

Mediating Spaces: Sound and Hybridity in Installation Practices

Jimmy Eadie

Abstract—This article will examine the relationship between theories and terms pertaining to *Sound Art*, *Intermediality*, *Hybrid* and *Installation Art*. These concepts and categories will be examined from the perspective of a practicing sound artist. The paper will look at key artists and theories, to better understand how these terms emerged and how they have influenced the context of discourse between the academy, scholars, and practitioners. A primary concern of the paper is to contextualize the importance of the terminology in light of the increasingly nebulous identification and interpretation of works that use sound as their primary medium. This article is pertinent to the performative arts and digital media cultures, as it offers definitions, literature analyses, and concepts that are central to intermedial and interdisciplinary research and practice.

Keywords—Sound art, Intermedia, Hybrid-Art, Sound Installation.

I. INTRODUCTION

THE paper explores the foundations and theoretical evolution of interdisciplinary art, drawing on diverse fields to analyze its multi-modal aspects. The research provides a 'practice-centered' view, acknowledging the hybrid nature of works and their experiential qualities. It discusses the bond between artist, artwork, and location, emphasizing the reflexive audience experience, especially in sound and listening. This holistic view assists artists in defining their work within larger artistic contexts.

II. SOUND ART

The term 'sound art' seems to be contentious among academics and practitioners alike [1]. Although sometimes misapplied, the term 'sound art' can result in ambiguity in sonic arts discussions due to its breadth and tendency to overlook diverse artistic practices. It may mask associations with varying creative disciplines. However, despite these drawbacks, 'sound art' can aptly depict a practice straddling multiple artistic and conceptual disciplines. Sound art, not a genre but a multidisciplinary concept, broadens music theory and blends with visual arts. Its expanding scope, relative to experimental music, fosters a more pluralistic view of both. Before setting aside the arguments over the terminology, there is a need to give some context to sound art's problematic title. Relevant definitions on the topic from eminent scholars and practitioners are highlighted here: Musicologist Leigh Landy claims that 'There is no single consistently used definition for sound art. Originating in the fine arts, the term is associated with sound

installations, sound sculptures, public sonic artefacts and site-specific sonic art events and could further be subdivided into more specific categories' [2, p.19]. Author Seth Kim-Cohen believes that 'the language of sonic practice distinct from music is only now emerging' [3, p.4]. These two simple definitions demonstrate the complexities of the term's use as a categorization. In contrast to other art movements, sound art is not associated with any particular era, place, or group of artists. It also took decades for the movement to actually have a name after its first pieces were created. In his anthology of modern music, *Audio Culture Readings in Modern Music*, Christoph Cox observes that 'sound art has become a prominent field of artistic practice, presented at major museums and galleries all across the globe' [4, p.1]. Artist and author David Toop describes sound art as 'sound combined with visual art practices' [5, p.3]. Toop curated the sound art exhibition *Sonic Boom: The Art of Sound* [6] at the Haywood Gallery, London. This was considered a vital landmark exhibition for sound art practice throughout the world. It was the largest exhibition of sound art in the UK, with over 30 international artists. The exhibition occupied the entire Hayward Gallery with a variety of sound installations that juxtaposed the mechanical and the organic, the electrical and the acoustic, the sculptural and the intangible. Sonic Boom attracted tens of thousands of attendees and remains a milestone show in the evolution and display of sonic art [7]. However, perhaps the most significant and insightful definition comes from Alan Licht, who differentiates sound art from music principally in terms of time and duration. Licht advocates the view that: A universal definition and definitive history of sound art may not be likely, [...] but ultimately it is better to honor sound pieces created in a non-time-based, non-programmatic way as being sound art [8, p.10]. As can be seen, a definition, critique, and discussion of sound art has many difficulties. However, as Licht suggests, *sound work* created in a non-time and non-programmatic way *should* be defined as sound art. Thus, we can at least begin to describe the concept of sound art, and how to apply it to a particular work. Pertinent to this paper is that the terms intermediality, art hybridity, installation, and sound art can often be interchangeable as there is overlap between them [9]. The convergence of meaning in set boundaries stirs debate as artists and theorists aim to categorize works accurately. To demystify sound art, artist-scholar Laura Maes crafted a taxonomy, establishing criteria to precisely pinpoint its unique characteristics: *concept, perception, space, site-specificness, open-form, interaction, production of sound, narrativity,*

endurance, and visual component [10, p.60]. An important consideration and a key argument of this article is that sound art usually attempts to heighten the individual's aural perception within a given space. As professor of Media Studies Kate Lacey observes, sound artists attempt 'to make listeners self-reflexively aware of themselves as *listeners*, within a particular setting and time' [11, p.217]. It could be said that many composers of music quite literally attempt to achieve the opposite of this statement, in that they attempt to transcend the performance setting in the hope the audience would experience a sort of emotional 'reverie' and be 'transported' when they listen to the music. As Don Ihde further states, the 'enchantment of music can seduce' and lead to a temporary sense of 'dissolution' of self-presence; essentially it can take you 'out of yourself' [12, p.132].

When discussing sound art, most discourse specifies only what it is not: it is *not* music, and it is *not* visual art. However, as Seth Cluett [13] observes, the visual element of sound art, although at times less apparent, can actually foreground the concept of sound by alluding to or highlighting the absence of sound. Evidence of this conceptual approach to sound art can be seen in the work of Christian Marclay [14], particularly his pieces *Cube* (1989), *Tape Fall* (1990), and *Boneyard* (1990). Casey O'Callaghan [15] emphasizes that hearing, compared to seeing, is considered as a secondary perceptual quality in Western philosophy, adding to the tensions between the ocular and the aural, and historically giving superiority to the visual aspect. Exploring this concept further, Peter Szendy believes that 'unlike visual perception, which enables a clear separation of subject and object, sound resonates in and through the listening body' [16, p.15]. Paying special attention to listening arrangements as 'signed listenings' and the juridical history of the listener, Szendy proposes an alternative model based on deconstruction: listening, he says, is 'tolerated theft' and our ears are always already haunted by the ear of the other [16, p.34]. David Toop's enlightened discrimination between the visual and sonic experience demonstrates these points further: 'Seeing is now-now-now-now-now-now-now-n-n-n..., whereas hearing is then-and-now-and-then, over there at the source of the sound and then here, within the body, already gone but still dispersing into ambience' [17, p.46]. An important point is that despite these perceptual differences, and the fact that sound art is simultaneously rooted within two different discourses, that of music and visual arts, the visual component seems to still play a significant role in many works.

III. EVOLUTION OF SOUND ART

Marcel Duchamp, a pivotal figure in modern art, played a crucial role in the development of sound art. His conceptual approach to sound and vision, showcased through ready-mades, visual art, sculpture, and music, laid the foundation for the integration of sound within conceptual arts. What could be considered the first conceptual piece of sound art, and a forerunner to sound art writ large, was Duchamp's readymade entitled *With Hidden Noise (A Bruit Secret)* [18]. The work was designed for interaction, audition, and vision. *With Hidden Noise* could be conceptually read as an infinite line that doubles

back on itself, permanently fixed in this position: a solidified loop. However, the work is not activated or completed until the object is shaken to make a sound, the origin of which is hidden from view. The work creates an interesting dialogue between conceptual, visual, and auditory experience, questioning perception and meaning through chance operation. Duchamp says of this piece: "Before I finished it Arensberg put something inside the ball of twine, and never told me what it was, and I didn't want to know" [19]. Duchamp's conceptual works challenged traditional notions that an artist must be a skilled craftsman, asserting the value in conceptual originality. Seth Kim-Cohen, noting Duchamp's 'non-retinal art', posits that sound art should similarly evolve into 'non-cochlear' art. Cohen questions the lack of such a shift in sonic arts, suggesting 'non-cochlear' practice could liberate sound art from auditory fixation and apply it to broader socio-political contexts. [20].

Artist Joseph Kosuth, commenting on artistic divisions and modalities, suggests that 'all art [after Duchamp] is conceptual [in nature] because art only exists conceptually' [21, p.33]. Fifty years after Duchamp, as if to echo Kosuth's claim, artist Robert Morris created *Box with the Sound of Its Own Making* [22], an essential work of American minimalist art. Kim-Cohen contends that "[Box] is both the sound of a sculpture and a sculpture of sound. It is a very early example of a sound sculpture; of a work existing simultaneously, equally, as sculpture and as a sound art work" [3, p.6].

As well as Duchamp, seminal artists John Cage, Pierre Schaeffer, and R. Murray Schafer were each pivotal in developing concepts of sound and listening beyond the domain of music and, as such, have had a great impact on the definition of sound art as presented in this article. These important practitioners have been written about at length [23], so there is no need to go into great historical detail here. Importantly, all share the characteristic of not differentiating between 'musical sounds' and 'extra-musical sounds', the latter conventionally being considered 'noise' or environmental ambient sound. This concept did have its genesis with Luigi Russolo at the turn of the 20th century [24]. However, there are pertinent differences between how Cage, Schaeffer, and Schafer determine their theories. In attempting to define sound within acousmatic music, Pierre Schaeffer, who was heavily influenced by Edmund Husserl's phenomenological principles [25], suggested removing the sound from its original context. Through his concepts of the *sonic object*, *reduced listening*, and *idée fixe*, Schaeffer suggested that we should rely purely on the acoustic qualities of sound to gain a deeper understanding. He was concerned with the physical material of sound and how this could acquire the plasticity of compositional material. To demonstrate this phenomenon, he famously removed the attack of the recording of a bell and subsequently found it resembled the sound of an oboe [26]. Expanding the field of discussion further, R. M. Schafer introduced the concept of the *soundscape* and *acoustic ecology*. Essentially, Schafer was concerned with how we experience an acoustic environment, and subsequently how to study and analyze these external sound fields, which he termed *sonography* [27]. Pauline Oliveros, a significant contributor to sound art, was a founder of the San Francisco

Tape Music Centre, a hub for electronic music in the 1960s. In 1988, she introduced 'deep listening', an aesthetic blending improvisation, electronic music, and meditation, aimed to foster a listening discipline among both trained and novice artists, responsive to environmental conditions in solo or group contexts [28]. This corpus of work enriches our comprehension of sound art and its distinction from music. Before the 1990s, sound art, often featuring 'noise' associated with traditional music, was generally classified as 'experimental music' or 'performance'. The ability to blend such unmusical sounds was once deemed exclusive to composers and musicians. John Cage, a major figure in music and art, is renowned for his intertwined rhetoric and work, complicating objective analysis. However, his music composition theories, especially his concept of silence, have significantly shaped the current discourse on sound art. As Cage remarked, "Silence is all of the sound we don't intend. There is no such thing as absolute silence. Therefore, silence may very well include sounds, and more and more in the twentieth century does" [29, p.166]. Essentially, for silence to function as an artistic act there must be a coherent structure, a framing as it were. This frame is the filter through which we perceive the work – sound and silence. As Kyle Gann suggests, in keeping with his Zen tendency to dissolve dualities, Cage thought of 'sound and silence as merely aspects of the same continuum' [30, p.163]. Conceptually Cage's work abandoned the compositional categories of work-form, material-content, thereby questioning the necessity of an artistic work at all for the origin or creation of aesthetic experience. As Douglas Kahn comments, Cage codified silence into a 'musical' event that could be experienced anywhere and at any time, essentially arguing that all sound could be music [31]. Cage's theories advocate an aesthetic of listening that does not impose intent on the listener but promotes openness to experiencing events as they occur. His seminal contribution to art was emphasizing the listening experience in a broad auditive field. By minimizing personal will in his work, Cage created aesthetic listening experiences unhindered by traditional compositional elements like form, melody, harmony. The lack of traditional structural principles in Cage's work aligns with Licht's contemporary definition of sound art. Despite its close ties with experimental music, some sound art interestingly omits sound, focusing on silence or visually representing the absence of sound [14]. In conclusion, sound art is evolving a unique language and methodology for audible art, beneficial for scholars, curators, and artists. This is essential for facilitating precise inter-disciplinary dialogue and idea exchange among artists.

IV. INTERMEDIAL ART

The concept of *intermedia* has been discussed in great detail within many texts [32] and has many interpretations and meanings. As such, it is difficult to map out its ontological and semantic fields. The individual who coined the term is artist Dick Higgins, who used it to describe artistic expression involving different media that could not be easily differentiated by traditional methods of analysis. Higgins applied the term as a means of expressing how a work can sit *in-between*, and

simultaneously be *interconnected* with, various interdisciplinary art forms. Primarily, intermedia signifies the blending of various media and creative techniques in artwork creation. It raises essential questions about the artist-artwork-audience relationship and audience experience. The term is used to highlight the innovative or disruptive potential of artworks expressing their message across multiple media formats. It denotes communication through various simultaneous discourses and combinations of diverse sensory interaction modalities.

The term *intermediality*, on the other hand, was devised by the German scholar Aage A. Hansen Löve in 1983, and was conceived as an analogy to *intertextuality* [33, p.4]. In broad terms, and much like Higgins' definition, intermediality refers to the interconnectedness of modern media of communication [34]. In his book *The Musicalisation of Fiction: A Study in the Theory and History of Intermediality*, Werner Wolf argues that the term 'can be applied in a broad sense to any phenomenon involving more than one medium' [35, p.40]. He maintains that intermediality is connected to, and can even be viewed as, a 'subdivision' of, intertextuality [35, p.46]. He further suggests that intermediality is a 'transgression of boundaries between conventionally distinct media of communication' [36, p.17]. Exploring the term intermediality further, Irina O. Rajewsky, a noted scholar on the subject, remarks that there are a variety of critical approaches that utilize the concept, each of which could be defined differently; as such, a host of related terms have surfaced recently, such as *infra-mediality*, *media-convergence*, *fusion*, and *hybridization* [37, p.44]. Therefore, Rajewsky's concept of intermediality incorporating *fusion* and *hybridity* can be directly applied to the concept of sound art. Importantly, it MUST BE REMEMBERED THAT INTERMEDIALITY HAS MANY interpretations, and it is difficult to distinguish between its implied and hermeneutic use. As Rajewsky insists, "it becomes necessary to define one's own particular understanding of intermediality more precisely, and to situate one's individual approach within a broader spectrum" [37, p.45]. Rajewsky's insights are useful for analytical understanding and practical, theoretical, or heuristic value. She suggests sub-categorizing intermediality into three definitions: medial transposition, media combination, and intermedial reference. Medial transposition deals with production-oriented transformations; media combinations encompass phenomena like theatre, opera, and sound art installations. Intermedial references imply the evocation, imitation, and technique use from one media to another, such as the musicalization of literature, ekphrasis, and combining different medial forms within a single medium [37, p. 51]. By categorizing intermediality into these phenomena groups, Rajewsky aims to distinguish various intermediality manifestations and foster their deeper understanding. Therefore, applying these definitions to a work can set up a framework that initiates an interdisciplinary discussion. Nonetheless, sound art discussions hinge on how individual artists use these categories and their context. Rajewsky is correct in asserting that anyone applying intermediality within sound art must define it. Fundamentally, the intermedial relationship stems from an integrative

combination of diverse media within a sound artwork. This combination fosters a unique audience experience, and the artwork's evolution is directly influenced by this media fusion and interconnection.

V. ART HYBRIDITY

Hybrid art is another term that is associated with intermediality and sound art. The term may be applied to help describe the interdisciplinarity and fusion of elements more easily. Artist and academic Victoria Vesna [38] defines hybrid art as a work that resides in between, 'above and below' what is generally accepted as 'culture', and is usually experimental and collaborative. Likewise, *Ars Electronica*, a worldwide platform for art technology and society, describes hybrid art as having a primary emphasis on the process of fusing different media and genres into new forms of artistic expression, that 'transcend boundaries' between art and research [39]. This definition of art hybridity has many similarities to the concepts of intermediality mentioned previously. A more in-depth description of art hybridity comes from professor of philosophy Jerrold Levinson, who is renowned for his work on the aesthetics of music. According to Levinson, hybrid art forms are those 'forms arising from the actual combination or interpenetration of earlier art forms' [40, p. 6]. He goes on to clarify, one striking and central significance hybrid art forms have, and which partly explains their appeal to and pursuit by artists, is this. Hybrid art forms, and the works they encompass, tend to be symbols of creativity it-self [40, p. 8]. Levinson posits that a hybrid art form is not just a structural category or a medium-derived phenomenon but a historical consequence. He categorizes hybrid art into three main categories: juxtaposition, synthesis, and transformation. Simon Shaw Miller elaborates these categories in his book, "Visible Deeds of Music": juxtaposition correlates with multidisciplinary work, synthesis with interdisciplinarity, and transformation with cross-disciplinarity. Importantly, he suggests that, once combined, all the individual identities of each category have been modified and thus forged into a completely new work. Levinson suggests that kinetic sculpture belongs to the category of *transformation*. He views kinetic sculpture as 'ordinary sculpture modified in the direction of dance' [41, p. 33]. Levinson comments that the interaction and reconfiguration of these works are dependent on the ambient conditions and are therefore beyond the artists' control. Essentially, each piece provides every audience member with a subtly unique experience. One of the best exponents of kinetic art, is the artist Max Eastley; his work *Aeolian Wind Sculptures* [42] exist on the border between the natural environment and human intervention and use the driving forces of electricity, wind, water and ice as a means of expression. These natural processes support Levinson's claim that the experiential and ambient qualities are beyond an artist's control. Discussing these terms and works within this taxonomy clarifies each concept's definition and highlights the overlap within each term. Sound-focused work typically exhibits fluidity among these categories. Notably, these experiential activities often occur in an installation or sound artwork setting, unlike the passive setting of music concerts, traditional theatre, or recorded listening. Thus, the hybrid artist crafts perceptual experiences allowing audience members to engage with the work on two levels: embodied (through bodily participation) and perceptual (through active participation in the work itself).

VI. INSTALLATION ART

The term loosely refers to the type of art into which the viewer physically enters, and which is often described as *theatrical*, *immersive*, or *experiential* [43, p. 6]. Installation art should create a situation into which the viewer/listener will enter and experience everything as a singular totality. Arguably, the difference between a music concert, an art exhibition, and installation art is that in the installation there is an emphasis on the spatial aspect. As Niamh Ann Kelly puts it, this emphasis is typically achieved by ensuring, first and foremost, that the viewer is 'not a passive spectator' but an active agent in how the work '(re)defines place' [44, p. 8]. The emphasis is often on sensory immediacy and physical participation within a space. However, Jacques Rancière disputes the notion of an always passive viewer and questions art that intentionally aims to engage the spectator by experimenting with ways to blur the separation between audience and performance. He asserts that we participate through the act of spectating [45]. Despite Rancière's claim, installation art offers a unique experience to the audience compared to traditional art forms like paintings, which are often viewed from a singular perspective. It necessitates active audience participation, possibly involving entering the artwork's physical space and interacting with it. Besides the visual aspect, it can also engage touch, sound, or smell. Crucially, installation art prioritizes experience and communication over the creation of a 'finished' artwork.

Bishop contends that Kurt Schwitters' *Merzbau* is a precursor to all installation art: 'this is immersive art where the participant has a heightened sense of self-awareness' [43, p. 41]. *Merzbau* transformed into an ever-changing abstract collage, featuring grottoes, columns, and found objects. It transcended being a mere studio, becoming a work of art in its own right. It was not limited to static painting or sculpture but constituted an entire environment in constant flux. Ilya Kabakov's installation works also exemplify this sensory immediacy, as he aims to fully immerse participants in dramatic environments through his concept of total installations [43, p. 14]. He creates environments which fuse elements of the everyday with those of the conceptual. Installation artists often aim to intensify the audience's awareness within a space, and their simultaneous response to both the installed object and the site is a significant aspect of their aesthetic. Bishop's concept of active spectatorship can aid in comprehending this connection. Many artists and critics contend that the need to physically navigate and engage with the work activates the viewer, distinguishing it from art that solely necessitates passive and detached optical contemplation [43, p. 11]. Impermanence lies at the core of installation art, emphasizing the transient nature of the experience. Unlike plastic arts or music, it prioritizes space and time over creating permanent artworks or recordings. The duration of the immersive experience becomes pivotal, keeping the audience engaged and enhancing their spatial awareness [46]. As Mark Rosenthal explains, "the time and space of the viewer coincide with the art," with no separation or dichotomy between the perceiver and the object. In other words, "life pervades this form of art" [47, p. 27]. Rosenthal offers a taxonomy for installation art, categorizing it into four types: enchantments, impersonations, interventions, and rapprochements. Enchantments and impersonations fall under

the "filled-space" installation category, while interventions and rapprochements are classified as "site-specific" installations. The filled-space installations, also known as "site-determined," can be recreated in other locations as there is internal coherence within the work itself, whereas the parts of the work in site-specific installations depend on a specific site for meaning. In contrast, the site-specific installation is closely tied to its specific location, with the parts relating to each other and the larger space as a whole. Therefore, the artwork cannot be moved to another space as its understanding and experience are deeply connected to the intended site. Consequently, there cannot be a universally applicable set of characteristics for all installations. Kelly contends that asserting an authoritative set of characteristics for all installation art would be an impractical and unproductive task, lacking in nuance and adaptability. [44, p. 8]. There can be no discussion of installation art without referring to Michael Fried's now infamous and influential essay '*Art and Objecthood*' [48]. This essay has continued to shape the many debates and arguments within contemporary art criticism. It was intended as a critique of minimalist sculpture of the time, and its overreliance on the theatricality of its staging and audience engagement and was directed specifically at the works of Donald Judd and Robert Morris. Fried accuses them of confusing the definition of 'object' and 'art', and of being overly theatrical, to the point that they were more ideologists than artists. He comments [48, p. 8] that these artists were preoccupied with the actual circumstances of the meeting between the viewer and the work, including the way the work was staged and presented to the audience. He argues that this concept was in stark contrast to modernist painters, who attempted to transcend the literalism of the painting's medium. Minimalists, he contends, capitulate to this base physicality. In opposition to Fried's argument, Angelika Nollert comments in favor of a staged theatricality: "installation art, like theatre, opens up spaces where illustrations can become happenings - ones which thrive on the awareness of their simulation" [49, p. 22]. She claims, the revolution that occurred when theatrical staging ideas and techniques were widely incorporated into later artistic practices, particularly installation and obviously performance art, continues to have a significant impact on how artists have challenged the realm of representation in general. Installation art has an inherent theatricality. It does not seek to transcend its medium like modernist art, but rather creates a dislocation between everyday life and art through strategic staging. It aims to surprise and provide a distinct experience. This concept is explored further by Alston [46], where he uses the term 'experience-machines' to describe spaces in which all the elements of site-specific theatre coalesce around the central aim to place audience members in a 'thematically-cohesive environment'. Similarly to experiencing a theatrical work of art as a spectacle, albeit in a silent seated manner, installation art could be viewed as an *activated spectacle*, in that the audience is located within the work. There exists both an interactive and contemplative engagement within this type of spectatorship. There is an element of curiosity and playfulness when entering an installation. We become almost performative characters within the work; in essence, we *become* the installation.

VII. AUDIO WALKS AND LISTENING

This final category refers to a sound piece that must be experienced by walking. An early example of this type of movement while listening can be found in the works of Max Neuhaus. His piece *LISTEN* (1966) explores the concept of audience movement within an art piece. Neuhaus decided that, instead of bringing sounds *into* the hall, why not simply take the audience *outside* [50]. *LISTEN* is conceptually similar to *soundwalking* by Westerkamp and Shafer, but they were more concerned with the 'eco-political implications' of noise abatement [51]. Westerkamp and Shafer's intention were to reveal a deeper level of understanding associated with environmental sounds by invoking the listener's semantic associations while walking through a specific location. While Neuhaus claimed that that our sense of 'location' is dependent on what we hear as well as what we see, he used a given social and aural setting as the basis for constructing a new experience of place through sound. With the creation of these non-visual works for American and European museums, he was the first to introduce sound as a fundamental medium into contemporary art. Neuhaus is an essential figure within the history of sound art, in that his work was an attempt to open up new relationships concerning the act of listening. He is also considered one of the first artists to extend the concept of sound as a medium within a site-specific place. Neuhaus declares "I am building with sound to bring a place into being" [52, p. 97]. Christoph Cox contends, "Neuhaus removed sound from time and instead set it in place" [53, p. 113]. Another noted Neuhaus work exploring a sense of place is *Drive in Music* [54], which utilized multiple radio transmitters along a section of road. Again, this work demonstrates a unique and singular artist working with sound. This aspect of representation of sound contrasts starkly with the stationary audience of a music concert and is one of the defining features within all the presented pieces. Historically, music has ascribed to a notion, or mode, of passive listening that was exemplified within the concert hall and music venue: a seated audience in front of the stage, at least in Western culture. A more recent development of this form of hybrid and interdisciplinary art is that of the *audiowalk*. The audiowalk in comparison to the soundwalk must be experienced through headphones as it usually contains both a narrated audio track and a recorded soundscape [55]. Importantly both these forms of perambulatory art explore sonic explorations that borrow from the concept of the *Dérive*. Guy Debord proposed that "Dérives involve playful constructive behavior and awareness of psychogeographical effects" [56, p. 177]. Psychogeography is a means of exploring the behavioral and emotional impact of an urban place [57, p. 9]. The audio content presented through headphones during an audiowalk is deliberately crafted to evolve in form and texture, offering participants a range of auditory perspectives. Significantly, the audio is designed not only to capture the participant's attention but also to seamlessly blend with the real-time sounds of the surrounding environment. Sarah Pink [58] argues that walking is crucial for our ethnographic and sensory perception of the environment. Sonic mediation during walking accentuates embodiment and draws attention to the internal self through the spatial and sensory aspects of a place, fostering a deeper connection with the environment. The use of sound in this way acts as a

threshold where vibrational intensities become transcorporeal, intertwining the walker and the environment in real-time sound fields. This convergence of sound, vision, and the participant's movement generates an unpredictable yet captivating mediated narrative. Lucy Lippard [59] emphasizes this point further, noting that there is an emotional intervention when engaging with a soundscape as an 'improvisational' act, and she goes on further to suggest that "space combined with memory defines place" [59, p. 9]. Similarly, Miwon Kwon [60] expresses the opinion that spatiality is based around 'memory and knowledge' and the conceptual idea of a 'lived space'. The experience of perambulatory listening can be understood as an embodied one, as it emphasizes sensory immediacy and spatial awareness. Physical participation is essential, as the audience is encouraged to walk into and around the installation works. These works are characterized by deterministic procedures that are interconnected through processual and kinaesthetic reactive movement. Audiowalks create immersive environments that compel the spectator to move and engage with the work from different directions and spatial locations. The temporal aspect of the work is significant, exhibiting both brief and prolonged characteristics. They may exist only for the duration of an exhibition, being destroyed afterward. However, they require participants to engage with the work for an extended period, in contrast to the fleeting engagement often associated with traditional plastic arts in gallery settings.

VIII. CONCLUSION

This article presents a historical and contemporary framework for discussing the terminology used in the fields of sound art, installation, and hybrid art. Each section delves into a central theme or concept crucial for understanding the overlap between these categories. The analysis aims to establish connections among the various theories. The article contributes to the media arts by providing insights into an interdisciplinary approach to incorporating sound in these fields. Throughout the discussion, the importance of "listening" in relation to place is emphasized, highlighting the significance of the spatial context in which artworks exist and the alternative perspectives it offers in the experience of such works. Listening connects us to the external world, enveloping us in sound vibrations that have physical and sensual effects. Sound can focus our awareness and heighten sensitivity to the environment. Sonically articulated spaces can expand our experiential possibilities independently of sight, offering ever-changing affordances. Sound serves as a physical, conceptual, and metaphorical medium, activating and transforming space. Importantly, participants become co-creators of these works, bringing their own physical, psychological, and cultural narratives to the embodied experience, distinguishing it from passive listening or viewing in traditional theater or concert hall environments. Ultimately, the article underscores the significance of the connection between artist, artwork, and place, and how this relationship fosters a reflexive sense of experience, particularly in relation to sound and listening. By converging these aspects of theory and practice, practitioners can contextualize and define their work within broader artistic cultures.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Licht, *Sound Art: Beyond Music, Between Categories*. New York: Rizzoli, 2007.
- [2] L. Landy, 'But Is It (Also) music?', in *The Routledge Companion to Sounding Art*, M. Cobussen, V. Meelberg, and B. Truax, Eds., New York: Routledge, 2016.
- [3] S. Kim-Cohen, 'Sculpture In The Reduced Field', 2008, [Online]. Available: <http://www.kim-cohen.com>
- [4] C. Cox and D. Warner, Eds., 'Introduction to the Revised Edition Music and the New Audio Culture', in *Audio Culture Readings in Modern Music*, New York: Continuum, 2004, pp. 1–17.
- [5] D. Toop, *Sonic Boom: The Art of Sound*. London: South Bank Centre, 2000.
- [6] N. Brown, 'Sonic Boom', *Frieze*, no. 54, 2000. [Online]. Available: <https://frieze.com/article/sonic-boom-0>
- [7] D. Toop, 'Sonic Boom: The Art of Sound', Google Arts & Culture. Accessed: Jun. 25, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://artsandculture.google.com/story/sonic-boom-the-art-of-sound/zQURWHc6BYCUJQ>
- [8] A. Licht, 'Sound Art: Origins, development and ambiguities', *Organised Sound*, vol. 14, no. 01, 2009.
- [9] H. Breder, 'Intermedia: Enacting the Liminal', *Performing Arts Journal*, vol. 17, no. 2/3, pp. 112–120, 1995.
- [10] L. Maes, 'Sounding sound art : a study of its definition, origin, context and techniques of sound art', Doctoral, Ghent University, 2013. [Online]. Available: <http://hdl.handle.net/1854/LU-4183502>
- [11] K. Lacy, 'The Routledge Companion to Sounding Art', in *The Routledge Companion to Sounding Art*, M. Cobussen, V. Meelberg, and B. Truax, Eds., Routledge, 2016.
- [12] D. Ihde, *Listening and Voice: Phenomenologies of Sound*. New York: State University of New York Press, 1976.
- [13] S. Cluett, 'Ephemeral, Immersive Invasive Sound as Curatorial Theme 1966 -2013', in *The Multisensory Museum: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Touch, Sound, Smell, Memory, and Space*, N. Levent, Ed., Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2014.
- [14] C. Marclay, 'White Cube - Artists - Christian Marclay'. [Online]. Available: https://whitecube.com/artists/artist/christian_marclay
- [15] C. O'Callaghan, *Beyond Vision: Philosophical Essays*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- [16] P. Szendy, *Listen A History of our Ears*. America: Fordham University Press, 2008.
- [17] D. Toop, *Sinister Resonance*. New York: Continuum, 2011.
- [18] M. Duchamp, *Object with Hidden Noise*. 1916. [Installation Art]. Available: <https://www.philamuseum.org/collections/permanent/51541.html>
- [19] M. Duchamp, *The Writings of Marcel Duchamp*. Da Capo Press, 1989.
- [20] S. Kim-Cohen, *In the Blink of an Ear: Toward a Non-Cochlear Sonic Art*. New York: Continuum, 2009.
- [21] J. Kosuth, *Art After Philosophy and After: Collected Writings, 1966-1990*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1993.
- [22] R. Morris, *Box with the Sound of Its Own Making*. 1961. [Sound Art]. Available: <https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/689665>
- [23] J. Pritchett, *The Music of John Cage*. Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- [24] L. Chessa, *Luigi Russolo, Futurist: Noise, Visual Arts, and the Occult*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012.
- [25] B. Kane, 'L'Objet Sonore Maintenant: Pierre Schaeffer, sound objects and the phenomenological reduction', *Organised Sound*, vol. 12, no. 01, p. 15, 2007.
- [26] B. Kane, *Sound Unseen: Acousmatic Sound in Theory and Practice*. Oxford University Press, 2014.
- [27] R. M. Schafer, *The Tuning of the World*. New York: Random House Inc, 1977.
- [28] P. Oliveros, *Deep Listening: A Composer's Sound Practice*. New York, NY: iUniverse, 2005.
- [29] R. Kostelanetz, *John Cage*. New York: Rk Editions, 1978.
- [30] K. Gann, *Kyle Gann: No Such Thing as Silence: John Cage's 4'33"*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010.
- [31] D. Kahn, 'John Cage: Silence and Silencing', *The Musical Quarterly*, vol. 81, no. 4, pp. 556–598, 1997.
- [32] D. Higgins, 'Intermedia', *Something-Else-Press Newsletter*, 1966, [Online]. Available: <http://www.primaryinformation.org/oldsite/SEP/Something-Else->

- [33] M. Arvidson, 'Music and Musicology in the Light of Intermediality and Intermedial Studies', *STM Online*, vol. 15, no. 1, 2012.
- [34] K. B. Jensen, 'Intermediality', in *The International Encyclopedia of Communication Theory and Philosophy*, American Cancer Society, 2016.
- [35] W. Wolf, *The Musicalization of Fiction: A Study in the Theory and History of Intermediality*. Amsterdam, Rodopi, 1999.
- [36] W. Wolf, 'Intermediality Revisited: Reflections on Word and Music Relations in the Context of a General Typology of Intermediality', in *Word and Music Studies*, Brill, 2002, pp. 13–34.
- [37] I. O. Rajewsky, 'Intermediality, Intertextuality, and Remediation: A Literary Perspective on Intermediality', *Intermedialités: Histoire et théorie des arts, des lettres et des techniques*, no. 6, p. 43, 2005.
- [38] V. Vesna, 'What is Hybrid Art? - Ars Electronica Blog'. [Online]. Available: <https://ars.electronica.art/aeblog/en/2015/03/24/was-ist-hybrid-art/>
- [39] Linz GmbH & Co. KG, 'Ars Electronica'. [Online]. Available: <https://ars.electronica.art/about/>
- [40] J. Levinson, 'Hybrid Art Forms', *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 5–13, 1984.
- [41] J. Levinson, *Music, Art, and Metaphysics*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- [42] M. Eastley, *Iveagh Gardens Installation – Max Eastley*. 1997. [Installation Art]. Available: <https://www.maxeastley.co.uk/1997/08/01/iveagh-gardens-installation/>
- [43] C. Bishop, *Installation Art*. London: Routledge, 2005.
- [44] N. A. Kelly, 'What is Installation Art?', 2010. Accessed: May 10, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://arrow.dit.ie/aaschadpcat/6/>
- [45] J. Ranciere, *The Emancipated Spectator*, Reprint edition. London: Verso, 2011.
- [46] A. Alston, *Beyond Immersive Theatre: Aesthetics, Politics and Productive Participation*, 1st ed. 2016 edition. Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.
- [47] M. Rosenthal, *Understanding Installation Art: From Duchamp to Holzer*. Munich, Germany: Prestel Publishing, 2003.
- [48] M. Fried, *Art and Objecthood*. Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press, 1967.
- [49] A. Nollert, *Performative Installation*. Cologne: Snoeck, 2004.
- [50] D. Lander and M. Lexier, Eds., *Sound By Artists*, Facsimile edition. Charivari Press & Blackwood Gallery, 2013.
- [51] M. Murph, 'Max Neuhaus, R. Murray Schafer, and the Challenges of Noise', Doctoral, University of Kentucky, Kentucky, 2018. [Online]. Available: https://uknowledge.uky.edu/music_etds/118
- [52] M. Neuhaus and G. Des Jardin, *Max neuhaus Inscription Sound Works Volume 1*. Stuttgart: Cantz Verlag, 1994.
- [53] C. Cox, *Max Neuhaus*. New York: Yale University Press, 2010.
- [54] Max Neuhaus, *Drive In Music*. 1967. [Installation]. Available: <https://cestunesortedepanel.wordpress.com/2013/09/21/max-neuhaus-drive-in-music-1967/>
- [55] A. Altavilla and A. Tanaka, 'The Quiet Walk: Sonic Memories and Mobile Cartography', in *Sound and Music Computing Conference*, Copenhagen, Denmark: Sound and Music Computing Conference, 2012.
- [56] G. Debord, *The Situationists and the City: A Reader*. London; New York, 2009.
- [57] M. Coverley, *Psychogeography*. London: Oldcastle Books, 2018.
- [58] S. Pink, *Doing Sensory Ethnography*. London: SAGE, 2009.
- [59] L. R. Lippard, *The Lure of the Local: Senses of Place in a Multicentered Society*, New Ed edition. New York: The New Press, 1997.
- [60] M. Kwon, *One Place after Another: Site-Specific Art and Locational Identity*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2004.