Article

Shape-in(g) Space: Body, Boundaries, and Violence

Space and Culture
2016, Vol. 19(2) 139–149

DOI: 10.1177/1206331215623208
sac.sagepub.com
SAGE

Thania Acarón[1,2]

Abstract

How does the body shape space, and space shape bodies? This article proposes an interdisciplinary conceptual framework based on characteristics of interpersonal and intrapersonal negotiations of space. I discuss how "personal" spatial boundaries and "levels" of space are constituted, sculpted, impacted, and negotiated across realms of lived experience. Categorizations are proposed according to embodied dimensions of the uses and perceptions of space: *body centrality, portability, extensibility, social flexibility*, and *transversality*. Spatial analyses often exclude theories from movement and body-based disciplines; therefore, an embodied approach is brought forth as a way to explore the relationship between spatial relations and different forms of violence. The impact on particular bodies, especially women and people with disabilities, is analyzed in terms of their spatial components, weaving in considerations from the field of movement analysis into social theory.

Keywords

space, body, embodiment, boundaries, movement analysis, human geography

> The best way to learn the location of invisible boundaries is to keep walking until somebody complains. (Sommer, 1969, p. 26)

This article analyzes cross-disciplinary spatial meanings and relationships. Space as a concept involves a multidimensional conglomeration of definitions, each seen through the lens of a field, a genre, or lived experience. The endless transmutations of the word "space" simultaneously dominate everything and nothing, provoking a vortex of the abstract and concrete. Space takes on, to coin Ingold's (2001, 2009) term, a *meshwork*[1] of realms: sensory/perceptual, emotional, cognitive, social, and political, and for some, the spiritual and moral. As I argue here, space has been deemed both a means to establish and preserve power and also a way to unify social relations. The body, as the nexus of experience, acts as both a receiver and actor, producing and being produced by spatial relations. Kornblum (2002) claims that violent occurrences inevitably involve spatial aspects that can be understood through the body. Low and Lawrence-Zúniga (2003) argue that "spatial analyses often neglect the body because of difficulties resolving the dualism of the subjective and objective body, and distinctions between the material and representational aspects of body space" (p. 2). Therefore, I propose that analyzing movement can contribute an important exploration of the role of the body in social theory.

[1]Independent Researcher, Scotland
[2]Independent Researcher, Puerto Rico

Corresponding Author:
Thania Acarón, Scotland.
Email: thaniadmt@gmail.com

In this paper, I review the literature on "personal" and "social" space, drawing from several disciplines to propose a categorical framework, which further develops the concept of *embodied space* (Low, 2003). I offer the following categorizations of space: *portability, extensibility, social flexibility*, and *transversality*, which illustrate the relationships between spatiality and lived experience. Through the exploration of these spatial categories, I explore the question: Does the body shape space, or space shape bodies? Finally, examples of how embodied space effects/is affected by violence, threat, and dominance are presented in order to illustrate a dialectical relationship of power relations present through spatiality, and its particular impact on marginalized bodies.

Cross-Disciplinary Conceptualizations of Space

Space has been theorized and researched empirically by many academic disciplines such as anthropology, sociology, social psychology, human geography, and movement analysis[2], with each claiming a piece for its own, reaffirming the spatial boundaries that they abide by or criticize. Gregory and Urry (1985) provide historical insight into spatial studies, particularly from the viewpoint of the field of geography, and state there was a thinking shift in the 1970s from "pure spatial processes" to the notion that space is shaped by social processes. However, as Michael (2009, p. 46) argues, "Space cannot be viewed as a static envelope or stage within which social life unfolds. Rather it is a dynamic entity constituted out of a shifting ensemble of meanings, practices, and interrelationships."

In social theory, architecture, human geography, and philosophy, studies on space have resulted with subsequent simultaneous categorizations and decategorizations (Hubbard, Kitchin, & Valentine, 2004). Simonsen (1996) groups social theories of space and place into three categories: (1) space as material environment, (2) space as social spatiality, and (3) space as difference. I emphasize the latter two groupings in this article.

The notion of personal space and body boundaries received much research attention in the 1960s and 1970s (Altman, 1975; Hall, 1969, 2003; Horowitz, Duff, & Stratton, 1964; Sommer, 1969; Sundstrom & Altman, 1976; Watson, 1970), which are reviewed extensively by Baldassare and Feller (1975). Sommer (1959) discusses that the concept originated in ethology and animal behavior studies and later evolved into studies of human behavior. 'Proxemics' is the study of human spatial perception, use of space, and social distancing across cultures, developed by anthropologist Edward T. Hall in 1966. He distinguishes between intimate space, personal space, social space, and public space, all irradiating from a person's body, which vary according to their culture and social context (Hall, 1969, 2003). Despite Hall's impact on subsequent research, the definition of personal space has also been criticized on empirical grounds based on inconsistencies in terms of culture and situational features (Baldassare & Feller 1975). Low (2003, p. 13) argues that "Hall is concerned that phenomenological theories of the universality of experience and language do not correspond to his findings of cultural difference at the individual level", illustrating the research tension between drawing cultural commonality and providing insight into individual experience.

Although Hall's work was done in the 1950s and 1960s, as early as the 1920s the concept of the *kinesphere* was defined as a spherical surrounding of the body's spatial reach by architect, dancer, and movement analyst[1] Rudolph Laban. He developed the concept of the kinesphere as a way to qualify the levels of space surrounding the body and widely used within dance and theatre (Laban, 1966; Laban & Ullmann, 1988). The kinesphere is the spherical of space around your body, as big as arms and legs can reach (from any vantage point—sitting, standing, or lying down). Brooks (1993) comments on how Laban's architectonic view of the body has been influential on art, drama, and dance and their corresponding professions. Additionally, this system has also been applicable to movement efficiency studies and physical therapy. From the literature reviewed on space, Merleau-Ponty (2004) and Lefebvre (1991) make references to art within

their mentions of space, but none of the authors make any connection to dance, which includes within its form both movement and extensive spatial references. Although Low and Lawrence-Zúniga (2003, p. 5) argue that "anthropologists [. . .] have noted the importance of body movement in the creation of place, conceptualizing space as movement rather than as a container (Pandya, 1990)," there is little to no mention of Laban's work in social theory, proxemics, or spatial analysis to date. This disconnect brings about the need to draw on body-based art forms to further integrate conceptualizations of space into social theory.

In addition to the terms kinesphere and personal space I have discussed before, other social theorists relate the body to spatial dimensions. A cross-disciplinary synergy is reached from the vantage point of spatial multiplicity and multidimensionality among the terms *embodied space* (Low, 2003) and *social space* (Bourdieu, 1996; Lefebvre, 1991; Massey, 2005). Lefebvre (1991) defined field of action as follows:

> As a culturally defined, corporeal-sensual field of significant distances stretching out from the body in a particular stance or action at a given locale or as it moves through locales [. . .] This field can be plotted along a hypothetical trajectory centered in the situated body with its expansive movements and immediate tactile reach, and extendable beyond this center in vision, vocal reach, and hearing (and further where relevant). The body is thus understood as a spatial field (and the spatial field as a bodily field). (p. 451)

Lefebvre (1991) agrees with Laban (1966), placing the body at the center (here I refer to this concept as *body centrality*), and its expansions (*extensibility*), which I will discuss in later sections. Bourdieu (1996, p. 12) defines *social space* as "an invisible set of relationships which tends to retranslate itself, in a more or less direct manner, into physical space in the form of a definite distributional arrangement of agents and properties." Lefebvre (1991) and Bourdieu (1996) make some connections between these spatial descriptions, pointing out relations between visible and invisible factors that affect cultural relations. However, I argue that using "social" or "personal" space as a term inspires an exclusivity of interpersonal dimensions of space, which discounts the intrapersonal dimensions exposed in this article.

The concept of *embodied space* offers a plausible integration. Low (2003, p. 10) defines it as "the location where human experience and consciousness take on material and spatial form". Low intends to place the body as the "center of agency, a location for speaking and acting on the world" (p. 10). This is one of the key concepts of this article, the body's ability to act as a protagonist/antagonist in its relationships to space and others. Low's (2003) term *embodied space*, with more exploration on its reach and application, interjects an emphasis on the body and its capacity for movement, which the term personal space does not necessarily allow. It focuses on the body's ability to effect and receive change through movement, and by extension, to language (verbal and nonverbal). Henceforth, the term *embodied space* will be used in substitution of personal space, and kinesphere when speaking about movement analogies.

In social psychology, early observations of human behavior and spatial negotiation within spaces were initially conducted in forms of experiments on human behavior (Baldassare & Feller, 1975; Sundstrom & Altman, 1976). Sommer (1969, p. 16) observed that the "clearest dominance orders are found in closed communities with restricted movement and limited space." He describes, as Foucault and Miskowiec (1986) do, behavior and hierarchy in prisons (presented by Foucault and Miskowiec as an example of a *heterotopia*[3] or excluded spaces). In the 1970s, experimental studies on crowding took flight based on the curiosity about the incidence of violence within enclosed spaces (Stokols, 1972). Although experimental studies show insight into the relationships between embodied space spatial restraints, a wider look at underlying situational factors and variables will be articulated by examining the spatial categorizations and their relationships to violence throughout this article.

Spatial Categorizations

On reviewing space literature and categorizations across different fields, some common conceptualizations are found. I have established *body centrality* as a fundamental characteristic of embodied space, with the body as an interacting agent on the world. Additionally, *embodied space* exhibits: *portability*: the capacity to carry our sense of space with us as we move which also is related to our differing capacities of movement; *extensibility*: extending beyond corporeal physical limits (which may include objects); *social flexibility*: modifying, contracting, and expanding according to action/reactions within social situations; and *transversality*: the capacity to penetrate different realms of lived experience. Each of these categories will be explored in-depth subsequently. I will discuss how space affects disabled bodies' perceptions, decisions, and access to spaces in the later sections.

Portability: Access and Mobility

The portability of our embodied space can be understood by visualizing a bubble around our body that moves as we displace ourselves. Traditional views of personal space imply that the shape of our sense of space is equidistant from its center, as the kinesphere was traditionally drawn (Little, 1965). However, as Hayduk (1981) posits, since our visual organs are located in the fronts of our bodies, and momentum dictates our tendencies to move forward, it could be an interesting point to reiterate that our back sense of space might not be as developed or prioritized in our day-to-day activities. Specialized training acquired in particular professions, hobbies, or interests might develop an equal tendency in the backwards direction. Nevertheless, portability implicates the capacity to move, which might vary depending on biological factors or situational factors (i.e., disease, disability). Each person holds expectations of what optimal portability would be, which are constrained or encouraged by life factors. The result is a sense of 'free space', or an ability to roam wherever one pleases. However, if someone else were to restrict one's portability with or without consent, we could interpret this restriction as an act of oppression, or violence. Restriction or allowance of portability conjures up notions of power, access, and ability. Massey (2005) and Koskela (1999) consider the concept of "open space" or free space "dubious" since they believe social power relations are negotiated in any kind of shared space—arguing covertly that the space shapes the body through power. For theorists like Foucault (Foucault & Gordon, 1980; Foucault & Miskowiec, 1986), Massey (2005), and Bourdieu (1977, 1996), power as manifested through social relations is a key factor on the (re)production of violence especially in the political realm. Massey (2005) describes the "spatial as political"—the way space can change the way political formulations are made. Kirby (2009, p. 1) echoes this sentiment: "Movement and change—aggressively regulated, channeled, and even denied in the creation and maintenance of social institutions and structural construction of social relations—are the reviving undercurrent circulating throughout social life."

Embodied space's *portability* is affected when access is denied to a particular group or individual's social spaces. As Freund (2001, p. 698) reiterates, "anybody that cannot comfortably use and/or 'find a home' in spaces will not only feel alienated from that space, but from his or her body as well". His research on the limitations of accessibility to public spaces by people with disabilities is particularly relevant to this discussion. The inability to access spaces or being alienated from spaces affects our portability, and restricts a part of our engagement with the social world, especially in the case of public and community spaces. Portability is hence integrally linked to our sense of agency. This poses questions of social responsibility and how spatial designs effect power relations on particular bodies. A tension arises between shared and individual notions of space, and how portability is implicated in spatial relations and negotiations.

Extensibility: The Space Beyond the Body

Extensibility is a characteristic of embodied space that relates to the notions of 'levels of space' radiating from the body to the outside world, which can be seen as a continuation of the body projected in space. Extensibility is a transposition of the self that goes beyond the body's skin and its physical limits. Sommer (1959) denoted personal space with a center from which experiences extend. The sensation while driving a car is an example of this. The spatial sense expands from the body to include the outside limits of the car. There is interplay between the body executing movements inside the car and reactions to the environment occurring externally. The extensibility of the space may even elicit bodily reactions, such as, for example, gasping when the car hits another car's bumper slightly while parking or an increased heart rate with acceleration beyond the speed limit. The sense of proprioception, which gives information about the position of our body and movements in space (Montero, 2006), directly relates to extensibility. Proprioception allows us to be able to sense our movements without needing to look at our body. The integration of the kinesthetic sense contributes to our body schema (the representation of our own body), which connects to the "sense of the self" (Schilder, 1935, as cited in Rice, Hardenbergh, & Hornyak, 1989). Montero (2006) considers that proprioception not only provides sensory information to the body but also functions as an aesthetic sense. She argues, presenting the case of dancers, that proprioceptive feedback is tied in to judgments of our own bodies. Proprioception provides a type of self-assessment—receiving information about our aesthetic qualities, much like the visual sense does. Based on this claim, spatiality can be further connected to intrapersonal processes of defining and constituting our own self-concept.

The idea that our embodied space extends beyond the skin's perimeter also gives insight into the relationship between extensibility and the intrapersonal notions of safety. *Extensibility* is also connected, for example, to the intricate personal meaning our belongings occupy. Kornblum (2002) argues that violent occurrences are related to invasions of psychological, social, or physical space. Someone entering our home or taking our personal belongings feels like an invasion of our personal space and a transgression of our bodies as transposed into the space. Theft involves a direct invasion of someone's property, a "taking" of the other's property. In the case of a home invasion (in this example without actually the person being there or being physically threatened or hurt), the idea of a thief's "penetration" into our conceived space affects our *extensibility* of embodied space. Those possessions and spaces our embodied space has extended toward and produced personal meanings and attachment to, when affected by the other, have repercussions on our own sense of space and consequently. Our sense of well-being is affected even if no physical violence or bodily hurt occurred. In shared spaces, our notion of extensibility might feel heightened, which may motivate territorial behavior (Altman, 1975). The space no longer feels safe; it needs to be defended and secured. This characteristic of embodied space gives insight into psychological and social considerations of "safe spaces." The spatiality of human considerations of safety holds much potential for future empirical research. A safe space involves not only places where our bodies feel sheltered from harm but also the possibility that the objects (extensions) also are not at risk.

This section described the characteristic of extensibility, which understands space as moving beyond our body boundary and connected to notions of property and safety. When we enact interpersonal relations, embodied space also exhibits social flexibility, which I will explore in the next section.

Social Flexibility: When 'My Space' Meets 'Other'

Embodied space reaches a fluid point, a perimeter, beyond which it can be said: "This space is no longer mine." When *embodied space* emerges as a boundary, the body looks up from

itself and shifts into the social realm. *Social flexibility* involves the modulation of space in order to disable or enable social experience, aiming to regulate interaction and intrapersonal processes. *Embodied space* is both an individual phenomenon and an interpersonal one. This shift into the social realm can take a physical dimension—as we execute movements on a daily basis to establish, claim, or defend our space. What happens when our *embodied spaces* collide? What sort of affective interactions occur in a boundary dance? Simonsen (1996) remarks on Heidegger's existential phenomenology on this respect, specifying that his conceptions of space examine dialectics between objectivity and subjectivity, and the distance toward or away from the environment that humans employ in order to relate to it—both overcoming and challenging this distance in order to make sense of the world. This back and forth constitutes constant extensions and contractions: the 'boundary dance'.

The term boundary, in the application of this article, and in keeping with the presumption that the bodymind is indivisible, refers to a permutable division or connection between self and other, self and the environment. The boundary of the body, in the biological sense, is its skin—it provides a way for the body to access, protect its inner organs, and defend the body from the world. A spatial boundary is established where people define their space to end, and where individual space becomes shared space. Boundaries offer a threshold of the impact of spatial choices made by subjects or external actors.

When space becomes personal, as a means for social transaction and negotiation, it can become a tangible measurable area of one's comfort, safety, and sense of trust in others and the environment (Kornblum, 2002). Kornblum (2002, p. 22) states, "The ability to share space with others and to maintain a healthy sense of self are key ingredients in developing nonviolent relationships". A negative impact on the body's boundary could, on the other hand, also provoke repercussions in the bodymind. Our perception of embodied space of threat, feelings of anxiety, annoyance, or mistrust elicits somatic responses such as shortness of breath, muscles tension, jaw clenching, or hands trembling, among many others. Emotional responses include fear, annoyance, confusion, disgust, anger, or any combination. Survival mechanisms—fight, flight, or freeze may be triggered—which all have spatial manifestations. We can intrude in someone else's embodied space, defend from an invasion aggressively, escape by engaging our fleeing mechanisms, or freeze—adopting stillness.

Gender, for example, can bring particular instances of exerting pressure on a boundary. In some cultures, "doing gender" involves spatial behavior (Hanson & Pratt, 1995; McDowell, 1992, 1993; Renninger, Wade, & Grammer, 2004). Stereotypically speaking, embodying masculinity is archetypally equated with nonverbal expression of privilege, needing to "take up space"—widening, expanding; versus feminine socialization of "minimizing," or "taking up less space" to avoid potential violence (Koskela, 1999; Linden, 2007; Low, 2003; McDowell, 1993; Pain, 1991). In recent media coverage, there was specific attention on men in the New York City subway occupying two seats by a widening of the legs (termed *manspreading*), which has triggered some attention to the daily boundary dances of gender domination in public spaces (Fitzsimmons, 2014). The notion of social flexibility portrays a quality of space that expands and contracts to accommodate sociocultural norms and situational factors. However, when seen through an analysis of power, dominance, as in the previous example of the spatiality of gender, it starts to transcend different realms of lived experience, exhibiting *transversality.*

Transversality: Cutting Across Dimensions

Transversality is portrayed through the interaction between internal and external processes, constructing or deconstructing boundaries between intrapersonal dimensions of the self, self and the other, self and environment, self and world. It involves all of the previous spatial characteristics, producing relationships between the body's agency, the inevitable influence of structures, and the phenomenological aspects of being-in-the-world (Husserl, 1964; Merleau-Ponty, 2002). I

examine transversality by looking closer at the question: Does the body shape space? Does space shape the body? In this next section, I will oscillate between the positions of spatiality as an active or reactive agent in lived experience. I offer the possibility of a transient duality, navigating the space between these two propositions.

Body Shapes Space Shapes Body

From a movement perspective, bodies can "shape" the space. Behnke (1974) maintains that the phenomenology of the lived body and Laban's movement analysis go hand in hand. She argues that motility is the basis from which the context of lived experience springs forth: "Movement, then, opens space, but is not necessarily 'through' or 'in' space; space is not an entity with characteristics or qualities, but a dimension lending itself to the way in which significance is gathered and revealed" (Behnke, 1974, p. 15). Interaction in spatial realms of lived experience occur while opening up our arms to welcome a hug, or shrinking into our seat when we do not want to be called on in an open auditorium, or advancing toward someone and asking them to dance. These are all qualities Laban and his collaborator Warren Lamb (Laban, 1966; Lamb & Turner, 1969; Maletic, 1987) explored in movement analysis as body-based polarities of shaping: spreading/enclosing, rising/sinking, advancing/retreating.[4] Being able to shape the space in our daily lives relates again to a sense of agency, of the capacity to shape or mold the environment around us—to exert change.

However, to presume that agency is independent of social context is problematic. While it is plausible that the body is able to exert changes in spatiality, which affect the environment and others, the same relationship exists conversely. In order to discuss the perspective of the space shaping the body, I examine the distinct anthropological case of the Israeli soldiers returning to war territories (Clarke, 2009) and the spatial negotiations undertaken by marginalized bodies. Regarding the latter, I particularly focus on women, older people, and people with disabilities (Koskela, 1999; Lysaght & Basten, 2003; Pain, 1991; Valentine, 1989, 1992).

The body can shape a space, for example, by exerting movements that exude dominance. This notion of the space shaping the body is exemplified by Clarke's (2009) portrayal of Israeli soldiers' bodily reactions while returning to the territories that they had once violently occupied. Clarke (2009) describes the Israeli soldiers "making spaces", walking around the occupied Palestinian territories as a way to "claim" and exert a presence—actions which serve as a point for the space shaping the body. As Clarke (2009, p. 89) states, "The bodily nature of encountering violent spaces and the way that it maps directly onto the experience and 'knowledge' of places is also a powerful evocation of the play of forces on bodies." Clarke's (2009) work exemplifies the power of a space with its symbolic attributions, as illustrated by soldiers' intense body-based training around behavioral strategies in "hostile" territories during the Intifadas[5] evoking Mauss' (1973) notion of "techniques of the body."[6] Clarke (2009) describes the Israeli soldiers' powerful experiences on returning to territories they had previously occupied, and here the space shaped their body. Although there was a shift in their role, from occupier to visitor, their bodily experiences did not absorb this shift. The soldiers found themselves enacting ritualized movements associated to violence (looking out for rocks, bodies to the wall, being alert and anxious). Despite the situation being no longer in effect, their *embodied space* connected with prior experiences in that space, producing body-based reactions related to the violence that had occurred there. In this case, the spaces carried historical significance that provoked a defensive form of *transversality*. Through a connection to lived experience, the spaces shaped their movements, their reactions, and their own embodied space.

Although principles of the *kinesphere* are universal, the *embodied space* of a disabled body, a marginalized body, a pregnant body (Koskela, 1999), or an ageing body also deserves careful emphasis in terms of the space shaping the body. Most of the literature on proxemics presumes a fully abled body, and ample use of perceptual and sensory data incorporated into

spatial orientation and spatial ability. As discussed in the portability section, older people and individuals with disabilities have limited access to places (Freund, 2001). Spatial restrictions inevitably restrict their mobility and the possibility of engaging with a wider community. Stakeholders that hold the power and ability to design public spaces inflict spatial difference—inequalities emerge through daily challenges to our portability. Inaccessibility to activities that promote integration as a member of a community affects transversality.

Spatial negotiations and spatial difference are also highlighted among the particular bodies of women (Koskela, 1999; Lysaght & Basten, 2003; Pain, 1991; Valentine, 1989, 1992). The authors discuss the everyday spatial choices that women make (consciously or unconsciously) due to fear of violence, genderization of space, and socializations of power. They speak to the "normalization" of women's spatial negotiations within everyday life, the social constraint of gendered/fear induced space being considered a "given" within a women's experience. Koskela (1999) terms it *spatiality of fear* and *gendered spatiality*. Koskela also distinguishes the production and reproduction of space within social practice as a determinant factor in women's everyday decisions concerning spatial planning and deeply affected by gender relations. The body of pregnant women, for example, is one on which many spatial invasions occur. Strangers may feel it is okay to invade a pregnant woman's embodied space by touching a pregnant belly without asking consent (Koskela, 1999). Other factors affecting spatial decisions for women are violence in public spaces (open/public space), sexual harassment (within a variety of spaces), domestic violence (closed/private space), and social isolation, sense of powerlessness, ageing, disability, and motherhood. Situational factors such as the time of day and the feminine versus masculine occupation of spaces are also discussed as factors influencing spatial decisions. Pain (1991) also hones in on women's fear of sexual violence and intimidation and its effects on spatial patterns. Valentine (1989, 1992) describes possible sources for women's spatial perceptions of violence, identifying rearing, social encounters (rumors) and media portrayal. Dragotesc (2011) addresses the influence of the media on women's perception of spaces, and the portrayal of the classic "she deserved it" attitude when a violent incident occurs in a public space.

These examples illustrate the importance of analyzing the effects of violence on space, as well as understanding the interaction between physical, psychological, and social realms. Although I have chosen to focus on examples based on potentially destructive influences on spatiality, *transversality* can be analyzed through constructive perspectives as well. Transversality may occur through acquiring proximity to another in intimate encounters, or in expressions of love, friendship, or admiration, which have concordant spatial characteristics. These examples further my two main arguments: First, space affects all realms of lived experience, positively or negatively, when it exhibits *portability, extensibility, social flexibility*, and *transversality*. Second, analyses of the body and movement analysis concepts can support our spatial-social understanding.

Conclusion

Embodied space is a locus of intersection, of multiplicity and an ongoing oscillation between physical, psychological, emotional, social, and political realms. Polymorphous boundaries are deconstructed, endlessly moving, intertwining, and embedding into each other to constitute our reality as beings-in-the-world. *Embodied space* exhibits the characteristics of *body centrality, portability, extensibility, transversality*, and *social flexibility*. These factors that are intensely affected in violent situations, but in the same way can also aid in intrapersonal insight, or in enabling interpersonal relations. As body shapes space and space shapes bodies, particular bodies, especially those of women, people with disabilities, and older adults are affected when embodied space is limited, restricted by others or the environment. Space is also shaped by perceptions of vulnerability to violence.

Although movement analysis and movement-based theories have been obscured within social theory, research can delve into embodied theories and movement observation as a linkage to a

corporeal approach to social experience. The body is not in a vacuum, it coexists within *embodied space* with its surroundings, is conditioned by its history, culture, gender, race, age, and class. This is what makes the discourse around violence, body, and space so relevant. A reductionist model of cause and effect and universal definitions of violence are not enough to adjust to the multiplicity of subjective experience. An endless dance therefore exists between boundaries of individual and universal, creating these flexible, portable, and extensible boundaries between frameworks.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Notes

1. Ingold (2009) states he borrows the term from Lefebvre, but refers to an intricate system of interconnections, which he describes as "paths along which life is lived" (p. 38). In this context, it provides movement to the interweaving quality of all realms of lived experience.
2. Movement analysis is a field of work informed by Rudolph Laban as a system of language/terminology that describes the qualities that occur in movement, with both an observational component and a notation system (writing movement down according to symbols). Although there are various systems of observing, notating, and quantifying movement, the two more widely known and used systems in which professionals can get certified are Laban Bartenieff Movement Analysis (LBMA) and Kestenberg Amighi Movement Profile (KMP; Kestenberg Amighi, Loman, Lewis, & Sossin, 1999; Laban, 1966; Laban & Ullmann, 1988; Maletic, 1987).
3. Foucault and Miskowiec (1986) describe heterotopias as places of inversion, alternative places where society is reflected in an upside-down way that still describes itself. Examples of prisons, psychiatric hospitals, colonies, and cemeteries are used to illustrate sites that are used as vehicles of expression of society's "shadows" and realities at the same time.
4. Laban proposed that the way the body shapes the environment exhibits certain "shape qualities." These involve spreading (i.e., opening arms), enclosing (i.e., arms shaping toward body), rising (moving vertically upwards toward any direction), sinking (i.e., body moving toward the floor), advancing (i.e., shaping movements in a forward motion), retreating (i.e., shaping movements backwards in motion toward the body). These are expressed in polarities, which entail a relationship to the outside world (Billingham 2008).
5. The Intifadas were periods of Palestinian uprisings in reaction to Israeli occupations of Palestinian territories. The first Intifada occurred from 1987 to 1993, and the second from 2000 to 2005 (Clarke 2009).
6. Mauss (1973) defines "techniques du corps" as a set of body-based actions that are "effectively" and "traditionally" passed on between human beings. This springs forth from his background in the military—the notion of automatization of the body—of those techniques that are practiced repetitively. He terms this as a "psycho-sociological taxonomy" of movement—with applications to sports, military regimes, stylized dance, and soon.

References

Altman, I. (1975). *The environment and social behavior: Privacy, personal space, territory, and crowding*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Baldassare, M., & Feller, S. (1975). Cultural variations in personal space: Theory, methods, and evidence. *Ethos*, *3*, 481-503.

Behnke, E. A. (1974). Space-time concepts as world dimensions. *Main Currents in Modern Though*, *31*(1), 13-17.

Billingham, L. A. (2008). *The complete conductor's guide to Laban movement theory*. Chicago, IL: GIA Publications.

Bourdieu, B. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
Bourdieu, P. (1996). *Physical space, social space and habitus*. Oslo, Norway: Universitetet i Oslo Institutt for sosiologi og samfunnsgeografi.
Brooks, L. M. (1993). Harmony in space: A perspective on the work of Rudolf Laban. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, *27*(2), 29-41.
Clarke, R. (2009). Embodying spaces of violence: Narratives of Israeli soldiers in the Occupied Palestinian Territories. In P. W. Kirby (Ed.), *Boundless worlds: An anthropological approach to movement* (pp. 69-94). New York, NY: Berghahn Books.
Dragotesc, A. M. (2011). Imagined(?) identities—The victim and the villain in awareness raising re-presentations of wartime violence against women. *Studia Universitatis Babes-Bolyai-Studia Europaea*, (2), 125-144.
Fitzsimmons, E. G. (2014, December 20). "Manspreading" on New York subways is target of new M.T.A. campaign. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2014/12/21/nyregion/MTA-targets-manspreading-on-new-york-city-subways.html
Foucault, M., & Gordon, C. (1980). *Body/power, power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*. New York, NY: Pantheon.
Foucault, M., & Miskowiec, J. (1986). Of other spaces. *Diacritics*, *16*(1), 22-27.
Freund, P. (2001). Bodies, disability and spaces: The social model and disabling spatial organisations. *Disability and Society*, *16*, 689-706.
Gregory, D., & Urry, J. (1985). *Social relations and spatial structures*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
Hall, E. T. (1969). *The hidden dimension*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
Hall, E. T. (2003). Proxemics. In S. M. Low & D. Lawrence-Zuniga (Eds.), *The anthropology of space and place: Locating culture* (pp. 51-73). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
Hanson, S., & Pratt, G. (1995). *Gender, work, and space*. Howe, England: Psychology Press.
Hayduk, L. A. (1981). The shape of personal space: An experimental investigation. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue canadienne des sciences du comportement*, *13*(1), 87-93.
Horowitz, M., Duff, D., & Stratton, L. (1964). Body-buffer zone: Exploration of personal space. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *11*, 651-656.
Hubbard, P., Kitchin, R., & Valentine, G. (Eds.). (2004). *Key thinkers on space and place*. London, England: Sage.
Husserl, E. (1964). *The idea of phenomenology*. The Hague, Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff.
Ingold, T. (2001, April). *Against space*. Paper presented at the Space, Culture, Power Conference, University of Aberdeen, Scotland.
Ingold, T. (2009). Against space: Place, movement, knowledge. In P. W. Kirby (Ed.), *Boundless worlds: An anthropological approach to movement* (pp. 29-44). New York, NY: Berghahn Books.
Kestenberg Amighi, J., Loman, S., Lewis, P., & Sossin, K. M. (1999). *The meaning of movement: Developmental and clinical perspectives of the Kestenberg Movement Profile*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Gordon & Breach.
Kirby, P. W. (2009). Lost in space: An anthropological approach to movement. In P. W. Kirby (Ed.), *Boundless worlds: An anthropological approach to movement* (pp. 1-28). New York, NY: Berghahn Books.
Kornblum, R. (2002). *Disarming the playground: Violence prevention through movement and pro-social skills, activity book*. Oklahoma City, OK: Wood & Barnes.
Koskela, H. (1999). Gendered exclusions: Women's fear of violence and changing relations to space. *Geografiska Annaler, Series B: Human Geography*, *81*(2), 111-124.
Laban, R. (1966). *The language of movement: A guidebook to choreutics*. Boston, MA: Plays, Inc.
Laban, R. V., & Ullmann, L. (1988). *The mastery of movement*. Plymouth, England: Northcote House.
Lamb, W., & Turner, D. (1969). *Management behaviour*. New York: International Universities Press.
Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space*. Cambridge, England: Blackwell.
Linden, P. (2007). *Embodied peacemaking: Body awareness, self-regulation and conflict resolution*. Columbus, OH: CCMS Publications. Retrieved from www.being-in-movement.com
Little, K. B. (1965). Personal space. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *1*, 237-247.
Low, S. M. (2003). Embodied space(s): Anthropological theories of body, space, and culture. *Space and Culture*, *6*, 9-18.
Low, S. M., & Lawrence-Zúniga, D. (Eds.). (2003). *The anthropology of space and place: Locating culture*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
Lysaght, K., & Basten, A. (2003). Violence, fear and the "everyday": Negotiating spatial practice in the city of Belfast. In E. A. Stanko (Ed.), *The meanings of violence* (pp. 224-244). London, England: Routledge.

Maletic, V. (1987). *Body, space, expression: The development of Rudolf Laban's movement and dance concepts*. New York, NY: Mouton de Gruyter.
Massey, D. B. (2005). *For space*. London, England: Sage.
Mauss, M. (1973). Techniques of the body. *Economy and Society*, *2*(1), 70-88.
McDowell, L. (1992). Doing gender: Feminism, feminists and research methods in human geography. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, *17*, 399-416.
McDowell, L. (1993). Space, place and gender relations: Part I. Feminist empiricism and the geography of social relations. *Progress in Human Geography*, *17*, 157-179.
Merleau-Ponty, M. (2002). *Phenomenology of perception* (C. Smith, Trans.). London, England: Routledge Classics.
Merleau-Ponty, M. (2004). *The world of perception*. London, England: Routledge.
Michael, B. A. (2009). Spatiality, power, and state-making in the organization of territory in colonial South Asia: The case of the Anglo-Gorkha Frontier, 1740-1816. In P. W. Kirby (Ed.), *Boundless worlds: An anthropological approach to movement* (pp. 45-68). New York, NY: Berghahn Books.
Montero, B. (2006). Proprioception as an aesthetic sense. *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, *64*, 231-242.
Pain, R. (1991). Space, sexual violence and social control: Integrating geographical and feminist analyses of women's fear of crime. *Progress in Human Geography*, *15*, 415-431.
Pandya, V. (1990). Movement and space: Andamanese cartography. *American Ethnologist*, *17*, 775-797. doi:10.1525/ae.1990.17.4.02a00100
Renninger, L. A., Wade, T. J., & Grammer, K. (2004). Getting that female glance: Patterns and consequences of male nonverbal behavior in courtship contexts. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *25*, 416-431.
Rice, J. B., Hardenbergh, M., & Hornyak, L. M. (1989). Disturbed body image in anorexia nervosa: Dance/movement therapy interventions. In L. M. Hornyak & E. K. Baker (Eds.), *Experiential therapies for eating disorders* (pp. 252-278). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
Schilder, P. (1935). *The image and appearance of the human body: Studies in the constructive energies of the psyche*. London, England: Kegan Paul.
Simonsen, K. (1996). What kind of space in what kind of social theory. *Human Geography: An International Review of Geographical Work in the Social Sciences and Humanities*, *20*, 494-512.
Sommer, R. (1959). Studies in personal space. *Sociometry*, *22*, 247-261.
Sommer, R. (1969). *Personal space: The behavioral basis of design*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
Stokols, D. (1972). A social-psychological model of human crowding phenomena. *Journal of American Planners*, *38*(2), 72-83.
Sundstrom, E., & Altman, I. (1976). Interpersonal relationships and personal space: Research review and theoretical model. *Human Ecology*, *4*(1), 47-67.
Valentine, G. (1989). The geography of women's fear. *Area*, *21*, 385-390.
Valentine, G. (1992). Images of danger: Women's sources of information about the spatial distribution of male violence. *Area*, *24*, 22-29.
Watson, O. M. (1970). *Proxemic behavior: A cross-cultural study*. The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton.

Key Online Resources

American Dance Therapy Association: www.adta.org
Association of Dance Movement Psychotherapy UK: www.admt.org.uk
Kestenberg Movement Profile: www.kestenbergmovementprofile.org
Laban Bartenieff Institute of Movement Studies: www.limsonline.org

Author Biography

Thania Acarón, PhD, BC-DMT, R-DMP, FHEA, is a performer, choreographer and dance movement therapist from Puerto Rico, currently based in Scotland. Thania holds advanced credentialing in the United States and the United Kingdom as a dance movement therapy lecturer and clinical supervisor. She holds a master's degree in dance education from New York University and obtained her PhD on the role of dance/movement in violence prevention at the University of Aberdeen. Thania offers international workshops on movement and wellbeing and interdisciplinary arts practice and is co-artistic director of Orphaned Limbs Collective (Websites: www.thania.info; www.orphanedlimbs.com).