

Figure 7. P3's Score.

Figure 8. P4's Score.

cessive reconfigurations of the architecture, moving the spheres along the paths of the wooden rails placed on top of the attractors. Finally, P5 developed a narrative around a magnetic persona, with a larger magnetic sphere as the body and head, and arms and legs made of smaller magnets. P5 built a series of structures with straws, clay and rubber bands around three of the attractors, and titled the score *A Day in the Park*. By wandering through the score, climbing and sliding on top of straws and sticks of different heights, the character modulated Stacco's magnetic fields. As P5 noted, the work was "more as a sculpture than a practical thing." In P5's open-world score, all interactions, and in particular those elicited by gravity, are redefined as magnetism. Coherently, the sole model chosen for the performance was the magnets one.

4.3 Performances

Once the scores were completed, the participants presented them and played for the group. In this section, we will observe how the scores redefined the gestural and sonic interactions with Stacco by comparing the initial open explorations with the final performance, and including insights from the conversation that followed. This section includes observations from P1 to P4, P5 chose to explore the score alone and during the group's break. For this reason, we chose to not record this performance.

Figure 9. P5's Score.

In his exploration of Stacco, P1 started with groups of two to three spheres on each attractor, using the choir model and focusing primarily on the interactions between the spheres rather than on their correlation with the sound. After a few minutes, P1 reduced the number of spheres to two, placed each one on a different attractor and began to systematically explore the sound by lingering on the gestures that had a bigger effect. Towards the end, P1 was holding the larger spheres a few centimetres above the board and rapidly switching from one attractor to the other. As P1 noted in the survey, performing was "very interesting but sometimes random." At the same time, the interface was "gesturally sensitive." During the final discussion, P1 also noted how playing Stacco is "like fighting with the instruments." This agency, he continued, is something that every instrument has, but with Stacco "you feel the physicality of the instrument, which in electronic music you often lose." Coherently with these insights, P1 used randomness as the defining feature of the piece, letting Stacco's magnetic fields autonomously reconfigure the score.

P1's performance with Stacco was a purposeful exploration of the instrument's agency. The entanglement of the latent dimensions in RAVE was mirrored through the unpredictable entanglements of the magnets, with the score conceptually and physically mediating the dialogue between the performer and the interface. The movements during the performance were not aimed at controlling specific sound features, since, as noted during the final discussion, P1 intuitively realised their entanglement. The performative gestures were aimed instead at breaking the system's homeostasis and letting the magnetic interactions affect the sounds.

P2's test with Stacco began where P1's exploration had finished: by moving magnets from one attractor to the other and looking for emerging patterns. Once P2 found a drastic change in amplitude, he would stop and start moving one magnet around the board, looking for a gesture that could control the overall amplitude. He found a few, and one in particular producing silence, thus realising that at least one of the data points was affecting, among other parameters, the overall amplitude. P2 tried out Stacco a second time, experimenting with the cardboard before composing his piece. Through this intermediate phase he discovered a new gesture: by turning as a knob a spherical

