

Erratum

Doctoral candidate: Anna Einarsson

Title of Dissertation: *Singing The Body Electric - Understanding the role of embodiment in performing and composing interactive music*

An error was introduced during the publishing process of this publication. On page 32 before the quote the following text is missing:

Second, turning to a perceptual dimension, to what degree is the computer response perceived (by the performer) as related to the sung input? To a large degree or small degree? For example this may depend on whether or not voice material is used for the subsequent sounding, and it may depend on how soon the sounding gesture from the computer arrives, among many other things.

The metaphors used by the singers in *Metamorphoses* suggest they perceive a close relationship to the computer response. They say “having conversations with the sounds”, “sounds embrace me as I embrace them”, “like playing with a playmate”. In One piece of a shared space it was experienced as only slightly related, the same for *PS! I will be home soon*.

Third, to encompass a dimension of ecological psychology (e.g. Gibson, 1986) is for instance to ask what role physical movements play for the interactivity, i.e. are the performers static or moving in the physical space and how does this have impact? Also questions concerning the audience would be of importance for the interaction seen from an ecological viewpoint, for example does the audience matter for the interaction, and if so, in what way? Do they move?

In all of my works the singers were active and moving in one way or another. This influenced the embodiment of the singing, a notion I will return to in a following chapter, thus by extension it influenced interactivity and the relationship towards the computer. The latter issue on the audience was something I did not explore for my thesis since the audience perspective had to be dropped from the investigation in order to narrow down the scope of the inquiry.

Control is a recurring concept in almost any of the above mentioned existing classification systems (Rowe, 1993; Bongers, 2000; Eigenfeldt, 2011; Pressing, 1990, Birnbaum et al, 2005). To me control is an important parameter in the *making* of technology, something reading my process diary towards my work reveals, but is of much less importance when *using* technology, when experiencing interaction with the computer technology. Perhaps quite obviously this relates to my compositional aesthetics and from having a background in jazz and improvisation. I have a grounded belief that something is added in the performance situation by the performer(s) and that this addition is a relevant and perhaps even vital addition.

Instead of the concept interactivity, Margaret Morse (2003) suggests the concept of responsivity, in part due to its over usage and in part due to how the word “inter” in interactivity implies an exchange between two entities that are dissimilar, while responsivity leaves more room for other interpretations as well. Susan Kozel (2007) adds that responsivity is less associated with control and more concerned with the role the individual plays in a greater system (Kozel, 2007, p. 21). Kozel also discusses how responsivity in contrast with interactivity allows for malfunctioning systems still producing artistically interesting results. “Responsivity, however, can apply even with a faulty system, an imperfect system, a flailing or failing system. It can also occur with an imaginary system (except, perhaps, on opening night). There are degrees of not working that can have extraordinarily rich responsive potential [...]” (Kozel, 2007, p. 188). Here I only partly agree, since a malfunctioning system also produces lots of frustration. Aesthetically I prefer the indeterminacy to happen at other levels in my works, but have the technology perform - at least to a large degree - the way I had planned for it to. Having said this I acknowledge there to be a phase during technical development where unexpectedness may be a welcome contribution to bringing the work forward. Nevertheless, technologies behaving haphazardly do not sit well with events intended to coincide at certain moments in time as necessary in a music composition fairly organized in time. However, in order to allow for different conceptualizations of the relationship towards the computer, not necessarily considering the computer as an “other”, and to signal an approach where minute control is not of primary concern in the performance situation, I have been using the term responsivity to denote my use of computer technology.

Technically I make use of semi-automated patches (computer programs). As I was anticipating when discussing the emergence of different schools of aesthetics in the EA-tradition on page one, I am combining the notated approach with an improvisational one, searching for a middle ground where there are enough degrees of freedom for the performer to have room for action and initiative using improvisation, while maintaining the identity of the overall shape of the piece by means of notation. I do not, like composer Arne Eigenfeldt, see “fixed-time objects... [as] the ideal that many composers will continue to find attractive” (Eigenfeldt, 2011, p. 146). My approach is to have the computer technology function conversationally (Drummond, 2009, p. 126), providing both predictable and unpredictable responses, and where there is also an autonomous process running into the program. Furthermore, my programs do not translate to any performance situation but are designed to present a particular work in a particular context. Jon Drummond encapsulates quite well the delicacy of responsiveness: