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Problem
This poster explores interactions triggered by installations in museums and the variety of ways people engage with these installations. Some of these are in line with the designers' expectations and others diverge in various points, through the journey of interactions. In other words, some people do not cover the full interaction process as intended, others demonstrate “unintended behaviors” or “uncommon behaviors” during the process.

We believe there is a need to generate a better understanding of this phenomenon. In this poster, we present an initial exploration. We will have a close look at this phenomenon, categorize and qualify the deviation. We then present examples and explain deviation model as tool to help capture the various stages of interaction (intended and actual).

Related Work
Many frameworks capture the interactive experience by people, for example as the M-Dimensions presented by Gonçalves et al [2], which demonstrates the ten dimensions that guide and evaluate interactive installations. Koeman [4] developed a framework that captures factors that influence engagement. We have developed a model that captures the deviation between the two trajectories, the designer's design intentions and the participants' forms of engagement [6].

Solution
We extend our initial stage of this research, where we developed a general model of the deviation of the intended and the actual experience with interactive installations.

The model consists of various points that capture the process of interaction with installations with five stages (lingering, exploring, primary outcome, secondary outcome, final result). These are visualized in two trajectories that illustrate deviation between a) designer's intention and b) the actual experience by people who interact.

In this poster we aim to further categorize the general model according to the shape of the two trajectories and then illustrate the observations of installations. For future research, we will look at how the deviations are formed and the corresponding reflections on the design process.

References

Method
A General Model of Deviation

The categories are based on the visualization of the deviation between the intended and the actual experiences presented by Wei et al (2020) (Figure 1). The two experiences are represented by two trajectories that go through the five interaction stages. In ideal cases, where the actual experience fully matches the intended, the two overlap (Figure 1 A). However, when the deviation happens at certain stages, the trajectory of the actual experience deviates from the intended (Figure 1 B and C).

Categories of Deviation

Based on the non-systematic observation of 10 months in museums, galleries and outdoor space in London, and according to the shape of the two trajectories of the general model, we present four categories of deviations as in Figure 2. They represent four common conditions of deviations and are widely witnessed in case studies.

It is worth noting that the model will only act as a framework or reference for designers to help them understand how their ideas work in real-life scenarios instead of being a standard for evaluating the installations.

Case Study
Cloud Rings, Wonderlab, Science Museum

Earth's Plates, Natural History Museum
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