



**HAL**  
open science

## Shared Diminished Reality: a new VR framework for the study of embodied intersubjectivity

Loup Vuarneßon, Dionysios Zamplaras, Julien Laroche, Joseph Dumit, Clint Lutes, Asaf Bachrach, Francois Garnier

► **To cite this version:**

Loup Vuarneßon, Dionysios Zamplaras, Julien Laroche, Joseph Dumit, Clint Lutes, et al.. Shared Diminished Reality: a new VR framework for the study of embodied intersubjectivity. *Frontiers in Virtual Reality*, 2021. hal-03099274v2

**HAL Id: hal-03099274**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03099274v2>**

Submitted on 27 Jan 2021

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Shared Diminished Reality: a new VR framework for the study of embodied intersubjectivity

Loup Vuarnesson, †<sup>1,\*</sup>, Dionysios Zamplaras, †<sup>2,\*</sup>, Julien Laroche<sup>3</sup>, Joseph Dumit<sup>4</sup>, Clint Lutes<sup>5</sup>, Asaf Bachrach, †<sup>6</sup>, and Francois Garnier, †<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>EnsadLab, Spatial Media, Ensad, PSL University, 31 rue d'Ulm Paris, France  
EMOTIC, Nantes, France

<sup>2</sup>Inrev/AIAC (EA4010), University Paris 8, 2 Rue de la Liberté, Saint-Denis, France  
EnsadLab, Spatial Media, Ensad, PSL University, 31 rue d'Ulm Paris, France

<sup>3</sup>Fondazione Istituto Italiano di Tecnologia (IIT), Center for Translational Neurophysiology of Speech and Communication (CTNSC), Via Fossato di Mortara, 17/19 - 44121 - Ferrara, Italy and EUR ArTec Paris 8 university

<sup>4</sup>Science and Technology Studies, University of California, Davis, Davis, CA, USA

<sup>5</sup>Cie DaPoPa, Paris, France

<sup>6</sup>UMR 7023 CNRS and EUR ArTec Paris 8 university, Centre CNRS Pouchet 59 rue Pouchet 75017, Paris, France

<sup>7</sup>EnsadLab, Spatial Media, Ensad, PSL University, 31 rue d'Ulm Paris, France

Correspondence\*:

Loup Vuarnesson  
loup.vuarnesson@gmail.com

Dionysios Zamplaras  
dzamplaras@gmail.com

2 †These authors have contributed equally to this work and share first authorship

3 † These authors share last authorship

4 10196 words, 1 table, 12 figures & pictures

## 5 **ABSTRACT**

6 Shaping both the environment and the embodiment of the users in that virtual world, VR offers  
7 designers and cognitive scientists the unprecedented potential to explore virtually a vast set of  
8 interactions between persons, and persons and their environment. By design, VR tools offer  
9 a formidable opportunity to revisit the links between body movement and lived experiences,  
10 and to experiment with them in a controlled, yet engaging and ecologically valid manner. In our  
11 multidisciplinary research-creation project we ask, How can we design (virtual) environments  
12 that specifically encourage interactions between multiple persons and that allow designers,  
13 scientists and participants (users or 'immersants') to explore the very process of interaction itself?  
14 Building on our combined experience with dance improvisation research and interactive virtual  
15 spatial design, we document a multi-user VR experience design approach we name Shared  
16 Diminished Reality (SDR), where immersants are co-present and able to move together while  
17 their bodies and the environment are represented in a minimalist way. Our working hypothesis  
18 is that non-anthropomorphic embodiment of oneself and one's partner(s) combined with open-  
19 ended exploration focus the attention of users on the quality of the interaction and encourages

20 playfulness and creativity. We present the Articulations VR platform and its design history, as well  
21 as design evaluations of SDR in a laboratory setting and through a mixed reality performance,  
22 interrogating the impact of our minimalist approach on user experience and on the quality of the  
23 interaction.

24 **Keywords:** copresence, dance improvisation, research-creation, multi-user experience design, enaction, non-anthropomorphic  
25 avatars, Virtual reality, mixed reality performance

26 This work has been supported by funding provided by the French national agency of research through the  
27 program "Investissements d'avenir" (reference ANR-17-EURE-0008)

## 1 INTRODUCTION

28 The question of embodied interactions has emerged as a central theme in the cognitive sciences, robotics  
29 and related fields, extending older philosophical preoccupations. Philosophers from Bergson (1939) and  
30 Merleau-Ponty (1945), to Noë (2012) and Manning (2009) have indeed insisted on the role of bodily  
31 actions in the construction of space and perception more generally. According to the enactive cognition  
32 stance, how we move in our environment and how we experience it as a world is a circular, co-constitutive  
33 process (Merleau-Ponty 1945; Varela et al. 1991). In other words, we realize the world by interacting with  
34 it and by realizing the world, we realize ourselves: we are present (Noë 2012 ; Manning 2009).

35 The recent and growing development of virtual reality (VR) tools allows us to design new lived worlds:  
36 to construct and visit new spaces, to try new practices and to interact with new contexts. Shaping both  
37 the environment and the embodiment of the users in that virtual world, VR offers designers and cognitive  
38 scientists the unprecedented potential to explore virtually a vast set of interactions between persons and  
39 their environment, new ways to be present to oneself, to the world and to others.

40 By design, VR tools offer a formidable opportunity to revisit the very link between body movement and  
41 lived experiences and to experiment with it in a controlled, yet engaging and ecologically valid manner. In  
42 this context of application, the design of the environment is usually under focus, allowing researchers to  
43 experiment with how subjects interact with the features of the virtual environment. Yet, a more recent focus  
44 in cognitive sciences research and experience design in VR (Greenwald et al. 2017 ; Wienrich et al. 2018)  
45 concerns the interaction between persons, giving a central role to relationality itself (De Jaegher et al. 2010,  
46 Laroche et al. 2014). Indeed, when the couplings between perception and action of two or more persons  
47 become intertwined, the dynamics of bodily interactions give rise to the experience of being 'co-present'  
48 (Froese et al. 2014a, Froese et al. 2014b). For Manning (2009), 'relational movement' (the way we move in  
49 relation with other bodies/selves) underlies our own sense of self ('bodying') and our being in the world  
50 ('worlding'). By interacting and moving together, we participate in each other's experiences and sense-  
51 making (De Jaegher and Di Paolo 2007). In other words, the way our lived experiences become meaningful  
52 and our world imbued with sense emerges from our active bodily encounters with our environment, and  
53 especially with others (McGann and De Jaegher 2009).

54 How can we design (virtual) environments that encourage interactions between multiple persons and  
55 that allow designers, scientists and participants (users or 'immersants') to explore the very process of  
56 interaction itself? A number of members of the research project previously addressed the formal study of  
57 open-ended interpersonal interaction by designing GIGs, an acronym for (in person) Group Improvisation  
58 Games. This consists in bringing groups of participants to explore their reciprocal interactions and to do so  
59 freely within a simple set of constraints (Himberg et al. 2018). How can VR support and contribute to the  
60 improvement of the methodological set-ups employed in this kind of research? And, in turn, how can this

61 line of research inform multi-person VR design? In this paper, we propose to use the tools of VR to control  
62 and manipulate the coupling between perception and joint action and thereby evoke differential affective  
63 experiences. For this purpose we propose a conceptual framework we name “shared diminished reality”  
64 (SDR). In this framework, inspired by the cross-perceptual paradigm (Auvray et al. 2009), immersants are  
65 co-present and able to move together but their bodies, and the environment are represented in a minimalist  
66 way. This allows the user to focus his/her attention on experiencing the interaction itself and allows the  
67 designers or scientists to track the core dynamics of the interactions between participants.

68 In order to present the SDR framework, we first review the potential of VR for the scientific and artistic  
69 research around movement and in particular relational movement, focusing specifically on what we consider  
70 minimalist designs. We will then turn to the interdisciplinary design and design-history of our shared VR  
71 platform (Articulations) which represents an attempt at instantiating SDR. In this paper, Articulations  
72 serves as both a theoretical object through which to reflect on SDR and an empirical testing ground of  
73 its art-science potential. In the second part of the paper we report two forms of design evaluation, one as  
74 cognitive science research (the ‘laboratory installation’) and the other in the ‘practice as research’ tradition  
75 (the ‘research-creation installation’).

## 76 **1.1 Use of Virtual Reality for the study of the cognition of movement, presence and** 77 **affect**

78 The increase in computer graphic capacities and the rise of immersive technologies in recent years  
79 have brought about the conception of new tools for the in-depth observation, study, and manipulation of  
80 the mechanisms of bodying and worlding. VR provides the capability of creating custom experimental  
81 installations where the environment, our own appearance, and the presence or representation of others,  
82 can all evolve and adapt dynamically to (joint) behaviours while carefully controlling action-perception  
83 coupling parameters.

84 VR has seen its scientific use spread and is considered by now as “valid and highly ecological without  
85 compromising experimental control” (Loomis et al. 1999). It has been used in a wide variety of fields  
86 including psychology, anthropology, ergonomics, neurosciences, both as an experimental tool and as a  
87 therapeutic application (Okun 2017), particularly in the treatment of mental illnesses (Wiederhold and Riva  
88 2019 ; Freeman et al. 2017). It has been applied to the study of the psycho-affective dimensions of art and  
89 mediated communication (Quesnel et al. 2018), and in the exploration of social mechanisms at play during  
90 interaction, in particular the feeling of co-presence (Garnier et al. 2017).

91 Interestingly, one of the first experiments to validate the potential of VR as an experimental paradigm  
92 targeted body ownership (Slater et al. 2010). The “rubber hand illusion” experiment (Botvinick and Cohen  
93 1998) has shown that visuotactile stimulation gives the illusion of embodiment with a substitute hand. Such  
94 embodiment techniques have been shown to result in the illusion of body ownership over the surrogate  
95 body – whether a physical manikin body (Petkova and Ehrsson 2008) or a virtual body (Slater et al. 2010).  
96 The very sense of self can be altered when inhabiting an artificial envelope. Numerous studies (Banakou  
97 et al. 2013 ; De la Peña et al. 2010 ; Kiltner et al. 2013 ; Lugin et al. 2016 ; Peck et al. 2013) observed how  
98 users’ virtual appearances can affect their thinking, feeling and acting. For example, Banakou et al. (2018)  
99 explored how switching between bodies can help the user to work on personal issues from an outside  
100 point of view. Yee and Bailenson (2007) provided evidence for what they named “Proteus Effect”: how  
101 the participant avatar’s appearance affects the participant’s behaviour, during virtual experience but also  
102 following it. When it comes to social interaction in VR, Nowak and Biocca (2003) showed that the degree  
103 of empathy that immersants express for each other isn’t correlated to the anthropomorphism of the avatars.



104 Rather, the willingness to contribute to a group task as well as the performances obtained, are more linked  
105 to visual similarities between participants and self-identification (Wallace and Maryott 2009 ; Van der Land  
106 et al. 2015). Anthropomorphism often leads to expectations that can't be met, while iconic representations  
107 may lead to more excitement (Nowak and Biocca 2003).

108 Along similar lines, anthropomorphic cues are not necessary for copresence to emerge. For example,  
109 Froese et al. (2014a, 2014b) used Lenay and colleagues' "cross-perceptual paradigm" (Auvray and Rohde  
110 2012), where sensory information about the other is reduced to a very minimal representation: pairs of  
111 participants explore a one-dimensional space with their finger on which they received a tactile stimulation  
112 whenever an other entity (the partner, a lure following the partner at a constant distance, or a static object)  
113 was present in their receptive field. This minimal sensorimotor structure was sufficient enough to bring  
114 about collective dynamics between human partners participants. Indeed, Auvray et al. (2009) showed  
115 that even when participants could not consciously differentiate between the (responsive) partner and the  
116 (non-intentional and sensory deprived) lure, they were attracted by each other's movement so that they  
117 spent more time interacting with each other than with the lure (in other words, they found each other  
118 collectively before each could find the other). When participants were invited to cooperate to find each other  
119 and co-regulated their interaction, they were able to recognize the other during these minimal interactions,  
120 and the feeling tended to be mutual (Froese et al. 2014a, 2014b).

## 121 1.2 Minimalist immersion

122 VR can propose either a modelisation of the real world based on an environment which imitates or  
123 mirrors the real world, or the creation of an artificial environment which does not correspond to anything  
124 which exists (Fuchs et al. 2006). It almost always also reduces or diminishes the richness of perceptual  
125 information, by design or by the limitations of the current technology. We find that this potential of VR to  
126 reduce, simplify, prune or limit the perceptual field and the sensorimotor contingencies of the experiencer  
127 echoes a fundamental aspect of both art making and experimental science.

128 The tendency towards abstraction<sup>1</sup> and minimalism<sup>2</sup> is indeed one of the major characteristics of artistic  
129 practice in the 20th century and can be found in a variety of artistic fields and media, be it visual, sound, or  
130 movement arts (such as dance or theatre). Similarly, a basic property of any experimental apparatus is to  
131 abstract away multiple features of the real world in order to be able to isolate the effect of specific factors  
132 or their interactions. Learning from minimalist art and science making, we suggest that the reduction or  
133 simplification of sensory data in immersive VR is a design feature rather than a problem to overcome.

134 As an important emerging medium within the digital arts, VR challenges our perception of space, time,  
135 and self for narrative and esthetic purposes. Through the use of graphic enhancement and motion capture,  
136 numerous contributions in dance and other interactive art have explored, through abstraction, the materiality  
137 of bodies themselves. Bodies can appear as made of smoke, sand, dismembered or decomposed. In  
138 "*Ballet Rotoscope*" (Euphrate, 2011), the japanese collective decomposes the movement of a ballerina and  
139 alternatively replaces it by trails drawn by her hands, or by bounding boxes. In "*Co:lateral*" (Barros &  
140 Moura, 2016-2019) and "*Unnamed Sound Sculpture*" (Onformative, 2012), the body textures are made of  
141 shades, sparky particles and smoke, making the movement and the body limits blurrier. In "*CLINAMEN*"  
142 (Harcier, 2020), three dancers are composed of multiple spheres, moved by randomly placed movement  
143 trackers on their whole bodies. Bodies are mixing, making it harder to differentiate one from another. In

---

<sup>1</sup> See the artists, Vassily Kandinsky, Kasimir Malevitch, Robert Delaunay, Piet Mondrian

<sup>2</sup> See the artists, Frank Stella, Donald Judd, Carl Andre, Dan Flavin

144 these artworks, dancers' expressivity remains perceivable through the abstracted qualities of motion, and  
145 through their appropriation of space.

146 These experiences and artworks demonstrate how VR design choices impact the way we build our  
147 representation of the world. Digital paradigms can also affect our sense of self and allow one to play with  
148 the contours of otherness, and limits of human-like entities. In *"Body Remixer"* (Desnoyers-Stewart et al.  
149 2020), several users see their own silhouettes displayed as particles on a wall, and a single user experiences  
150 the scene through a VR headset. In *"Your Place And Mine"* (Sra et al., 2018), the authors explore the idea  
151 of moving and dancing simultaneously in different locations, embodied into realistic human avatars. In  
152 *"Spheres, a Dance for Virtual Reality"*, Sarah Neville (2019) adds the idea of haptic connexion to others.  
153 A single participant interacts in VR with abstract silhouettes and some luminous spheres are connected  
154 to their hands. When they enter in contact, the participant feels a vibrating feedback from the controllers.  
155 Some VR platforms now allow multiple users to dance together with different levels of avatar realism  
156 (DanceVR, WaveVR, VRChat). While the user can only control the hands and head of the avatar (no foot  
157 tracking), the rest of the body is animated in either autonomously or in a concordance with the tracked  
158 members. Taken together, this corpus exemplifies that more than being a technical constraint, the idea of  
159 reducing the set of perceptive information coming from our own body and from social interaction offers  
160 new directions for inquiry and artistic creation.

161 Building on these ideas, in January 2019, we initiated the Articulations project, a collaboration between  
162 the virtual spaces design research group at the ENSADLab and the ICI project (Himberg et al. 2018)  
163 research group interested in the study of interaction through joint dance improvisation. The project led  
164 to several public presentations as well as the formalization of a concept that we call Shared Diminished  
165 Reality (SDR). We next discuss the platform and its design process, and then propose a formalization of  
166 SDR and two different evaluations of our approach.

## 2 THE ARTICULATIONS PLATFORM

### 167 2.1 The research creation process

168 Financed by the new ArTec graduate school (<http://eur-artec.fr/>), the Articulation project stands at  
169 the tangential point between the artistic and scientific practices, exploring what minimalistic body  
170 representation in VR can offer, both as an artistic material and a research tool. The initial idea of this  
171 research was to study interpersonal dynamics and emergence of autotelic creative behaviours through the  
172 abstracted representation of movement and bodies, made possible by the use of virtual reality.

173 The operating principle of the project was to foster a real-time innovation dynamic between the artists,  
174 the scientists and the designers through constant iteration between interface development and technological  
175 improvements. The process included in-group residencies and workshops, structured experimentations and  
176 performances open to the public.

177 In the three residencies that took place in 2019, we invited the team and various guests – artists,  
178 cognitivists, philosophers, anthropologists, designers – for a collaborative experience, letting everyone's  
179 domain of knowledge or practice influence the design process. Immersing ourselves in a shared virtual  
180 reality scene, we explored what seemed relevant, avoidable, and essential to let a playful sense of self  
181 emerge.

182 As questions and suggestions arose about the virtual surroundings and the form of the avatars, we took  
183 advantage of the quick editing capacity of VR, manipulating at will the reduced bodies and environment




**Figure 1.** On the left: Two participants testing the platform during the ENSAD public event.




**Figure 2.** On the right: Articulations team preparing the performance with two hip-hop dancers

184 appearances. Designing through experience, as well as through debriefing and sharing, we sought to reach  
 185 a balance between shaping a comfortable visual experience, and keeping a relatively abstract scene that  
 186 would let us explore how body diminution influenced our willingness to engage in the virtual relationship.

187 The creative residencies also allowed us to collectively formulate hypotheses we then tested more  
 188 formally during a series of public sessions and open-ended aesthetic insights that led to the development  
 189 of a VR-dance performance. Collectively, they led us to the development of the Articulations platform: a  
 190 minimalist environment where subjects interact in a minimalist manner.



**Figure 3.** Third person point of view




**Figure 4.** First person point of view

191 In this platform, participants are equipped with virtual reality helmets and two wrist trackers. Once  
 192 immersed, they see two spheres representing their own hands that move in accordance with their movements.  
 193 When the scenario is started, the other participant appears, consisting of three spheres representing the  
 194 positions of their hands and head (Figure 3 & Figure 4). Several changes in the environment and the  
 195 appearance of the participants can be automated or manually controlled by the team via an external  
 196 interface.


197 The design goal was to play with the perception of oneself, of the other, or of movement itself, in time  
 198 and space and how such changes influence the feeling of being independent or the sense of togetherness.  
 199 Considering the research on Proteus effect (Yee and Bailenson 2007) and how avatar representation can  
 200 influence how users behave, spheres were chosen as the embodiment shapes. Through our own experience

201 we believed that this design simplicity would allow our users to approach the experience with a fresher and  
 202 more “neutral” state of mind.

203 The virtual environment itself was chosen to provide a good balance between minimalism and comforting  
 204 surroundings. The wide blue sky, the natural-like lighting and the marble floor offer something rich enough  
 205 to arouse the desire and confidence to explore while focusing the user’s attention on the interaction with  
 206 the other or with the behaviour of one’s avatar. At times during the experience, participants see their  
 207 appearances or that of the environment change: an addition of a mirror (Figure 5), differentiating the  
 208 colours of the participants’ spheres (Figure 6), making them invisible, replacing them with particle systems  
 209 whose behaviour changes according to movement qualities, or more abstract forms.




**Figure 5.** General point of view of the mirror condition with similar colors



**Figure 6.** Third person point of view of the mirror condition with different colors

## 210 2.2 Design Details

211 In terms of software, the Articulations project provides a multiuser virtual platform, with a networked  
 212 client server architecture (Figure 7), all developed using the Unity3D platform .



**Figure 7.** Illustration of the Articulations basic technical setup. Additional ‘viewer’ devices can be connected to the server.

213 For the first exploratory phase of the development, additional tools, plugins and frameworks provided  
 214 by the Unity 3D community were used. This allowed us to quickly prototype a server client architecture



215 of a virtual multiuser environment. This first version was developed in order to conduct experiential  
216 sessions during the team's first residency, which took place in Meriel, France, in May 2019. This prototype  
217 allowed for up to four users, using the HTC Vive, to be simultaneously immersed inside the same virtual  
218 environment (VE) through a network of clients.

219 Each user was represented with three spheres, initially two of the same size for the hands and one third,  
220 bigger, for the head. The larger head sphere integrated a black rectangular shape where the user's face  
221 would be, in order to indicate the head's orientation. The hand spheres were driven by the Vive controllers.  
222 The goal of these sessions was to experiment with the appearance of the avatar, as well as to better define the  
223 needs in terms of environment and interaction design. During the residency, interdisciplinary discussions  
224 led to eliminating the difference between the spheres so the head and the hands were the same size and no  
225 head orientation was shown. This minimalism decreased the anthropomorphism and seemed to increase  
226 the playfulness of the encounters. Based on feedback from the Meriel residency, the second phase of the  
227 project was launched. It was decided to opt for a custom developed OSC based client/server system<sup>3</sup>,  
228 which would allow us to better handle the connections and the interactions implemented, and also render  
229 our platform independent from third party developers. This is of great importance, as Articulations is a  
230 research project and parts of it are intended to be eventually made open source, so that other researchers  
231 can further contribute to its evolution.

232 The architecture allows for a single server to host multiple clients which are assigned roles. The two main  
233 clients are the immersed participants while other clients can connect, assigned the role of a viewpoint. The  
234 server handles the evolution of the VE and the multiple conditions that are implemented in the form of  
235 scenarios. The server is in charge of creating data files to store all the information during each session, such  
236 as date and time, the conditions used, the duration, as well as the position and rotation of all the tracked  
237 body parts of each client.

238 A separate interface was designed for the viewpoint clients, which allows them to either mirror the  
239 viewpoint of one of the main clients, or manipulate a virtual camera to navigate the VE. A viewpoint  
240 client cannot alter the session and is not visible by the main clients. The view point client (Figure 8) was  
241 conceived for three potential purposes: having a rendition of the virtual scene projected on a screen, in  
242 order to give the audience a third person point of view; tracking an external tablet that would serve as a  
243 virtual camera with the possibility to move freely into the physical space; and allowing participants to do a  
244 post-experiment re-viewing and commentary of their performance.


245 The environment can evolve on demand: from a minimalist arena to a dance studio, or to more artistic  
246 landscapes. The ambient light, symbolized by a sun, can go from deep night to full daylight, its intensity  
247 varying according to the time of day chosen. A mirror (an optional feature that played an important role in  
248 our experimentations) allows participants to see what they look like and how their movements appear (both  
249 individually and as an ensemble).

250 A critical aspect of the installation design, whose importance we came to appreciate more fully through  
251 experimentation, is the mapping between the physical and virtual localisation of the two movers in space.


252 In the first prototype we developed (on the left in Figure 9) the physical action space and virtual space  
253 were superposed. This choice was motivated both by an implicit heuristic of the research team to maximize

---

<sup>3</sup> We chose OSC as it is a widely used protocol in the field of digital art, making it easy to handle data exchange even for non-expert coders and artists. Furthermore, the whole data encapsulation system is pretty simple and straightforward, making it simpler to build a customizable and flexible networking system.




**Figure 8.** The user interface named as the “Viewer”, where one can watch a live or past performance from a third point of view



**Figure 9.** First platform proof of concept, with shared (left) and separate (right) physical spaces

254 the overlap between the virtual and physical interaction and technical limits of the tracking devices. The  
 255 size of the virtual space and the location of the avatars in it were identical to the physical space (participants  
 256 could physically touch each other) and so the participants were offered a partially coherent visual, tactile  
 257 and auditory experience. However, since the avatars only represented 3 points on the body, the rest of the  
 258 body was invisible (partially dematerialized), generating surprising (and potentially dangerous) collisions  
 259 in the physical space.

260 For technical reasons (helmet cables getting intertwined) and to avoid recurring collisions between the  
 261 subjects, it was decided to separate the respective positions of the participants, distancing them from one  
 262 other physically, while keeping a face-to-face position in the virtual visual space (on the right in Figure 9).  
 263 The new arrangement thus produced a different mapping between visual, haptic and auditory feedback.  
 264 The body of the other was visually dematerialized. This dematerialization was confirmed by the absence of  
 265 haptic contact. The distancing attenuated auditory cues from the partner, which also reduced and altered  
 266 the verbal interactions.



**Figure 10.** Spatial configuration used during the workshop at the Tate Modern in June 2019. The green triangle represents the viewpoint of the camera projecting a 2D representation of the experience on a screen (the green bar).

267 For the public event that took place in the Tate modern museum in June 2019, we made use of the  
 268 wireless vive set-up for the first time. This setup allowed for lighter and freer movements by the participants  
 269 but required total separation of their physical positions (Figure 10). The total decoupling of the visual  
 270 spheres from the physical position of the partner's body prevented many participants (naive regarding the  
 271 workings of the platform) from making the connection between their physical partner and the 3-sphere  
 272 avatar. Similarly, for an outside observer it became harder if not impossible to 'read' the mapping between  
 273 the physical and virtual interactions. The same spatial configuration was later used for an experimental  
 274 session in the Pouchet CNRS center in Paris.

### 3 SHARED DIMINISHED REALITY

275 Through our research-creation process, we found that dissolving (the experience of) humanness by  
 276 minimizing the visual perception of one's self and one's partners seemed to enhance creativity and  
 277 expressivity flow.

278 Deprived of most usual communication clues and with diminished environmental distraction, participants  
 279 dynamically engaged in responsive interaction, and deployed rich ingenuity in creating a shared vocabulary  
 280 through abstract movement. In line with Heider & Simmel (1944) and Lenay's group (Auvray et al. 2009 ;  
 281 Deschamps et al. 2012), we observed how simple objects in movement can convey emotion, and be the  
 282 basic building blocks of a relationship as long as we find in the moving object a sense of "otherness". From  
 283 an experience design perspective and in dialogue with cognitive science, art performance, anthropology and  
 284 sociology, we would like now to summarize how these observations address the design research field, by  
 285 formalizing them into a more general concept that addresses inter-relational dynamics through abstraction  
 286 in VR. We call it Shared Diminished Reality (SDR), recognizing that shared VR requires only minimal  
 287 design features, and this may be ideal in foregrounding interactive copresence in a shared space.

288 As we discussed above, VR always diminishes the users' experience of their own body and the  
 289 environment. By removing their bodies, we, as designers, modify their bodying experience with the  
 290 world, and therefore their sense of being and presence. The SDR perspective builds on this fundamental  
 291 aspect of VR to explore new paradigms of interaction at the frontiers of humanness and relationship



292 by tweaking bodily appearances and expressive channels. New behaviours emerge through these virtual  
293 interactions, with which users compose relations and experiences.

294 Virtual bodying is afforded/possible as long as users are able to easily feel present. Sense of presence, as  
295 a concordance of senses of agency, self-location, and body-ownership (Kilteni et al. 2012), may be reached  
296 as long as the virtual world's rules are understood and integrated. In a Diminished Reality design, one aims  
297 at offering the minimal set of information allowing for rapid and intuitive self-location and self-motion  
298 perception (Lopez et al. 2015). However, the affordances of the environment (what one can do or how  
299 one can interact with it) should be minimized. The proximal or action space of the user should remain  
300 purposefully empty. When alone in the diminished environment, after a few seconds of uncertainty, the user  
301 has 'figured out' their location and organization in space. However, when Diminished Reality is "shared",  
302 body-ownership, agency and ultimately the sense of presence emerge through interaction with another.  
303 Making Sense (of self and the world) becomes inherently relational, fostering the necessity to engage with  
304 the other. The user's (re)actions create differences that are used dynamically as affordances for the sense  
305 making by the other (De Jaegher and Di Paolo 2007 ; Kimmel et al. 2018).

306 SDR is therefore a framework for designing multi-user experiences, where the main goal is to find the  
307 right balance between removing as many bodily and environmental affordances as possible while providing  
308 the minimum needed to allow a sense of (co)presence, expressivity, and interaction. We consider that  
309 balance as central in shared VR, and decisive to give our users a space to let (collective) creative flow  
310 happen (Csikszentmihalyi 1997). SDR proposes to shape the channel of interaction so to make the (shared)  
311 sensory-motor loop lighter and more transparent to the users and researchers.

312 In Articulations, our goal was to focus on the observation of shared movement and emergence of collective  
313 creative flow. In phase with the enactive literature and priming effects that are operant also in the virtual,  
314 the world was carefully shaped with a naturalistic open sky and a vast floor, showing clearly that nothing in  
315 the global environment had to be figured out. Making use of smooth spheres as avatars, the bodies remained  
316 minimized to very basic information. We invited the users to freely explore the environment. There was no  
317 'task' or goal to be accomplished, leaving the users to (co)create their own experience. Finally, to minimize  
318 the presence of technology, we chose to replace the cable with a Wifi adapter, and the controllers with  
319 trackers placed on their wrists. That gave our users the ability to move into the scene with less attention  
320 regarding the hardware and keeping their hands free, concentrating on inhabiting the interactional scenario.  
321 Everything was designed to keep the focus on movement relationalities.

## 4 EVALUATION

322 The Articulations experience has been created through interdisciplinary innovation. A critical component  
323 in such a process is the (collective) evaluation of 'working hypotheses' regarding the effect of certain  
324 parameters on user/'in-world' experience leading to design choices. Design evaluation is in reality an  
325 ongoing dimension of the design process itself. However, in a design research process there are 'major'  
326 moments where intuitions, ideas, observations or accidents/surprises that emerged during the design  
327 process inform a more formal evaluation step. We present this evaluation step of the platform and the SDR  
328 framework it embodies two distinct epistemological forms:

329 - A "laboratory" installation for movement interaction studies: An installation that takes the form of a  
330 laboratory experiment, allowing us to collect both real time kinetic data and post-experience subjective  
331 reports. The installation is used to test specific hypotheses or answer specific questions. Below we briefly  
332 discuss an experiment that used kinetic data to test our hypothesis that reduced visual feedback of one's

333 own body increases interpersonal coordination. We will then turn to the analysis of user reports in order  
334 to evaluate whether SDR design brings about a creative attitude in participants, a meaningful relational  
335 experience between them, and the experiential effects of the minimalist body representation, minimalist  
336 decor and open-ended scenario/invitation.

337 - A "research-creation" installation that made use of a performative form, based on the dematerialization  
338 of bodies in dance. Research creation evaluates a proposition in terms of whether it continually generates  
339 new questions. Through the creation process that we report here, new questions emerged about the potential  
340 of the hybrid virtual-physical space as 'mixed reality'.

341 Below we discuss these two forms separately. However, it is important to keep in mind that in practice  
342 the different installations are not separate but interwoven and interconnected.

#### 343 **4.1 The Laboratory installation.**

344 One of the original motivations for the Articulations project was the creation of a VR framework that  
345 allows for an ecological but controlled study of movement interactions. In this section, we first present  
346 a brief summary of an experiment reported elsewhere (Laroche *et al.*, under review) to show how our  
347 platform can bring forth meaningful data on relational movement. Then, we report qualitative evaluation of  
348 user experience in SDR based on analysis of questionnaire and interview data..

349 To evaluate the potential of SDR as a fruitful context for the acquisition and the quantification of  
350 movement interactions data, we organized a number of public sessions that were conceived as ecological  
351 laboratory experiments making use of the Articulations platform. Participants were invited to explore  
352 the Articulations world in dyads (as described above). In the spirit of SDR design, there was no task  
353 or goal beyond autotelic exploration. The presence of a second participant in the virtual environment  
354 was not made explicit before the experience. As we mentioned earlier, one of the consequences of the  
355 reinforced dematerialization of the bodies through spatial dislocation, was that, if they were not warned,  
356 the participants did not immediately know the other spheres to be the physical partner. Without the ability  
357 to use voice, facial expression, limbs, fingers, or even orientation of the spheres as communication cues,  
358 participants needed to invent gestural strategies to dynamically figure out what relational situation they  
359 were in, and to potentially realize that another human inhabited the other spheres. In any case, this situation  
360 entailed a very playful exploration.

361 To evaluate how the design of the installation contributed to the movement dynamics and their associated  
362 experiences, we introduced slight design variations (e.g. the suppression of the visual feedback of the  
363 spheres representing one's own hands) across the experiential sessions. Each session (lasting between 10  
364 and 15 min) was thus composed by one baseline block and 2 to 3 blocks each introducing a different kind  
365 of variation. To analyze the gestural strategies deployed by the participants, we tracked and synchronously  
366 recorded the position of the 2x3 spheres at a rather high resolution (60 samples per second). This allowed  
367 us to analyze the entire trajectory of the spheres in the 3D space, and from there we were able to derive a  
368 number of kinematic features, such as the pace or intensity of movements, as well as their similarity across  
369 partners for instance. To explore the associated experiences of participants and see if they were related to  
370 kinematic features, we used questionnaires and interviews.

371 The kinematic study, performed in the Tate modern gallery in June 2019, provided interesting results  
372 (Laroche *et al.*, under review). For instance, suppressing the visual feedback of one's own hands increased  
373 the actual coordination of hands across partners, as if the lack of self-feedback prompted attention toward  
374 the coupling with the partner's movements. By relating kinematic features to the experiential questionnaires,

375 we also observed that when the two partners moved more slowly and similarly in space, this correlated  
376 with their mutual feelings of closeness, particularly when they were unable to see their own hands in the  
377 virtual world. In short, the installation proved useful in revealing how changing the visual feedback leads  
378 to contrasting movement patterns and induces different qualities of experience that post-hoc questionnaires  
379 were able to probe (for more details, see Laroche et al., under review). More generally, the meaningful  
380 patterns uncovered by the experimentation demonstrate the usability and interest of SDR design for  
381 experimentation in socio-affective cognitive science.

382 We now turn to the experiential reports relating to how the SDR design was experienced by the users.  
383 The protocol and the observations described below come from a second experimental session (October  
384 2019) performed in the Pouchet CNRS center in Paris. After each dyad completed their 12 minutes of  
385 improvisation (similar to the protocol used in the Tate) we proceeded to solicit their experiential reports in  
386 3 stages. First, a pre-recorded message, played through the headset's headphones, prompted participants  
387 to verbally report their feelings while still navigating the same virtual environment with their own avatar,  
388 yet in absence of their partner's. They were asked to report their experience of the moment, as well as  
389 the changes they notice compared to the beginning of the experience, or anything else they wanted to  
390 share about the experience itself. After the headsets were taken off, the participants were accompanied to a  
391 small room where they completed a questionnaire (individually). The questionnaire was composed of a  
392 quantitative section (the participant was asked to indicate their adherence to 26 different assertions regarding  
393 the experience: from 0: not at all to 6: strongly adhering), and a section with open questions allowing  
394 for personal elaboration. Once the questionnaires were completed the two participants were interviewed,  
395 together, by two team members (an anthropologist and a psychologist) following a semi-structured protocol.

396 The choice and wording of assertions was grounded in reports collected from the users of the installation  
397 during the previous experimentations and collective retreats. Reviewing the answers to the questionnaires  
398 and the transcripts of the conversations from these earlier events, we identified statements that addressed  
399 one particular aspect of the personal experience. We extracted those representative of or similar to the other  
400 statements and those prototypical to the categories of the experience most relevant to our research interest  
401 (relational movement, bodying, immersion). Importantly, we formulated the questionnaire by staying as  
402 loyal as possible to the wording from the first-person experiences, reformulating them only when in need  
403 to precise, clarify or stylistically adjust the language. Adhering to the verbal descriptions provided by  
404 the participants themselves was fundamental to keep away from our abstractions and expectations and to  
405 address the subjective experiences directly.

406 The 26 assertions in the questionnaire could be split into 3 overlapping categories (Table 1). (i) assertions  
407 regarding the virtual environment and the degree of engagement in the experience (ex: 'I found the virtual  
408 space silent and seductive'), (ii) assertions regarding the participants' experience of their own body and  
409 movement (ex: 'I had a pleasant sense of lightness'), (iii) assertions regarding the relationship to the other  
410 avatar/participant (ex: 'my movements were motivated by what I thought the other person could see'). 6  
411 of the assertions focused on the specific modulations introduced during the experience (ex: 'I did not pay  
412 attention to the reflection of our movements in the mirror'). The list of assertions was composed of positive  
413 and negative formulations and of evaluations associated with positive and negative valence). The ratings of  
414 the 6 assertions regarding the specific modulations were used as factors in the analysis of the quantitative  
415 data (Laroche et al., under review). Here we will focus on the rating of the assertions concerning the  
416 globality of the experience, proceeding by category. For each category we will point out assertions on  
417 which there was a relative agreement across participants (defined as a mean score higher than 3.5 or lower

418 than 2.5, with standard deviation lower than 2, cf highlighted rows in Table 1) and will provide related  
419 qualitative statements produced by participants during the monologue or interviews.

#### 420 4.1.1 The virtual environment and the degree of engagement

421 Overall, participants found that the minimal aspect of the virtual environment was inviting (A9 m=4.48,  
422 sd=1.47) and enhanced their curiosity and creativity (A23, m=4.38, sd=1.6). Overall, the immersion  
423 experience was not disturbed by elements of the ‘real world’ (A11, m=1.55, sd=1.23). The absence of  
424 a pre-specified goal or instructions regarding ‘what to do’ did not hinder the experience (A32, m=1.79,  
425 sd=1.83). In the interviews, the term “silence” and the minimal aspect of the design came up a number of  
426 times:

427 *“The silence was so deep that I could imagine wind just in my head, moving my hair, probably it was by*  
428 *hearing my own breathing.”* (P30)

429 *“The fact that the environment was so minimalist allowed me to avoid parasitic variables to the experience*  
430 *so in my mind there is nothing to add.”* (P11)

431 Several participants shared that the experience produced a ‘sensation of freedom’ (P36, P43). Being  
432 immersed and totally engaged with the experience, participants had a sense that time was slowing down:

433 *“Time seemed to pass much more slowly, I was thinking of nothing but the problem of the ”spheres” in*  
434 *front of me.”* (P23)

435 Immersion in the experience could be so strong as to attenuate participants’ interoceptive awareness:

436 *”the feelings of the heat and exhaustion I accumulated while moving in this machine-heated room came*  
437 *to my awareness only at the moment I took off the headset.”* (P23)

438 This last comment highlights how VR immersion can have a powerful impact on one’s experience of  
439 their own body and movement. A theme we turn to next.

#### 440 4.1.2 The experience of one’s body and movement

441 In the questionnaire, participants reported a sensation of lightness (A34, m=4.28, sd=1.56), once again  
442 suggesting an important impact of the immersive VR experience on their interoceptive and kinesthetic  
443 awareness and body image. This theme appeared also in the interviews:

444 *“I still remember the first 20 seconds when I was learning to use the space, to use the absence of my*  
445 *‘body’ and the transition in which I become immaterial. This condition is a bit weird, because I felt myself*  
446 *closer to the ground than I used to be.”* (P30)

447 One participant related this sense of lightness, or absence of a relationship to the floor (gravity), to a  
448 more fluid experience of their movement:

449 *“No connection to the ground, allowing for a more fluid movement.”* (P29)

450 The impact of visual deprivation on the sense of weight also came up with respect to the scenario where  
451 the participant’s own ‘hands’ were invisible to them:

452 *“I did not feel the gravity of my hands.”* (P29) The minimal visual body representation heightened the  
453 kinesthetic quality of self awareness:

454 *“My body mass didn’t exist, only my movement.”* (P43)

455 *“The opening of my movements towards a space that is larger, a more elastic feeling and warmth, a kind*  
456 *of inner energy.”* (P20)

457 Our questionnaires did not contain assertions concerning transformation or alteration of self-identity but  
458 in the interview this theme came up regularly:

459 *“I understand myself better, it is clearer.”* (P52)

460 *“I adopted and accepted the idea of being just 3 balloons, and I decided to feel myself fragmented.”* (P30)

461 *“It is an experience that has awakened in me completely new sensations and emotions in relation to my*  
462 *body and its movements and its relationship to others.”* (P44)

463 As the last quote suggests, the experience of one’s body and one’s movement was intrinsically intertwined  
464 with the presence and experience of the ‘other’ (spheres of partner), or the relationship. We turn to the  
465 relational dimension of the experience next.

#### 466 4.1.3 The experience of the relation

467 It is interesting to note that most participants were not immediately aware that the ‘other’ three spheres in  
468 the virtual environment were the avatars of their physical partner. Some realized this only when the mirror  
469 appeared, some only towards the end of the experience and some only during the interview. Despite this  
470 fact, participants did report an important positive impact of the other spheres and the relationship with them  
471 on their experience. Participants overall agreed with the assertion that the presence of the other amplified  
472 their movements and creativity (A22,  $m=3.7$ ,  $sd=1.8$ ).

473 In the interviews, a variety of relational experiences were shared:

474 *“Here, I discover this great satisfaction of being followed or chased around. This is the main thing that I*  
475 *learned about myself.”* (P47)

476 *“This ‘innocence’ makes me say (to myself), be careful, in your relationships, be vigilant.”* (P13)

477 *“[I found out] That I’m a very solitary person because I didn’t notice the movement of my partner and I*  
478 *was happy being on my own.”* (P27)

479 *“I took it as a game, where the balls ask me for things I have to give, and then I realized it was the other.”*  
480 (P31)

481 For some, the minimal body representation of the partner limited their ability to ‘read’ them and interact:

482 *“It is very difficult to interpret the behavior and intentions of the other subject only through the movement*  
483 *of the three spheres.”* (P15)

484 *“It is by the direct experience of a body that I can represent it independently of any other virtual*  
485 *parameter (space, volume, temporality, movement).”* (P46)

486 For others, the absence of self visual feedback enhanced the interaction:

487 *“When losing our spheres, we feel like we have fewer gestural options, we are kind of more obliged to*  
488 *follow the other.”* (P37)

489 *“When i no longer see my spheres, there is a shift from global attention and awareness towards the other*  
490 *[person] ”* (P37)

491 Overall, the combined feedback from the questionnaires and interviews suggests that participants were  
492 immersed in, receptive to, and inspired by the minimalist design of the environment. This extends to

493 the ‘minimalist’ design of the scenarios. The absence of a specific goal, explicit task or instructions of  
494 ‘what to do’ did not inhibit the movement or creativity of the participants but actually enhanced it. While  
495 the minimalist avatars made it more difficult for some to interact with their partners, they did alter body  
496 perception in interesting and novel ways, destabilized perceptual ‘habits’ and increased awareness to  
497 one’s own movement and to that of the partner. In particular, many participants did not recognize the  
498 avatars as their human partners at least for some of the experience, and as a consequence could experiment  
499 relationality outside the habitual social sphere. Importantly, we found that the relation had an impact on the  
500 experience of the virtual environment in a subtle but significant way.<sup>4</sup>

## 501 4.2 A research-creation installation

502 As a research creation project, Articulations focuses on the collaboration between artists and scientists  
503 as a means of discovering new questions pertinent to each of them. For scientists this means learning  
504 how, e.g., dancers engage with and explore the embodiment potential of VR in ways that scientists and  
505 most pedestrian participants do not (the latter are more semiotic/signaling in their practice) - leading to  
506 the creation of new forms of measurement (Deleuze and Guattari 1994). At the same time, artists explore  
507 platforms like Articulations in order to develop new practices of artistic expression, including designing  
508 new sensations, through the creation of artworks. The collaborative participatory design brings about the  
509 creation of new concepts that answer these emergent questions.

510 In the process of designing a performative version of the Articulations project we proposed to two  
511 performers and a choreographer to explore the possibilities offered by this new paradigm, in search of  
512 new forms of mediation and gestural creations through the dematerialization of bodies. The resulting  
513 performance was presented to the public twice, once during the Artec “portes ouvertes” presentation in the  
514 Center of Arts at Enghien-les-bains and the second time alongside of other performances presented in the  
515 scope of the “Virtual Creativity, Collective Realities” symposium which took place in the ENSAD in Paris.

516 As previously stated, our research and design processes included three interdisciplinary workshops as  
517 well as three residencies that nourished both the theoretical and artistic approaches to the Articulations  
518 platform. Some of these sessions included the participation of several guests who were affiliated with  
519 dancing in various ways, either as dancers themselves or as practitioners of other movement or dance  
520 related activities. It soon became clear to our research team that people with such a background not only  
521 perceive and experience the platform in another way, but also reveal a certain performative aspect to  
522 those who are observing them. Thus, the idea of creating a spectacular form of the platform through a  
523 performance emerged.

524 One of the values of the design process of a performance is that the artists push the scientific researchers  
525 to test the limits of the platform, while co-creating vocabulary for interaction for the various forms of  
526 engagement proposed by the platform. We came to realize that it is often these performative aspects of  
527 the platform itself, revealed through this process, that not only help guide platform innovations, but also  
528 create a common vocabulary between observers/researchers and the dancers/immersants. This allows for  
529 both scientific research design and performative design to converge towards a research-through-creation  
530 procedure, based on an ongoing interdisciplinary dialogue that ensures clarity for those members of the  
531 team unfamiliar with either design perspective.

---

<sup>4</sup> With respect to the concept of ‘shared VR’, one subtle but important finding in the analysis of the questionnaire regards the interdependence between one’s experience of the virtual environment and the dyad. We looked for assertions for which the responses of the two partners correlated significantly. We found that that was the case for one assertion: “I found this minimalist and silent environment inviting” ( $r=3.27$ ,  $p=0.032$ ). A possible interpretation of this correlation is that one’s experience of the virtual environment was affected by and/or affecting the experience of her partner.





**Figure 11.** Picture from the ENSAD Performance in Paris

532 The collaborative conception and design processes with the team and other researchers helped fuel ideas  
533 concerning the possibilities of the setup and interactions, as well as having feedback as to what they were  
534 seeing and sensing when watching the others in immersion. These experiences informed how we imagined  
535 the audience would react as the performance unfolded and how to best frame the actions so that they would  
536 best be perceived by the audience.

537 One important goal was conceiving a performance that was engaging, personable, accessible and that  
538 reduced the sense of distance that can occur due to barriers imposed by the elaborate technological setup.  
539 This was tackled through creating an experience that would be both entertaining and reveal the inner  
540 workings of our research.


541 Two of the performers, whose practice is based in hip-hop movement language, were outfitted with  
542 virtual reality headsets. They conversed at the beginning of the performance as if they were discovering the  
543 virtual environment and the possibilities of moving within it. This sort of low-key discussion invites the  
544 audience to understand the actions happening on stage and observe the performers and the setup without  
545 fear of a reciprocated gaze. The choreographic language was a mix of hip-hop and contemporary dance  
546 that moved in and out of unison movement accompanied by custom created music. In addition, we needed  
547 to decide the order of the execution and the effects that would be present in the video projection, while  
548 making sure this setup would work as a meaningful whole.

549 One fundamental difference in experiential design between the "laboratory" installation and the "research-  
550 creation" installation was that in the latter the audience had to be able to perceive the virtual space shared  
551 by the dancers and understand their actions and choices. The virtual reality experience had to become a  
552 mixed reality experience. Whereas in the "laboratory" installation this virtual space was only addressed to  
553 the performer and therefore had no need to be perceived in the physical space, in the "research-creation"  
554 installation it was essential to materialize their presence on stage for the audience.

555 Since the Articulations platform was originally conceived and developed to immerse participants inside  
556 a virtual environment, using it in the context of a public performance presented a number of challenges  
557 at many levels: technically, visually, scenographically and dramaturgically. Both the choreography



558 and the performance were then conceived in a way to address these challenges and produce a shared  
 559 experience between immersants and audience. The technical platform itself was modified in order to  
 560 present the performers executing choreography in the physical space, while sharing feedback from the  
 561 virtual environment with the spectators, transforming their virtual experience into a shared one, by  
 562 projecting the virtual world inside the performance's physical space.



**Figure 12.** Research creation installation - The red and blue zones are the action spaces of the two dancers, whereas the green zone is the Mixed reality space - the mediator's action space superimposed on the virtual space merging the presence of the dancers.

563 Through the evolution of the platform's design the physical spaces of the participants became non-  
 564 overlapping. In the first version, the participants could physically touch and collide (Figure 9). In the more  
 565 advanced versions of the design (Figure 10, Figure 12), each of the dancers occupied a separate physical  
 566 space. The physical space in between the spaces of each dancer (see Figure 12 - green square) persisted  
 567 however as a fictitious interaction zone.

568 An important innovation that emerged through the collaborative process was the turning of this fictitious  
 569 space into a mixed reality zone inhabited by the virtual presence of the two dancers and the physical  
 570 presence of a third performer, a mediator embodied by the choreographer who was not wearing a headset,  
 571 and who served as a bridge between spectator and performance space. In the version depicted in figure 6,  
 572 the fictitious zone was geometrically located halfway between the zones of the two dancers. We realized  
 573 this virtual space would remain an abstraction for the audience if it was not actualized by a presence on  
 574 stage (Figure 12 - green figure). Thus, a "mediator" was necessary to make the link between these two  
 575 realities: that of the real bodies of the two dancers on stage, and that of their fusional and dematerialized  
 576 presence in the virtual space.

577 Working closely together with the choreographer, the designers added the ability to use a tracked VR  
 578 sensor coupled with a virtual camera, as part of the performance, in which the mediator could simultaneously  
 579 be on stage as a participant "filming" the avatars of the immersed performers and their interactions inside  
 580 the virtual environment. The camera's output was then projected live on a screen behind the performers,  
 581 directing the gaze of the audience to the performers movements in the live space, to their virtual interactions  
 582 and to the emerging relationalities in space/time. At the same time, the mediator used light touch to provide  
 583 the two immersed dancers a link to the physical reality.

584 This mixed-reality shared experience is formed by multiple elements deriving from different dimensions,  
585 the physical space that includes the performers and the public, and the virtual environment that is being  
586 actualized through the performers' gestures and interactions. Rather than conceiving the virtual and the  
587 physical as two discrete realities the mediator's presence turns them into a "continuum" along which he  
588 seamlessly moves to provide glimpses of the events happening in another dimension.

589 The notion of the continuum finds its origin in the work of Paul Milgram and his research team (Milgram  
590 and Kishino 1994). In their work, they introduced the concept of the reality-virtuality continuum. They  
591 proposed the concept of a virtuality continuum in the context of visual displays, but their ideas have since  
592 been adopted and extended to fit all domains of research around virtual and mixed reality, whether scientific  
593 or artistic (Georgakopoulou et al. 2019).

594 In their publication "Enabling a continuum of virtual environment experiences", Davis et al. (2003),  
595 inspired by Lewis Carroll's book, "*Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*", attempt to extend the concept of  
596 the continuum. They are referring to the story as a metaphor for moving through various dimensions of  
597 reality. At the beginning of the story Alice meets the White Rabbit, a creature from another dimension. At  
598 this point, they propose, the rabbit is part of Alice's reality and at the same time it doesn't belong there,  
599 thus augmenting her reality. We argue that in fact, the rabbit is very much part of Alice's reality as well as  
600 part of another reality. He is able to inhabit and seamlessly move through the different dimensions.

601 The rabbit then acts as an interface, an inter-mediate, guiding Alice through immersion. Their meeting is  
602 a key point to the story, as it marks the moment where her reality becomes augmented by the presence of an  
603 element of another reality. Much in the same way in our case, during the performance, the third performer  
604 becomes the White Rabbit, assuming the role of a mediator between the multiple dimensions, while his  
605 presence augments the audience's reality.

606 In continuing the development of the performance, a new choreographic score based on feedback  
607 accumulated during the interviews and exchange sessions with the participants would be created. The score  
608 would unveil the various experiences as well as the underworkings of the process, and would embody and  
609 reflect the sensations and observations of the various participants. In addition, working together with a cast  
610 of dancers versed in improvised dance and somatic practices would add a dimension to the project that ties  
611 the performance and the research more closely together. The question of mixed reality and the white rabbit  
612 concept that emerged through the creation process has become a (scientific) research question that will be  
613 addressed in our upcoming research workshop in 2021.

## 5 CONCLUSION

614 The recent emergence of VR has challenged designers to conceive enjoyable and satisfying experiences of  
615 free, creative joint exploration. Interacting in space through movement offers new paradigms for interaction  
616 design. In this article we proposed the notion of Shared Diminished Reality as a design guideline for  
617 such development and presented a concrete project (Articulations) that instantiates this approach. Through  
618 our work on Articulations we observed how letting abstracted bodies move and interact in a minimal  
619 environment without a predefined goal can result in the creation of singular and intimate expressive patterns.

620 The design of the platform was carried out by the iteration of experiments: collective embodied hypothesis  
621 generation, prototype design, and experiential evaluation. A good example of the potential of this approach  
622 is the evolving mapping between the physical and virtual spaces. In the original design, bodies were  
623 partially dematerialized (only certain body parts were co-localized with the avatar). We then found that  
624 it was necessary to create a physical distance between users to avoid collisions between the parts of the

625 user's physical bodies not visible in the experience. Furthermore the partial dematerialization produced  
626 a strange sense of incoherence between the virtual physical copresence. The distancing resulted in a full  
627 dematerialization of the haptic presence of the other body during the VR experiment and a liberation  
628 of the users' gestures and imagination. The distancing of the subjects has also de-anthropomorphized  
629 the experience of the 'other', as they are no longer a priori aware that they are in the presence of the  
630 representation of another person.

631 The effect of de-anthropomorphizing was evaluated using movement quantification, and experiential  
632 reports as well as the mapping between them. In turn, the resulting mixed space (empty physical space  
633 inhabited by virtual movement) inspired the scenographic and dramaturgique development of a live-  
634 audience performance. Analysis of the kinetic data (Laroche et al under review) provides additional  
635 evidence for the impact of diminished reality on behavior. These results also point to the more general  
636 potential of SDR for scientific research on interaction.

637 In the post-experience questionnaires and interviews, participants reported finding the simplicity of the  
638 virtual environment calming, appealing, freeing, curiosity inducing, and socially creative. They were  
639 moving and co-creating their own interactional rules, even though the nature of the 'other' spheres was not  
640 always clear as to whether it was human or digitally generated. The user's usual sense of self was altered by  
641 the minimalism of their own appearance while their visual similarity fostered a social encounter that made  
642 them improvise together.

643 Future studies by us and others should examine how these minimalist interactions reveal humans as  
644 storytellers, whose emergent behavior is not just connected to their perception but are connected to the  
645 stories they are telling themselves about what is happening. These can be seen in our initial interviews  
646 to co-shape their self and environmental understandings, suggesting the deep flexibility of cognitive  
647 mechanisms that may be missed in less open-ended experimental arrangements.

648 The participants' behavior and post-experience reports regarding their interaction with the minimalist  
649 design can inspire new forms of interfaces and virtual agents. By carefully attending to relational  
650 movement, immersive experiences can become more social, but without the overdetermination of typical  
651 anthropomorphic avatars.

652 In the Performative installation, the physical distancing allowed the dancers to explore new choreographic  
653 forms playing on the entanglement and fusion of dematerialized bodies in the VR space.

654 The dancers' distancing also had an effect on the scenography, creating a median space locating the virtual  
655 reality zone on the stage. This zone, inhabited and actualized by the choreographer, transformed the  
656 VR experience into a mixed reality experience for the spectators and dancers. The choreographer's role  
657 then became that of a mediator, an active passer between the virtual experience and the physical stage  
658 experience.

659 Interdisciplinary art-science labs are able to create innovative approaches to VR precisely by including  
660 multiple voices in all aspects of design, and by foregrounding play and performance as necessary aspects of  
661 this innovation. Our transdisciplinary approach offered us a way to conceive an experiment that is pertinent  
662 in each of these fields separately. Our platform, and its extension to the concept of Shared Diminished  
663 Reality is the very result of the workshops and residencies, where we tried to express and adapt our  
664 concerns through the language of different research fields.

665 One important value of the hybrid research creation procedures, such as the performance design of  
666 the Articulations platform, is in allowing for the emergence of a research through creation process. This  
667 particular form allowed for extended experimentation with features and ideas that have occurred through the

668 previous phases of the Articulations project. For example, the recording camera feature of the performative  
669 platform was an idea that has been put forth in the earlier stages of our project, long before the conception  
670 of the performance itself. In turn, the experience gathered through the performance will nourish the design  
671 of the Articulations project in its later phases.

672 By creating interdisciplinary art-science labs, practices of playful variation are brought into direct  
673 dialogue with both scientists designing experiments and designers creating virtual environments. Each  
674 participant brings not only new questions about what can be done with technology, but also brings their  
675 values, including different notions of fun, engagement challenge, and novelty. This is similar to the video  
676 game industry, where players often reinvent games through the ways in which they play creatively with  
677 glitches, “mod” the games, and play new games on top of the apparent game (Boluk and LeMieux 2017).  
678 These emergent practices often seed the next wave of games. Similarly, artists and dancers reinvent media  
679 such as virtual reality through engaging the technology within a frame of play and asking new questions  
680 (Kozel 2007).

681 The Articulations platform was developed with and for dancers. This was both a strength and a limitation.  
682 It emphasized the creation of an environment that invites interactive movement exploration without verbal  
683 language. Choreographers, for instance, noticed things about distracting environmental features, and  
684 interpersonal signaling constraints that no one else did. Similar contributions were made by visual artists,  
685 programmers, anthropologists and psychologists in the lab. The challenge of creating a performance  
686 tested the improvisational abilities of all the team members, while also providing a discrete goal to  
687 have a production-ready system. It sharpened the environmental design, the interactive formats, and the  
688 experimenters’ awareness of the experience of being in diminished reality.

689 The way we shaped our experimentation protocol is also something that goes beyond our usual work  
690 habits. The questionnaires and interviews were designed based on how we, virtual reality designers,  
691 sociologists, anthropologists, dancers, and cognitivists, had each gathered behavioral data within our own  
692 disciplinary frames. Concepts such as presence, sense of self, bodying, worlding, each have their own  
693 literature and references in our fields, but this confluence allowed us to stand at the crossroads of them,  
694 allowing each of us to learn new things that we can return to our fields with, what Cohen-Cole describes as  
695 the interplay between interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary (Cohen-Cole 2007).

696 Shared Diminished Reality emerged from an interdisciplinary research creation process between the  
697 laboratory and performances. By aesthetically abstracting the gesture from other forms of communication,  
698 it highlighted and confirmed the semantic and emotional power of the gesture and its central role in  
699 interpersonal communication. Scaffolding shared experiences, built on users’ emergent gestural vocabulary,  
700 seems to be an interesting lead to follow. Virtual reality is certainly an art of the gesture, of the act in  
701 becoming, and this new artistic form is fully in line with the continuity of living art such as dance or  
702 improvisational theater, as much as the arts of temporal storytelling such as cinema.

## REFERENCES

- 703 Auvray, M., Lenay, C., and Stewart, J. (2009). Perceptual interactions in a minimalist virtual environment.  
704 *New ideas in psychology*, 27(1):32–47.
- 705 Auvray, M. and Rohde, M. (2012). Perceptual crossing: the simplest online paradigm. *Frontiers in human*  
706 *neuroscience*, 6:181.

- 707 Banakou, D., Groten, R., and Slater, M. (2013). Illusory ownership of a virtual child body causes  
708 overestimation of object sizes and implicit attitude changes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*  
709 *Sciences*, 110(31):12846–12851.
- 710 Banakou, D., Kishore, S., and Slater, M. (2018). Virtually being einstein results in an improvement in  
711 cognitive task performance and a decrease in age bias. *Frontiers in psychology*, 9:917.
- 712 Bergson, H. (1939). *Matière et mémoire: essai sur la relation du corps a l'esprit* (1965 ed.). Paris, Paris:  
713 *Les Presses universitaires de France*.
- 714 Boluk, S. and LeMieux, P. (2017). *Metagaming: Playing, competing, spectating, cheating, trading, making,*  
715 *and breaking videogames*, volume 53. U of Minnesota Press.
- 716 Botvinick, M. and Cohen, J. (1998). Rubber hands ‘feel’ touch that eyes see. *Nature*, 391(6669):756–756.
- 717 Cohen-Cole, J. (2007). Instituting the science of mind: intellectual economies and disciplinary exchange at  
718 harvard’s center for cognitive studies. *The British Journal for the History of Science*, 40(4):567–597.
- 719 Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1997). Flow and the psychology of discovery and invention. *HarperPerennial, New*  
720 *York*, 39.
- 721 Davis, L., Rolland, J., Hamza-Lup, F., Ha, Y., Norfleet, J., and Imielinska, C. (2003). Enabling a continuum  
722 of virtual environment experiences. *IEEE Computer Graphics and Applications*, 23(2):10–12.
- 723 De Jaegher, H. and Di Paolo, E. (2007). Participatory sense-making. *Phenomenology and the cognitive*  
724 *sciences*, 6(4):485–507.
- 725 De Jaegher, H., Di Paolo, E., and Gallagher, S. (2010). Can social interaction constitute social cognition?  
726 *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 14(10):441–447.
- 727 De la Peña, N., Weil, P., Llobera, J., Giannopoulos, E., Pomés, A., Spanlang, B., Friedman, D., Sanchez-  
728 Vives, M. V., and Slater, M. (2010). Immersive journalism: immersive virtual reality for the first-person  
729 experience of news. *Presence: Teleoperators and virtual environments*, 19(4):291–301.
- 730 Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1994). *What is philosophy?* Columbia University Press.
- 731 Deschamps, L., Le Bihan, G., Lenay, C., Rovira, K., Stewart, J., and Aubert, D. (2012). Interpersonal  
732 recognition through mediated tactile interaction. In *2012 IEEE Haptics Symposium (HAPTICS)*, pages  
733 239–245. IEEE.
- 734 Desnoyers-Stewart, J., Stepanova, E. R., Riecke, B. E., and Pennefather, P. (2020). Body remixer: extending  
735 bodies to stimulate social connection in an immersive installation. *Leonardo*, 53(4):394–400.
- 736 Freeman, D., Reeve, S., Robinson, A., Ehlers, A., Clark, D., Spanlang, B., and Slater, M. (2017). Virtual  
737 reality in the assessment, understanding, and treatment of mental health disorders. *Psychological*  
738 *medicine*, 47(14):2393–2400.
- 739 Froese, T., Iizuka, H., and Ikegami, T. (2014a). Embodied social interaction constitutes social cognition in  
740 pairs of humans: a minimalist virtual reality experiment. *Scientific reports*, 4:3672.
- 741 Froese, T., Iizuka, H., and Ikegami, T. (2014b). Using minimal human-computer interfaces for studying  
742 the interactive development of social awareness. *Frontiers in psychology*, 5:1061.
- 743 Fuchs, P., Moreau, G., and Tisseau, J. (2006). *Le Traité de la Réalité Virtuelle*, volume 3. Presses des  
744 MINES.
- 745 Garnier, F., Vuarnesson, L., and Berthoz, A. (2017). An immersive paradigm to study emotional perception  
746 in co-presence through avatars. *International Journal of Virtual Reality*, 17(2):46–64.
- 747 Georgakopoulou, N., Zamplaras, D., Kourkoulakou, S., Chen, C.-Y., and Garnier, F. (2019). Exploring the  
748 virtuality continuum frontiers: Multisensory and magical experiences in interactive art. In *VISIGRAPP*  
749 *(2: HUCAPP)*, pages 175–182.



- 750 Greenwald, S. W., Corning, W., and Maes, P. (2017). Multi-user framework for collaboration and  
751 co-creation in virtual reality. 12th International Conference on Computer Supported Collaborative  
752 Learning . . . .
- 753 Heider, F. and Simmel, M. (1944). An experimental study of apparent behavior. *The American journal of*  
754 *psychology*, 57(2):243–259.
- 755 Himberg, T., Laroche, J., Bigé, R., Buchkowski, M., and Bachrach, A. (2018). Coordinated interpersonal  
756 behaviour in collective dance improvisation: the aesthetics of kinaesthetic togetherness. *Behavioral*  
757 *Sciences*, 8(2):23.
- 758 Kilteni, K., Bergstrom, I., and Slater, M. (2013). Drumming in immersive virtual reality: the body shapes  
759 the way we play. *IEEE transactions on visualization and computer graphics*, 19(4):597–605.
- 760 Kilteni, K., Groten, R., and Slater, M. (2012). The sense of embodiment in virtual reality. *Presence: Teleoperators and Virtual Environments*, 21(4):373–387.
- 762 Kimmel, M., Hristova, D., and Kussmaul, K. (2018). Sources of embodied creativity: interactivity and  
763 ideation in contact improvisation. *Behavioral Sciences*, 8(6):52.
- 764 Kozel, S. (2007). *Closer: performance, technologies, phenomenology*. mit Press.
- 765 Laroche, J., Berardi, A. M., and Brangier, E. (2014). Embodiment of intersubjective time: relational  
766 dynamics as attractors in the temporal coordination of interpersonal behaviors and experiences. *Frontiers in psychology*, 5:1180.
- 768 Loomis, J. M., Blascovich, J. J., and Beall, A. C. (1999). Immersive virtual environment technology as a  
769 basic research tool in psychology. *Behavior research methods, instruments, & computers*, 31(4):557–564.
- 770 Lopez, C., Falconer, C., Deroualle, D., and Mast, F. (2015). In the presence of others: self-location, balance  
771 control and vestibular processing. *Neurophysiologie Clinique/Clinical Neurophysiology*, 45(4-5):241–  
772 254.
- 773 Lugin, J.-L., Polyshev, I., Roth, D., and Latoschik, M. E. (2016). Avatar anthropomorphism and  
774 acrophobia. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM Conference on Virtual Reality Software and Technology*,  
775 pages 315–316.
- 776 Manning, E. (2009). *Relationships: Movement, art, philosophy*. mit Press.
- 777 McGann, M. and De Jaeger, H. (2009). Self–other contingencies: Enacting social perception.  
778 *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, 8(4):417–437.
- 779 Merleau-Ponty, M. (1945). *Phénoménologie de la perception* [phenomenology of perception].
- 780 Milgram, P. and Kishino, F. (1994). A taxonomy of mixed reality visual displays. *IEICE TRANSACTIONS on Information and Systems*, 77(12):1321–1329.
- 782 Noë, A. (2012). *Varieties of presence*. Harvard University Press.
- 783 Nowak, K. L. and Biocca, F. (2003). The effect of the agency and anthropomorphism on users' sense  
784 of telepresence, copresence, and social presence in virtual environments. *Presence: Teleoperators & Virtual Environments*, 12(5):481–494.
- 786 Okun, M. S. (2017). Virtual reality training for parkinson's.
- 787 Peck, T. C., Seinfeld, S., Aglioti, S. M., and Slater, M. (2013). Putting yourself in the skin of a black avatar  
788 reduces implicit racial bias. *Consciousness and cognition*, 22(3):779–787.
- 789 Petkova, V. I. and Ehrsson, H. H. (2008). If i were you: perceptual illusion of body swapping. *PloS one*,  
790 3(12):e3832.
- 791 Quesnel, D., Stepanova, E. R., Aguilar, I. A., Pennefather, P., and Riecke, B. E. (2018). Creating awe:  
792 artistic and scientific practices in research-based design for exploring a profound immersive installation.  
793 In *2018 IEEE Games, Entertainment, Media Conference (GEM)*, pages 1–207. IEEE.

- 794 Slater, M., Spanlang, B., Sanchez-Vives, M. V., and Blanke, O. (2010). First person experience of body  
795 transfer in virtual reality. *PloS one*, 5(5):e10564.
- 796 Van der Land, S. F., Schouten, A. P., Feldberg, F., Huysman, M., and Van den Hooff, B. (2015). Does  
797 avatar appearance matter? how team visual similarity and member–avatar similarity influence virtual  
798 team performance. *Human Communication Research*, 41(1):128–153.
- 799 Varela, F. J., Thompson, E., and Rosch, E. (1991). *The embodied mind: cognitive science and human*  
800 *experience*. 1991.
- 801 Wallace, P. and Maryott, J. (2009). The impact of avatar self-representation on collaboration in virtual  
802 worlds. *Innovate: Journal of Online Education*, 5(5).
- 803 Wiederhold, B. K. and Riva, G. (2019). Virtual reality therapy: Emerging topics and future challenges.  
804 *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 22(1):3–6.
- 805 Wienrich, C., Schindler, K., Döllinger, N., Kock, S., and Traupe, O. (2018). Social presence and  
806 cooperation in large-scale multi-user virtual reality-the relevance of social interdependence for location-  
807 based environments. In *2018 IEEE Conference on Virtual Reality and 3D User Interfaces (VR)*, pages  
808 207–214. IEEE.
- 809 Yee, N. and Bailenson, J. (2007). The proteus effect: The effect of transformed self-representation on  
810 behavior. *Human communication research*, 33(3):271–290.



**Table 1.** Categories and quantitative results of post-experiential questionnaires

Assertion ID	Immersion	Body	Relation	Assertion	Mean	SD
A9	x			I found this visual and silent space very appealing.	4.48	1.47
A10	x		x	I often (regularly?) forgot that some of the spheres represented another person.	3.62	2.15
A11	x			Real-world elements have often extracted me from my virtual reality experience.	1.24	1.56
A12		x	x	My attention was more focused on my own movements than on the relationship between our respective movements.	2.86	1.98
A13	x	x		In this virtual reality experience, I felt like I was more than my usual self.	2.76	2.03
A14		x		My movements were smoother and easier than usual.	2.83	1.86
A15			x	The connection and interaction with the other person was easy and very natural.	3.07	1.81
A16	x			I would have liked the experience to last much longer.	3.48	1.89
A17		x		I was more aware of my body than usual.	2.71	1.92
A18			x	I didn't feel that the other person was responding to the suggestions I was making.	2.95	1.71
A19	x	x		I find that the virtual reality installation limited the potential of my movements.	2.36	1.79
A20		x	x	My movements were motivated by what I thought the other person was perceiving.	2.52	2.06
A21	x		x	My partner didn't like the experience	1.79	1.84
A22		x	x	My movements and creativity were amplified by the presence of the other person.	3.79	1.85
A23	x			The simplicity of the virtual reality environment made me all the more curious and explorative.	4.38	1.61
A24			x	I was often the one who initiated interactions with the other person.	2.88	1.52
A25	x	x	x	When we could see our spheres in the mirror, I had the feeling that our movements were one.	3.19	1.92
A26	x		x	I didn't pay attention to the reflection of our movements in the mirror.	1.83	2.13
A27	x		x	When our spheres had different colors, I felt more separated from the other person.	1.98	2.14
A28	x		x	I had the feeling that the other person was absorbed by the mirror.	1.31	1.7
A29	x	x	x	When I could no longer see my own spheres, I found that I interacted more with the other person.	2.38	2.17
A30			x	The other person's way of moving made me feel that they were seeing things different from me.	2.86	1.98
A31	x	x	x	When I couldn't see my own spheres anymore, I felt closer to the other person.	2.48	2.12
A32	x			Not having any specific instructions or goals confused and misled me.	1.83	1.79
A33			x	Co-habiting the virtual space with the other person created a feeling of intimacy.	3.14	2.09
A34		x		I had a pleasant feeling of lightness	4.29	1.57