Complementary Therapies in Clinical Practice 26 (2017) 5–11

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Complementary Therapies in Clinical Practice

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/ctcp

Application of magic in healthcare: A scoping review

Michael T. Lam, Helen R. Lam, Lalit Chawla*

Department of Family Medicine, Schulich School of Medicine & Denistry, Western University, Canada

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 7 September 2016
Accepted 1 November 2016

Keywords:
Magic
Magic trick
Magic performance
Humor therapy
Humanities
Medical humanities

ABSTRACT

Study Design: Scoping review.
Introduction: The art and science of magic traces back to ancient days. Physicians are often compared to magicians metaphorically. Nonetheless, there exist various genuine applications of magic in the healthcare setting.
Purpose: To explore and summarize the literature reporting the applications of magic tricks or any derived techniques in healthcare or clinical environments. *Methods*: A literature search was performed on ten databases: Medline, Embase, CINAHL, Cochrane Central, Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, PEDro, Scopus, the International Index to Performing Arts, General OneFile and Newstand, to identify references related to the application of magic in healthcare. Relevant studies were charted, categorized, and summarized.
Results: 29 relevant references were found, consisting of 20 peer-reviewed publications and nine popular literature articles. Five distinct applications of magic in the clinical setting were identified. The literature showed an overall lack of academic evidence.
Crown Copyright © 2016 Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Contents

* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: chawla123@gmail.com (L. Chawla).

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ctcp.2016.11.002
1744-3881/Crown Copyright © 2016 Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

1.1. History of magic

Magic, also known as illusion, illusionism, magic trick, magic performance, stage magic, sorcery, and conjuring, dates back over 5000 years. It was recorded on a scroll from around 2170 B.C. that the pharaoh Cheops of ancient Egypt witnessed a magician named Dedi perform the effect of cutting off a goose's head and re-attaching it [1]. The 'cups and balls' trick, in which the magician hides several small balls under three cups and causes them to switch places and disappear, is depicted on a wall painting inside the 4000 year old Beni Hasan cemetery by the Nile River in Egypt [2].

The word 'magic' [*mageia* in Greek, *magia* in Latin] was in ancient times associated with fearsome practices such as witchcraft, wizardry, deception, and enchantment. Early Christians such as St. Augustine of Hippo (354–430 A.D.) believed that magic involved cursing and led to contact with demons [3]. In the Middle Ages (400–1350) and Renaissance era (1350–1600), magicians known as mountebanks performed at fairs throughout Europe, wearing long robes embroidered with moons and stars [1]. Some street magicians worked with thieves to steal purses and were dismissed as cheats and liars [2]. By the Renaissance era, magic became focused on science and the manipulation of the forces of nature. The first book about magic was published in England during this period detailing the tricks and explaining that magicians were in fact not witches with magical power [4]. Some magicians were alchemists or mechanics who experimented with a variety of natural materials. Magic later began to be manifested as a way to manipulate the laws of physics [5]. By the 19th and 20th centuries, the term 'rationalist magicians' was used to describe performers who distinguished themselves from superstitions and spiritualism [3]. The father of modern magic, Jean Robert-Houdin of France, started out as a watch maker fascinated with delicate machinery [6]. His shows were often divided into acts that manifested science, demonstrated mechanical devices known as automata (including a famous mechanical orange tree that grew in front of the audience's eyes), and ignited scientific curiosity [5]. For instance, he would have his son suspended in the air after faking inhalation of some ether. Another effect involved asking an audience member to lift a box on stage, which could be done initially, but became impossible after the reciting of magic words. In truth, the box had a metal bottom and beneath the stage stood an electromagnet that was controlled by an assistant [2]. Over the last century, magic has established itself as both a form of amusement and a scientific technique of illusion. It has become a trade rooted upon the concept of human cognition and the way the human brain interprets information taken in by the five senses. Interestingly, the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States hired a magician in 1953 to write a deception manual to be used by spies during the Cold War [7].

1.2. Purpose of this scoping review

Magic is grounded in the fundamental principles of perception, deceit, and psychology. By studying how the human brain processes information, an illusionist is able to find creative ways to manipulate it. Because healthcare revolves around the functioning of the mind and body, we believe that there exist a handful of fashions in which magic can be applied clinically. While magic is widely used as a form of amusement or a pastime, the goal of this study is to investigate whether it has any direct or indirect applications in the healthcare setting and to identify levels of evidence that exist in regards to the efficacy of such interventions.

2. Methods

2.1. Scoping review methodology

We decided that the scoping review methodology described by Arksey and O'Malley was the most appropriate research method for this study [8]. A scoping review, also known as a scoping study or mapping review, is a research method in which literature from a previously under-explored area is extensively searched and examined. It is effective when a body of literature has not yet been comprehensively reviewed and exhibits a complex and heterogeneous nature [9]. Its aim is to scope the knowledge landscape on the topic to identify existing knowledge and major areas of interest and to determine whether a systematic review is of value while suggesting potential directions for future research. Unlike a systematic review, a scoping review does not provide conclusive answers to a specific clinical question, but rather summarizes key concepts and charts existing studies regardless of quality.

2.2. Search methods

We searched a total of ten databases to cover both the scientific and popular literature. A comprehensive literature search was conducted using the Ovid search interface in Ovid MEDLINE (R) < 1946 to March Week 1 2016>, Embase Classic & Embase <1947–2016 Week 11>, Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials < February 2016>, and the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews <2005 to March 10, 2016> (see Fig. 1). CINAHL and PEDro were searched for nursing/allied health literature and the International Index to Performing Arts for performing arts literature. With respect to natural, social and multidisciplinary sciences we searched Scopus. For popular, non-academic media articles, namely magazine and newspaper columns, we searched General OneFile and Newstand. Reference lists on relevant papers were searched and publications from other sources were also added.

2.3. Inclusion and exclusion criteria

References were included if they: 1) were in English, and of stage magic performance without reporting direct clinical or healthcare applications. 2) reported any application of magic in healthcare. We excluded references that: 1) discussed supernatural beliefs, witchcraft, mental healing, spiritual therapy, mysticism, spirituality, cognition, perception, sensory, psychology studies, 2) reported the use of magic as an amusement in fund raising or health promotion events, 3) used the words 'magic' or 'magician' as metaphors or rhetoric, and 4) focused on the science and technology (see Fig. 2).

3. Results

3.1. Literature search

A total of 405 references were obtained from the literature search. After removal of 39 duplicates, the remaining 366 references were subjected to the first round of title and abstract screening, after which 58 were deemed relevant. After the second round of screening involving the detailed examination of full texts, 27 references were included for this review [10–36]. (See Tables 1 and 2) Among the 31 excluded references, 21 were unrelated to clinical application, five used the word 'magic' metaphorically, two were non-English, and three were either an excerpt or an abstract of another already included reference.

Download English Version:

https://daneshyari.com/en/article/5565113

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/5565113

Daneshyari.com