Lesley University DigitalCommons@Lesley

Expressive Therapies Capstone Theses

Graduate School of Arts and Social Sciences (GSASS)

Spring 5-18-2020

T is for Territory: A Literature Review of Human Experience in Dramatic and Virtual Spaces

Jennifer Marshall *Lesley University,* jmarshallchafee@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lesley.edu/expressive_theses Part of the <u>Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons</u>

Recommended Citation

Marshall, Jennifer, "T is for Territory: A Literature Review of Human Experience in Dramatic and Virtual Spaces" (2020). *Expressive Therapies Capstone Theses*. 172. https://digitalcommons.lesley.edu/expressive_theses/172

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School of Arts and Social Sciences (GSASS) at DigitalCommons@Lesley. It has been accepted for inclusion in Expressive Therapies Capstone Theses by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Lesley. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@lesley.edu.

T is for Territory:

A Literature Review of Human Experience in Dramatic and Virtual Spaces

Capstone Thesis

Lesley University

4/27/19

Jennifer Marshall

Drama Therapy

Christine Mayor

Abstract

A theoretical investigation of the spaces where dramatic realities and virtual realities reside is researched and examined. How and for what purpose these locations exist is considered. Is technological space actual, virtual, or somewhere in between and where do our bodies intersect in that dimensional landscape? Can we as practitioners of drama therapy, specifically Developmental Transformations (DvT), be in conversation with the growing dominance of virtual technologies, and where do the boundaries of human territory fit in relation to both? Possible implications for future practice/research are considered. An appendix is included with examples of my art-based response to the research.

Keywords: developmental transformations, dramatic reality, virtual technologies

T is for Territory:

A Literature Review of Human Experience in Dramatic and Virtual Spaces

Introduction

The topic of my capstone thesis will be a theoretical examination of advancing technological spaces, artificial intelligence (AI) and virtual realities in relation to drama therapy and dramatic reality, specifically within the form of Developmental Transformations (DvT). There is not an obvious overlap between these two 'spaces' in creative arts literature and there are clear differences and tensions between them; however, both rely on encounter and operate through noticing, gathering, and an of expression human behavior. I am interested in whether comparing or making associations between the imaginative dimension of dramatic reality and the built environment of virtual realities can amplify or help our work as practitioners of drama therapy? One could say that each allows for an engagement in a 'world' set just apart from ordinary life. Can the similarity between the two worlds establish greater legitimacy for the dramatic reality created in the *playspace* between client and therapist using DvT?

I will be examining writing about the encounter between therapist and client while in the dramatic reality of the DvT *playspace*, which can be considered a container for human information that arises and accumulates while both therapist and client are in play. In *Text for Practitioners*, Johnson (2013), the founder of DvT describes the *playspace* as a term for a 'particular state of play' one that depends upon, "a mutual agreement among the participants that everything that goes on between them is a *representation* or *portrayal* of real or imagined being" (p. 39). Thoughts, gestures, feelings, etc. form an encyclopedia of data for the patient and therapist to consult. Patients can reflect on what was there and not there inside the room, made real in the imaginal space between them. Pendzik (2006) frames this ability to manifest together

T IS FOR TERRITORY

through improvisational engagement as, "another level of reality within actual life" where transitions from the ephemeral to the palpable become, "*virtuality made concrete*" (p. 273). Therapists can 'read' what emerges as information to reveal the specific client, but also can see larger 'patterns' within wider humanity.

Of all dramatic processes, why focus on DvT? Prior to studying drama therapy, I followed my interest in performance by creating hybrid pieces of dance-theatre. A strong influence at the time was Anne Bogart (1995) who created *Viewpoints*, which was a way of approaching dramatic work through the body in relation to: Time (tempo, duration, kinesthetic response) and Space (shape, gesture, architecture, spatial relationship, and topography) (p. 22-23). These processes were considered somatically through *sourcework*, a space and time when collaborators, "fill up their own knowledge, interest, dreams, and reactions" to the central 'question' that Bogart (1995) believed any great theatrical piece carries inside of itself (p. 17-18). *Viewpoints* were the actor's way into their own source of answering that question dialogically within the world of the play.

When I encountered DvT it stood out for me as having a similar feel, yet aimed at a therapeutic opening. I am not a practitioner of the form, rather a drama-therapist-in-training who is still at the very edges of understanding *how* the therapist is using the technique; however, I can say that the times I have participated in one-on-one and group DvT, I have experienced what a client might and the articles I have chosen feel true to my time in the *playspace*.

I will be contrasting this theory with literature on how the iteration of noticing and gathering of human behaviors garnered through data accumulation form the basis of AI. Through our responses to and interaction with our devices, we inadvertently extend pieces of ourselves to the infinity loop of data, interlocking what AI teaches us with what we are inadvertently teaching

T IS FOR TERRITORY

it. AI is presented to us as an inevitable part of our future, a tool to liberate the body and brain from human limitations through extending their capacity into extraordinary realms. To create an immersive approximation of the human form and psyche, AI must first gather the texture of humanity by examining "patterns" of thinking and behavior. One way this can be achieved is through the accumulation of the human users information during their online interface, gathered with the aim of supporting technologies to artificially generate an alikeness of human response for better user experience. I am interested in the evolution of the psyche, what changes over time and what remains the same. Perhaps we are capable of shifting and growing through our time spent in 'artificial' spaces with an 'intelligence' not hindered by doubt, conscience, and shame, things the human psyche is often contending with, particularly when seeking therapeutic support. Imholz (2008) notes that, "virtual worlds are now ready and willing and able to be the playground for our unconscious but without the judgment, credentials, clinical experience, or ethical scruples of a seasoned psychotherapist" (p. 49). For all its iterative skill, self-reflection is a quality that AI does not yet possess, but one a DvT practitioner would need in order to track the emerging patterns of the client, and of the self in relational play with the client.

In a different form of information retrieval, during the DvT encounter, the qualitative experiences can overlap between the therapist and client who are forming a 'world' together. In my readings I have come to believe that the research and theorizing from technological spaces offers information, language, and theory that is worthy of comparing to DvT practices. After all, we are already in this conversation, as I type this text into my platform and you read it on yours, we are not alone but in a shared space with a complex terrain that is collecting our exchange. For what purpose varies, but there is value in considering our role in this exchange. Through my research I intend to bring some awareness to that encounter and the human 'transformations'

happening within that exchange, and then compare that similar exchange as it lives in the dramatic realm of DvT. As practitioners of drama therapy, we deliberately engage clients within dramatic reality as a form of healing. We are attuned to this notion of spaces holding more than one reality simultaneously, and it is in this noticing that my interest in virtual and dramatic realities came together.

Methods

This project began with a central question; does the dramatic reality experienced in DvT's *playspace* have any corollary with human's active engagement with realities in virtual space? I researched the main body of DvT literature using the "primediscrepancy" website, (Developmental Transformations, n.d.) which hosts articles, a blog, podcasts and David Read Johnson's (2013) *Text for Practitioners*. I read up on the history and foundations of 'dramatic reality' as it relates to drama therapy or therapeutic uses, including imaginal realms that are created between therapist and client in an encounter.

I addressed the subject of technology from a layperson's perspective, seeking articles with simple technological explanations, and a psychological bent. I researched articles through the Lesley library using a key word search such as: therapy or treatment or intervention or counseling or psychotherapy AND drama therapy or expressive therapy or creative art therapy AND data gathering or noticing or relational listening or knowledge accumulation. In conjunction with these, I also searched for: AI or artificial intelligence or machine learning or algorithms or robots or virtual reality. I was initially influenced by the work being done at the MIT Media Lab, Fluid Interfaces and used their website to better understand emerging technologies. I organized my articles in Endnote and also hard copies in folders divided between the 'virtual' and the 'dramatic' subject findings.

T IS FOR TERRITORY

Below, I synthesize my findings in the following subsections: Dramatic Reality and the *Playspace*, Virtual Reality and Virtual Spaces, Artificial Intelligence and Human Space. Additionally, because my topic is more abstract and theoretical, in the discussion section I have chosen to write two 'stories' that help to illustrate how the concepts synthesized my literature review are related and might inform both virtual and dramatic realities. This way of attempting to articulate these overlaps is furthered through my arts-based research process, detailed below.

As a way of tracking myself-as-researcher, I considered this project through writing reflections in a daily journal, and by creating an arts-based response in the form of a 'primer' a scholastic-style notebook I titled, *T is for Territory*, which held pictures and text that functioned as a learning tool for my topic. The materials I used were colored pencils and pens along with images from magazines and newspapers. Sajnani (2012) discusses attuning to difference when using improvisation for art-based research, "By drawing attention to the slippages, leakages and the spaces between carefully created forms, new information is gathered about knowledge itself" (p. 82). I turned to the primer when I felt lost or confused inside the research, or I needed a new perspective to reflect the findings, but also when the ideas felt too dire or serious and I wanted to infuse my own thinking with whimsy and humor.

The traditional 'primer' functions as a way to teach a subject, but within the intended curriculum there is often a hidden curriculum, one that speaks to the surrounding cultural affect of the material presented, and this tension is what I aimed to capture. LaMarre and Rice (2016) refer to the compiling of image, narrative, and self within story, using Harris's (2010) term 'bricolage research' (para. 9). It is with this dynamic in mind that I layered my own words and images with the findings, as a way to artistically grapple with the research, and to allow the full dimension of my inquiry to be brought forth through both a linear and an associative logic stream.

Literature Review

Dramatic Reality and the Playspace

In her essay, "On dramatic reality and it therapeutic function in drama therapy," Susana Pendzik (2006) describes 'dramatic reality' as, "the materialization of another level of reality within actual life" and draws it as a circle surrounded with another circular layer, she calls 'ordinary reality' (p. 272-273). A smaller imaginative territory existing inside a larger one, this imagery evokes a sense that dramatic reality is its own world and takes up space, but is held within the ordinary one and must contend with that encasement in order to exist. In the act of seeing a live theatre performance, "It is the convention of the fourth wall, an imagined barrier across the front of a stage between an audience and performers, which creates for an audience a 'safe' sense of the action as viewable object, as artistic product rather than ontological reality" (Lovell & Reinthal, 2014, p. 82). Drama therapists intentionally lead clients into that other level of reality, which can create a distance or a gap for them to more 'safely' view parts of the self. Pendzik (2006) links concepts of 'presence' and 'form' to the therapeutic interaction. In her meta-synthesis, she catalogues the many names used by drama therapists to describe this 'space' and lands on "dramatic reality" as a generic connotation that is independent of any particular style of working, saying that, "as long as we and our clients are involved in dramatic reality, we are doing drama therapy" (Pendzik, 2006, p. 272).

Drama therapists use different names to describe the location of this encounter with dramatic reality. Johnson (2005), founder of DvT, refers to it happening within the boundaries of the *playspace*, which is framed as a duet between therapist and client or in a group form. Players meet improvisationally in the encounter, with no props or intermediary devices, and agree to be open to imagined representation and dialectical expression with each other in the emerging

action of play. Reynolds (2011) describes how the therapist becomes a prop or 'playobject', being an, "object for use within the play: a broken toy (of course the leader cannot "perfectly" perform what is desired) that is subject to the needs and desires of the group" (p. 299). Human 'behaviors', those that we present and those we normally keep from public view are shared, noticed, gathered and form the world of the *playspace*. Johnson (2013) describes the players letting go of their held perspectives and histories and allowing them to be played with by all in the space, "In this way, something real is transformed into something imaginal" (p. 44). The client does not verbally process after the encounter, which offers a natural permeability to the world beyond the office door. Most importantly, the therapist must be 'imperfectly present' sharing vulnerability with the client as a way of being open to genuinely play with the material the client evokes. In a discussion of improvisation and art-based research, Sajnani (2012) adds an element she calls "bodystorming," where a question or theme is considered prior to the beginning of play (p. 81). I see a link between bodystorming and Bogart's sourcework in evoking a collective bewilderment as a way to openly commit to trusting that an answer will emerge within dramatic reality.

One way to strengthen our awareness of our shared human condition is engaging in free play with another the *playspace*. In working to treat violent forms of masculinity, Landers (2002) refers to the *playspace* as a 'condition' where representational forms of cause and effect can be experienced within an imaginative world (p. 19). It is a designated area, an agreement between participants, and a way of experiencing ones actions in a setting that is separate from daily life. The risk between players is mitigated by committing to representational play, and through agreeing to restrain from actual harm, which lowers fear and establishes trust (Johnson, 2013, p. 40).

T IS FOR TERRITORY

Johnson, Forrester, Dintino, James, and Schnee (1996) describe how the therapist becomes the playobject, toy, or property for the client during play, writing, "like any projective object, the therapist is the recipient of projected material from the client" (p. 297). This allows the focus to remain on the encounter and forces the need for all that is imagined to be materialized through the body of the players. In this way, the therapist and client direct their focus away from objects and onto what is brought forward for play, "the uncertain, ungraspable encounter between consciousness's without reliance on the reassuring world of 'thingness'" (Johnson et al., 1996, p. 297). Tangible parts of life normally experienced outside the self, such as external objects or other people, become animated into the roles and characters put forth by the players who must enlist their psyches and use their bodies for them to exist within the play.

There is uncertainty in what might come forward, much like writing stream of consciousness in a journal, but unlike the static pages there is someone there with you who, Johnson (2013) describes as, "noticing, feeling, animating and expressing" along with you (p. 23). Further, the therapist expresses feelings into, "revised images/forms/ideas in preparation for their representation or symbolization" in response (Johnson, 2013, p. 23-24). Our socially constructed selves begin to shed during play, when the desire to join the story-stream overrides mannered behavior. The therapist is managing the "state of play, not the content of the play" while keeping an eye to what is emerging next (Johnson, 2009, p. 98).

Yet, in writing about the use of DvT while playing with race, Mayor (2012) describes how biases can arise in play unexpectedly, writing, "psychological material or cultural differences not even in the consciousness of the members may leak in the play" (p. 217). What sneaks past the conscious mind can hold insights into clients unhealed parts and the therapist has a chance to help bring it forward for further investigation if they are attuned to this leakage. This 'leaking' is a secondary territory noted by the therapist when there is difference between words and actions in play and is particularly informative as it might be directing the client's behavior without their knowing. This 'leaking' is in part what the therapist is continually watching for, intentionally noticing in their clients.

While using DvT to work with an elder client, Porter (2000) sees the encounter as a place to focus "on the body as the vessel of memories, emotions, impulses and desires, in contrast to the mind" and finds this healing because, "all human beings are connected energetically, so it is possible to access certain parts of oneself by first experiencing them or witnessing them in another person" (p. 311). We can 'see' in each other the parts of life that are gathered up into the sublimated understory and what may be hidden by groomed behavior can find its way out through the body in relational play. In the world of the DvT *playspace*, story layers strip away from being held exclusively by the self and move to mutuality within the landscape of pretend. The client can export what was held secretly into a shared reality, evaluate it, and allow it to reintegrate it back into the conscious self.

The room itself fills with invisible material - images, language, repeated forms - all the elements of interaction between client and therapist that have been projected out for play. Johnson (2013) uses t' to mark the collected, "discrepancy between the imaginal and conceptual domains" because for every associative choice represented there are a multitude not chosen, which hang unspoken accumulating in the space (p. 19). What is chosen, what is implied, and what remains unspoken all become source material for the developing play. This relational world-building within the *playspace* is not found by a locational map, yet is materialized as dramatic reality. Reynolds (2011), using DvT to work improvisationally with children finds that, "Rather than a geographic location, the *playspace* is a relational experience that exists only

between the people who are playing and ceases to exist when the play stops" (p. 301). Hidden and overt expression begins to reveal itself to the client and they grow to tolerate that revelation both internally and in relation to the therapist through repeated play.

Embodied portrayals in pretend are absorbed into the play, lifting off from one person's singular ownership to malleable 'content' between the players. Reynolds (2011) notes that the encounter between therapist and client is non-linear and improvisational, which can evoke fears and fantasies about being in the presence of another due to worries about what the other might think of them; however, with DvT, "the freedom to play out past patterns and imagine multiple future ones, can provide participants with an increased capacity to tolerate these feelings" (p. 299). The capacity of a person's self-perception will show in real time what they are able to grasp and if the material might need to played out again and again for insight to occur.

Johnson (2013) writes, "DvT is an approach to Being, placing our attention on the as-yetformed part of our experience outside or beyond the combination of repeating forms that constitute our construction of Reality" (p. 12). There is a dynamic between the past, the formed, and the as-yet formed human psyche that transforms through play, moving directionally to expand what a person constructs as real. Another example is Pitre's (2014) work with children who have experienced trauma. She describes how DvT supports a client to differentiate between past and current realities, stating, "As the improvisational environment increasingly encourages role-switching, the mobility of the roles begins to un-hitch them to individual people, and the child can experience them (and therefore the past) as separate from current reality" (p. 254). The 'past' can enter into the in the here-and-now, expanding the dimensional reality along with the client's awareness.

"Conversare" (Johnson & Sajnani, 2015) is a conversation about social justice that takes

place between a 'text describing DvT,' Johnson (DJ), and Sajnani (NS), where concepts of control and territory are engaged, lifted, and considered. The text reads, "Dominant control requires the capital necessary to territorialize the imagination and its material expression, to attribute meaning to form, and to secure the repetition of preferred social, sexual, and political bodies through multiple forms of representation" (a delete was inserted and then text was recovered) then sentence goes on to say, "Territory not under anyone's control/ can be termed unclaimed, or wilderness..." (after backslash text has a delete line through it...) (Johnson & Sainani, 2015, p. 64-65). The form of this paper perhaps teaches us more about territory, boundaries, and a shared imaginal space than the actual text provided. How far the boundaries of the mind extend when material is shared in the *playspace* can feel like a limitless wilderness, and the shared circumstance of play can shift the domain of ownership. A dimensionalization of perspective crosses over distinct states of one's understanding, says Johnson (2013) such as then/now, body/mind, me/you, real/unreal, and allows players a way to varielate or balance these territories dynamically and form, "slightly different perspectives on the same phenomenon" (p. 36-37). At some basic level, the goal of DvT is to expand space within the psyche to fit the whole self, and to connect again to the shared human epistemology. Considering the value of that internal space and its role within the human condition was on my mind as I researched virtual reality and artificial intelligence.

Virtual Reality and Virtual Spaces

The following research represents a range of technology articles that touch upon virtual space, artificial or amplified intelligence, psychology, territory, and other worlds. They serve as an illustration of some ways in which people in the field talk to one another and were chosen because the authors showed an interest in both machines and humanity.

In his memoir, *Dawn of the new everything*, Jaron Lanier (2017) remembers coming up with the term 'virtual reality,' in the 1970s, writing, "VR was the term I liked for first-person presence in a virtual world, but most especially when there were other people in there with you" (p. 238). Although he popularized the phrase within the technology community, he makes reference to the fact that these words had been put together previously by two thinkers I felt were important to my research. The first was Antonin Artaud (1938) in *Theatre and its double*, who makes a metaphoric comparison between theatre and an alchemical symbol. Second, Susanne Langer (1953), in her book *Feeling and form*, who refers to the manifested work of an artist as a "virtual world," a created space that is "significant in itself and not as part of the surroundings" (p. 65, 114–115). This historical terminology lays a foundation where virtual space as a built environment of illusion is shared with art, in particular drama, and our current computer technologies. I am investigating the evolving way humans interface with the world of technological realities, which constitute more than virtual reality specifically within a technology space. To begin, I will briefly review virtual reality and discuss its affects on human users.

McIntosh (2008) writes about the social meaning imbedded within the construction of virtual space. He uses Lefebvre's (1991) *Production of space* and Gottdiener's (1985) *Social production of urban space* as a framework for his ideas of the built environment, particularly, "their conceptualization of the production of space as a physical manifestation of the internal dynamics of the social structure that created it" (McIntosh, 2008, p. 198). The template space for the author's virtual investigation is in 'Second Life,' a Multiplayer online role-playing game using a three-dimensional platform, where players as avatar in the space can "create and amend the virtual landscapes themselves" (p. 197-198). Because the version is 'free' to users, McIntosh (2008) feels outside of a "monetized or capitalist function" (p. 204). Ten years have passed and

users of technology have come to understand that "free" is often a dubious term as it can be attached to giving up privacy, but for the moment McIntosh (2008) describes a space where the players work together to co-create the world. Within the space he sees details such as weeds growing in the cracks of the sidewalk as having "symbolic significance," offering players, "opportunities to make connections between uncontrollable natural objects like the weeds and potential symbolic meaning" (McIntosh, 2008, p. 202). Because the world is freely created in Second Life, each specific detail is a deliberate choice that some player interjected into the scenario. Why would weeds be rendered in a virtual space when in the actual world they symbolize a lack of decorative choice and are usually only present due to capitalist forces that determine whether or not one can afford to keep the weeds at bay? How the space is constructed has cultural meaning within the virtual world, but also in relation to the players whose imagined ideas of space toggle between it and the actual world.

Virtual reality has the potential for self-discovery and self-construction according to Gualeni (2016), who takes a philosophical look at VR and sees a place where humans can "negotiate with various aspects of our (individual as well as collective) existence in previouslyunexperienced guises" (p. 1). There are overlaps between his ideas of what can be played out within virtual 'space' and the pretend of the *playspace*, although in VR there is a projective tool used. As Gualeni (2016) explains, "virtual experiences and digital worlds are (still) encountered through devices, i.e. through interfaces and technological artifacts" (p. 4). Currently, the 'machine' is still an object we touch and functions as an intermediary between actual and virtual experiences, although 'hands free' devices such as Amazon's virtual assistant, Alexa, are an emerging technology that is considered 'frictionless' or one step closer to forgetting that there is a machine. Gualeni (2016) notes that, "human beings are expected to be at the same time selectively aware and unaware of the mediating role of a virtual reality device in relation to their experience" (p. 5). While at the same time he admits that users are being actively tricked, "the disclosure of a convincing 'illusion of a world' can be similarly identified as one of the most evident aspirations guiding the advancements of virtual reality and video game technologies" (Gualeni, 2015a, 45, 46, as cited in Gualeni, 2016, p. 3).

Further, Koles and Nagy (2012) compare virtual and real life identities, exploring how self-consciousness may affect a person's identity while playing as an avatar within a virtual space. These authors study the relationship between players and their avatars in the game, Second Life, administering an Aspects of Identity Questionnaire, (AIQ-IV, Cheek, Smith, & Tropp, 2002) and the Self Consciousness Scale (Scheier & Carver, 1985) with 153 respondents, aged 18-73, to measure identity and self-consciousness in real life and as expressed in virtual identities (Koles & Nagy, 2012, p. 7). Self-consciousness is broken into 'private' and 'public' categories (Scheier & Carver, 1985). Koles and Nagy (2012) note that when humans focus on their inner thoughts and emotions through activities such as writing and meditation they are engaging in private self-consciousness, while public self-consciousness requires an 'audience', 'presence of other individuals', or the 'perception of social feedback' (p. 4). Findings showed genuine feelings behind the virtual selves, concluding, "the impact of private self-consciousness on personal and relational aspects of virtual identities emphasizes the role of the *private* in addition to the *public* aspects of the virtual self and existence, with certain extent of congruence between real life and virtual identities" (Koles & Nagy, 2012, p. 11). Identity and selfconsciousness are at play and spillover into both spaces.

Bittarello (2008) looks at virtual worlds throughout time, offline and online. Marking them as 'mythic' spaces, "located on a different plane of reality," she sees three ways to enter

virtual worlds: by dreaming or vision, in travel, or through a gateway (p. 6-7). It is easy to conceive of technology as a 'mythic' space because the influence of time spent within it resides both in the here-and-not-here simultaneously. This is similar to time spent in dramatic reality, where the self is present, as-is, but also available to pretend. The author cites Margaret Wertheim (1999), who argued that the West has reduced all space to the *physical reality* of *matter*, arguing "from the late seventeenth century on, the new physicalist vision has been invoked as a powerful epistemic scythe to hack off anything that could not be accommodated into the materialist conception of reality" (Wetheim, 1999, p. 151, as cited in Bittarello, 2008, p. 8). It becomes harder to maintain a space for conceptual thoughts about technology when the machine is our interface. Bittarello (2008) challenges the dualism between physical and metaphysical space, instead seeing an alliance via embodiment writing, "We have an integration of life online and life offline because both are experienced (obviously) via the body" (p. 9). It is also through the mediating space of the body where human psychological realms can be understood to reside. It is in some ways an inverse location of a far-reaching mythic space because although the body is material, it also contains a dimensionality of mind that covers time/space and here/not here, elements which are ephemeral and hard to pin down. How we express and re-integrate what emerges is an important component to time spent in VR.

Gualeni, Vella, and Harrington (2017) find an academic 'blind spot' in VR research when it comes to participants entering and exiting virtual worlds and in-game roles believing that, "accessibility and immersive phenomenological richness are likely to exacerbate the potentially dissociative effects of virtual experiences" (p. 3). They look to the action of de-roling used in drama therapy and psychodrama as a way to counter virtual reality's investment in, "concepts that have close relationships with states of sensory and/or psychological detachment from the actual world," seeing de-roling as a pathway to return participants whole (p. 12). In an immersive Live Action Role-Playing (LARP), players experience, "the problem of 'bleed,' in which the line between the LARP situation and the players actual life is blurred, allowing intense and potentially troubling emotions through (Montola, 2010; Bowman, 2013)" (Gualeni et al., p. 8). This may have a relationship with 'leaking,' the term used in DvT to describe behaviors, words, and images from the client's sub-story that come out to play, and have the capacity to be seen felt and incorporated alongside the therapist or other players. The difference here is that the agreed upon reality to pretend in the *playspace* explicitly creates an understanding that all parties will 'un-pretend' or de-role at the end of the session. In this instance, if the player is de-roling, what is VR doing? Would VR also de-role, and is it even pretending?

An example of two people physically being in this world and within a 3-dimensional (3D) space concurrently is CocoVerse, which functions as a 3D whiteboard and platform for real-time collaborative experiences in room-scale VR (Greenwald, Corning, & Maes, 2017, MIT Fluid Interfaces). A video example shows two people in a white room, each wearing a head-mounted display and two handheld controllers. They are able to move freely and you see the two bodies gesturing to one another; one does an imaginary limbo and they look like they could be doing silent DvT, but when the perspective shifts to us seeing what the room looks like from their perspective, their bodies are erased and only the headset and hand controllers are seen floating in space. Each has a virtual paintbrush in their tool-belt and as they begin to draw into the space, the images hang in the air and one can add to the others pre-existing picture. Each is taking primary action, responding in relation to one another, and building upon the objects materialized in the room and all of this is happening in conjunction with the technology.

In another example of human/machine art processes, Sundararajan (2013) describes the work of Harold Cohen, a painter who developed the computer program 'AARON' to create abstract and representational art. Although AARON's artistic output is believed to be creative, Cohen (2010) rejects that claim, seeing the work as relational, writing, "Creativity...lay in neither the programmer nor in the program alone, but in the dialogue (sic) between program and programmer" (as cited in Sundararajan, 2013, p. 5). Insisting that what is created is due to a relational dependence, one upon another. Both examples highlight artistic creation in a shared sphere and represent deliberate attempts to capture what is happening in that invented third space.

In the 'Journal for virtual worlds research', Gualeni (2016) argues for virtual experiences to be understood as "existential tools" to, "negotiate with various aspects of our (individual as well as collective) existence in previously-unexperienced guises" (p. 9). There is a psychological imprint made, a collective 'idea' formed while engaging in technological realities, yet it can be hard to pin down how exactly this interaction is affecting the human psyche. Gualeni (2016) reminds us that the mechanical clock, not the steam engine, was the "defining machine of the industrial age" due to its, "effectively 'producing' a regular and parcelized understanding of time, that paved the way for all the technical and social developments of that period" as an example of how technologies shape thought in ways that are subtle, pervasive and often transcending their original use (Mumford, 1934, p. 14-15, as cited in Gualeni, 2016, p. 3). Time became contained within the clock and a person's relationship to time shifted. One could 'use' time in one-way or another, they could apportion time and control it, but also found in turn that they could be used and controlled by it.

Artificial Intelligence and Human Space

'User' is a common term referring to human beings when using their devices, but it also subtly connotes they have an authority over those devices. In researching artificial intelligence (AI), most authors seemed fairly unified in the idea that AI's intention is a force for good, but they also offered caution. There is an overarching theme, or perhaps illusion, that as the user we can maintain control.

Russell, Dewey, and Tegmark, (2015) encourage research priorities that will maximize the societal benefit of AI as it is becoming more capable, through addressing topics such as ethics, law, security, and control. They acknowledge that as AI's capabilities, "cross the threshold from laboratory research to economically valuable technologies, a virtuous cycle takes hold whereby, even small improvements in performance have significant economic value, prompting greater investment in research" (Russell et al., 2015, p. 106). It becomes inevitable that resources will continue to flow in this direction, particularly when outcomes are considered 'virtuous'. But are they always and who decides? In, 'Cyberspace as/and Space', Cohen (2007) theorizes about the meaning of technological space from a legal perspective saying,

Cyberspace is part of lived space, and it is through its connections to lived space that cyberspace must be comprehended and, as necessary, regulated. In particular, a theory of cyberspace and space must consider the rise of networked space, the emergent and contested relationship between networked space and embodied space, and the ways in which networked space alters, instantiates, and disrupts geographies of power. (p. 213)

To better understand technically how AI gathers data, I read Somers' (2017) 'Is AI riding a one trick pony?' where he visits Geoffrey Hinton, the father of 'deep learning,' at the Vector Institute in Toronto. Hinton discovered 'back-propagation' in 1986 as a way of training a neural network (NN) with more than two or three layers, but it was not until a 2012 paper where he showed that deep neural nets, trained using back-propagation, beat state-of-the-art systems in image recognition, that the concept took off (Somer, 2017, p. 2). The NN was able to win mainly because, after almost 30 years, the invention has found its needed partner in companies like Google, Facebook, and Uber, who provide vast amounts of data and money, funding the growth of commercializing this technology.

Somers (2017) describes the process of NNs in lay terms, as looking like a club sandwich; net neurons have an 'input layer' where an image is inserted, these layers are stacked with another layer of artificial neurons that get excited and pass that excitement to the other neurons they are connected to, by way of differing weights in the form of numbers, again and again until the topmost layer or 'output layer' will have two neurons representing, the 'image' or 'not the image' that was originally input, and the machine will sort between them (p. 2-3). 'Backpropagation' is used when there is a discrepancy in the answer. Programmers can start with the output layer to determine what went wrong at each connection down through the neural layers to the first set of connections. This resembles the action of a therapist working back through a client's history, making associations through story. Further, numbers are assigned to represent excitement levels between the neurons, and are meant to model synapses, so when the number is higher the connection is stronger (Somers, 2017). In this way, NNs seem to be able to build their own representation of ideas, and can take things, images, etc., "and put them into what mathematicians call a high-dimensional vector space, where the closeness or distance of things reflects some important feature about the world" (Somers, 2017, p. 4). There is some confident anthropomorphizing of the brain's internal workings in the language and structural diagram of neural nets, yet, to Hinton that is what thought is, describing thought as "a dance of vectors" (Somers, 2017, p. 6-7). NN's use our data to coordinate the recognition of existing

patterns. The more pictures of every imaginable way a specific image could look, the better AI will be at accurately determining hierarchical categories to fit it into. This gives rise to active data gathering on a grand scale as a way for the machine to learn what it has no capacity to infer.

With a more mathematical perspective, de Saint Laurent (2018) discusses and debates claims about AI's capability for human intelligence and notes that there is a psychological component to how researchers and lay people think about that answer, arguing that the brain analogy is but one way of understanding NNs; another way to see them is as "a series of transformations of the data, each representing a 'layer' in the network. The transformations are most often linear: each variable is multiplied by a weight and the results are added together" (p. 738). She goes on to describe that neural networks having to do with non-linear transformations, require mathematical operations that can not be done by hand and only recently by a computer, thereby having less in common with biology, and more with statistical models. She notes that there is a limit to using this networked data for problem solving since, "AI models can only learn to reproduce existing classifications as they are," thus leaving the possibility open for overt discrimination and unseen biases to be reproduced mathematically (p. 742). Misconceptions about the independent 'agency' of AI overlook who builds the models, for what purpose or use, and who profits, which leads to a, "deresponsibilisation of those who produce AI models as well as those who use them" (de Saint Laurent, 2018, p. 743).

For example in, 'A computer based system to design expressive avatars,' Diego-Mas and Alcaide-Marzal (2015) design a procedure using genetic algorithms (GAs) and artificial neural networks (ANNs) to create a face with a combination of traits (to represent attractiveness, reliability, responsibility) that will provoke a positive response from the observer for application in areas such as e-commerce and e-therapy (p. 2). The ANN is trained to simulate the perceptual

response to the avatar's faces, and the GA will find the best combination of traits. This process is scientifically complex, but the internal workings use names that are similar to terms of human evolution: moving from initial population, to fitness, to selection, with survivors/ parents and their offspring, moving to a new generation, replacement, and population (Diego-Mas & Alcaide-Marzal, 2015, p. 4). With so many computational layers, it is easy to lose sight of whether or not the standardized face is actually attractive, reliable, and responsible, or whether our relational response is the only real affect created. Like all evolutionary language, it mirrors the culling of the less accepted, and in this case it is facial features of eyes, mouth, nose, etc. This has racial implications, but is introduced in such an incremental fashion that the authors are relieved from having to address it and are unhindered in their efforts.

el Kaliouby is the CEO of Affectiva is working to create mood-aware technologies that can read non-verbal behavioral cues in real time. In el Kaliouby's (2017) article, 'We need computers with more empathy,' she begins with a story about rehearsing a speech in her room that mentioned Alexa, whereby her own Alexa wakes and says, "Playing Selena Gomez". The author had to yell "Alexa, stop" a few times before she was able to quiet the device (p. 8). el Kaliouby's annoyed tone was unreadable to Alexa, which is precisely what she would like to see change. She is working to have technology "read and respond to human cognitive and emotional states" in the hopes of, "making our tech interactions more personalized, relevant, authentic, and interactive" (p. 9). Her company, Affectiva, focuses on an emerging category of AI called 'emotion AI' that is developing algorithms to classify basic and complex human emotions by using "a vast corpus of data consisting of six million face videos collected in 87 countries, allowing an AI engine to be tuned for real expressions of emotion in the wild" (el Kaliouby, 2017, p. 8). Evidence has been gathered showing that people's devices, especially conversational interfaces like Alexa, are treated the way we treat each other; however, "younger generations are losing some ability to empathize because they grow up with the digital interfaces in which emotion, the main dimension of what makes us human, is missing" (el Kaliouby, 2017, p. 9). The only way forward seems to be through advancing the 'appearance' of empathy in the device, not the way the person treats the device.

Shulevitz (2018) writes in, 'Alexa, how will you change us?' that smart speakers, "listen even when you are not interacting with them, because they have to be able to hear their 'wake word,' the command that snaps them to attention" (p. 96). Shulevitz (2018) has researched voice assistant devices created by Amazon and Google and attests that they want to, "colonize space. Not interplanetary space. Everyday space: home, office, car" (p. 96). This illustrates a dimensional expansion of technology into arenas of human physical space. It does not stop there; Shulevitz (2018) goes on to say that, "Machines give us a way to reveal shameful feelings without feeling shame" (p. 99) by allowing us to, "keep company with emotive entities unencumbered by actual emotions" (p. 104). To be in conversation with your smart device can mirror the feel of conversation with another human being, and even though there are distancing factors, very personal requests are often made and in this way technology begins interacting with a person's psychological space. Programmed responses with a goal to fulfill your wishes and needs - straight away - have a way of smoothing over the one-sided exchange. Amazon and Google both have "personality teams" working hard to make the digital assistant's language more colloquial. For example, Alexa has been proposed marriage over a million times and her decline is both genuine and telling, saying, "We are in pretty different places in our lives. Literally. I mean you're on earth and I'm in the cloud" (Shulevitz, 2018, p. 101). It is an answer that responds to the here-and-now, while also offering an existential conundrum and making us

laugh.

In an introduction to *AI Magazine*, Ford, Hayes, Glymour and Allen (2015) advocate for human centered computing in the development of AI. The authors see this form of AI as "less about *artificial* intelligence and more about *amplified* intelligence" or what they are calling, "cognitive orthoses-that is, technological systems that leverage and extend human cognition" (Ford et al., 2015, p. 7). They contend AI is 'android epistemology' and should aim beyond mimicking human behavior, saying, "The *scientific* goal is to provide a computational account of mental ability itself, not merely of human mentality" (Ford et al., 2015, p. 7). A deceptive distance is created, which abdicates responsibility for the use of human data or the impact of AI once in the world.

This is distance is particularly thorny when that which constitutes a technological 'world' is encroaching into the space of the human psyche. Researchers at MIT are interested in the moments of threshold between drowsy and fully unconscious sleep where dreams and creativity are closest to our conscious minds, and in, 'Dormio: Interfacing with dreams' Horowitz, Reynolds-Cuellar, Maes, Grover, & Breazeal (2018) identify a gap in uses for AI enhancement during the third of our lives we spend asleep, stating that, "we build interfaces exclusively for the awake state. We are left with no way to exchange information with our unconscious selves, failing to make use of our nightly altered cognition" (p. 2). These researchers are attempting to create methods to harness the unconscious, making it another location by apportioning it to a separate space from consciousness. Creative lucidity between worlds represents a window that artists and psychologists also consider to be an important piece of the human self to look through.

In a twist to the narrative that technology is a necessary tool to expand human capabilities, a NYTimes article by Bowles (2017) entitled 'Where silicon valley is going to get in touch with its soul' includes an interview with Ben Tauber, a former Google product manager and the new executive director of Esalen which is located on the Pacific coast, south of Carmel California. Founded in 1962, Esalen has a lodge for classes, little cottages, a hot springs, and was where the 1960s leaders of the humanist psychology movement gathered and worked, often in a clothing optional state (p. B1). Tauber is quoted as saving, "there's a dawning consciousness emerging in Silicon Valley as people recognize their conventional success isn't necessarily making the world a better place" (Bowles, 2017, p. B4). Bodhi Kalayjian, an early Google employee and Google chef, now an Esalen baker and masseuse thinks that, "It's about putting Silicon Valley back in their bodies" he says, "Everybody's got a soul. It's about finding it" (Bowles, 2017, p. B4). This movement is a reversal from the idea of online connection. In this movement, the creators and programmers are fashioning the internal journey back to the self. This provides an interesting juxtaposition of these twin states of human engagement, showing in some way that these distinct locations might not be easily interchangeable. Just as we users of technology need the chaperone of a 'device' to get us into whatever technological program we are entering (ie., phone, computer, etc.), so the people of Silicon Valley need the landscape of Big Sur, the silence of nature, the cottages, Kombucha, and the movement and consciousness 'Inner-net' classes to reengage their 'souls.'

Carl Rogers (1977) founder of the person-centered approach to therapy likely roamed those same California hills with the idea that the human being is a trustworthy organism, "capable of evaluating the outer and inner situation, understanding herself in its context, making constructive choices as to the next steps in life, and acting on those choices" (as cited in Levine & Levine, 1999, p. 14-15). Roger's theories are a conceptual reality held by drama therapists and a foundational part of our psychological healing practices. When I consider what is at play with virtual realities and AI's attempts to augment humanity, I am not inspired to believe we are dealing with an equally trustworthy organism.

Discussion

Through researching the spaces of DvT and virtual VR, AI, I found the two streams to have some overlap. Both engage in a 'world' set just apart from actual daily living, they share an encounter with an initial agreement (whether or not what happens inside can be "agreed upon" may be contested), and by operating through the body, each has the ability to evoke physical behaviors and shift psychological states. I found less overlap when it came to their intentions. What is collected inside technological spaces becomes part of the machine's domain, fixed in that material form, but can later be re-allocated for other uses. While DvT also collects the human exchange, it happens through forming something shared, which is noted in real time but then dissipates and is reformed or 'transformed,' rather than being held static. The dramatic reality that arises in DvT is co-created, where "at least two different entities have to concur about the fact that the invisible world that is being manifested is truly material-for a given time" (Pendzik, 2006, p. 275). What is collected can offer something novel to the human user who interfaces with it, however it is held through the psyches' of the participants, either collectively in the room or singularly depending upon what remains upon later reflection.

Gualeni, Vella, and Harrington (2017) investigate the need for de-roling after a player encounters virtual reality, as a way of safely transitioning out of an in-game role (p. 7). Users experience the virtual environment from a subjective standpoint as having an existence within that world, say Gualeni et al. (2017) "conceptualized as an embodiment in the form of the avatar

T IS FOR TERRITORY

– the figure the player identifies as 'herself' in the gameworld (p. 10). But how does virtual reality identify? Even as virtual experiences continue to be intentionally enhanced through developers' use of constructs like "immersion, presence, and incorporation," the demographics of the developers, along with attendant power dynamics, remain unidentified (Gualeni et al., 2017, p. 12). In other words, the development and presentation of virtual realities lack self-reflection or culpability, which is different from dramatic reality, where both the DvT therapist and client would carry that capacity and value it as a condition of the *playspace*.

Further, the word 'user' establishes a hierarchical relationship between human and machine, where machine is a tool, and person a user of that tool. However static the machine-tool may appear to the user, it has a complex world of data gathering, rising in sophistication as more users enter their data. We think of this space as virtual, but there is increasing movement to export those realities into physical space.

I used to live in San Francisco and recently visited after being gone for 3 ¹/₂ years. I parked my car in a street across from a hospital. I had an errand there and was feeling glum and serious with a grim look on my face. A car went by just I stepped out of the car door onto the street. We were positioned in such a way that the woman in the passenger seat, her face, was at almost the exact height as mine. Her expression was ecstatic; she was smiling and her whole expression was jubilant. When our eyes met she tilted her head to the side and let out a laugh. I was immediately self-conscious, feeling shame arise (because I too was once a happy San Francisco resident and now here I am visiting with a face of sadness and worry), but just as the feeling arose the car continued on. I thought, "You are being ridiculous- that woman will not even remember you!," and in that split second I relaxed and smiled, taking in the whole car on its way. That is when I saw the insignia across the door 'cruise automation' and the lifted sensors on

the top and silver panels on the side of the car. It was a driverless test car being tested and the shame sensation returned immediately because I thought, "She won't remember me, but that car will." It was the first time I had the feeling of being emotionally implicated by technology, knowing in real-time that I was part of the landscape view of those sensors, an object of obstruction to be noted and learned from. I was a subject in the car's educational story of learning to navigate safely.

Porter (2000) sees the core-self as "related to a sense of Being, Consciousness or Divinity" and can be touched upon through an embodied DvT encounter because, "all human beings are connected energetically, so it is possible to access certain parts of oneself by first experiencing them or witnessing them in another person" (p. 311) This 'finding' of self in another is also a type of dimensional data gathering found in the space between self and other. It is through using technological devices that our testimony is accumulated. Manifested technologies claim that with AI, which is created through human data/not android epistemology, we can allow machines to be responsible for some of the work and toil of daily living, but in doing so we will be sharing spaces of engagement out in the actual world.

However, when reading about Diego-Mas and Alcaide-Marzel's (2015) work to create the face of an avatar that appears to express reliability/attractiveness/trust, and ensure that users will 'feel' those emotions when we interface with it, I was struck by the fact that there is no struggle or concern that the avatar actually has those attributes. There will be the façade or representation of humanity, without the human psyche within. In contrast, DvT, drama therapists and clients play with representational roles as a way to shake up fixed patterns and gain dimensional perspective. This is done as a way to broaden a person's psychological interiority and find genuine moments of access to states such as reliability/attractiveness/trust. I grew up on what was called 'unincorporated land' and I hold this notion of ownership over a location as a conundrum that lives in the present tense. Those displaced from the ground that was my childhood home are connected to me in a larger story that is unseen perhaps, but still, exists. In 'Conversare' NS, (2015) interjects when DJ writes about territory not under anyone's control, to speak of colonization, "Someone assumed that they inhabited the 'wilderness' and that this area was 'unclaimed' or 'not under any control'" whereby DJ, responds questioning who 'un-claims' the above, can someone be 'other' to that definition and instead reside, "in a territory you can go to feel safer, better, such as the Romantic notion of the Noble Savage who eschews territory and is one with nature: Avatar, Pocahontas, aborigines" (Johnson & Sajnani, 2015, p. 65). Fascinating that an Avatar would have been considered a 'Noble Savage' when this author spoke, that idea itself now being almost quaint considering our current entwinement with our technologies, and the hyper-capitalism that bolsters companies such as the Vector Institute and Affectiva to continually farm our digital commentary.

There is something in this idea of space and whether or not it is owned or shared that aligns with my perception of how DvT and virtual technologies intersect. Mayor (2012) describes the conditions of the therapeutic encounter, writing, "DvT relies on the establishment of the playspace, which is an ethical agreement between the therapist and client(s) of mutuality, restraint against harm, and discrepant communication" (p. 216). Since that publication, a fourth condition called reversibility has been added (Johnson, 2013, p. 44). These are not tangible requests, and yet they create the structure that houses the encounter and are foundational to safe play. Because within our bodies are territories that come together in the playspace to transform, to inhabit, and expand their understanding of self, relation to other, and scope of humanity.

Our relationship with technology is slowly shifting as we become more aware of how AI collects our information and for what purpose. It has become commonplace that upon entering a site, using an app, signing up a service, that we click some form of an *I Agree* button as an entryway. We agree to the encounter because it provides the building blocks for our augmented self, yet by doing so we also forego our autonomy within the space of engagement. Part of us joins with some vague awakened source. This, too, is a structured space of play (although the conditions are not mutual or restraining from harm), where the content created may just transform our data into a separate, and according to the developers, more updated version of being human or even in the case of AI, a new form of human being altogether. The two practitioners of DvT, DJ and NS, perhaps accidentally, connect for me the delicate arrangement of developing artificial space in technology with the human beings residing within that location. My question is, are we expanding into AI or is it expanding into us? Are we, in our current 'artisanal' version of humanity handing over to our devices what will become the 'unclaimed wilderness' and will our bodies become the 'unclaimed area'?

In the early 1990s I lived in the South Bay and was in close proximity to Silicon Valley as it was in a process of discovery with technology, and things were moving fast. Computational systems were bigger back then, took up more physical space, and every upgrade came with a need to get rid of the body of the devices. So you would finds these computer carcasses in trash bins and in piles whose 'guts' were those skinny motherboards, which looked like an arial view of mini-cities with criss-crossing street lines connecting buildings to parking lots, all placed on that flat green board, similar to the base of a Lego set. I was studying drama and my flat-mate was a visual artist and we could not see ourselves in this new environment, were not part of its' collective imagination. We began to gather those circuit boards and thought it would be clever to nail them to our head-boards, glue them to the bookshelves, the dressers, and our rooms were transformed by what we called, 'Silicon Valley Furniture.' Yet these decades later, that image feels prescient. Our relationship to technology has entered our personal spaces, become part of our dreams, surrounded our bookshelves, and is living in our homes.

We offer our good minds to join with the idea that this relationship to technology is interdependent and inevitable. It's easy to perceive our play as mutual, and believe that as our devices advance in mirroring us, they will reinforce our humanity in return, but the research showed that what is advancing is the ability to categorize not personalize, as a way to streamline the human exchanges that would otherwise take time and financial resources. There is no need for an artisanal human until one is approximated through technological processes. As people continue to give over information for the development of AI, I cannot help but wonder why there is no fear attached. Is it simply their assumed anonymity or restraint from harm within online space? Or is there something to the discussion about colonizing space, a deeper belief that humanity is somehow superior and ultimately in 'control' of what it creates?

Spending time in the DvT *playspace* is exciting but can also be scary as the play moves quickly across internal domains and between players, making the client feel a lack of control. With self-protection comes rigidity and what is often missing is a way for people to expand the psyche to include one's full self, not just the presentable testimony. Even though DvT has been used for decades with members of the population young and old, some who have been set to the margins or some who feel comfortable in the main frame, this feels like a critical moment for drama therapists to take seriously the liminal dimension of dramatic reality. This is a place where the human dilemma can be manifested, accumulated, and incorporated back into the real world.

Future Recommendations

Are there parallels between these strands of research? The dynamics of dramatic reality have some natural overlap with virtual realities, although as I search for literature the conversation feels a bit one-sided. The field of virtual technologies borrow work being done by health providers, psychologists, and even drama to forward their thinking and even claim a future where artificial manifestations can take over those jobs, but I do not read that same level of audacity the other way around. Those who practice DvT are able to access multiple dimensions of data through the voice and shape of an encounter, layering sessions over time for a dynamic look at a person's psyche. By the nature of the *playspace*, clients are forced into an embodied investigation of self, which is even more valuable as our devices move our attention into virtual realms. DvT uses esoteric language and is nested within the small field of drama therapy, while technology is adept at naming and braiding itself into a story of unavoidable human evolution. Complex models of AI can quantify large amounts of data; however, DvT practitioners do this as well. Further research into virtual spaces might bring insight for language to better convey what is happening within dramatic spaces, and by documenting what is found within an individual encounter in the way that AI would, which is as information that connects the human condition more broadly.

This paper calls for drama therapists to regain some swagger and speak with the arrogance that this field deserves. My process of research has been an iterative spiral that only just begins the conversation. DvT's investigations into the human psyche are valuable data gathering. Encounters in the *playspace* lower fear, encourage risk, and support the growth of a more embodied human. As technology promises to solve health related problems, the research shows how that promise is outpacing the reality, yet we are still 'holding' these ideas in our

33

imagination and that myth shapes how we perceive our own capabilities. So when we go into these rooms of empty space for an encounter, we can think about our connection to this technological push toward extending human capacities that is so well funded, so tended to, so researched, and perhaps be bolstered by our commitment to accessing a similar goal only through different means. And there is power in meeting in these spaces and growing the connection between people through embodied exchanges, a small-scale resistance is enacted. Our 'smart phones' and our Googlible questions can confuse us into thinking that our minds *do* need augmenting and the answer is in virtual worlds. But if human attributes are important enough to try to replicate, we must feel emboldened by how valuable we are – in our minds and bodies. In these worlds of our psyche and models of encounter, such as DvT, we may be able to grow and expand that territory.

References

- Bittarello, B. M. (2008). Another time, another space: Virtual worlds, myths and imagination. *Journal of Virtual Worlds Research*, *1*(1), 246-266.
- Bogart, A. (1995). Viewpoints. In T. Landau (Ed.). Lyme, NH: Smith and Kraus, Inc.
- Bowles, N. (2017). Where Silicon Valley is going to get in touch with its soul. *New York Times*. Retrieved from: https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/04/technology/silicon-valley-esaleninstitute.html
- Cohen, J. E. (2007). Cyberspace as/and space. Columbia Law Review, 107(1), 210-256.
- de Saint Laurent, C. (2018). In defense of machine learning: Debunking the myths of artificial intelligence. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, *14*(4), 734-747.
- Diego-Mas, J. A., & Alcaide-Marzal, J. (2015). A computer based system to design expressive avatars. *Computers in Human Behavior, 44*, 1-11.
- Dintino, C., & Johnson, D. R. Playing with the perpetrator: Gender dynamics in developmental drama therapy. In S. Jennings (Ed.), Dramatherapy: Theory and practice, Vol. 3. (pp. 205-221), London, UK: Routledge.
- Ford, K. M., Hayes, P. J., Glymour, C., & Allen, J. (2015). Cognitive orthoses: Toward human-centered AI. *AI Magazine*, (Winter), 5-8.
- Greenwald, S. W., Corning, W., & Maes, P. (2017). Cocoverse: A playground for cocreation and communication in virtual reality. Retrieved from: *MIT Media Lab, Fluid Interfaces website*. <u>https://www.media.mit.edu/groups/fluid-interfaces/overview/</u>
- Gualeni, S. (2016). The experience machine: Existential reflections on virtual worlds. *Journal of Virtual Worlds Research*, 9(3), 1-10.
- Gualeni, S., Vella, D., & Harrington, J. (2017). De-roling from experiences and identities in virtual

worlds. Journal of Virtual Worlds Research, 10(2), 1-18. 10.4101/jvwr.v10i2.7268

Horowitz, A. H., Grover, I., Reynolds-Cuéllar, P., Breazeal, C. & Maes, P. (2018). Dormio: Interfacing with dreams. *Paper presented at the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, (alt10). Retrieved from: *MIT Media Lab, Fluid Interfaces website*. https://www.media.mit.edu/projects/sleep-creativity/overview/

- Imholz, S. (2008). The therapeutic stage encounters the virtual world. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, *3*, 47-52.
- Johnson, D. R. (2005). *Text for Practitioners One*. Retrieved from: https://primediscrepancy.wixsite.com/dvt40
- Johnson, D. R. (2013). *Text for Practitioners Two*. Retrieved from: https://primediscrepancy.wixsite.com/dvt40
- Johnson, D. R., Forrester, A., Dintino, C., James, M., & Schnee, G. (1996). Towards a poor drama therapy. *The Arts in Psychotherapy*, *23*(4), 293-306.
- Johnson, D. R., & Sajnani, N. (2015). Conversare: Developmental transformations and social change NS delete: Justice. *Chest of Broken Toys*, 1, p. 57-77. Retrieved from: https://primediscrepancy.wixsite.com/dvt40
- Kaliouby, R. E. (2017). We need computers with empathy. MIT Technology Review, 120(6), 8.
- Koles, B., & Nagy, P. (2012). Who is portrayed in Second Life: Dr. Jekyll or Mr. Hyde? Journal of Virtual Worlds Research, 5(1), 1-17.
- Landers, F. (2002). Dismantling violent forms of masculinity through developmental transformations. *The Arts in Psychotherapy, 29*, 19-29.
- Lanier, J. (2017). Dawn of the new everything. New York, NY: Henry Holt.
- Levine, S. K., & Levine, E. G. (1999). Foundation of expressive arts therapy: theoretical and clinical

perspectives. London: J. Kingsley Publishers.

- Lovell, S., & Reinthal, T. (2014). "I saw a woman": Performance, performativity and affect. *Anglistica AION: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 18*(1), 79-91.
- Mayor, C. (2012). Playing with race: A theoretical framework and approach for creative arts therapists. *The Arts in Psychotherapy*, *39*, 214-219. doi: 10.1016/j.aip.2011.12.008
- McIntosh, K. (2008). The social construction of virtual space. *Michigan Sociological Review*, 22, 196-214.
- Pendzik, S. (2006). On dramatic reality and its therapeutic function in drama therapy. *The Arts in Psychotherapy*, *33*(4), 271-280.
- Porter, L. (2000). The bifurcated Gift: Love and intimacy in drama psychotherapy. *The Arts in Psychotherapy*, *27*, 309-320.
- Reynolds, A. (2011). Developmental transformations: Improvisational drama therapy with children in acute inpatient psychotherapy. *Social Work With Groups*, *34*:*3*-4, p. 296-309.
- Russell, S., Dewey, D., & Tegmark, M. (2015). Research priorities for robust and beneficial artificial intelligence. *AI Magazine*, (Winter), p. 105-114.
- Sajnani, N. (2012). Improvisation in art-based research. Journal of Applied Arts and Health, 3(1), 79-86.

Shulevitz, J. (2018). Alexa, how will you change us? The Atlantic, Vol. 322, 94-104.

- Somers, J. (2017). Is AI riding a one-trick pony? MIT Technology Review, (November-December), 1-7.
- Sundararajan, L. (2014). Mind, machine, and creativity: An artist's perspective. *Journal of Creative Behavior*, 48, 136-151.

Appendix: *T is for Territory*, Primer

Creating art-based materials alongside this research allowed me to build bridges between these two streams of thinking, which I felt were in conversation, yet had very little evidence to prove a correlation. The images emerged on the page and showed a world where DvT and technology were together, which emboldened me to take my research forward. I was often infuriated by the content in the articles about AI and virtual reality, and I found a sense of authority by rearranging the ideas to fit my own composition. Art making was a freeing practice that gave me the courage to transfer associative connections made from the picture into the critical writing, even when it felt audacious to do so. I learned that the art could be trusted to hold what I was unable to grasp through logic and it would 'speak back' to me later, so I could translate those ideas into research appropriate language.









"Maybe if we could hook these devices into our brains, they could have some ideas of what our goals dre, what our intent is, and what our fonstration is ". Justin C. Sanchez Task Finished 1 Decision Execution Process Other Factors Feedback from Decision Execution Environmental Layout & Structure Navigation Wayfinding Decision Making Process Experience 1 int Start Q Ability Cognitive Mapping Human Senses Memory Process Inferred Spatial Sensory & 4 Inferred Inform Search Strategy (Start)



THESIS APPROVAL FORM

Lesley University Graduate School of Arts & Social Sciences Expressive Therapies Division Master of Arts in Clinical Mental Health Counseling: Drama Therapy, MA

Student's Name: Jennifer Marshall

Type of Project: Thesis

Title: <u>T is for Territory: A Literature Review of Human Experience in Dramatic and Virtual Spaces</u>

Date of Graduation: May, 2020

In the judgment of the following signatory this thesis meets the academic standards that have been established for the above degree.

Thesis Advisor: <u>Christine Mayor</u>