suppress spontaneity and authenticity in theatrical creation.

However, these emotions cannot be fully understood outside the cultural context in which the Romanian actor is shaped. Fear, shame, and ridicule are influenced by a collective mentality shaped by conformity and distrust—an aspect explored in a subsequent section.

The article thus traces the dynamic of these psychological obstacles and explores possible pedagogical strategies for transforming them into creative resources. We begin with the most visible and often inhibiting of them: the fear of ridicule.

2. The Cultural Legacy of Shame and Fear in the Training of the Romanian Actor

The topic proposed is motivated by both pedagogical observations and reflection on the cultural context in which future actors are formed. Shame, fear of ridicule, and fear of the unknown are not merely individual reactions but reflect a collective emotional background, often transmitted unconsciously through education, religion, and social norms. Contemporary Romanian culture retains within its mental structure the imprint of a moral tradition in which shame functions as a behavioral regulator, and fear, as a mechanism of control.

The fact that Romania is a predominantly Orthodox society is relevant in this respect. Traditional expressions of religiosity have emphasized values such as humility, fear of God, and shame as a form of moral discipline. In many families and communities—especially rural ones—religious education passed down through generations operated through mechanisms of inhibition: *"you should be ashamed," "don't sin," "God will punish you."* For previous generations, fear and shame acted as affective moral compasses, rather than rational ones. This cultural background still influences the difficulty many young people experience in assuming free expression, vulnerability, or error—elements essential to the artistic training process.

In this regard, Jean-Jacques Rousseau's perspective remains surprisingly relevant: *"Man is born free, and everywhere he is in chains"* (Rousseau, *Writings on Art*, 1981). These "chains" can be understood as cultural, moral, and educational systems that, instead of encouraging authentic self-expression, induce conformity and fear of judgment. In the process of training, the actor is often called to become aware of and break these constraints in order to access a space of genuine expression.

Some anthropologists distinguish between "shame cultures" and "guilt cultures." In the former, behavior is regulated by the fear of others' judgment; in the latter, by internal conscience and guilt. Romania shows traits of a shame-based culture, where social validation conditions self-expression. Therefore, the actor faces not only personal fears but also an internalized cultural system that inhibits exposure, experimentation, and the acceptance of failure.

From this perspective, artistic formation also involves a process of identity reconfiguration: the student is not merely learning methods and techniques, but is also challenged to reconsider their relationship with their emotions and to confront cultural constraints. Fear and shame cannot simply be denied—they must be understood and transformed into expressive resources.

In this context, Ion Cojar's assertion becomes especially relevant: *"The art of the actor is a specific way of thinking"* (Cojar, 1998). This idea remains fundamental for understanding not only the mechanisms underlying acting as a craft but also the broader creative process—one that demands reflection on the self and conscious scenic presence.

Through this cultural lens, it becomes clearer that the actor's emotional obstacles are not only personal but collective. What follows is a closer analysis of these emotions, beginning with one of the most frequent and visible forms of blockage: the fear of ridicule.

3. The fear of embarrassment – the blocked space between intention and expression, or between others' judgment and one's own self-censorship

In the previously discussed cultural and pedagogical context, one of the most common forms of blockage in the training of the Romanian actor is the fear of ridicule. This fear is not merely a fleeting embarrassment, but a deep-rooted self-defence mechanism, triggered by the anticipation of possible negative judgment. The student is not necessarily afraid of the scenic action itself, but of the image they believe they project in the eyes of others — a fear of being ridiculous, inadequate, or overly exposed, which limits expressive freedom.

The fear of ridicule acts as an invisible yet persistent filter through which all intentions pass before being expressed: *"How will I look?", "What if it's silly?", "What if they laugh?"* This constant self-monitoring can lead to stage paralysis or to a formal interpretation devoid of real engagement.

In practice, this fear manifests through recognisable behaviours: hesitation in gestures, bodily rigidity, the use of irony as a defensive mechanism, and emotional distancing from the material. Students often end up "performing by form," keeping a protective barrier between themselves and the character.

Declan Donnellan notes that "the fear of ridicule is the fear of the void" — that unexplored inner space, devoid of certainty and control, where true creation begins (Donnellan, 2006). In this sense, ridicule is not an objective trait of the performance, but a projection of insecurity. The student does not fear what they are doing, but how they imagine they are being perceived. They fear being seen.

This fear is not always tied to the content of the scenic act, but rather to the assumption that the action might provoke laughter or disdain from others. In an improvisation exercise where students were asked to invent an unusual way of walking, their reactions included hesitation, nervous laughter, justifications, or refusal. The blockage did not stem from a lack of imagination, but from the anticipation of being perceived as "ridiculous."

Another exercise involved simulating an exaggerated "dramatic death" in Bollywood style — with grand gestures and high intensity. Again, many students minimised their expressiveness, avoiding sounds or exaggeration. Instead of playful abandon, there was a heightened alertness to external reactions: glances toward the teacher, seeking approval, fear of disapproval. The issue was not the action itself, but the gaze accompanying it.

To overcome this blockage, it is essential that the pedagogical space becomes one free of sanctions, where the student can experiment precisely where they feel the greatest resistance. Exercises involving *"embraced awkwardness"* — where the actor intentionally

plays clumsy, excessive, or ridiculous — help dissociate mistake from shame. Once the student experiences doing something "silly" and still feels emotionally safe, the fear of ridicule begins to lose its grip.

This approach is supported by Viola Spolin, who states that *"in improvisation, there are no mistakes; the only mistake is not accepting the game and its rules"* (Spolin, 2008). In this way, mistake — and by extension, ridicule — becomes a possibility for learning and creation.

In contemporary pedagogy, it is crucial to continually remind ourselves that the stage act is not a demonstration of skill, but a search for truth. And truth involves risk, failure, and moments of fragility. As Peter Brook says, *"true creation begins where control ends"* (Brook, 2014). Therefore, the fear of ridicule should not be eliminated, but rather recognised as a signal that the actor is nearing authenticity.

4.   Shame – The Identity-Based Emotion That Inhibits Expression

If the fear of ridicule arises from the anticipation of external evaluation and blocks spontaneous expression, shame goes deeper, touching the level of personal identity. It is no longer just the fear of being perceived negatively, but the painful belief that *"something is wrong with who I am."* Shame thus becomes a disintegrative emotion, affecting not only the performance but also the individual's relationship with themselves.

From a clinical psychology perspective, June Price Tangney explains that shame and guilt are self-reflective emotions that involve introspection and personal evaluation (Tangney & Tracy, 2012). Although they share common traits, the key distinction lies in their focus: guilt targets behaviour ("I did something wrong"), whereas shame targets identity ("something is fundamentally wrong with me") (Tangney & Dearing, 2002). While guilt can motivate reparative action, shame often leads to withdrawal and isolation.

In pedagogical processes, the transition from ridicule to shame is not abrupt but marks an intensification of vulnerability. If ridicule can be overcome through play and irony, shame requires an empathetic approach and a safe space. A student who utters a line while lowering their gaze or diminishing their presence is not just protecting the gesture, but shielding their self-image.

Ion Cojar asserted that the actor must embrace their own biography as a source of expression: *"The actor does not hide behind the character, but reveals themselves through it"* (Cojar, 1998). The actor lives the character through their own emotional and affective structure. In this light, shame becomes an indicator of fragile inner territories that are rich in artistic potential. It should not be avoided, but acknowledged and transformed into scenic truth.

A scene exercise involving extreme confrontation illustrated this dynamic. Although the character was in a desperate situation that required a dramatic gesture—such as falling to their knees to beg for help—a student avoided the gesture, despite fully understanding the pedagogical direction. This was not a technical issue, but a deep resistance tied to vulnerability and the shame of exposure.

This moment proved significant not through behavioural correction, but through the recognition of the internal blockage. The emerging question—*"Why can't I do this gesture, if I know it's right for the scene?"*—redirected the analysis from acting competence to personal biography. Where shame blocks action, it opens the door for authentic pedagogical intervention.

Such moments demand a dual presence from the teacher: technical discernment and genuine empathy. Shame cannot be corrected through instructions; it must be worked through in a space where the actor can attempt to reveal themselves. The necessary validation is not formal, but deeply connected: *"Is it a necessary gesture? Then you have nothing to lose. Try again."*

In actor training, the body is not merely a tool for expression—it is a space where emotion is manifested. Fear, shame, and the unknown are not abstract concepts; they are expressed through blocked gestures, contracted postures, and suspended breathing. To address them effectively, a somatic understanding is needed—a kinesthetic reading of how these emotions inhabit the body and how they can be released.

Kinesiology, a discipline exploring the link between movement, the nervous system, and emotional balance, offers a useful framework. Emotions are not only felt but also carried: in tense shoulders, curved spines, uncertain steps, or rigid gestures. In cases of shame, one often observes withdrawn shoulders, lowered gaze, shallow breathing—signs of a retreating presence. Unlike ridicule, which overstimulates expressiveness, shame diminishes and silences it. The ashamed actor is not "too much," but "not present enough."

Exercises in bodily reconnection—guided breathing, conscious walking, contact with objects or partners—can help reestablish stage presence. However, beyond technique, the essential experience is to be seen without being judged, to be accepted with all one's fragility.

Like ridicule, shame is not an obstacle to be eliminated, but a signal from the self asking for integration. When recognised and contained, it can become a powerful source of scenic intensity. The actor who embraces vulnerability not as weakness but as a source of truth can reach rare emotional depth.

Therefore, in actor training, shame is not merely a hindrance—it is a gateway. Not toward technical performance, but toward authenticity. The pedagogy that supports this passage offers more than methods; it facilitates an inner exploration where artistic expression and self-assumption become inseparable.

5. Fear of the Unknown – Anxiety in the Face of Scenic Uncertainty

If the fear of ridicule limits playful exposure and shame inhibits personal expression, the fear of the unknown influences the actor's willingness to step into the uncharted space of creation. It is a more subtle yet deeply inhibiting fear. It does not always manifest visibly but often through the silent avoidance of risk, the preference for familiar solutions, and the constant search for safety in a field where total control is impossible.

By definition, the actor is an explorer of uncertainty. No rehearsal is ever the same, no emotion can be mechanically reproduced, and the stage is a living, open territory. Accepting this instability is a prerequisite for artistic authenticity. Yet, especially during the training years, students often resist unpredictability. They seek the "correct scheme," the "safe line," or the "proven formula"—clear signs of a need for control that can stifle spontaneity.

In one scene exercise, a student was given a key instruction to break out of mental control: "Get out of your head and let your body decide." Still, the student remained motionless for much of the scene. Later, he confessed: "I didn't know whether to move or stay still. What was the right thing to do?" His reaction did not reflect a lack of understanding, but a fear of acting in a space without pre-established answers.

This fear does not manifest as nervousness but as blockage—a suspension of impulse, a tense waiting for a security that will never come. More than shame or ridicule, it creates an inner silence where the creative voice retreats until the environment becomes predictable again.

"When we strip away control, the possibility of a living theatre appears" (Brook, 2014). This idea suggests that not only acceptance but trust in the unknown is a vital competence. And this trust is not taught through theory—it is developed through direct experience, in contexts where uncertainty becomes a source of expression.

Stage exercises that involve delaying reactions, suspending intention, or exploring without a set goal can help foster this availability. The exercise "Three breaths before the line," for example, helps suspend automatic response and opens a space in which the actor begins to feel, listen, and respond authentically. The pedagogical question becomes: "What happens if you don't react right away?"—inviting the student into deep listening and mature response.

From a kinesiological perspective, fear of the unknown is associated with visible tensions—especially in the solar plexus area, in breathing, and in bodily movement — which may become either excessive or frozen. It is the body no longer trusting its capacity to support the present moment without a preset plan. That is why grounding exercises, conscious breathing, and somatic presence are essential.

If shame calls for empathy and recognition, and ridicule for relaxation and humour, the unknown requires trust—in the space, in the partner, and in the self. In this sense, the teacher is not merely an instructor but a guide who accompanies the student into the unknown, sharing the risks of the creative process.

On stage, the unknown is not a void but a potential. In pedagogy, working with the unknown means expanding the horizon of acceptance until the empty space is no longer felt as a lack—but as a promise.

6. The Fears of Creativity: A Comparative Analysis

After examining the three major psychological obstacles in actor training—fear of ridicule, shame, and fear of the unknown—this section proposes a comparative perspective that highlights both their structural differences and shared mechanisms. This approach is not only pedagogically valuable but also deepens the understanding of the student's inner dynamics.

Although each of these emotions originates from a specific source and manifests differently, they often converge at a common point: the tension between the actor's fragile inner world and their exposure to the gaze of others. This in-between space becomes both the site of potential transformation and of blockage.

Fear of ridicule is triggered by the presence of others. It reflects the fear of being perceived as inadequate, ridiculous, or "outside the norm." It generates behaviors such as avoidance, overcontrol, self-irony, or withdrawal. Without a supportive pedagogical framework, this fear may lead to a formal, unauthentic performance.

Shame, however, has a different nature. It doesn't arise from the fear of being seen, but from conflict with one's self-image. It is perceived as a signal of a deep insufficiency: "Something is wrong with me." Because of its identity-based nature, shame can be more paralyzing than ridicule, requiring an empathetic approach attentive to the student's emotional landscape. Gershen Kaufman points out that shame involves a unique form of

"being seen"—even without an external audience: "Only the self need watch the self, and only the self need shame the self" (Kaufman, 1996, p. 6).

This fragile exposure of the self is just one facet of the actor's art. In contrast, Denis Diderot proposed, in *The Paradox of Acting*, that true performance requires not emotional identification with the role, but lucid detachment. He stated: "The colder the actor, the more master of himself he is, and the more capable of moving his audience" (Diderot, 2010). This view introduces an essential nuance: emotions don't necessarily need to be felt intensely, but rather understood and channeled. Students navigating between shame and control must learn not only to let go, but to develop functional detachment that allows expression to flow without being blocked by fear.

The fear of the unknown, less obvious in behaviour, manifests through resistance to unpredictability and a desire for control. It's not always experienced as a clear emotion but as a constant tension in the absence of fixed references. Actors affected by this fear tend to avoid improvisation and open-ended situations, seeking safe formulas that limit real scenic dynamics.

Each of these emotions relates differently to the idea of otherness and control: fear of ridicule is triggered by the presence of others; shame by internal self-evaluation; and fear of the unknown by the absence of stable reference points. For this reason, actor training must address each vulnerability with specific tools, creating a supportive rather than punitive environment.

Often, these fears do not appear in isolation—they reinforce each other. Shame may fuel fear of ridicule, and the desire for control (linked to fear of the unknown) may intensify feelings of inadequacy. For instance, a student who avoids an improvisation may simultaneously feel ashamed, afraid of being ridiculous, and paralysed by the lack of a clear plan. In such cases, pedagogical intervention must address the entire emotional system.

A comparative analysis of these blocks not only clarifies their differences but also reveals their deep interconnections. The actor doesn't face a single emotion but a network of states that include resistance and openness. In this context, pedagogy cannot be reduced to the application of techniques—it requires constructing a coherent path of integration and traversal. Fragility is not an obstacle, but a starting point, and embracing it can become the foundation of authentic stage presence.

Component	Fear of Ridicule	Shame	Fear of the Unknown
Origin	External (the gaze of others)	Internal (identity-based self-judgment)	Situational (lack of structure or predictability)
Direction	How do others see me?	What's wrong with me?	What do I do when I don't know what comes next?
Bodily Manifestation	Rigidity, control, defensive humour	Withdrawal, contraction, avoidance of eye contact	Apparent restlessness or complete freeze
Inner Discourse	"I'll look ridiculous"	"I am flawed"	"I don't know what to do; I'm not in control"

Scenic Risk	Superficiality, inauthenticity	Absence of emotional truth	Creative paralysis, lack of presence
Pedagogical Need	Validation, embracing mistakes	Acceptance, working with vulnerability	Tolerating uncertainty, deep listening

Table 1: Comparative Overview

This map highlights the fact that each fear requires a differentiated pedagogical strategy. However, in practice, these emotional responses often overlap. In a simple improvisation, for example, a student might say: *"I feel ashamed to do this, it sounds ridiculous and I don't even know how to do it."*—a sentence that brings together shame, embarrassment, and uncertainty all at once.

For this reason, the teacher's intervention cannot be one-dimensional. It requires a refined presence—one that is sensitive to nuance and capable of identifying not just the outward symptom, but the underlying fear that drives it. Working with these three fears means supporting the student in gradually unblocking their expressive flow, while also rebuilding trust in their own artistic self.

Essentially, **the fear of embarrassment** says, *"I can't let myself be seen like this."* **Shame** says, *"I can't be like this."* **Fear of the unknown** adds: *"I don't know who or what to be."*

Together, they form a triad of vulnerability that must not be suppressed or rushed through, but rather recognized, acknowledged, and transformed into a pedagogical space. Only in this way can the student-actor become truly available—not just for the role, but for the creative process as a becoming of the self.

7.   Transforming Fear into a Creative Resource

If the actor—like other professionals who operate in spaces of exposure—is inevitably confronted with fear, shame, and uncertainty, the essential question becomes: can these emotions be transformed into artistic fuel? Many theatre masters and direct pedagogical experience affirm that they can. Not only can these states be overcome, but paradoxically, they can become the most fertile ground for creation.

As Lev Dodin states: *"Theatre is the place where you cannot lie. In life you can cheat, on stage you cannot. If you try to lie, the audience will abandon you."* (Dodin, 2008)

This demand for authenticity means that fear, shame, and uncertainty are not accidental obstacles, but testing grounds—and, simultaneously, gateways to artistic truth.

Fear, shame, and uncertainty can awaken presence, sharpen emotional clarity, and generate authenticity. Jerzy Grotowski spoke of *self-revelation* as the actor's essential path. When these emotions are acknowledged and re-signified, they become creative resources rather than barriers.

7.1. The Handbrake" – Metaphor and Psychological Mechanism

As the actor nears a moment of transformation—when they seem to have grasped the nature of their fears—there sometimes emerges a subtle yet powerful resistance: a tendency toward self-limitation that is difficult to detect, but visible in expression. This

hesitation no longer stems from fear itself, but from an internalized protection mechanism. In pedagogical language, this state is often referred to as "the handbrake is on."

The metaphor is evocative: the student is "running," but with visible restraint—as if dragging an invisible weight. The voice is weak, gestures are held back, the gaze avoids contact or seeks validation. Nothing seems "wrong," yet the expression is not fully authentic. Although the resources are there, something prevents them from unfolding completely.

This behavior may relate to self-handicapping—an unconscious strategy by which the individual limits effort or risk to protect their self-image in case of failure. Thus, the student avoids full engagement in order to preserve a silent justification: *"I didn't give it my all, so it's not my fault if it didn't work."*

Recognizing this state is essential. At first, what's needed is an empathetic gaze, not correction: *What is the student holding back? What are they afraid to express? What part of themselves lacks trust?* These questions open a reflective space that avoids the pressure of immediate correction.

The pedagogical intervention aims not at instant performance, but at gradually releasing expression. Exercises involving large gestures without text—just with the body, in a safe space—can help redirect energy into expression. Other times, working with conscious stillness—inviting the student to remain present in immobility, to observe the tension without forcing release—can be effective.

The metaphor of the "handbrake" becomes a valuable pedagogical tool: not accusatory, but diagnostic. Instead of a blunt comment like "you're not expressive enough," one might say: *"What would happen if you loosened the handbrake a little? Just one millimeter?"* This approach invites negotiation with the comfort zone, rather than abrupt departure from it.

In many cases, the restraint begins to dissolve when the student feels seen and unconditionally accepted. The pedagogical space becomes one of reconnection—with the body, with personal choices, with the creative process seen as a journey, not a test.

The handbrake doesn't vanish suddenly. It is acknowledged, adjusted, understood. It becomes part of the actor's journey toward expressive freedom. And perhaps most importantly, it offers a clear image of one's own protective mechanisms—an image which, once brought to awareness, can be transformed into scenic authenticity.

7.2. Pedagogical Example: The Courage to Act

A meaningful example from pedagogical practice illustrates how fear of exposure and the relationship with the unknown can become catalysts for genuine personal transformation. During a group discussion, a student confessed that she anxiously avoided sitting alone in a café. Not for practical reasons, but because of the discomfort triggered by the gaze of others: *"What will people think?" "What if something happens to me?" "They'll think I have no friends..."*

This reaction mirrors the experience of the novice actor stepping on stage for the first time, feeling exposed before an audience. Simply being present in a public space becomes a trigger for an inner critical and inhibiting dialogue.

The pedagogical value of this experience lies in the student's conscious decision to face her fear. It was a deliberate act: one day, she went alone to a café, sat down, and had a coffee. A seemingly simple gesture, yet profoundly significant. By letting go of anticipated judgment, she discovered another side of exposure: time with herself, the freedom to

observe, to write, to be present without defensiveness. This decision sparked a shift in perception—more self-trust and an increased willingness to stay in contact with herself and with the world.

This experience confirms a key intuition in theatre pedagogy: working with fear does not mean eliminating it, but reframing the relationship with it. It also reiterates the idea that actor training is not merely the accumulation of techniques, but a personal search, supported by questions such as: *"Why do I do theatre?" "What do I discover about myself when I'm exposed, when I'm not in control, when I step into the unknown?"*

The role of the pedagogue in this process is to create a space where these questions can arise, be felt, and be experienced—not just intellectually formulated. That is where true personal development begins.

8. Pedagogical Strategies for Overcoming Obstacles

In the face of the three major psychological tensions—fear of ridicule, shame, and fear of the unknown—the role of the pedagogue is not merely to transmit techniques, but to guide deep inner processes. Each of these obstacles requires a specific intervention, as well as an integrative understanding of how they interconnect. Below is a set of strategies developed through direct classroom observation, and inspired by concepts articulated by theatre masters such as Cojar, Spolin, and Grotowski.

8.1. For the Fear of Ridicule

Although this resistance may seem superficial, it is rooted in a deep need to control others' perception. Intervention cannot be direct ("don't be afraid"), but must instead create a safe, playful, and liberating space.

- Intentional exaggeration exercises: The actor is invited to play "deliberately ridiculous"—exploring absurd gestures, exaggerated expressions, inappropriate vocal tones. Ridicule becomes a choice, not a failure.
- "Celebrating the ridiculous": Validation criteria are reversed— the most "ridiculous" moment is applauded. In this way, risk becomes merit, not shame.
- Catalyst questions: Reflections such as "What would I hate for others to see in me?" or "What am I most ashamed to express?", followed by concrete exercises in expressing those themes, help students confront hidden fears gradually.

8.2. For Shame

Deeper and subtler than ridicule, shame requires a pedagogy rooted in empathy and the encouragement of vulnerability as a source of expression. Work is not done *against* shame, but *alongside* it, in a process of integration.

- Controlled confession exercises: Actors are invited to share personal thoughts or experiences, in a consensual and emotionally secure environment. Exposure is gradual, without pressure.

- Work with confessional texts: Dramatic fragments that explore intimate or taboo subjects are used. The exercise becomes an opportunity to give voice to shame and diminish its power.
- Validation of vulnerability: The pedagogue, as an empathetic witness, validates the sincerity of each gesture. Messages such as "I felt you there," or "You don't have to be perfect, just present" help build a climate of trust and support.

8.3. For the Fear of the Unknown

This fear, often diffuse and difficult to name, is addressed by cultivating trust in the process, rather than in the outcome. The goal is not control, but openness to unpredictability.

- Improvisations with no clear instructions: Only a starting point is offered (an object, a state, a line), with no fixed destination. The actor is encouraged to enter action without a "map," learning to trust intuition.
- Reaction delay games: Exercises such as "3 breaths before responding," or "Feel the impulse, but don't act on it immediately" help train patience, presence, and tolerance for uncertainty.
- Active silence exercises: Actors are placed in scenic situations without dialogue. In the absence of explicit action, they learn to generate presence through simply existing in silence. The unknown becomes a source of latent scenic energy.
- Guided reflection: After each exercise, time is set aside for individual and group reflection. Questions such as "What scared me?", "Which part of me needed control?", "What did I feel when I didn't know what would happen?" support the process of awareness and acceptance of one's fears.

9. Conclusions

The fears that arise in the actor's training process—fear of ridicule, shame, and fear of the unknown—are not simply obstacles to be overcome, but inner territories worth exploring, understanding, and inhabiting with lucidity and compassion. They do not indicate a character flaw, but rather a living, active space where identity pressure, socio-cultural conditioning, and the need for authenticity converge.

In the pedagogical space, these fears demand more than technical correction. They call for an ethics of accompaniment—a pedagogy that nurtures not just performance, but presence; not just expressiveness, but the courage to remain in silence; not just formal safety, but the risk of being human. In this sense, the teacher's role becomes almost therapeutic: that of creating a space in which the student can face their own limits without fear of being rejected or prematurely corrected.

The analysis of the three "demons" of acting creation, mirrored by the cultural legacy of fear and shame, reveals a structural tension between what the stage requires—openness, acceptance, vulnerability—and what society, family, or school often cultivate: avoidance of exposure, fear of error, suppression of difference. In this context, the art of acting becomes more than a profession; it becomes a process of identity reconfiguration—through which the student learns to see themselves differently, to tolerate their own fragility, and to transform fear into creative fuel.

If there is a deeper stake in theatre pedagogy, beyond techniques and methods, it may be this: not the elimination of fear, but its re-signification. Instead of running from ridicule, the actor in training learns to understand its message; instead of being ashamed of their shame, they listen to it and transform it into scenic emotion; instead of avoiding the unknown, they pause within it and allow it to transform them.

To train an actor ultimately means to shape a human being capable of remaining present in the face of their own instability without freezing. Someone who dares not to know, not to control, not to shine—but simply to be. And this, perhaps, is one of the most valuable lessons that theatre art can offer society: the lesson of a presence that is vulnerable, but whole.

Bibliography:

1. Aristotle. *Poetics*. Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Române, 1965.
2. Banu, George, and Monica Tonitza-Iordache. *The Art of Theatre*. Editura Nemira, 2004.
3. Berlogea, Ion. *History of Universal Theatre*, Vols. 1–2. Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, 1982.
4. Brook, Peter. *The Empty Space*. Editura Nemira, 2014.
5. Cojar, Ion. *A Poetics of the Actor's Art*. Editura Paideia, 1998.
6. Diderot, Denis. *The Paradox of Acting*. Editura Nemira, 2010.
7. Dodin, Lev. *Endless Journey*. Editura Camil Petrescu, 2008.
8. Donnellan, Declan. *The Actor and the Target*. Editura UNITEXT, 2006.
9. Grotowski, Jerzy. *Towards a Poor Theatre*. Editura UNITEXT, 1998.
10. Kaufman, Gershen. *The Psychology of Shame: Theory and Treatment of Shame-Based Syndromes*. Springer, 1996.
11. Popescu, Mihai. *Scenes of Romanian Theatre*. Editura UNITEXT, 2004.
12. Popovici, Anca Mădălina. *The Theatre's Long Journey to the Self*. Editura Anima, 2000.
13. Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *Writings on Art*. Editura Minerva, 1981.
14. Spolin, Viola. *Improvisation for the Theater*. UNATC Press, 2008.
15. Stanislavski, Konstantin S. *An Actor's Work on Himself*. Editura Nemira, 2018.
16. Stanislavski, Konstantin S. *My Life in Art*. Editura de Stat pentru Literatură și Artă, 1954.
17. Tangney, June Price, and Ronda L. Dearing. *Shame and Guilt*. Guilford Press, 2002.
18. Tangney, June Price, and Jessica L. Tracy. "Self-Conscious Emotions." In *Handbook of Self and Identity*, edited by Mark R. Leary and June Price Tangney, Guilford Press, 2012.
19. Zamfirescu, Florin. *Acting or Magic*. Editura Privirea, 2003.