

Dramatic Arts and the Architecture of Human Communication and Connection

Wankwan Polachan, Mahidol University International College, Thailand

The Paris Conference on Arts & Humanities 2026
Official Conference Proceedings

Abstract

This research investigates the degree to which dramatic structures function as foundational cognitive frameworks for human communication and connection. By synthesizing insights from performance studies, rhetoric, and narrative psychology, the paper interrogates how storytelling mechanisms facilitate comprehension and persuasive empathy. Central to this inquiry is the application of Aristotelian mimesis defined as the representational process through which individuals interpret and structure sensory data into coherent meaning. The study utilizes a three-element analytical scaffold consisting of the Dramatic Arc, the Transformative Journey, and Theme. The methodology employs a systematic qualitative comparative analysis of impactful communicative artifacts to evaluate these concepts in practical application. Specifically, the research examines successful global media campaigns, high-stakes CEO keynote addresses and contemporary television advertisements. By deconstructing these specific artifacts, the study evaluates how the Aristotelian arc specifically the movement through tension and resolution aligns with the human brain's cognitive processing of order and narrative sequence. Furthermore, it explores how the Transformative Journey serves as a tool for emotional alignment by positioning the audience as the protagonist, while the Theme provides the conceptual coherence necessary to bridge the gap between transactional data and shared values. Departing from purely rhetorical assertions, this research situates performance-based structures within contemporary communication theory to identify a replicable model for effective engagement. The study concludes that the integration of these dramatic elements is a vital mechanism for elevating communication from a simple transactional exchange of information into a transformational human experience that fosters deep trust.

Keywords: dramatic arc, transformative journey, theme, mimesis, communication

iafor

The International Academic Forum
www.iafor.org

Introduction

Imagine the Japanese government hands you an impossible public relations campaign: your job is to promote public toilets in Tokyo. If you approach this like a standard corporate pitch, you dump data. You show design methods, architectural costs, and square footage. Consequently, your audience instantly stops listening because transactional metrics alone create cognitive friction. But the government took a different path by hiring filmmaker Wim Wenders, who leaned entirely into the dramatic arts to create the Oscar-nominated film, *Perfect Days*. Watching this film provides a massive “eureka” moment regarding human communication. Wenders successfully sold Tokyo toilets as a worldwide phenomenon because he intuitively used a three-part dramatic framework. He proved that performance structures are not just for the theater—they are deeply tied to our evolutionary wiring.

Public communication is often described simply as the transfer of information from sender to receiver. That description is useful, but incomplete. The messages that people remember and connect with establish a situation, make a problem consequential, show what can change, and connect the immediate subject to a larger human value. This paper examines that structuring process through the concept of Dramatic Communication Architecture, testing the extent to which structures developed in the dramatic arts provide a foundation for human connection in the real, data-driven world. The proposed framework brings together three elements: Dramatic Arc, Transformation Structure, and Theme. The research began with a broad question: to what extent do structures developed in the dramatic arts provide a foundation for communication and human connection outside of the world of theatres and literature? The question is attractive precisely because it is easy to overstate. Once an analyst begins looking for drama, almost any sequence can be read as an arc, any before-and-after comparison as transformation, and any slogan as theme. The central methodological challenge is therefore not simply to find dramatic patterns, but to identify them without forcing the evidence.

To address this problem, the study combines humanities-based interpretation with evidence controls. It traces a path from Aristotle’s *Poetics* to propositions, concepts, research constructs, and the examination of selected samples, including successful global campaigns, a TED Talk, and a high-stakes keynote by a technology CEO.

The paper asks four questions: How can Dramatic Arc, Transformation Structure, and Theme be operationalized without treating every communicative sequence as dramatic? How do these constructs appear across different public communication forms? Which medium-specific features and competing explanations qualify the interpretation?

Literature Review

Mimesis and the Arrangement of Action

Aristotle’s *Poetics* (1996) provides the classical point of departure. Mimesis is relevant not as simple copying, but as the representational process through which individuals interpret and structure sensory data into coherent meaning. We use mimesis to take chaotic, raw facts—like the square footage of a public toilet—and structure them into something recognizable. Plot, or *mythos*, is the arrangement of incidents into a whole with a beginning, middle, and end, where the parts matter because of their relation to one another.

This distinction is important when dramatic ideas travel into communication research. A presentation agenda has a beginning and an end, but that alone does not make it a dramatic arc. A campaign can show events chronologically without creating meaningful complication, recognition, or consequence. The operational question is whether an initial condition generates pressure, whether a turn is prepared by what came before, and whether the conclusion resolves or reframes the situation.

Narrative, Cognition, and Persuasion

Does this architectural theory work outside the theater? The great cognitive psychologist Jerome Bruner (1991) proved that our minds are not cameras; we do not just passively record objective reality. We construct our reality using narrative blueprints. Without stories, the world is chaotic, terrifying sensory data, and a spreadsheet of market fluctuations means nothing to the human mind on its own. We use what Bruner called “folk psychology” to organize that data into a story so we can survive it.

This humanities-based wisdom is deeply supported by the hard science of the brain. A few years ago, neuroscientist Dr. Paul Zak (2015) was on a late-night flight and decided to watch Clint Eastwood’s *Million Dollar Baby*. By the end of the film, this highly rational scientist was sitting in his seat, sobbing uncontrollably. Wondering what just happened to his brain, he returned to his lab, drew blood from test subjects, and discovered something that changed our understanding of communication. He found that a well-crafted dramatic arc literally hijacks human biology. When a story introduces a problem or tension, the brain instantly releases cortisol, which forces the audience to pay attention and focus. When the story forces empathy, the brain floods with oxytocin—the molecule of human connection and deep trust. A narrative scaffold isn’t just a stylistic choice; it is a biological remote control.

Transformation and the Hero’s Journey

Campbell’s (1949) monomyth has strongly influenced contemporary understandings of transformational narrative. In applied communication, the Hero’s Journey is often used to position a customer, employee, or citizen as the protagonist, with a leader or brand serving as the guide. However, its popularity also creates a methodological risk: not every instance of change constitutes a journey, and not every public message contains a hero.

For this reason, the study uses Transformation Structure as a broader construct. The coding process asks who or what changes initial condition is established, what pressure or action intervenes, and whether a changed state follows as a recognizable consequence. This approach makes it possible to distinguish individual, institutional, collective, and systemic transformations. Hero’s Journey terminology is reserved for artifacts that provide stronger evidence of a departure–trial–transformation–return sequence.

At its core, the Transformative Journey asks a simple question: who or what changes, and how does that change occur? The model requires an initial state, a pressure or conflict, an action shaped by a specific choice, a key moment of recognition, and finally, a changed state linked by consequence. Wenders uses this structure to create emotional alignment, drawing the audience into the experience until they are positioned as active participants in the transformation.

Theme, Rhetoric, and Shared Value

Theme is the ultimate “so-what” in communication. It is defined here as the larger meaning or value orientation that holds an artifact together. It acts as a “value bridge” to turn dry, transactional facts into a beautiful, shared human ideal. In our methodology, strong evidence of a theme means a value claim is repeated, integrated, and supported by every action that came before it. It is not the same as topic. Domestic violence may be the topic of a campaign, while protection through institutional responsibility is its theme. Artificial intelligence may be the topic of a keynote, while the manufacture and distribution of intelligence as a new industrial model is its theme.

A theme is considered strongly supported when it recurs or culminates across structurally different parts of the artifact and remains connected to represented actions and consequences. This rule places Theme in dialogue with narrative coherence (Fisher, 1984), leadership storytelling (Denning, 2005), brand narrative (Escalas, 2004), and popular presentation practice (Gallo, 2014).

Analytical Model

To prove this architecture exists universally and avoid confirmation bias, we built a disciplined, forensic bridge from Aristotle’s ancient Poetics directly to modern rhetoric. We extracted 28 exact passages from ancient texts and broke them down into 99 strict analytic units. The study utilizes a three-element analytical scaffold:

Dramatic Arc (Organizing Attention)

The shaped movement of a communication artifact over time, taking the audience on a deliberate journey from setup through rising complication to resolution. Dramatic Arc refers to shaped movement over time. Strong evidence requires more than chronology. Multiple segments must form an intelligible relation, and a turn, recognition, resolution, or reframing should emerge from the preceding structure. The two principal coding categories are arrangement of incidents and turning–recognition–resolution.

Transformation Structure (Organizing Change)

The before-and-after engine requiring an initial state, decisive action, and a changed state connected by consequence. Transformation Structure identifies meaningful movement from an initial condition to a changed condition through pressure, action, choice, recognition, or consequence. Strong evidence includes an identifiable agent or transforming entity, an initial state, an intervening pressure or action, and a consequential changed state. A simple comparison between “before” and “after” is not enough.

Theme (Organizing Meaning)

The framework that structures raw facts into recognizable patterns and binds them with a larger worldview. Theme identifies an explicit or repeated value orientation that gives conceptual coherence to the artifact. Strong evidence requires recurrence or integration across the artifact. Topic, tagline, and isolated moral language are coded as false positives when they are not connected to the represented choices and consequences.

Methodology

Research Design

The study uses systematic qualitative comparative analysis to test whether the three constructs can be applied with sufficient precision across modern, data-heavy communication. As an instrument-development pilot, it examines four high-stakes communication artifacts from distinct rhetorical contexts, using close reading, narrative analysis, rhetoric, performance studies, and digital-humanities corpus practice to assess whether the framework can support a larger comparative study.

Analysis proceeds at two levels. Artifact-level records summarize the overall strength of each construct, medium, source quality, and alternative explanations, while segment-level records link observations to transcript lines, timestamps, scenes, or other stable locators. Each segment is first described in ordinary language and then assigned a construct code, reducing the risk of seeing only what the codebook anticipates.

Selected Samples

The pilot contains 5 artifact records from four broad communication contexts:

1. AXA's "Three Words" Campaign: Elite Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) dealing with intensely heavy, fatal statistics.
2. GoDaddy's Brand Campaigns: Everyday B2B and B2C commercial marketing are used as a baseline for the universality of transformation.
3. NVIDIA CEO Jensen Huang's GTC 2025 Keynote: The extreme edge of technical pedagogy and corporate data-dumping.
4. Carole Cadwalladr's TED Talk: Global political advocacy representing the challenge of making invisible, highly abstract data visceral and human.

AXA is treated as one communication case represented by two related artifacts because the documentary and award case film narrate the same intervention differently.

Artifacts were selected for methodological variation rather than statistical representation. The corpus includes social-impact communication, humorous commercial communication, technical corporate communication, political advocacy, public education, and instructional speech. It is therefore appropriate for testing discrimination across forms, but not for estimating how common the constructs are in public communication generally.

Results

The pilot confirms that the architecture of human connection relies entirely on the structural mechanisms used to organize it. The data indicates that the three constructs can be applied across heterogeneous artifacts, but not with equal strength or in identical form. Theme is the most portable construct. Transformation ranges from personal and institutional change to behavioral possibility and technological-system change. Dramatic Arc appears in problem-resolution campaigns, investigative demonstrations, instructional talks, and paradigm-change keynotes.

Table 1
Cross-Artifact Assessment

Artifact	Dramatic Arc (Organizing Attention)	Transformation (Organizing Change)	Theme (Organizing Attention)	Rhetorical Context
AXA (Campaign) documentary/case film	Strong. Establishes a claustrophobic crisis of unresolved pressure before introducing a policy turn.	Strong. Beneficiary moves from danger to recovery; institution changes the meaning of its contract.	Strong. Anchors lethal statistics to the universal human right to safety and dignity.	Elite CSR prevents information fatigue.
GoDaddy case film	Moderate. Problem-intervention sequence driven by commercial narrative.	Moderate. Achieves marketing agency through a self-reliant choice to build a website.	Moderate. Connects digital assistance with performed confidence.	Commercial baseline.
NVIDIA keynote	Strong. Leverages the tension of a technological dead-end to drive toward a resolved future.	Strong. Reframes data centers as AI factories in a systemic production shift.	Strong. Intelligence as a manufactured and distributed industrial model.	Technical exposition; product roadmap
Carole Cadwalladr TED Talk	Strong. Scales a private crisis into a macro-structural emergency (“digital coup”)	Strong. Rejects false saviors and transfers heroic agency to the listener (“We are the cavalry now”).	Strong. Unifies massive dataset under a simple moral theme: “Data rights are human rights”.	High-stakes political advocacy.

AXA: Institutional and Beneficiary Transformation

The AXA case provides the clearest provisional configuration of all three constructs. The documentary and case film establish domestic violence as a condition in which the home becomes unsafe while a victim may lack money or another place to go. A change in insurance wording becomes the institutional turn, enabling emergency relocation and support.

The arc is a problem–intervention–resolution sequence. Transformation occurs at two levels: the beneficiary moves from danger toward refuge and recovery, while the institution changes the meaning and function of its contract. Theme centers around protection, safety, dignity, and the idea that a small contractual change can produce a meaningful refuge. The interpretation remains qualified by brand-purpose framing and campaign promotion.

GoDaddy: A Resistant Case

The GoDaddy case film is important because it does not cleanly support the complete framework. It contains a comic premise, a business-launch backstory, campaign escalation, and a Super Bowl payoff. This creates moderate arc-like organization, but the sequence may be better explained as campaign chronology built around celebrity and novelty.

Transformation is moderate. The film suggests movement from launching a business to gaining public visibility, but it does not clearly establish a protagonist's initial state, sustained pressure, recognition, and consequential changed state. Theme is more plausible through the repeated proposition Act Like You Know, which connects AI assistance with performed confidence. However, the phrase may function more directly as brand positioning than as a value structure. The case demonstrates that the protocol can decline to confirm a construct rather than discovering drama everywhere.

NVIDIA GTC: Systemic Transformation

The NVIDIA keynote tests the framework in long-form technical communication. Its candidate arc begins with the history of accelerated computing and an AI inflection point, introduces pressure through growing computational demand, presents architectural and software responses, and extends those responses into cloud, enterprise, robotics, and future infrastructure. It is better understood as a paradigm-change sequence than as a conventional character plot.

Transformation is strongest at the systemic level. Data centers are reframed as AI factories; enterprise software, storage, engineering work, and robotics are represented as changing within a new production model. The theme is that intelligence is becoming something manufactured and distributed through accelerated-computing infrastructure. Technical exposition, product-roadmap logic, investor communication, and sales-platform functions remain powerful alternative explanations. The dramatic interpretation supplements rather than replaces them.

TED Talks: Different Rhetorical Tasks

TED Talk of Cadwalladr shows recurrent structure serving different purposes. Cadwalladr moves from personal vulnerability to a broader warning about digital power and then to collective agency. Cadwalladr's advocacy requires factual verification independent of its dramatic organization.

Configurations Rather Than a Universal Formula

The most defensible pilot result is configurational. AXA combines a strong problem–turn–resolution structure with institutional and beneficiary transformation. GoDaddy combines moderate chronology and a memorable brand idea with weak transformation. NVIDIA combines paradigm change, systemic transformation, and technical exposition. The TED Talk combines testimony, investigation and advocacy. The framework is therefore more useful as a set of comparative questions than as a universal three-step formula.

Discussion

When humans are bombarded with raw data, our evolutionary instinct is to physically and mentally shut down to avoid cognitive fatigue. However, when meaning is established through Theme, attention is organized through the Dramatic Arc, and change is structured through the Transformative Journey, communicators successfully prevent cognitive overload. A profound rhetorical mechanism uncovered in this research is Audience-Protagonist Transference. Cadwalladr's TED Talk demonstrates this masterfully; by looking directly at the audience and declaring, "We are the cavalry now," the message ceases to be an external broadcast. The audience transitions from passive observers into empowered protagonists with a clear behavioral mandate. The framework forces them to act. Even in the laboratory of extreme rhetoric—such as Jensen Huang's two-hour tech keynote—the dramatic arc holds. Beneath the avalanche of silicon specs and product roadmaps, Huang relies on a massive macro-dramatic arc to hold his investors' attention, proving that these structures are a biological necessity for human attention. The three constructs provide a shared vocabulary while retaining medium, purpose, and context. Dramatic Arc asks how the message moves; Transformation asks what changes and at what level; Theme asks what larger meaning makes the parts cohere.

Conclusion

The verdict of this research is undeniable: the architecture of human connection does not rely on the volume of information delivered; it relies entirely on the structural mechanisms used to organize it. Dumping raw, sterile data points trigger immediate cognitive friction, asking the evolutionary machinery of the human brain to do heavy lifting it was never designed to do. When we utilize this rigorous, three-element scaffold—Theme, the Dramatic Arc, and the Transformative Journey—we bridge the gap between hard data and deep human empathy. Wim Wenders used it to make the world fall in love with Tokyo public sanitation. Carole Cadwalladr used it to sound the alarm on global democracy. Tech pioneers use it to make microchips feel like a new industrial revolution. These dramatic forms are not decorative flourishes from the arts department; they are vital, evolutionary cognitive frameworks and the native language of human comprehension, behavioral change, and collective trust. If you want your audience to just hear you, give them data. But if you want them to connect with you, to trust you, and to follow you, build them an architecture.

Limitations and Recommendations

The pilot study has several limitations. The sample is purposive and small, and several artifacts were selected because they were highly visible or widely recognized. Future research should therefore include ordinary or lower-visibility artifacts matched by medium, topic, period, and intended audience. The immediate recommendation is to treat the framework as an auditable contribution to instrument development and to test its explanatory value through a larger multimodal study. Paul Zak's work on trust and empathy offers useful biological context for this extension, particularly in relation to how oxytocin supports human connection.

Declaration of Generative AI and AI-Assisted Technologies in the Writing Process

The author declares that ChatGPT and Gemini were used to assist with manuscript restructuring and in the research workflow process to support source inventory, segmentation, and

provisional qualitative coding. All theoretical claims, source selections, analytical decisions, interpretations, and final wording were reviewed and remain the responsibility of the author.

References

- Aristotle. (1996). *Poetics* (M. Heath, Trans.). Penguin Books. (Original work published ca. 335 BCE).
- Bruner, J. (1991). The narrative construction of reality. *Critical Inquiry*, 18(1), 1–21.
<https://doi.org/10.1086/448619>
- Campbell, J. (1949). *The hero with a thousand faces*. Pantheon Books.
- Denning, S. (2005). *The leader's guide to storytelling: Mastering the art and discipline of business narrative*. Jossey-Bass.
- Escalas, J. E. (2004). Narrative processing: Building consumer connections to brands. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 14(1–2), 168–180.
https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327663JCP1401&2_19
- Fisher, W. R. (1984). Narration as a human communication paradigm: The case of public moral argument. *Communication Monographs*, 51(1), 1–22.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03637758409390180>
- Gallo, C. (2014). *Talk like TED: The 9 public-speaking secrets of the world's top minds*. St. Martin's Press.
- Schechner, R. (2013). *Performance studies: An introduction* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Zak, P. J. (2015). Why inspiring stories make us react: The neuroscience of narrative. *Cerebrum*, 2015, Article 2.

Contact email: wankwan.pol@mahidol.ac.th