The Co-Creation Space: Supporting Asynchronous Artistic Co-creation Dynamics
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ABSTRACT
Artistic co-creation empowers communities to shape their narratives, however HCI research does not support this multifaceted discussion and reflection process. In the context of community opera, we consider how to support co-creation through the design, implementation, and initial evaluation of the Co-Creation Space (CCS) to help community artists 1) generate raw artistic ideas, and 2) discuss and reflect on the shared meaning of those ideas. This work describes our user-centered process to gather requirements and design the tool, and validates its’ usability with 6 community opera participants. Our findings support the value of our tool for group discussion and personal reflection during the creative process.

CCS CONCEPTS
- Human-centered computing  →  Computer supported cooperative work; Collaborative content creation; Collaborative and social computing systems and tools.
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1 INTRODUCTION
As media creation becomes globally pervasive, artistic co-creation [11, 28] has the capacity to empower communities to shape and share their own narratives [3], thereby fading the distinction between high and low culture [11, 28, 33]. Technology has the potential to support artistic co-creation, however current tools do not adequately support the development of multifaceted artistic, social, and education goals [8, 11] that evolve over time through discussion between professional facilitators and community members. In HCI, participatory design (PD) considers co-creation in favour of concrete goals (e.g. education [6] and tool design [6, 18]), but does not support the dynamics of parallel creative processes, and the evolution of intangible goals [20]. Likewise, media co-creation [2, 26] aims to support artistic co-creation processes by including community members in artistic creation, but does not support iterative community involvement which is vital to artistic co-creation [11]. We design, implement, and test the Co-Creation Space (CCS), to support creative discussion about media in a non-judgemental "safe space" [15]. This tool allows co-creators to 1) put raw ideas into an easily communicable digital formation, and 2) engage in discussion and reflection dynamics.

We situate our work in community opera, working with 3 projects in Ireland, Portugal, and Spain. We employ an user-centered approach to gather requirements and validate the usability and value of our tool through these projects. Based in Dublin, the Irish project (IP) develops a digital opera with remote Irish communities. The second, a Portuguese project (PP) in Leiria, engages prisoners in opera co-creation to lower criminal recidivism. The Spanish project (SP) helps migrant workers in Barcelona learn creative skills through collaboration with professionals at the Liceu opera house. Our contribution lies in understanding and supporting discussion around the artistic co-creation process.

2 RELATED WORK
PD practices employ co-creation methods in explicit goals, such as tool creation [16, 34], public deliberation [9], and community management [7]. Such processes engage users at clearly demarcated moments of the co-creation process in explicit roles [16, 23], such as workshop and prototyping phases [9, 23]. In parallel, PD practices in media use workshops, interviews, and high-fidelity prototypes to engage community participants at different steps of the co-creation process [13, 14, 30, 35]. This demonstrates the gap in supporting cooperative work that 1) engages community participants as equals to professionals, and 2) supports the complexity of artistic goals and processes that develop over time. Rossitto [22] characterizes participants, art, and context as interdependent with co-creation technologies, and Varghese [30] questions participatory processes that do not involve community members throughout the creative process. Relatedly, Holmer [14] describes power differences between designers and participants in PD [8], and Clarke [8] recognizes that insight and change comes from working with contradictions in complex community relationships.

3 GATHERING REQUIREMENTS
We gathered tool requirements with 12 leaders from the project over 3 focus groups. Each session lasted 2.5 hours, and took place over Zoom during May of 2020. Leaders had on average 9.4 years of experience in opera production, and included 4 executive and artistic directors, 2 studio/outreach producers, a digital communications manager, 2 project managers, 2 social program coordinators, and a staging assistant. In preparation, participants filled out a booklet probe, a method of context mapping [29, 31] to elicit feedback about how the projects might use technology for co-creation.

Two moderators led each focus group; one facilitated, while a second took notes. After consent and introductions, participants described their roles and experiences in opera production, and discussed their interpretations of a standard opera timeline. Participants then envisioned how technology could support their co-creation goals, and a moderator summarized related concepts. Finally, participants responded to a high-level artist illustration of tool interaction, discussing how it compared to their co-creation needs. A moderator then summarized participant ideas and tool requirements, and a week after, project leaders were sent the summary to reflect and provide clarifying comments or questions. The focus groups were analysed using thematic analysis, employing a modified version of the six-phase framework developed by Braun and Clarke [4, 5, 19]. Transcribed and cleaned audio-recordings of the sessions were independently open-coded by the moderators for key words and emergent trends, grouped, labeled, and given a description. Through iterative discussion, open codes were grouped to generate high-level themes and sub-themes.

3.1 User Experience Themes and Design Requirements
Theme 1: Support Divergent Elements of Co-creation: Leaders wanted to archive workshop materials, share different phases of co-creation, and needed a space to support education goals and cross-fertilization activities, such as recorded stories by prisoners about their lives. Supporting uncertain timelines was likewise important. Opera usually plans productions years in advance, whereas these projects had to "be prepared to adapt and change" (SP).

Theme 2: Building Relationships: Helping participants connect remotely was important for building trust and community relationships. In the prison context, we found that dignified communication created lasting impact;"we have to know the names of the mothers, of the girlfriends" for inmates to"be immersed and cooperative" (PP).
Theme 3: Technology Flexibility: Community participants had limited technology access, and relied on mobile experiences rather than expensive computers. In complement to this, participants required an interface with minimal learning, and access to content in a variety of languages, as well as the ability to subtitle and translate text.

Theme 4: High-Quality Audio: Leaders wanted to maximize audio quality to feel the physical sensation of the singers; "opera...lives from the quality of the timber...and most...tools compress...the harmonics" (PP). Comparing to existing platforms, the CCS felt like a "mixture of Google Drive and a chat," (P6) but was simpler (P5), and positioned "text and multimedia...at the same level" (P6). Users also felt the tool’s emoji and comment reaction features were more intuitive than "platforms like Slack, Twitter, and Reddit" (P4), and enjoyed reacting to videos with emojis as a helpful way to highlight a reaction to something specific (P3, P4).

5 VALIDATION OF INTERFACE USABILITY
We evaluated the the tool with 6 participants from the Spanish project in December 2020, including 4 students from Escola Masana, and 2 SINEA creatives. The study was conducted in Spanish, and took between 1 and 2 hours to complete. To evaluate both mobile and laptop usability, the first 3 tasks were conducted on a phone, and the last two tasks were conducted on a laptop. After consent, participants were introduced to the tool through a scenario where they were told to imagine they were working with a team member on a poster for the opera. Using a “think aloud” protocol [10], users tested the interface of the tool through 5 tasks, including creating an account, interacting with the media timeline, and commenting on a video with emojis and text. All participants completed the tasks, and at the end of the study, answered open-ended questions that compared the tool to other social media platforms, envisioned its usefulness for co-creation processes, and considered what media editing features they would want to include.

Overall, participants described the CCS as “well thought-out tool” (P6); “fast, easy to use” (P5) and “simple...[because] it [focuses] on the co-creation process” (P6). As well as helping to “share ideas, or to stay up-to-date with other people’s work,” they saw it as an archival “black box...when people do not agree on something, they can just go back to the post and see what they decided back in the day” (P1). Compared to existing platforms, the CCS felt like a “mixture of Google Drive and a chat,” (P6) but was simpler (P5), and positioned “text and multimedia...at the same level” (P6). Users also felt the tool’s emoji and comment reaction features were more intuitive than “platforms like Slack, Twitter, and Reddit” (P4), and enjoyed reacting to videos with emojis as a helpful way to highlight a reaction to something specific (P3, P4).

Interface suggestions included different ways of searching for content, accounting for privacy concerns, and visual design changes. These included having a greater awareness of others users of the tool; “Who has access to the platform?” P6 asked. “All the users or just the people from MY group?” Participants also wanted more direct communication capabilities, such as a private chat feature and video calls (P43), and gave feedback to improve the interface through a different color palette (P1), larger images with less text (P4), and different labels for tagging features (P3, P4, P6).

6 DISCUSSION
We support artistic co-creation through the design, implementation, and evaluation of the Co-creation Space (CCS) to help community artists generate raw artistic ideas, and discuss and reflect on the shared meaning of those ideas in a multi-lingual "safe space." By developing relationships with 3 opera projects, we discovered the complexity of rethinking a traditional art form in context of new technology [27], while working with communities speaking different languages with varying technology needs. Our experience reflects the literature on artistic co-creation; is precisely through (not despite!) this complexity that leads to democratic participation described by Matarasso and others [3, 8, 11]. We gathered requirements with 12 leaders from 3 community opera projects, designed the tool through a user-centered approach, then evaluated the interface with 6 community participants. Our work is primarily limited by its context in opera, and by the size and context of the...
pilot evaluation, which did not evaluate the complex relationships and power dynamics inherent to artistic co-creation [8, 14]. Future work will validate our findings through open pilots in different performing art contexts and community production processes, as described by Green and others [2, 12, 13].

Social and Temporal Affordances: Participants were motivated by the social affordances of the tool, connection to another during co-creation, and asynchronous feedback on their work. During the design process, we recognised that the tool may be used for mentorship (e.g. a costume expert explaining a sewing technique) as well as for collaborative co-creation processes (e.g. inmates posting audios can be integrated into a composition). By systematically documenting and archiving ideas, discussions, and choices, participants were able to see “the different steps of the creative process” (P1) and follow “the evolution of the work” (P4), allowing them to recall when and why they made creative choices. As well as validating the participant process, this archival process may also allow for the assembly of new experiences [30].

Supporting Reflection and Discussion: As the CCS focused on simplicity, a challenge was determining what features were central to reflection and discussion dynamics. When discussing media editing, some participants wanted image and processing features such as trimming photos, cutting video length, and adding titles to a video. Others opposed processing features “as there are already other platforms and tools dedicated to editing images” (P4). Similarly, some participants wanted scheduling and digest features, but existing platforms and tools dedicated to editing images "(P4), allowing them to recall the evolution of the work" (P4), allowing them to recall the evolution of the work.

Table 1: Requirements Gathered for the Co-Creation Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Type</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interface</td>
<td>Simple/intuitive interface; onboarding; Standardized tags; Feedback (commenting and tagging); Password protected user profiles; Edit profile settings after onboarding; Content moderation; Privacy settings; Mobile/Desktop Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Playback support for HD audio and video; Adaptable video quality for device/bandwidth context; Image previews; Transcode video files into CCS video format; Upload and store standard image and video files and 360° videos; 360° video player; Store, upload, and visualize 3D models; Timestamped media reactions; Screencast support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>Caption overlays for videos; Subtitles/descriptions (edit offline, download, upload); W3C Compliance; Multi language translation; Offline interface that syncs with online database; Admin permissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Public-facing co-creation summary timeline; Post notifications; Post thread timeline; Daily digest; Calendar schedule.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 CONCLUSION

We created the CCS to support collaboration during artistic co-creation. We gathered requirements for, designed, and implemented the tool using an user-centered process, and validated the tool with 6 community opera participants, finding that they valued the tool as a safe space to share raw ideas, discuss and receive feedback, and reflect on their work. In contrast to explicitly defined PD practices, the CCS supports the complexity of community co-creation processes, giving community participants equal status to professionals, and supporting dynamically evolving co-creation goals.
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