Object Companionship: An Artistic Research Method and Object-Led Praxis in Participatory Theater

Mari Rusi-Pyykönen,

Independent Scholar

Biography

Mari Rusi-Pyykönen D.A. (theatre and drama at the Theatre Academy Uniarts Helsinki), MSc (occupational therapy), group psychotherapist, and educator in the context of university of applied sciences, vice-president of FIDEA, The Finnish Drama and Theatre Education Association. She has a long-term participatory theatre work experience with vulnerable, marginalised people in different contexts in the field of participatory art in Finland and in international contexts. Her special interest is in group centred, object-orientated work in open-ended participatory processes.

Abstract

This paper focuses on two key perspectives of my artistic doctoral research. First, Born from the moment, focusing on my improvised, group-centred working approach with found objects in the context of process drama (one of the forms of participatory theatre). Second, Thinking by hands with found objects. This perspective addresses the use of the bricolage practice (Rogers, 2012) and the object-oriented, material-concrete activity as a process work method in the practical part of my research. Likewise, the paper draws attention to the effects of neo-liberal politics that lead to instrumental, project-

based design of participatory theatre practices. The scope of the paper is limited to explore my object-oriented working methods.

Keywords

Artistic practice-led research, object companionship, object-oriented practice, bricolage, new-materialism, instrumental paradigm

Background

The roots of participatory theatre—the field that exists outside the domain of the institutional theatre—lie in the soil cultivated by 1960s and 1970s citizen activism, radical educational philosophy, and socially critical, experimental theatre groups (Nicholson, 2014; Prentki & Preston, 2009). The multifaceted conventions of the activity started to take shape in different communities and everyday settings as part of a broader development in participatory arts (Frieling, 2009). The promotion of social justice and equality, with a social activist attitude and socially critical activity, were adopted as the starting point for participatory theatre (Rifkin, 2010). This meant that people's life situation and environment were holistically considered in the planning of activities. The current practices of participatory theatre are situated in the ample field of participatory art as intentionally driven activities with a community art, pedagogical or therapeutic emphasis (Prentki & Preston, 2009). It is implemented with people who are not theatre professionals or experts.

Based on its historical starting points, participatory theatre has been linked to experimental performance practices and working processes. The activities were typically based on situational, improvised events. The practices of participatory theatre were typically process-like in its first decades, but since around 1990 they could be characterised as project-like (Dwyer,

2016). "Project" became an umbrella term shared by the various forms of participatory art at the beginning of the 1990s (Bishop, 2012). A strengthened neo-liberal trend was a central factor that contributed to the change in practices. Projectification seems to be linked to the way in which neo-liberal social policy programs work, especially their project-centredness and the rhetoric of funding applications. Participatory theatre practitioners come to depend on a funding system that demands evidence-based outcomes for the continuation of their project funding (Mullen, 2012; Rifkin, 2010). The emergence of projectification can be viewed against the practice of neo-liberalism, in which temporary changing projects are made to meet the needs of the finacier, and the projects' significance is measured in money (Balfour, 2009; Nicholson, 2016).

Kennedy Chinyowa (2011), PhD in Theatre for Development uses the concept of "instrumental paradigm" to describe the top-down working methods of participatory theatre projects. The concept refers to a mindset and action model in which the target group is expected to participate in forms of work designed and modelled in advance to accomplish predefined changes. Externally set requirements for solid outcomes started to favour instrumental methods that have a linearly progressing structure and a process that ends with a foreseeable result (Chinyowa, 2011; O'Connor, 2016). In the framework of neo-liberal cultural policy, art and culture are usually viewed as methods and instruments used to accomplish something external to art: arts projects with a clear social agenda (Goodley & Runswick-Cole, 2011; Nicholson, 2016). The neo-liberalisation of the arts and the financial system it has brought, can be found behind the emergence of the instrumental paradigm (Dwyer, 2016; Mullen, 2012). This has brought challenges for participatory theatre practitioners to defend their position in the competition for resources.

The research underpinning this paper is motivated by a concern about this neo-liberal trend. The research objective is to propose a plausible alternative for the widespread instrumental approach with strictly phased working methods of participatory theatre practices.

Born from the moment: Working with object actors

What it's like to be a thing. (Brannagan, 2013)

Participatory theatre is not a clear-cut concept, genre or working method, but "participatory" refers to the aesthetic process jointly produced by the group in the performance event (Rifkin, 2010; Fischer-Lichte, 2014; Hughes & Nicholson, 2016). In my understanding the ultimate quality of the practices of participatory theatre, its ontology, consists of situationality, situations and events. They encompass presence and encounters, relationships and impressions obtained in a shared sensory space. In the field of participatory theatre, my working method is situated in the domain of process drama. A group-led, group-centred work approach and an unpredictable, eventful working process are typical of the process drama (Eriksson, 2011; O'Neill, 1995). The process proceeds in sketchy fragments, and its form is built as episodes through improvisation.

In my work as a workshop group leader, I typically aim at building an object-led shared working space that emphasises the bodily and multisensory nature of perception. My work is based on situational dramaturgy, and where the human is seen as a co-creator with the object. In practice it means that a procedurally constructed dramaturgical composition is created by a temporal space and the participants' jointly improvised ideas. This occurs in the zone of the group's shared experience and imagination.

My present working method in participatory theatre is connected to my background in mental health work settings and the occasionally insufficient material working conditions that prevailed from the 1970s to the 1990s. This scarcity was one reason for my interest in an object-led and concrete work approach. At that time, I worked with individuals in vulnerable life situations

and used materials that had been disposed of or happened to be available in nature. If possible, we worked outdoors because it gave the participants a chance to leave the premises of a closed institution and enter a different shared sensory space. The most central expressive element in the activity was not speech but a sensory feel of the surrounding non-human beings: clouds, tree trunks, plants, the surface structure of rock. Later, inspired by my work with three-dimensional materials (e.g., the multi-art Tila/Space project in the mid-1990s), I gradually started to include "performing space" in my work in process drama by building mini-malist installations both indoors and outdoors. They served as starting points for the working process, orienting partici-pants' perceptions towards installation-based performance situations (Rusi-Pyykönen, 2020).

My object-led and concrete work approach in the workshops refers to the utilisation of accidentally found or otherwise available objects and materials in their own habitus, both as pretexts and as object actors. In the context of process drama, pretext refers to a preliminary framework, some sort of a catalyst for the direction of the prospective process (O'Neill, 1995). Pretexts (e.g., text, music, image, object, light, space) are the material elements of episode-based working. They structure the space, create an atmosphere, introduce the topic, carry the work process. Pretexts are supposed to dramaturgically organise the resources that are created together in the performance event. The object pretexts in my workshops are typically simple and unassuming (e.g., a pile of discarded chairs or two large frost veils in an empty space). This is how they leave room for the participants' perceptions, sensuous images, and imagination.

In the workshop event, the performance of objects with human actors is original and in-tensive, and I call it "object agency". The hypothesis is that objects settle in action-based relationships in their own habitus: they move, propose solutions, form dynamic assemblages, and have an expressive ability. Object actors construct situations in montage-type juxtapositions and equations (Huttunen, 1997). In equations, the perception of interrelations between objects

produces a new meaning. This makes it possible to integrate different elements and perspectives in work to create new uncanny entities.

For example, for the "Old Objects meet with News Images"—workshop (Rusi-Pyykönen, 2020), I built two large assemblages, side by side on the floor of an empty space: a circle of scrap objects and a square consisting of a news photo collage. From the participants' perspective, drawing a juxtaposition between those two elements was a huge conflict—immaterial power and material deprivation met in it. The examination of tensions in the juxtaposed elements produced ever-changing montage-like assemblages and series of still photos, which consisted of objects, news photos, and human actors. The news photos came and conquered room on the circle, covering some deprived objects, wrapping themselves around the scrap objects and pushing them to the outer circle. As the objects unintentionally formed a new interrelationship, the dynamics of their authority relationship also changed. Working with object actors offered constantly variable, experimental assemblages and different perspectives for observing them. Simultaneously, assemblages concretely embody the complexity of the issues at hand. The function and history of the object was also a focus of interest in the workshop.

All objects carry something in themselves as object memories: operating environments, experience situations, relationships, disposals (e.g., Brannagan, 2013). An abandoned object, detached from its function, has been orphaned from its own functional context. The perception of its invalid status touches and arouses discomfort and melancholy: disposed human-size Rescue Anne—dolls in old hospital beds, worn-out wooden tools, balls of recycled yarn, and scrap metal found on flea markets embody mental images of their background and function. Exactly because of their history, the a forementioned objects were chosen as the starting point for my process drama-workshops and as their non-human actors (Rusi-Pyykönen, 2020).

Thinking by hands with found objects

Think through things, not about them. (Allen, 2014)

In the field of artistic research, my doctoral dissertation is situated within practice-led research (Haseman, 2006). Research in this area is typically author-led and experiential, as well as based on one's own works. As a rule, the research process starts from a practical and critical knowledge interest in developing the practices of one's field (Haseman, 2006). Typical of artistic research, in the practical part of my work I started to transform my object-led praxis in process drama through action to a way of knowing. In the research stage that I call "the object project", the methods included making process works by hand and taking notes regularly. The method progressed as an experimental, material-concrete activity. The aim was to gain deeper understanding of my object-oriented practice.

The objects I had accidentally found provided the starting point for nine process works, assemblages, which I created by joining found objects and surplus materials with elements I had made. The purpose of the process works was to apply the method of making by hand in knowledge production and in processing research-related questions. The process works can be understood as assemblages consisting of the available materials and the insights and thought structures that arise in the process: as three-dimensional, sketchy constructions of the thought process related to my research task. As the material outcome of the method the completed process works are both research material and results of the research.

In my process work method, working with objects can be examined as making by hand guided by perception and thinking. Working by hand as such can be regarded as a personal way of thinking (Pallasmaa, 2009). When doing something with your hands, your hands and corporality are tools for experiential knowledge acquisition, whereby knowing is not based on ready-made concepts, thoughts, or form. Instead, knowledge grows during the work process

within us, through sensory perception, in cooperation with materials and the environment (Ingold, 2013; Lundborg, 2011; Paterson, 2013).

Making the process works by hand represents the way I think about the questions related to the research. The aim of making the process works was not to create an arts or a crafts product, but to provide new insights and understanding regarding an object-led work praxis. The process works served as surfaces reflecting my own thinking. Concrete work on them served as a central method for understanding and guiding my research process, as well as for developing it into visual, material performances (Borgdorff, 2011; Haseman, 2014). The process works commented on the research process and the main themes of my work. Their comments were non-verbal and sensory. Therefore, part of my research is situated beyond language. (The process works were documented as pre-examined practical part of my research at Gallery Laterna Magica. The nine assemblages, as a whole called At Hand photographed for my doctoral dissertation by photographer Johanna Tirronen in Kaapelitehdas, Puristamo.) I relate the work method I used for the process works to bricolage technique. Bricolage is equivalent to do-it-yourself (DIY), which is linked to environments of shortage and scarcity (Rogers, 2012). Its main idea is to utilise free materials available in the neighbourhood and compile works from materials at hand, often found objects. Essential for the work process is inventing a new use for everyday objects and materials that were not originally intended for artistic purposes. A work created with bricolage is an assemblage of different elements modified and joined in a certain way (e.g., Siukonen, 2011). In the art world, bricolage refers to a technique close to arte povera (Scotti & Chilton, 2017).

In the research context, the concept of bricolage implies critical, curious, and experimental mixing and adapting of work methods in a research process, whereby a crafts-based approach and elements of creating by hand are central (Rogers, 2012). Epistemologically, a bricoleuse (actor) works on a pragmatic foundation: the produced knowledge combining praxis and theory

is closely connected to activities with objects and materials (Kincheloe, McLaren & Steinberg, 2011). In the work starting "here and now", the cognitive and the expressive are inseparable because the technical solution chosen for the work is already, simultaneously, part of the expression to which the author has brought something personal (Rusi-Pyykönen, 2020). My research work can be understood as bricolage artisanship of doing and thinking.

Three cornerstones of the process work method

The cornerstones of my process work method were developed through the retrospective examination of individual manual work. They were the following: *object companionship, sensuous images,* and *adhesion of mental image of objects.* My starting point in working with objects is that every object has its own specific meaning, and it can as such contain an artistic or research-related idea (Allen, 2014).

I call a long-term relationship with process works object companionship: while working, we gradually develop a special relationship with each recovered object. An object relationship can become fair and close, but also volatile and reluctant, which makes interaction with objects unpredictable and multifaceted. Now the development of companionship called for temporal space to see around and behind the objects as well: what they told about their background and how they themselves built the environment of their activeness. In object companionship, the sensory experience means being in a relationship with the object and its characteristics. I associate the aesthetics of my process works' shabbiness with this relationship. It represents the experiential value of poverty and wornness in my works, as well as a way of looking at the surrounding world and ourselves. One's own perception or sensation recognises and can appreciate the peculiarity of a used and abandoned object. Wornness highlights the materiality of objects. The worn-out aesthetics of an object's surface structure is not just a visual trace left

by time and use—it also represents tactile bodily sensations evoked by the object, which appeal to the sense of touch in our hands.

It is a rare moment when an object escapes its destiny. (Kantor 1993)

I include the object pretexts and object actors of my workshop practices, as well as the found objects of my process works, in the "poor objects" defined by theatre director Tadeusz Kantor (1993). Kantor characterises an object as poor if it has been stripped of its daily function and utility value and thrown away. When useless, it has become idle, goalless, deprived of dignity, minor. For Kantor (1993), the material impact of time on an object and its surface structure are significant, which appeals to the senses, especially the sense of touch. In its own way of manifestation, an object can stimulate an experience of similarity in the viewer. A poor object can thus make a viewer feel compassion and attachment towards itself (Paavolainen, 2011; Rayner, 2009).

Understanding the tangible properties of objects is also an effort to understand their ability to touch us affectively (Paterson, 2013). In the object companionship of my research, the fates of worn-out and damaged found objects as orphaned from their function are parallel with the corporality of human life: its fragility and limitedness. This highlights the similarity of objects and people. The analogy with objects opened new perspectives on companionship and deepened the understanding of working with them. Object companionship provided the opportunity to concentrate on exploring the comparability, symbolic nature, and similarity between found objects and human corporality in fragile life situations. Consequently, the theme of fragility became an overarching seam in my research process.

Sensuous images, as another cornerstone of my process work-method, clarify how making something with one's hands and the sensuous images evoked by the work were integrated with the associations jointly produced by the found objects and imagination. When creating some-

thing by hand, we are in a reciprocal and communicative relationship with material and sensory impressions. These include the immediate lived experiences, sensations and instinctive conceptions caused by perceptions. In the process work method, making by hand stimulated thoughts, free associations, and actions in different sketchy experiments. It is bodily, action-based thinking with objects, whereby the hand understands, and objects stimulate mental images and imagination.

Sensation refers to the reaction of senses to internal or external stimuli. Through the association areas located in the cerebral cortex, our senses cooperate with each other: they combine, adapt, and interpret sensations simultaneously supplied by the different senses, integrating them with information saved in memory based on earlier experiences (Berger, 2016; Lundborg, 2011). Sensory experiences result from our interpretation and analysis of sensations coming from within or outside of our body (Paterson, 2013). People's everyday activities in their environment are based on the relationship between what they perceive and what they remember. Perceptions thus have an experiential as well as a sensory dimension.

According to philosopher Kari Turunen (1998) perceptions live on as mental images (e.g., a blossoming apple tree). A *mental image* can be characterised as an experience resembling perception or as a representation of real-world objects, things, and events. It is a visual construction created by our mind based on memory. It is an image (of, for instance, a bunch of rowan berries) we see in our mind. Thoughts, memories, dreams, and ideas are saved mental images (Berger, 2016). As part of human consciousness, they are some sort of instruments between perceptions conveyed through the senses and our inner world. As a continuous flow of pictures, mental images are created from sensations across the different sensory areas (Vyshedskiy, 2014). Therefore, they depend on sensory perceptions; as experiences, they are subjective and transforming spaces of thoughts or experiences. Turunen (1998) describes, that mental images are typically picture-like, simplified, and fleeting.

Sensuous images are linked to *imagination*. With its process-like ability, imagination creates sensational experiences of things in our minds, which cannot, in reality, be perceived nor are present (Turunen, 1998). Imagination is bodily and multisensory, and it is based on mental images (Berger, 2016). Mental images can be understood as units of imagination. Imagination needs mental images as its building material (Vyshedskiy, 2014). When working with objects, mental images and chains of thought unite. Based on my process work method imagination produces associations, which can stimulate and connect thoughts, concepts, events, and emotions that do not seem to be related to each other in any way. The connection between perceptual experiences, images and imagination and emerging associations provides essential understanding when working with objects.

In the association area of the brain, sensory perception experiences, mental images, memories, and imagination are activated by each other (Berger 2016). Mental images are closely connected to our memory, and our memory to objects. Sensory perception experiences also have the ability to connect to each other and stimulate new associations and trains of thought (Damasio, 2011; Lundborg, 2011). Consequently, when we process materials with our own hands, our sensations, memories, imageries, and associations generated by imagination can be integrated. In the same way, based on everyday perceptions (e.g., a wallpaper pattern, a wooden clothes hanger, a decrepit paddle), we can suddenly have recollections and mental images that are, in a strange way, associated with questions related to the process works.

> When I returned from a long work trip, I was sitting on a plane at Lisbon airport, which had to wait a surprisingly long time to take off. To exclude from my senses the anguish awakened in the cabin, I began to read the airline magazine in my back pocket. My eyes hit my horoscope sign carb ornament-like dark green symbol. The detail of its curving shape immediately associated to one pattern of wallpaper pieces I had previously recovered. Beneath the symbol of the crab was a quote in

> Portuguese from Victor Hugo: Live savoring your nostalgic moments – Melancholy
>
> is the happiness of being sad. (Rusi-Pyykönen, 2020)

The current situation and Hugo's quote, were associated with the ingredients of life experiences: delay, departure, getting lost on the route, broken. The juxtaposition of the crab symbol and the old piece of wallpaper gave rise to the meaning of the period. The reminiscent of the temporal dimension and meanings hidden in the layers of wallpaper. This vision later became the process work *Fragments of the Past* (Rusi-Pyykönen, 2020).

Sensations, memories, imageries, and associations provoked by imagination were united in creating the process works (Saladini, 2011; Turunen, 1998). The imageries generated during the process provided important information and new perspectives, which guided the conceptions formed regarding the research topic. In addition, the examination of sensuous images deepened our former understanding of object-led process drama work progressing through mental images.

The adhesion of mental image of objects is the third cornerstone of the process work method. A mental image is a visualisation in our mind consisting of structured inner pictures (Turunen 1998). I use the term *mental image of objects* referring to an image in our mind that starts from multiple mental images generated by the sensory impression an object provides. In the process work method, the sensuous images that arise when working by hand produced associations. These associations started to be gradually processed into mental image of objects. For example, a worn-out steering paddle used in the process work *Ohjaamisen apukäsi* ("a helping hand in steering a boat") gradually received the mental image "tactile grasp". The word belongs in the tactile sense terminology, and it generated sensorimotor imageries of different actions related to the steering of a boat with the paddle. Furthermore, these mental images were associated with group leadership: a resonating, situation-aware work approach. In the process work *Hitaasti piirtyvä ymmärrys* ("slowly outlined understanding"), an old wooden tool once used in laundering was associated with a pair of compasses: drawing with a pair of compasses and creating

Figure 1. The process work—*Hitaasti piirtyvä ymmärrys* is a reflection on the ethical dilemmas when practitioners working on participatory projects are content with quickly acquired knowledge and with thin thinking. © JohannaTirronen 2016 (in Rusi-Pyykönen, 2020).

form and space. The associations were crystallised as the mental image of "rotation" in Figure 1. (Rusi-Pyykönen, 2020).

Adhesion involves attraction between two objects or their parts, which attaches one part to the other. I use "adhesion" to describe what happens when an object crystallised as one or more mental image of objects links its revealed property (e.g., tactile grasp) to another object. The term adhesion is parallel with film director Sergei Eisenstein's (1978) "collision" in the montage of attractions method. The method is based on attraction between elements. However, the difference lies in that creating an attractive montage is based on an idea: it involves the author's proactive, intentional activity and design experiments to accomplish a specific impression. In the process work method, instead, adhesion refers to object-led, unexpected impressions made on people and their sensory reactions to it, whereby an occasional collision becomes meaningful. The event generates a special reaction and thus "vivifies" something unexpected in the objects. The idea of the process work, *Pohjakosketus itseen* ("bottom contact with oneself"),

Figure 2. Pohjakosketus itseen—process work dismantles the ideal of good leadership, and the associated better-knowing attitude. © JohannaTirronen 2016 (in Rusi-Pyykönen, 2020).

Figure 2, arose when an old aspen trolling coil and a grotesque human figure were attached to each other. In my process work method, mental image of objects and their associations caused the adhesion of different elements, thus producing insights.

For my research process, the adhesion of mental image of objects proved to be the most significant cornerstone of the process work method. The attraction between objects generated sensory and bodily imageries, which stimulated imagination. Object companionship, the process of making by hand, and sensuous images created a foundation for understanding this phenomenon.

Conclusions

In my research, I aimed at approaching participatory theatre practices from a perspective outside of instrumental, pre-designed action models and performance structures. The relationship between performance structure and the process is essential for the participatory work: does a predefined structure with its structured methods tie the process, or is the process as free and

non-predefined as possible? Based on the findings of my research, participatory group activities can be freely mobile only when the structure is flexible and spacious as well as supports the purpose of the activities clearly and vividly (Rusi-Pyykönen, 2020). This provides the necessary framework for working, yet without predefining the content, process, and the ways the participants interact. Participatory theatre is characterised in my study by the group's common way of working. It involves activities that can enable interactive, equal encounters and opportunities for participation for people with different starting points and backgrounds.

The purpose of the "object project" was to test the object-led construction of investigative thinking that occurs when we create something with our hands. It developed into the process work method through guided practical work. In the process work method, I sought a material expression for the thoughts related to the research task. As a method, it was a tool for thinking and a temporal event, in which something changed, was handled, and concretised into a tangible construction. The process works, as well as the thoughts and associations they evoked, produced themes and perspectives for the research. The method demonstrates that when concrete objects at hand, such as found objects and materials, are mixed, and juxtaposed according to the methodological principles of montage, the produced process works can express abstract ideas and bring forth trains of thought that feed research.

Understanding the attraction between found objects provided a new perspective on working with objects and on situational dramaturgy. The cornerstones of the process work method offered tools for analysing the construction of my object-led working. Creating the concrete process works played an essential role in the formation of my research questions, insights, and new epistemological understanding of thinking by hands. The works served as discussion partners and commented on the topics that crossed my mind during the process. Through multisensory imagination, the method of making by hand provided the opportunity to be impressed

and emotionally touched: it generated compassion for the found objects and their fate. It was precisely the ability of objects to touch that proved to be a key element in object-led working.

Pre-designed plans and instrumental action models are inevitably liable to simplification and misinterpretation concerning, for instance, the participants' daily life within social change. In working methods, equivocal situations are often simplified as recognisable roles and predefined ethical-political views (e.g., Bala & Albacan, 2013; Balfour, 2009). Based on my long-term experience, the instrumental paradigm of the work does not meet the multidimensionality of reality and cannot get below the surface of issues (Rusi-Pyykönen, 2020). People's life situations and social circumstances are too complex and multidimensional to be influenced by fixed-term and non-recurring projects. Instrumental paradigm is often accompanied by a "know-it-all" -attitude of practitioners (Dwyer, 2016). When operating with brief interventions, practitioners in the field of participatory theatre cannot possibly know what living in certain conditions means, how someone feels, and what the other person's viewpoint on an issue is. People are experts on their own lives, so the main starting point for work is their personal view and experiential knowledge. In addition, strictly phased methods restrict the group's spontaneity and sharing of thoughts and feelings: they give no room for the flow of sensory and affective experiences and imageries. There is always some degree of ambiguity and surprise associated with participatory artistic processes. In the workshop settings, this ambiguity could be described as identifying an unbuilt, potential space for shared activities where no one has a predefined privileged position. That kind of a way of working is not aimed at the final form or result. Instead, the aim is to create an open and unhurried pattern of events. A potential space of shared activities help practitioners to dissolve stereotypical constructions that have become problematic from the viewpoint of equal working practices.

People live and cooperate in the world not only with other people but also with others understood as non-human. In the world around us, materials are undergoing a constant change

process concerning, for example, form, colour, structure, and motion. Our daily life is spent in material activities, with different objects and materials, in the surrounding cultural reality. We can think that people and objects share a parallel and reciprocal operating environment (Bennet, 2010; Lehtonen, 2014). Despite of this, the world of non-human beings has been mostly ignored in the individual narratives of participatory theatre focusing on the main characters – in the approaches that focus on human activities and emotions (e.g., Nicholson, 2014; 2016). The object-led approach I describe in this paper, to which an equal, unpredefined working space for human and non-human actors is typical, offers an alternative for individually oriented, structured forms of activity. I end my article with a thought-provoking quote from Rustom Bharucha, an Indian theatre director and culture critic:

> When the play ends what remains / when the play ends what begins. (Bharucha, 2011)

References

Abraham, N. (2014). Witnessing change: Problematizing the impact of participatory theatre for vulnerable groups at kids company. *Royal central school of speech and drama*.

Allen, R. (2014). *Theatre machines. A practice-based enquiry into the performance of objects* (Doctoral Dissertation). Aberystwyth University.

Bala, S., & Albacan, A. I. (2013). Workshopping the revolution? On the phenomenon of joker training in the Theatre of the Oppressed. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, *18*(4), 388–402. https://doi.org/10.1080/13569783 .2013.836915

Balfour, M. (2009). The politics of intention: looking for a theatre of little changes. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, *14*(3), 347–359. https://doi.org/10.1080/13569780903072125

Bennett, J. (2010)). *Political ecology of things*. Duke University Press.

Berger, C. C. (2016). *Where imagination meets sensation, mental imagery, perception, and multisensory integration* (Doctoral Dissertation). Karolinska Institute.

Bharucha, R. (2011). Problematizing applied theatre: a search for alternative paradigms. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, *16*(3), 365–384. https://doi.org/10.1080/13569783.2011.589996

Bishop, C. (2012). *Artificial hells: Participatory art and the politics of spectatorship*. Verso Books.

Borgdorff, H. (2011). The production of knowledge in artistic research. In M. Biggs & H. Karlsson (Eds.), *The routledge companion to research in the arts* (pp. 44–63). Routedge.

Brannagan, M. M. (2013). *The Memory of Things: Walter Benjamin's Modernity* (Doctoral Dissertation). University of Manitoba.

Chinyowa, K. C. (2011). Revisiting monitoring and evaluation strategies for applied drama and theatre practice in African contexts. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, *16*(3), 337–356. https://doi.org/10.1080/13569783.2011.589994

Damasio, A. (2011). *Itse tulee mieleen. Tietoisten aivojen rakentaminen. [Self comes to mind. Constructing the conscious brain.]*. Terra Cognita.

Dwyer, P. (2016). Peacebuilding performances in the aftermath of war: Lessons from Bougainville. In J. Hughes & H. Nicholson (Eds.), *Critical perspectives on applied theatre* (pp. 127–149). Cambridge University Press.

Eisenstein, S. (1978). *Elokuvan muoto. [Film Form: essays in film theory]*. Love Kustannus.

Eriksson, S. (2011). Distancing at close range: making strange devices in Dorothy Heathcote's process drama Teaching Political Awareness Through Drama. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, *16*(1), 101–123. https://doi.org/10.1080/13569783.2011.541613

Fischer-Lichte, E., Arjomand, M., & Mosse, R. (Eds.). (2014). *The Routledge introduction to theatre and performance studies*. Routledge.

Frieling, R. (2009). Toward Participation Art. in (eds.), the art of participation. In R. Frieling, B. Groys, R.Atkins, & L. Manovich (Eds.), *The art of participation* (pp. 32–49). Thames & Hudson.

Goodley, D., & Runswick-Cole, K. (2011). Something in the Air? Creativity, culture and community. *Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance*, *16*(1), 75–91. https://doi.org/10.1080/13569783.2011.541610

Harvey, D. (2008). *Uusliberalismin lyhyt historia. [Brief History of Neoliberalism]*. Vastapaino.

Haseman, B. (2006). A manifesto for performative research. *Media International Australia*, *118*(1), 98–106. https://doi.org/10.1177/1329878X0611800113

Hughes, J., & Nicholson, H. (2016). Applied Theatre: ecology of practices. In J. Hughes & H. Nicholson (Eds.), *Critical perspectives on applied theatre* (p. 1–12). Cambridge University Press. doi: 10.1017/CBO9781107587977.001

Huttunen, T. (1997). Montaasi ja teksti. *Synteesi*, *4*, 58–79.

Kantor, T. (1993). The Milano Lessons. In M. Kobialka (Ed.), *A journey through Other Spaces: Essays and Manifestos, 1944–1990: Tadeusz Kantor*. University of California Press.

Kincheloe, J. L., McLaren, P., & Steinberg, S. R. (1993)). Critical pedagogy and qualitative research: Moving to the bricolage. In N. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research. (4. ed.)* (pp. 163–177). SAGE.

Lehtonen, M. (Ed.). (2014). *Maa-ilma. Materialistisen kulttuuriteorian lähtökohtia. [Earth-Ear. Premises of material cultural theory].* Vastapaino.

Lundborg, G. (2014). *Handen och hjärnan. från lucys tumme till den tankestyrda robothanden.* Atlantis.

Mullen, M. (2021). Resourcing the arts for youth well-being: challenges in Aotearoa New Zealand. *Arts and Health*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/17533015.2021.2017306

Nicholson, H. (2014/2005). *Applied drama: The gift of theatre*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Nicholson, H. (2016). A good day out: applied theatre, relationality and participation. In J. Hughes & H. Nicholson (Eds.), *Critical Perspectives on Applied Theatre* (p. 248—268). Cambridge University Press. doi: 10.1017/CBO9781107587977.013

O'Connor, P. (2016). Applied theatre and disaster capitalism. Resisting and rebuilding in Christenburch. In J. Hughes & H. Nicholson (Eds.), *Critical perspectives on applied theatre* (pp. 172–189). Cambridge University Press.

O'Connor, P., & Anderson, M. (2015). Research in a post-normal world. In P. O'Connor & M. Anderson (Eds.), *Applied theatre research. Radical departures* (pp. 3–94). Bloombury. doi: 10.1017/CBO9781107587977.013

O'Neill, C. (1995). *Drama worlds. A framework for process drama*. Heinemann.

Paavolainen, T. (2011). *Theatre/Ecology/Cognition : Theorizing Performer-Object Interaction in Grotowski, Kantor, and Meyerhold*. Acta Universitatis Tamperensis 1619.

Paterson, M. (2011). *The senses of touch – haptics, affects and technologies*. Bloomsbury.

Prentki, T., & Preston, S. (Eds.). (2009). *The applied theatre reader*. Routledge.

Rayner, A. (2009). Presenting objects, presenting things. In D. Krasner & D. Z. Saltz (Eds.), *Stazing philosophy. Intersecting of Theater, Performance and Philosophy* (pp. 180–99)). The University of Michigan Press.

Rifkin, F. (2010). *The ethics of participatory theatre in higher education. A framework for learning and teaching.* The Higher Education Academy: PALATINE- Dance, Drama and Music. Lancaster University. http://www.scribd.com/doc/61511898/Ethics-of-Participatory-Theatre.

Rogers, M. (2012). The Qualitative Report. *Contextualizing theories and practices of bricolage research*, *17*(748), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2012.1704

Rusi-Pyykönen, M. (2020). *Hetkestä syntynyttä. Suunnamuutoksia ja uudenlaista otetta osallistavan teatterin käytäntöihin. [Born from the Moment; New departures and grasps for participatory theatre practices.* Theatre Academy of University of the Arts Helsinki, Performance Research Center.

Saladini, E. (2011). The art of telling history: Christian Boltanski. *Art, Emotion and Value*, 331–344.

Scotti, V., & Chilton, G. (2017). Collage as Art-Based Research. In P. Leavy (Ed.), *Handbook of Arts-Based Research* (pp. 355–376). The Guilford Press.

Siukonen, J. (2011). *Vasara ja hiljaisuus. Lyhyt johdatus työkalujen filosofiaan. [Hammer and silence: A brief introduction to the philosophy of tools].* Kuvataideakatemia.

Turunen, K. (2011). *It seems to me: an introduction to reflective philosophy*. Atena.

Vyshedskiy, A. (2014). The mental synthesis theory: The dual origin of human language. In *The Evolution of Language* (pp. 344–352). https://doi.org/10.1142/9789814603638_0046