

Documentation of interactivity (basis for discussion for the cop meeting)

- There can be several motivations to describe interactivity: a) detailed description when transferring the work to newer equipment. b) to test an installation c) to add to the general description of the artwork (i.e. for public access) d) other
- The spreadsheet below gives an idea how to document the interactivity for a) and b) mentioned above.
- For a general description of the artwork in a database (c), Tiziana Caianiello's form seems to be too extensive. However, some features could be used and be combined with Katja Kwastek's ontology of interactivity (s. publication list at the end).

Case study: Shan Shui (2013) Geert Mul <http://geertmul.nl/projects/shan-shui/> (s. separate documentation)

Extreme and typical situations	Visitor input	Description of output (sound, image, ...)	Computer action	Source code
no visitors		Still image (each time the program is started a different image ?) Sound:	randomly (?) pick an image from image database	
1 visitor				
	visitor enters room	The image splits at the horizontal position where the visitor entered the range of the sensor and a new image starts to overlay the previous image from the centre of the split. Sound:		line no... to line no ...
	visitor moves horizontally	The image split follows the visitor horizontally leaving behind a blurred track. Sound:		
	visitor moves toward screen	The vertical dimension of the image becomes smaller and smaller the closer the visitor moves to the screen. The minimal vertical size of the image is about one		

		quarter of the projection size. The image is centred in the middle. Sound:		
	visitor moves away from screen	The vertical dimension of the image becomes larger and larger the further away the visitor moves from the screen. The maximal vertical size of the image is (almost?) the full height of the projection. It is centred in the middle. Sound:		
Several visitors				
many visitors		The image is split up at several horizontal positions at the same time (the positions of the visitors). The single images are therefore not recognisable anymore, as they are constantly overlaid by new images. Sound:		
optimal number: 1 to 2 visitors?		Sound:		

Questions

- Should the spreadsheet above also contain a column for the equipment / hardware?
- Would it help document the levels of interactivity as for instance suggested by Herbert 2013?

(Herbert 2013, pp. 212–214):

1 Static

The art object does not change and is viewed by a person. There is no interaction between the two

2 Dynamic-Passive

The art object has an internal mechanism that enables it to change or it may be modified by an environmental factor such as temperature, sound or light. The internal mechanism is specified by the artist and any changes that take place are entirely predictable. (...) The viewer is a passive observer of this activity performed by the artwork in response to the physical environment.

3 Dynamic-Interactive

All of the conditions of the dynamic passive category apply with the added factor that the human 'viewer' has an active role in influencing the changes in the art object. (...) The work 'performs' differently according to what the person does or says. There may be more than one participant and more than one art object...

4 Dynamic Interactive (Varying)

The conditions for both 2 and 3 above apply, with the addition of a modifying agent that changes the original specification of the art object. The agent could be a human or it could be a software program. Because of this, the process that takes place, or rather, the performance of the art system cannot be predictable. It will depend on the history of interactions with the work.

- Has anybody used a formal model to map the physical activation to the logical response of a device as suggested in Dix et al. 2009, chapter 4.2?
- How to document the evolvement of an artwork (performativity / processuality) which is based on interactivity? Is this also part of interactivity?

Literature

interactivity

(Lurk, Enge; Rinehart; Stern 2016)(Herbert 2013; Kwastek, Spörl 2009; LIMA, SBMK 2015; Lopes 2001)(Dix et al. 2009; Giebeler; Graham 1997)

(Caianiello; Campbell 2000)

Publication bibliography

Caianiello, Tiziana: Modul interactivity English and German.

Campbell, Jim (2000): Delusions of Dialogue: Control and Choice in Interactive Art. In *Leonardo* 33 (2), pp. 133–136.

Dix, Alan; Ghazali, Masitah; Gill, Steve; Joanna, Hare; Ramduny-Ellis, Devina (2009): Physigrams: modelling devices for natural interaction. In *Formal Aspects of Computing* 21, pp. 613–641.

Giebeler, Julia: Interaktive Videoinstallation. Dokumentation und Reinstallation am Beispiel des Werks Exchange Fields von Bill Seaman. Fachhochschule Köln, Köln. Institut für Konservierungs- und Restaurierungswissenschaft, Fakultät Kulturwissenschaften.

Graham, Beryl (1997): A Study of Audience Relationships with Interactive Computer-Based Visual Artworks in Gallery Settings, through Observation, Art Practice, and Curation. Doctoral thesis. University of Sunderland.

Herbert, David (2013): Internet art and interaction: a study into the creation of a taxonomy of interaction in online art works. PhD, Loughborough University.

Kwastek, Katja; Spörl, Ingrid (2009): Taxonomy Interactive Art. Research Report. Phase II. Ludwig Boltzmann Institute.

LIMA, SBMK (2015): Project Transformation Digital Art. Preservation of born-digital art. Amsterdam.

Lopes, Dominic (2001): The Ontology of Interactive Art. In *The Journal of Aesthetic Education* Vol. 35 (No. 4 (Winter, 2001)), 65-81.

Lurk, Tabea; Enge, Jürgen: Metadatenblatt zur Erfassung von Netzkunst.

Rinehart, Richard: A System of Formal Notation for Scoring Works of Digital and Variable Media Art.

Stern, Nathaniel (2016): Interactive Art. Interventions in/to Process. In Christiane Paul (Ed.): A Companion to Digital Art. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.