

The Experience of Interactive Art: A Curatorial Study

Elizabeth Muller

Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Faculty of Information Technology

University of Technology, Sydney

2008

Certificate of Authorship/Originality

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Signature of Student

Production Note:

Signature removed prior to publication.

Abstract

Interactive art exists through the participation of its audience. There is an increasing awareness amongst artists, critics and curators that the audience's experience is of central importance to the understanding, creation and exhibition of interactive art. Because of its emphasis on experience and participation, as well as its engagement with science and technology, interactive art offers challenges and opportunities for curatorial practice in museums and galleries. The research reported in this thesis investigates the audience's experience of artworks in order to develop a critical framework for, and a curatorial approach to interactive art. It draws on insights, methods and techniques from the interdisciplinary field of Human Computer Interaction (HCI) for studying and working with people's experience of interactive technologies.

The research approach of the project is reflective curatorial practice, based on close collaborations with artists during the creation and exhibition of their work. The research centres on two case studies: *Cardiomorphologies*, by George Khut, a physiologically interactive artwork that creates real time visual and sonic representations of the participant's heart and breath; and *Contagion*, by Gina Czarnecki, a multi-user installation based on a complex interactive representation of the spread of disease within populations. Both of these artworks were publicly presented in *Beta_space* at the Powerhouse Museum, Sydney, a dedicated venue for "prototyping" interactive artworks developed as part of this doctoral project.

The first outcome of the research is an experiential approach to curating interactive art, which integrates the exhibition of prototype artworks with the creative process. The approach adapts techniques from HCI for use in artistic contexts.

The second outcome is a critical framework for the experience of interactive art, which draws on the work of pragmatist philosopher John Dewey and artist David Rokeby. An examination of the participants' experiences of the two case study artworks demonstrates how the framework can be used by curators, artists and researchers to understand the aesthetic impact of interactive artworks.

Together these two outcomes demonstrate how direct engagement with audience experience contributes to interactive art research and curation. The thesis concludes by exploring future directions for this experience-centred approach, including the impact on documentation and archival practice and the curation of group exhibitions.

Acknowledgements

My thanks, first, to the artists who collaborated with me in this research, George Khut and Gina Czarnecki. It was a pleasure to work with such passionate and dedicated practitioners. I am grateful to my principal supervisor, Prof. Ernest Edmonds, who facilitated the project and in particular created the opportunity for me to develop *Beta_space*. Thanks are also due to my secondary supervisors Associate Prof. Toni Robertson and Prof. Ross Gibson, who both provided intellectual guidance and moral support at different stages of the research.

My thanks to the UTS Faculty of Information Technology for the International Scholarship that supported the bulk of my research. Thanks to the staff at the Powerhouse Museum for their partnership and investment in *Beta_space*. In particular I would like to thank Matthew Connell, curator of *Cyberworlds*, for his enthusiasm and good humour. Thanks to the Australasian CRC for Interaction Design (ACID) for their financial support of both *Beta_space* and the symposium *Engage: Interaction, Art and Audience Experience* in November 2006.

Thanks to my colleagues and friends at the Creativity and Cognition Studios, in particular Mike Leggett, Greg Turner and Brigid Costello, who gave me feedback on my ideas over many lunches and tea-breaks, and helped me with research documentation. Thanks to Zafer Bilda who assisted in data collection for *Contagion* and to Deborah Turnbull for her work on *Beta_space* and *Engage*. Thanks to everyone in the Interaction Design and Work Practice Laboratory, particularly Kirsten Sadler, Penny Hagen, Astrid Twenebowa Larssen and Lian Loke for sharing inspirational texts.

I would like to thank friends who have made particular contributions to the production of this thesis: Paul Harvey for his advice on presenting data; David Low for copy-editing the manuscript; George Khut for his help with formatting; Chris Caines, Carli Leimbach and Greg Turner for documenting the artworks. Sincere thanks to Susan Wineglass, Keir Smith, Klara Leander, Tom Spence and Louise Curham for being there when I came home, with cups of tea and encouragement.

Above all, enormous thanks to Lucas Ihlein for his belief in this project and my ability to complete it, and for his invaluable editorial assistance in its final stages.

Finally I would like to thank my parents, Susan and Alan Muller, for teaching me to love to learn. This project, like everything I do, has been possible because of their support.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	15
1.1. Research questions.....	16
1.2. Research approach	17
1.3. Research contributions	18
1.3.1. An experiential approach to curating interactive art	18
1.3.2. A critical framework for the experience of interactive art	19
1.4. Thesis structure.....	20
CHAPTER 2 RESEARCH APPROACH	22
2.1. Introduction: Reflective Curatorial Practice	23
2.2. Context and precedents.....	23
2.2.1. Creative practice-led research	23
2.2.2. Examples of curatorial practice-led research	25
2.2.3. Knowledge in practice	26
2.3. Communicating practice-led knowledge	28
2.4. The relationship between practice and writing in this thesis	29
2.5. Characteristics of reflective practice.....	30
2.5.1. Reflection-in- and reflection-on-action	30
2.5.2. The material of reflection-on-action	31
2.5.3. The focus of reflection-on-action	31
2.6. Research process	34
CHAPTER 3 INTERACTIVE ART AND AUDIENCES	37
3.1. The challenge of a new medium.....	38
3.2. Systems aesthetics and the dematerialisation of the object.....	40
3.3. Materiality and experience.....	46
3.3.1. Physical materiality	47
3.3.2. Social materiality	48
3.4. Working with experience	50
3.5. Conclusion	52
CHAPTER 4 CURATORIAL PRACTICE AND INTERACTIVE ART	54
4.1. The museum as laboratory.....	55
4.2. Contemporary curating	56
4.3. Audience research in museums	58
4.4. Interactive art and the museum.....	60
4.5. Curatorial responses to digital art	61
4.5.1. Virtual curating	62
4.5.2. “Open”, distributed and software assisted curating	63

4.5.3.	“Upgrade” curating	64
4.5.4.	Curating interdisciplinary process	65
4.5.5.	Hybrid spaces for interactive art	66
4.6.	Conclusion	67
CHAPTER 5 HUMAN COMPUTER INTERACTION AND INTERACTIVE ART		68
5.1.	Background: The human-centred approach to HCI.....	69
5.2.	Interaction design methods	70
5.3.	The rise of experience in HCI.....	71
5.3.1.	<i>Plans and Situated Actions</i> : Lucy Suchman	72
5.3.2.	The Phenomenological approach	73
5.3.3.	Participatory Design	74
5.3.4.	The Pragmatist approach	75
5.4.	HCI and interactive art	76
5.4.1.	Conferences and symposia on HCI and interactive art	77
5.4.2.	<i>Engage: Interaction Art and Audience Experience</i>	78
5.5.	Examples of significant studies in HCI and interactive art.....	79
5.5.1.	Museum exhibit design and evaluation	80
5.5.2.	HCI laboratory-based evaluation	81
5.5.3.	Situated studies of audience interaction	82
5.6.	The rise of aesthetics in HCI	84
5.7.	Pragmatist aesthetics and HCI	85
5.8.	Summary of conclusions from the literature review	86
5.9.	How the literature review addresses the research questions	87
CHAPTER 6 A CRITICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE EXPERIENCE OF INTERACTIVE ART: JOHN DEWEY AND DAVID ROKEBY		90
6.1.	Introduction	91
6.2.	John Dewey	92
6.3.	<i>Art as Experience</i>	93
6.4.	Engagement and Reflection	95
6.5.	The work that art does	96
6.6.	Technology and human experience	98
6.7.	The role of art in a changing technological world	99
6.8.	Four principles of the framework	102
6.9.	David Rokeby	103
6.10.	Similarities between Dewey and Rokeby	104
6.11.	Control.....	105
6.12.	Complexity.....	107
6.13.	Mirroring	110
6.14.	Summary of the framework	111

CHAPTER 7 METHODOLOGY	114
7.1. The process of interaction design	115
7.2. Capturing experience	115
7.2.1. Definition of experience	116
7.2.2. Artistic context	118
7.3. <i>Beta_space</i>	119
7.3.1. Partnership with the Powerhouse Museum	121
7.3.2. “Living laboratories” in ICT innovation	122
7.4. Experiential Goals	122
7.5. Personas and Scenarios.....	123
7.5.1. The development of the Personas: <i>Bystander</i> pilot study	124
7.5.2. Personas and Scenarios in the case studies	126
7.6. Prototyping.....	127
7.7. Experience Workshops	129
7.7.1. Developing the Experience Workshop method	130
7.8. Video-cued Recall.....	131
7.8.1. Developing Video-cued Recall: <i>Iamascope</i> pilot study	132
7.8.2. Video-cued Recall Process	134
7.9. Semi-structured Interviews	135
7.9.1. Interview script	135
7.9.2. Interview process	136
7.10. Ethical issues	137
7.11. Data analysis	137
7.11.1. Transcription	138
7.11.2. Meaning categorisation	138
7.11.3. Interpretation	139
7.12. Conclusion: An experiential approach to curating interactive art	140
CHAPTER 8 <i>CARDIOMORPHOLOGIES</i>, BY GEORGE KHUT	141
8.1. Description of <i>Cardiomorphologies</i>	142
8.2. George Khut and the background of <i>Cardiomorphologies</i>	143
8.3. Background of the collaboration.....	145
8.4. Overview of process of making and exhibiting <i>Cardiomorphologies</i>	147
8.5. Experiential Goals	148
8.6. Personas and Scenarios.....	149
8.7. Prototype	152
8.8. Recording audience experience of the prototype	155
8.8.1. Experience Workshops	155
8.8.2. Video-cued Recall	158
8.9. Analysis of the audience experiences of the prototype using the experiential goals ..	161
8.10. Development of the final iteration	167

8.11. Recording audience experience of the final iteration.....	170
8.12. The aesthetic experience of <i>Cardiomorphologies</i>	173
8.12.1. Control	173
8.12.2. Complexity	176
8.12.3. Mirroring	178

CHAPTER 9 REFLECTION ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF CURATORIAL PRACTICE IN *CARDIOMORPHOLOGIES* 181

9.1. Evaluation of the methods used.....	182
9.1.1. Experiential Goals	182
9.1.2. Personas and Scenarios	183
9.1.3. Experience Workshop	183
9.1.4. Video-cued Recall	184
9.2. Characteristics of the experiential approach to curating interactive art	185
9.2.1. Working with audience experience as a material	186
9.2.2. The dialogue between “real” and “ideal”	187
9.2.3. Collaboration between artist and curator	189

CHAPTER 10 *CONTAGION* BY GINA CZARNECKI 191

10.1. Description of <i>Contagion</i>	192
10.2. Gina Czarnecki and the background of <i>Contagion</i>	193
10.3. Background of the collaboration.....	196
10.4. Overview of the process of making and exhibiting <i>Contagion</i>	197
10.5. Starting point.....	199
10.6. Experiential Goals	200
10.7. Personas and Scenarios.....	203
10.8. Prototype	204
10.8.1. Description of the prototype	205
10.8.2. Rationale for the prototype	207
10.9. Audience experience of the prototype	209
10.9.1. Experience Workshop	209
10.9.2. Video-cued Recall	212
10.10. Semi-structured Interviews.....	214
10.11. Analysis of the audience experiences using experiential goals	217
10.12. Development of the final iteration	226
10.13. Audience experience in the final iteration	229
10.14. The aesthetics of interaction in <i>Contagion</i>	231
10.14.1. Engagement and Reflection in <i>Contagion</i>	231
10.14.2. Control	232
10.14.3. Complexity	236
10.14.4. Mirroring	238
10.14.5. Conclusion: The role of difficulty in audience experience	240

CHAPTER 11 REFLECTION ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF CURATORIAL PRACTICE IN <i>CONTAGION</i>	243
11.1. Introduction	244
11.2. Evaluation of the methods used.....	244
11.2.1. Experiential Goals	244
11.2.2. Personas and Scenarios	245
11.2.3. Prototype exhibition	246
11.2.4. Experience Workshop	247
11.2.5. Video-cued Recall	248
11.2.6. Semi-structured Interviews	249
11.3. Characteristics of the experiential approach to curating interactive art	249
11.3.1. Audience experience as a unifying focus in complex projects	249
11.3.2. Audience experience in moving from concept to implementation	251
11.3.3. Exhibiting artistic prototypes	253
CHAPTER 12 CONSOLIDATED RESULTS	257
12.1. Overview	258
12.2. An experiential approach to curating interactive art	258
12.2.1. Evaluation of methods	259
12.2.2. Characteristics of the approach	260
12.3. A critical framework for the experience of interactive art.....	262
12.3.1. Control	263
12.3.2. Complexity	264
12.3.3. Mirroring	265
12.3.4. “Cultivating difficulty” in interactive art	266
CHAPTER 13 CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK	268
13.1. Overview	269
13.2. How the research questions were addressed.....	270
13.3. Contributions of the thesis.....	272
13.3.1. An experiential approach to curating interactive art	272
13.3.2. A critical framework for the experience of interactive art	273
13.4. Future work	273
13.4.1. Group exhibitions	274
13.4.2. Documenting experience	275
REFERENCES	278
APPENDICES	296

List of Figures

Figure 1 Cybernetic Serendipity at the ICA, 1968	41
Figure 2 Cornock and Edmonds' taxonomy of interactive possibilities	44
Figure 3 Simple lifecycle model of interaction design (Preece et al. 2002)	116
Figure 4 <i>Beta_space</i> in the Powerhouse Museum, Sydney	120
Figure 5 <i>Cardiomorphologies</i> final iteration	142
Figure 6 <i>Cardiomorphologies</i> v.1 (2004)	146
Figure 7 <i>Cardiomorphologies</i> prototype 'Cross Mode' and 'Rings Mode'.	154
Figure 8 <i>Cardiomorphologies</i> prototype 'Spectral Graph'	154
Figure 9 <i>Cardiomorphologies</i> prototype set-up	155
Figure 10 Experience Workshop responses against Experiential Goals.....	158
Figure 11 <i>Cardiomorphologies</i> final visualisations.....	168
Figure 12 <i>Cardiomorphologies</i> final iteration sensors	169
Figure 13 <i>Contagion</i> final iteration	193
Figure 14 <i>Contagion</i> final iteration	193
Figure 15 <i>Contagion prototype</i> exhibition..	205
Figure 16 <i>Contagion</i> prototype Mirror.....	206
Figure 17 <i>Contagion</i> prototype Colour Palette.....	207
Figure 18 <i>Contagion</i> prototype Face	207
Figure 19 Experience Workshop responses against Experiential Goals.....	210
Figure 20 <i>Contagion</i> final iteration screen shot	227

List of Tables

Table 1 Structure of a creative-production research project against a summary of my research activities and the corresponding parts of the thesis	36
Table 2 Overview of methods used in this study against the four activities of interaction design	117
Table 3 Timeline and methods used in <i>Cardiomorphologies</i>	148
Table 4 Experience Workshop summary of responses	157
Table 5 <i>Cardiomorphologies</i> prototype Video-cued Recall participants	160
Table 6 <i>Cardiomorphologies</i> Video-cued Recall participants	172
Table 7 Timeline and methods used for <i>Contagion</i>	200
Table 8 Summary of Experience Workshop responses	212
Table 9 <i>Contagion</i> prototype Video-cued Recall participants.....	214
Table 10 <i>Contagion</i> prototype Semi-structured Interview participants	217
Table 11 <i>Contagion</i> Semi-structured Interview participants.....	231
Table 12 Summary evaluation of the methods used.....	261

List of Appendices

Appendix A	Enclosed video documentation – DVD track listing.....	297
Appendix B	Sample research participant consent form	298
Appendix C	Cardiomorphologies visitor information card	299
Appendix D	Cardiomorphologies At Beta_space publicity material	300
Appendix E	Sample Of Cardiomorphologies Video-Cued Recall Report abridged transcription (Lynn).....	301
Appendix F	‘Evolving Creative Practice’ : Conference paper based on joint reflection with George Khut (Khut & Muller 2005).....	303
Appendix G	Contagion signage.....	315
Appendix H	Sample of Contagion prototype Semi-Structured Interview abridged transcription (Geoff)	316
Appendix I	Interview between Elizabeth Muller and Gina Czarnecki April 2006 edited transcript.....	319
Appendix J	Muller, L., Robertson, T. and Edmonds, E. (2006) “Experience Workshops”. In Proceedings of <i>OZCHI Workshop on The Object of Interaction</i> , Sydney, November 20-24 th 2006, ACM Interaction Conference Proceedings Series, Sydney	331

Foreword

The motivation for this research project grew from my experience as a curator exhibiting new media and interactive artworks between 1999 and 2004. Each time I organised an exhibition I was struck by the way the artworks came to life with the entrance of the audience. I was fascinated by people's reactions and behaviour, their unexpected uses, and creative mis-uses of the artworks, their preferences and curiosities, their questions and conversations. Meanwhile, I was increasingly aware of two problems which I perceived in the field of interactive art.

The first was the prevalence of disappointing interactive artworks. I had encountered enough rewarding and satisfying work to convince me that, used well, computer-based interactivity produced compelling aesthetic experiences. However I had also encountered numerous artworks where I felt the potential of the interactive situation was not being fully exploited.

The second problem was the way interactive art was written about in artists' documentation, in marketing materials, and in the growing body of critical literature. Descriptions of work seemed to focus largely on the technology and often implied, it seemed to me, that the more "cutting edge" the technology the better the artwork. The term "interactive" was used so generally that it was practically meaningless. There seemed to be a lack of adequate critical and descriptive language to talk about the nature and qualities of the different kinds of interaction offered by different artworks. I felt that these two problems could be addressed by a closer consideration of the audience's reactions to the works. Was it possible, I wondered, to develop my own interest in audiences into a more robust and methodical basis for my curatorial practice? Was it possible to connect artists making interactive artwork to the rich and fascinating "resource" of the audience's encounter with the work? Was it possible to bring some of the liveliness of real audience experiences into the critical discourse surrounding interactive art?

In 2003 I initiated a project called the New Technology Arts Fellowship (NTAF) in partnership with the Crucible research network for interdisciplinary design led by Alan Blackwell. Blackwell brought me into contact for the first time with Human Computer Interaction (HCI), an interdisciplinary field that focuses on the encounter between people and computer systems. Our collaboration opened up new possibilities for developing my interest in audiences. The project brokered three partnerships between artists and technology researchers at Cambridge University in England, with the aim of stimulating the creation of new interactive artworks (Leach

2003). One aim of the project was to find ways to include audiences in the collaborations. Inspired by the HCI techniques of user-testing and prototyping which I had recently discovered, I organised a work in progress “exposition” with our partner gallery, Kettle’s Yard. The artists and technologists found ways to show early versions of the ideas they were working on to the audience. We framed the overall event as a research experiment, in which audiences were invited to contribute to the ongoing development of the works. I was interested to find out how audiences would respond to this unusual use of the gallery. By talking to visitors and watching their behaviour I discovered that most audience members were very open to this experimental and process-based form of exhibition. They readily grasped the idea that the objects in the gallery were not finished works, and seemed keen to give feedback and discuss the research processes represented in the space. The experiment also proved valuable for the artists, who were interested to see how audiences reacted to their ideas and engaged with the things they had made. The success of this early experiment persuaded me that the field of HCI would reward closer attention, and became the motivating factor behind this research. In the thesis that follows I show how my engagement with HCI has generated new possibilities for curatorial practice, as well as new ways of understanding and talking about the aesthetic effects of computer-based interaction in art.