Marija GRINIUK
The University of Lapland, Finland

PERFORMANCE ART USING BIOMETRIC DATA

101

• PERFORMANCE ART USING BIOMETRIC DATA

Summary. This research analyzes performance art that uses biometric data, based on two concept perspectives – inhuman interconnections and transcorporeality – applied to examples of European performance art from Lithuania, Finland, Poland, and Denmark. The term performance art theoretically refers to all art that involves the human body, human biometric data, inhuman interconnections, transcorporeality, and liminal space. This study examines the differences between wide-scope interactive art and design and performance art involving biometric data created through the application of recent developments in consumer technology for live events. This research examined three case projects through the method of autoethnography. The data presented in the article was either collected during the author's performance art events or at performances the author was attending as a visitor. The cases are analyzed by means of qualitative data analysis, utilizing terms representing human biometric data and interactivity adopted from research within the fields of interactive art and interactive design. The study examines the combination of biometric data and art to explain the phenomenon of humans meeting technology, revealed through data collected from a body and transmitted to an audience during a performance art event. The conclusion revisits the key terms – performance art, biometric data, inhuman interconnections and transcorporeality – as applied to artistic practices, where performance art and biometric data meet.

Keywords: performance art, biometric data, inhuman interconnections, transcorporeality.

INTRODUCTION

This article builds upon three cases of contemporary European performance art with biometric data, analyzed using terminology from peer-reviewed literature on the theme of interactive art and design, and performance with biometric data. The cases were selected using an autoethnographic approach, in which the author collected data for analysis during 2015–20 from performance events, which were either self-realized or were attended as a visitor. These performance art cases are: *The Tests: Techno-Voyeurism into a Performing Body* (2019–present), realized in Finland, and *Mark Making* (2015–2019), realized in Denmark and Lithuania, by the author Marija Griniuk; and *The Neurophysiology of an Artist in a Performance Experiment_e1/2015–2017* (FUNom 2020), realized in Poland by Viola Kus. This article is written from the perspective of a performance artist, who in her artistic work combines performance with biometric data from the

performing body. The aim of this research is to investigate how this performance art with biometric data cases can be analyzed utilizing key terms, adapted from the interactive art and design literature. The research is related to Griniuk's ongoing doctoral studies, in which she focuses on developing a new methodology to document performance art through biometric data, targeted as process innovation¹ within documentation practices by performance artists.

Utilizing an autoethnography methodology,² the author analyzes photo and video material of past self-realized performances (in the first and the second cases) or visited performances (in the third case), along with the author's notes and interviews with the audience members. In the first and second cases, the source materials are recorded data from the live brain activity of the performer. The data was organized according to the place and date of the performance, and further classified as self-realized or as visited performances. The data was analyzed using

qualitative data analysis³ and thematic literature sources were examined to determine and describe the terms utilized for analyzing performance cases.

This article comprises three parts. In the first, entitled *Cases*, the author presents three cases of European performance art with biometric data. In the second, *Terms*, the author provides the key terms from the thematic literature review sources, which are utilized in the third part, *Discussion*, in which the author analyzes and discusses the presented cases.

CASES

This article examines three cases of performance art events. The first and second are projects realized by Marija Griniuk in Finland – *The Tests: Techno-Voyeurism into a Performing Body* (2019–present), along with an earlier independent artistic research project realized in Lithuania and Denmark (2015–2019) called *Mark Making*.⁴ *Mark Making* (figures 1 and 2) was a performance during which the live brain activity of the performer was visualized for the viewers through software, developed in collaboration with computer scientist Tue Brisson Mosich; the data was projected as the performance background.⁵ The running graph visualized the states of attention and meditation of the performer. Later, this artistic research project developed into *The Tests: Techno-Voyeurism into a Performing Body*, for which the performance art events and conference presentations by the author were documented using EEG (electroencephalography) data, which is used for monitoring brain activity.⁶

Fig. 1. Marija Griniuk, “Mark Making”, 2018, ArtVilnius Art Fair, Lithuania. Photo: Airida Rekštytė, Gallery Meno Parkas

The Neurophysiology of an Artist in a Performance_ Experiment_e1/2015-2017, the third case within this study, was attended by the author as an audience member in 2018. The data for this study includes the field notes and online project description materials. In this project, the performance artists were sometimes taken into a laboratory environment, where they performed without the viewers present – the viewers could only see the data from their biometric measurements. Other performances were conducted in a gallery environment. The project was initiated by the artist Viola Kus, acting as the experiment and research coordinator.⁷ The project was presented as a “Case study – a natural experiment ... (involving) performers, recipients, researchers (measuring cognitive states and recording sounds), researchers/observers (interviews with artists and audience) and documenting the experiment (videos, photos)”.⁸ The author visited the performance event entitled *Session 2_e1/reperformance Ola Sojak-Borodo*⁹ in 2018, where the event took place in two spaces. In the first space, the performer was interacting with the text on a phone screen, while in a magnetic resonance angiogram (MRA) test laboratory environment. In

Fig. 2. Marija Griniuk, “Mark Making”, 2015, PerformanceRum, Aarhus, Denmark. Photo: Still from the video documentation

the second space, the audience was seated and could observe the ongoing changing data on the computer screen. Unfortunately, the author had limited access to real-time information during this performance, as the presentation was in Polish, which the author does not speak fluently. Most of the publicly available written materials about this project are also in Polish. Therefore, the author communicated briefly with the artist to clarify the project's process. In the performance art event as experienced by the author, inhuman interconnections were generated by the human body of the performance artist, connected to medical equipment in a laboratory (*Session 2_e1/reperformance Ola Sojak-Borodo*).

The terminology has been studied in the thematic literature under the following keywords: “biometric data,” “interactive art,” “interactive design,” and “performance.” This terminology was applied to understand the case examples of performance art.

BIO MATERIALITY, INHUMAN INTERCONNECTIONS, AND TRANSCORPOREALITY

The interaction between a performer, performance props, and space, together with audience engagement via recent technological developments, can be measured using the *biometric data* of the performer and/or the audience members;¹⁰ however,

appropriate and stable terminology for this phenomenon lacks in academic discourse. Biometric data can be retrieved from a performing artist who is interacting with his or her surroundings and the audience,¹¹ or from audience members who are involved in participation.¹²

In this section, specific terms, including *bio materiality*, *bio art*, and *non-human*, will be defined. In an artistic context, bio materiality¹³ involves the fusing of material from living organisms with artwork, reflecting a collaboration between artists and scientists. Bio art refers to art media involving bio materiality¹⁴ and is based on data from living tissues, bacterial media, genetic sciences, and biological processes, retrieved from humans, animals, or plants. According to the manifesto *What Bio Art Is*, which specifies the criteria for bio art, interactive art, design, and performance art that use biometric data can be categorized as bio art.¹⁵

Non-human, as explained by the scholar Jeffrey Jerome Cohen,¹⁶ refers to inanimate objects from the natural world that surround humans and animals (e.g., stones). The term non-human is more narrow than inhuman. Inhuman conceptualizes the interconnectedness between human and inanimate objects and technology. Inhuman is a term used to erase hierarchies or differences between the human and non-human.¹⁷ In this paper, the term inhuman,

Fig. 3. Interactive art and design and performance art with biometric data. Created by Marija Griniuk

in relation to performance using biometric data, is used to describe a performing human body and the technology attached to it, along with the objects used in the performance, as one entity, one body. This entity exists within the liminal space of a performance, which determines the data collected during it. If, for example, during a performance, the headgear for an EEG is mounted in such a way that it causes pain to the performer, this can influence the data retrieved. The term *inhuman*, extended by the author to include inhuman interconnections, is derived from Cohen's work, which defines a human as a biological human being.¹⁸ Sociomateriality triggers interaction, which depends on human and non-human interconnections. The term *inhuman* has been applied to the process of erasing the boundaries between human and non-human objects, exemplified by a stone in Cohen's work.¹⁹ *Inhuman* is a way of conceptualizing human and non-human interconnections through frictions and viscous porosity.²⁰

Transcorporeality, as explained by Alaimo,²¹ is the connection of human beings to the natural world, which contains plants, stones, earth, and other surrounding objects. Within this study, *transcorporeality* is expanded into the sphere of performance art, and refers to the inseparability of a performer from the objects and space involved in the performance and from the audience and sociopolitics of the site. *Transcorporeality* is similar to the term *inhuman interconnectedness*, since it involves material interchanges between bodies and objects in a space, but it goes beyond this definition to include interchanges between humans and non-humans, along with sociopolitical contexts and power networks, as explained by Alaimo.²² *Transcorporeality*, according to another definition, is a meeting and interchange point between humans and non-humans.²³ *Transcorporeality*²⁴ can also be written as *trans-corporeality*.²⁵ Within this paper, *transcorporeality* expands on the concept behind *inhuman interconnections* by emphasizing not only connections between humans and technology, but also the social, cultural, and/or political context of a performance using biometric data, which is achieved in the moment of perception of the performance by a

spectator. The *transcorporeal* performing body is seen herein as a body meeting an audience at the site of a performance and being influenced by a socio-materiality of action, which is recorded as biometric data. The term *transcorporeality* can just as well be applied to performance art, in the manner of a camera or with the participation of an audience. The performance artist and scholar Annette Arlander defined *transcorporeality*,²⁶ based on Alaimo's definition,²⁷ as interconnections and interchanges involving the body and (nonhuman) nature. She explained the term *transcorporeality* in relation to her performance works in natural surroundings. The social science scholars Julie Livingston and Jasbir K. Puar define humans/animals/plants as biosocial species and examine the political effects that shape interspecies relations.²⁸ This explanation of *transcorporeality* seems to be built upon descriptions in the book *When Species Meet* by Donna Haraway, which included her "Cyborg Manifesto".²⁹

A cyborg is a cybernetic organism, a hybrid of machine and organism, a creature of social reality as well as a creature of fiction. Social reality is lived social relations, our most important political construction, a world-changing fiction... This experience is a fiction and fact of the most crucial, political kind.³⁰

Haraway's approach to *transcorporeality* drew on feminist posthumanism, positing a concept of the human as a single entity free of dualisms, hierarchies, and exceptionalism.³¹ This posthuman entity, underpinned by *transcorporeality*, embodies multi-layered horizontal crossings and transformations.³² Livingstone and Puar used the term "interspecies"³³ – defined similarly to *transcorporeality*.

The choice to examine performance art that uses biometric data through *inhuman interconnections* and *transcorporeality* was based on a type of performance art that involves the human body moving in a space of interactions with the audience and props or objects supporting the interactions, which together influence the inner state of the body in performance situations.³⁴ Performance using biometric data is a very narrow and new field of study, resulting in a lack of appropriate terminology. In addition, very

few current European performers are working with biometric data. This is why the study is undertaken to develop the terminology for performance art with biometric data.

PERFORMANCE ART, LIMINAL SPACE, AND LIMINOID SPACE

Performance as a Term to Describe Phenomena.

There is a difference between the definitions of performance and what can be analyzed as the manifestations of performance. The term performance has been applied to a wide spectrum of human activities and, in recent years, has gained prominence in business, where performance means “doing a job efficiently with maximum productivity. In the corporate world, people, machines, systems, departments, and organizations are required to perform.”³⁵ Performance as art, according to performance studies researcher Richard Schechner, has restored performance as a core behavior, meaning “out there,” “separated from ‘me,’”³⁶ Schechner explained:

Performances can be generalized at the theoretical level of restoration of behavior, but as embodied practices, each and every performance is specific and different from every other. The differences enact the conventions and traditions of a genre, the personal choices made by the performers, directors, and authors, various cultural patterns, historical circumstances, and the particularities of reception.³⁷

This definition highlights the importance of context in defining what performance is and expands on his previous work,³⁸ in which performance is explained as a very wide spectrum of activities, consisting of the space, the body, and interactions with the audience. Many classical theater professionals are critical of Schechner, claiming that his approach to performance is too broad.³⁹ The researcher Jon McKenzie explains the intertwining of cultural, organizational, and technological performances and, building upon the ideas of liminality and liminal, introduces the term *liminoid*.⁴⁰

In this paper, performance involves a human body, human biometric data, inhuman interconnections, and transcorporeality, defined according to Schechner’s theory⁴¹ and expanded upon specifically in

relation to performance artworks that involve biometrics. This paper argues that performance using biometric data is inseparable from its site, since biometric data is produced at the site of a performance⁴² and, thus, is either influenced by the site or activates it, as the trigger for the creation of a liminal space. The size of the room, whether the performance is indoors or outdoors, whether the room is dark or light, whether the (performing) body has a tired mind or not, the distances between objects, the number of audience members, their reactions during the performance, and the distance from them all influence the performing body and the biometric data collected from it. When using biometric data, the site⁴³ is always at the core of the performance, since all kinds of materiality influence the body. Performance is used in this paper to describe a performance at a site,⁴⁴ which consists of a ritual, and where a liminal space is created in order for transformation to occur.⁴⁵

Pearson wrote about site-specific performance,⁴⁶ which is too narrow a concept for this paper, but the work introduces the concept of a site as revealing the “placeness” of performance and its impact on the performing body. In other words, in this paper performance is an embodied, time-defined activity on a site by a performance artist, and biometric data for this activity is produced by the body (in the liminal space of the performance), or influences the body while it is in the liminal space. Knowledge is rendered and communicated to the viewer through biometric data that is retrieved from the performing body in the liminal space of the performance. When transformation, as the result of this biometric-data-based performative activity, ends, the artwork ends.

Liminal and Liminoid Spaces. A liminal space is a space with the biometric data of performance art at its core, because biometric data is either produced in the liminal space of the performance or itself creates the liminal space. The definition of the term *liminal space* is based on Schechner’s definition of performative activity,⁴⁷ which fundamentally constitutes a meeting between facilitators and participants as a liminal space. During live activities, *sociomateriality* is central to the liminal space, either between the facilitating performance artists or between the

artists and the participating audience.⁴⁸ In the definition posited by the scholar Claire Bishop, in relation to participatory art projects, a liminal space is the space and time of an action, which directs attention towards one activity – what can be called the liminal space of collective co-creation;⁴⁹ in other words, the sharing of a single goal with others.

The terms liminality and liminal describe the embodied work of a performer in a space on the threshold between multiple culture-based objects, props, and cultural sites.⁵⁰ Explaining technology-based innovation⁵¹ within performance art practices, McKenzie describes techno-performance, using *digital limen* and *liminoid* as terms to refer to the cyberspatiality of a body whose actions are digitally recorded; in other words, living bodies are recorded, archived, and recombined through multimedia communication networks,⁵² and the spatiality of the body becomes the cyberspatiality of the recorded performance. A liminoid space is a transitional space for the performing body and, in this context, is attached to a technological presence in the space and moment; a performing body is influenced by its context-specific environment.

INTERACTIVE ART AND DESIGN

The core differences between interactive art and design and performance art will be discussed in this section. Interactivity is explained by the scholar and artist Joan Soler-Adillon as an artificial situation in which one or more agents carry out a series of actions in order to gain responses to their specific behavior, which is synchronized with their previous actions in a space.⁵³ Interactivity itself might not be seen as performance, but could be said to facilitate performance when it interacts with one or more bodies.

Interactive design, as defined by Graham, is a user-oriented design that involves users in the design process and is accessible to the users through communication of this process.⁵⁴ It is oriented towards cycles of collaboration between a designer and users.⁵⁵ The goal of interactive design is the co-development of a design product.⁵⁶

Han describes interactive art as art that allows interconnections between artworks, artists, and

the audience.⁵⁷ This interconnection can become dynamic and “the feedback between the interactors and the system can create the highest degree of indeterminacy and subjectivity, which leads to a higher level of user engagement.”⁵⁸ Interactive art, as defined by Soler-Adillon, is art that involves one or more agents (viewers) in order to make the artwork complete and meaningful⁵⁹ – for example, when viewers become the artwork or viewers activate the installed artwork through their specific behavior. There is a certain fluidity in definitions of performance art and interactive art, regarding viewers becoming the artwork. This is exemplified by artist Eric Andersen’s *Achilleus* (1988), which activated the viewers in a space by creating casts of their feet, as artefacts, which in a later phase, after the interaction, became an installation. Andersen called the artwork performance, but according to Soler-Adillon, it could just as well have fit the definition of interactive art.⁶⁰

In this paper, what distinguishes the term performance⁶¹ from interactive art⁶² and interactive design⁶³ is that in performance there is no product involved and the performance artwork is complete after the transformation within the live action involving biometric data has happened, as explained by Schechner.⁶⁴

BIOMETRIC DATA

The artist and researcher Yoon Chung Han defines biometric data within art and design projects as an index used to identify and verify individual responses from measured parts of the body:⁶⁵

When matching biometric data with real identities, the relationship between one’s biometric data and identity can be indexical. In linguistics and the philosophy of language, indexicality refers to an indexical behavior or utterance which points to some state of affairs ... “Index” means that the physical vehicle is a trace left by the referent, and the best example of an index is the fingerprint. A fingerprint is an identifier and an index written by genetics and nature that corresponds to each living creature.⁶⁶

The term biometrics, defined in the works of Jain, Hong, and Pankanti⁶⁷ and Jain, Bolle, and Pankanti,⁶⁸

is a method of identifying people and their *behavioral characteristics*. In this paper, the term biometric data specifically means human biometric data, with a performance artist producing the data within a performance. Biometric data can include finger- or palm prints, palm veins, hand geometry, facial or iris recognition data, retinal scans, DNA, and odors, and it has recently expanded to include a person's movements (e.g., handwriting, gait, typing rhythm, and voice).⁶⁹ Biometric data can be static, as exemplified by DNA, skin patterns, irises, fingerprints, body contours, etc., or dynamic, such as facial expressions, body gestures, electroencephalography (EEG), blood pressure, or body temperature.⁷⁰ The gathering of biometric data requires interaction with an interfacing body in some way. The execution of the interaction could be said to be performative; thus, part of the performance is the interaction and another part is the mediated data.

DISCUSSION

The performance cases by Marija Griniuk and Viola Kus are examples of art combined with bio materiality,⁷¹ which involves collaboration between artists and scientists. As described in the manifesto *What Bio Art Is*, bio art projects involve direct biological intervention and political, social, cultural, and ethical implications.⁷² They challenge the boundaries between the human and the nonhuman, the living and the nonliving, the natural and the artificial.⁷³

The inner states of performing bodies are often hidden from the audience. In the described cases, performances using biometric data gave the viewers access to new knowledge of the inner states of a human body immersed in a live performance. *Mark Making* involved visualization of the performer's live brain activity, which made states of extreme concentration or relaxation visible while the performer was immersed in the performance. This new knowledge informed the spectators about the effect of interaction input on the bodily condition of the performer. In *The Tests: Techno-Voyeurism into a Performing Body*, this information was saved and it was possible to recreate it as documentation of the performance. In these two examples, technology connected to

the body in order to visualize or document its inner state resulted in inhuman interconnections; transcorporeality fell within the sociomateriality of a performing body in the site-specific environment of a performative action. The 2015 performance of *Mark Making* took place in the project space PerformanceRum in Aarhus, Denmark and was attended by around twenty-five visitors, the majority of whom were the author's colleagues, which created the very particular sociomateriality and experience of the site of the performance. The 2018 *Mark Making* performance was during the art fair ArtVilnius in Lithuania, where the author was presented as one of the Gallery Meno Parkas artists. Looking at these two particular performances, the transcorporeal body is a vastly different body; in the first case, the artist belongs to the artist-run environment, and in the second case, is officially represented by the gallery at the art fair. The two ways of presenting the artist and the two different performance sites each have an impact on the artist's emotional condition, feelings, and empathic connections during the performances, which is reflected in the biometric data generated during them.⁷⁴

In both *Mark Making* and *The Tests: Techno-Voyeurism into a Performing Body*, Griniuk utilizes technology-based means to read her biometric data in order to empathetically connect with the audience and, through these means, to non-verbally invite the audience members to co-perform in real time; they can influence the unfolding performative action and see these outcomes, as the performing body reacts to the audience's triggers and the triggers of the objects surrounding the performer. These empathic connections, witnessed by the audience in the real time of performance are caused by transcorporeality, as the union of objects, space, audience and performer, and placeness, as the narrative within the site of the performance. The performance is dependent upon real time, as it is through real time that the bodily changes within the performer unfold to the viewers; as such it is intimately tied to inhuman interconnections, as interconnections with the objects and technology, along with transcorporeality as the sociomaterial space and the narrative of the site of the performance.

In the projects by Viola Kus, the inner states of the involved participating artists were visible to the audience in real time; for example, knowledge about the performer's brain activity and pulse was retrieved, rendered, and communicated to the audience in real time during the live art events. In this case, as encountered by the author of this paper, the transcorporeal body was a combination of the human body, the technology, and the very particular sociomateriality of the medical environment, in which the performance artist could not see or sense the audience, but was surrounded only by medical personnel and MRA equipment while performing. The transcorporeal body was immersed in the performative activity, but it was only seen as raw biometric data by the audience outside the laboratory, which was completely accessible and understandable only to a neuroscientist. In other words, the transcorporeal body transmits the novel space for spectating performance, in which the body is interpreted from the data seen by the audience at large, but remains abstract for the common viewer and can only be accurately understood by the medical specialists in the laboratory environment. In this case, the norms of spectating performance artwork have been altered through the innovation of technology-based rendering of the body in interactions with the materiality of the placeness of performance.

In performance art, human and non-human elements influence the performing body at the site of a performance to an equal degree, since the materials, technology, and performer immerse the audience in the liminal space of the performance artwork. As outlined in this paper, inhuman refers to the human and non-human triggers within interactive art that build the "inner" liminality of the facilitating performer, the audience, and the materiality of the art piece. Performance using biometric data gathered through inhuman interconnections means that both human and non-human (material and technology) objects at the site of a performance can influence the values of the resulting biometric data. According to the scholar Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, the term inhuman, in essence, erases the boundaries of hierarchical relations between the human and non-human;⁷⁵ for example, a stone in a performance art situation

could represent both symbolic importance to the human performer and input to the biometric data produced during the performance. If this stone has a particular value to the performer, such as connection to a certain narrative or coming from a certain location, it could have an emotional impact on an artist during the performance, which could also influence the data.

The term transcorporeality is relevant in performance with biometric data, as the body, technology, and sociocultural context of the performance are key. Transcorporeality is built upon inhuman interconnections and expands the concept behind this term, since it means not only the connections between a performing body and the objects within performance, but also the dynamics between the performer, the environment, the surroundings, the context of the performance, and the audience. In particular, transcorporeality as a term could be applied to performance as activism, in that such artworks carry a critical message regarding society, education, or politics and involve biometric data. "Transcorporeality means that all creatures, as embodied beings, are intermeshed with the dynamic, material world, which crosses through them, transforms them, and is transformed by them."⁷⁶ Within a performance art event, the transcorporeal body is the body of the performer, immersed in the liminal space of the performance, intermeshed with the technological devices attached to the body in order to collect biometric data, the software that transmits and interprets the live data, the context of the performance, the sociocultural or pedagogical message of the performance, and the reactions of the audience members. As in Haraway's "Cyborg Manifesto,"⁷⁷ the transcorporeal body becomes "more-than-human" by having inhuman interconnections between the body and technology, alongside the body being influenced by sociomateriality and the message within the performance.

CONCLUSION

The key terms – performance art, biometric data, inhuman interconnections, and transcorporeality – have been utilized to analyze three European performance art cases. Performance with biometric

data, communicated in real time, provided new knowledge to the viewers regarding the inner states of the performing bodies in the liminal space in the described cases; one exception is the case of *The Tests: Techno-Voyeurism into a Performing Body*, in which the biometric data became the data through which the performance art event was documented. Within the provided cases, inhuman interconnections were human and non-human triggers of interactions within the performance art, uniting the performing body, the technology, and the objects within the performance with the biometric data. Transcorporeality within the three cases referred to the unity of the body, the technology, the objects, and the sociopolitics of the site of performance, social aspects of interactions, involving the context and the audience's reactions to the artwork performed in real time. This research can be used by performance artists and performance art researchers, as the study establishes and clarifies the terminology relating to performance art that uses biometric data. Further investigation should be directed toward the ethical issues of working with bio art, particularly with regard to performances involving human biometric data.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you to the anonymous reviewers for their valuable feedback. This research was supported by The Lithuanian Council for Culture. This article was finalized during the residency program at Vindbyholtgaard Refugium (Leif Hasle's Fond, Denmark) in 2020. Thanks to The University of Lapland.

References

- Alaimo, Stacy. *Bodily Natures*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2010.
- . *Exposed: Environmental Politics and Pleasures in Posthuman Times*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2016.
- . "Transcorporeality". In *Posthuman Glossary*, edited by R. Braidotti and M. Hlavajova. London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2018.
- Anderson, Jon. "Talking whilst walking: A geographical archaeology of knowledge". *Royal Geographical Society* 36, no. 3 (2004): 254–261.
- Anderson, Leon. "Analytic autoethnography". *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 35, no. 4 (2006): 373–395.
- Arlander, Anette. "Dune Dream – Self-imaging, trans-corporeality and the environment". *Body, Space & Technology* 17, no. 1 (2018): 3–21. Accessed Apr 26, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.16995/bst.293>.
- Bishop, Claire. *Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship*. London: Verso, 2014.
- Cohen, Jeffrey Jerome. *Stone: An Ecology of the Inhuman*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015.
- FUNom. "Viola Kus". Accessed April 15, 2019. <https://www.funom.org/projects>.
- DSwiss. "GDPR: New EU Regulation Defines the Handling of Customer Data". Accessed May 18, 2020. https://www.dswiss.com/en/news/gdpr/?gclid=CjwKCAjw5Ij2BRBdEiwA0Frc9dTnsQ7v50mzOOjy-4tasB6vx6LWLCve_EYcU398htw13hbxsoUYDsx-Cy8wQAvD_BwE.
- Graham, Lisa. *The Principles of Interactive Design*. Clifton Park, NY: Delmar Cengage Learning, 1998.
- Griniuk, Marija. "Performance Pedagogy: Performing Fluxus pedagogy in a contemporary Lithuanian context". *Acta Paedagogica Vilnensia* 44 (2020): 152–163.
- Han, Yoon Chung. *Biometric data art: Personalized narratives and multimodal interaction*. PhD diss., University of California Santa Barbara, 2016. Accessed April 27, 2020. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3t71k2jk>.
- Haraway, Donna. *When Species Meet*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008.
- Harding, James Martin, and Cindy Rosenthal. *The Rise of Performance Studies*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Hauser, Jens. "Observations on an art of growing interest toward a phenomenological approach to art involving biotechnology". In *Tactical Biopolitics: Art, Activism, and Technoscience*, edited by Beatriz da Costa and Philip Kavita. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2008.
- Hoby, Mads. "Touchbox: Intriguing touch between strangers". In *CHI '12: CHI Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, May 2012: 1023–1026. Accessed 26 November 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2212776.2212376>.
- Hoby, Mads, and Maja Fagerberg Ranten. "Behavioral complexity as a computational material strategy". *Int Journal of Design* 13, no. 2 (2019). Accessed November 26, 2019. <http://www.ijdesign.org/index.php/IJDesign/article/view/3263/861>.
- Hoby, Mads, and Jonas Löwgren. "Touching a stranger: Designing for engaging experience in embodied interaction". *International Journal of Design* 5, no. 3 (2011): 31–48.
- Ingold, Tim. *Being Alive*. London: Routledge, 2011.
- Jain, A. K., R. Bolle, Lin Hong, and S. Pankanti. "An identity-authentication system using fingerprints". *Proceedings of the IEEE* 85, no. 9 (1997): 1365–1388. Accessed May 16, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1109/5.628674>.
- Jain, Anil, Lin Hong, and Sharath Pankanti. "Biometric identification". *Communications of the ACM* 43, no. 2 (2000): 90–98. Accessed May 16, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1145/328236.328110>.
- Kac, Eduardo, Marion Laval-Jeantet, Benoît Mangin, Marta de Menezes, George Gessert, and Paul Vanouse. *What bio art is: A manifesto*. Last updated 2017.

- Accessed May 16, 2020. http://www.ekac.org/manifesto_whatbioartis.html.
- Latulipe, Celine, Erin A. Carroll, and Danielle Lottridge. "Love, hate, arousal and engagement: Exploring audience responses to performing arts". In *CHI '11: Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, May 2011: 1845–1854. Accessed May 16, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1978942.1979210>.
- Lewis, William W., and Niki Tulk. "Editorial: Why performance as research?" *PARTake: The Journal of Performance as Research* 1, no. 1 (2016): article 1. <http://scholar.colorado.edu/partake/vol1/iss1/1>.
- Livingston, Julie, and Jasbir K. Puar. "Interspecies". *Social Text* 29, no. 1 (2011): 3–14. Accessed May 10, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1215/01642472-1210237>.
- McKenzie, Jon. *Perform or else: From discipline to performance*. London: Routledge 2001.
- Pearson, Mike. *Site-Specific Performance*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Rabinow, Paul and Gaymon Bennett. "From bioethics to human practices, or assembling contemporary equipment". In *Tactical Biopolitics: Art, Activism, and Technoscience*, edited by Beatriz da Costa and Philip Kavita. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2008.
- Schechner, Richard. *Essays on Performance Theory: 1970–1976*. New York: Drama Book Specialists, 1977.
- . *Performance Studies*. London: Routledge, 2013.
- Seiyoung Jang. *Alata*. Video recording of live performance. Performed March 8, 2018 at Littlefield Concert Hall, Mills College, Oakland, CA, USA. Accessed May 12, 2020. <http://www.seiyoungjang.com/music.html>.
- . *The embodied instrument: From wearable instruments to the idealized form*. Master's thesis, Mills College, Oakland, CA, USA, 2018.
- Soler-Adillon, Joan. "The intangible material of interactive art: Agency, behavior and emergence". *Artnodes*, no. 16 (2015). Accessed May 5, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.7238/a.v0i16.2744>.
- Trott, P. *Innovation Management and New Product Development*. London: Pearson Education, 2017.
- Wagner, Claire, Barbara Kawulich, and Mark Garner. "A mixed research synthesis of literature on teaching qualitative research methods". *SAGE Open* 9, no. 3 (2019). Accessed May 4, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019861488>.
- ⁴ Marija Griniuk, "Performance Pedagogy: Performing Fluxus Pedagogy in a Contemporary Lithuanian Context", *Acta Paedagogica Vilnensia* 44 (2020), 152–163.
- ⁵ Ibid.
- ⁶ Ibid.
- ⁷ FUNom, *Viola Kus*, accessed April 15, 2019, <https://www.funom.org/projects>.
- ⁸ Ibid.
- ⁹ Ibid.
- ¹⁰ Celine Latulipe, Erin A. Carroll and Danielle Lottridge, "Love, Hate, Arousal and Engagement: Exploring Audience Responses to Performing Arts", in *CHI '11: Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (May 2011), 1845–1854, <https://doi.org/10.1145/1978942.1979210>; Mads Hoby and Maja Fagerberg Ranten, "Behavioral Complexity as a Computational Material Strategy", *International Journal of Design* 13, no. 2 (2019), accessed November 26, 2019, <http://www.ijdesign.org/index.php/IJDesign/article/view/3263/861>.
- ¹¹ Griniuk, *Performance Pedagogy*.
- ¹² Latulipe et al., *Love, Hate, Arousal*.
- ¹³ Jens Hauser, "Observations on an Art of Growing Interest Toward a Phenomenological Approach to Art Involving Biotechnology, in *Tactical Biopolitics: Art, Activism, and Technoscience*, ed. Beatriz da Costa and Philip Kavita (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2008); Eduardo Kac, Marion Laval-Jeantet, Benoît Mangin, Marta de Menezes, George Gessert, and Paul Vanouse, *What Bio Art Is: A Manifesto*, last updated 2017, accessed May 16, 2020, http://www.ekac.org/manifesto_whatbioartis.html.
- ¹⁴ Ibid.; *ibid.*
- ¹⁵ Kac et al., *What Bio Art Is*.
- ¹⁶ Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, *Stone: An Ecology of the Inhuman* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015).
- ¹⁷ Ibid.
- ¹⁸ Ibid.
- ¹⁹ Ibid.
- ²⁰ Ibid.
- ²¹ Stacy Alaimo, *Bodily Natures* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2010); Stacy Alaimo, *Exposed: Environmental Politics and Pleasures in Posthuman Times* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2016).
- ²² Ibid.
- ²³ Tim Ingold, *Being Alive* (London: Routledge, 2011).
- ²⁴ Ibid.
- ²⁵ Alaimo, *Bodily Natures*; Alaimo, *Exposed*; Anette Arlander, "Dune Dream – Self-imaging, trans-corporeality and the environment", *Body, Space & Technology* 17, no. 1 (2018), 3–21, accessed Apr 26, 2020, <https://doi.org/10.16995/bst.293>.
- ²⁶ Arlander, *Dune Dream*.
- ²⁷ Alaimo, *Bodily Natures*; Alaimo, *Exposed*.
- ²⁸ Julie Livingston and Jasbir K. Puar, "Interspecies", *Social Text* 29, no. 1 (2011), 3, <https://doi.org/10.1215/01642472-1210237>.
- ²⁹ Donna Haraway, *When Species Meet* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008).
- ³⁰ Ibid., 150.
- ³¹ Stacy Alaimo, "Transcorporeality", in *Posthuman Glossary*, ed. R. Braidotti and M. Hlavajova (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2018).
- ³² Ibid.
- ³³ Livingstone and Puar, *Interspecies*, 3.

Notes

- ¹ P. Trott, *Innovation Management and New Product Development* (London: Pearson Education, 2017).
- ² Leon Anderson, "Analytic Autoethnography", *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 35, no. 4 (2006), 373–95.
- ³ Claire Wagner, Barbara Kawulich and Mark Garner, "A Mixed Research Synthesis of Literature on Teaching Qualitative Research Methods", *SAGE Open* 9, no. 3 (2019), <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019861488>.

- ³⁴ Richard Schechner, *Essays on Performance Theory: 1970–1976* (New York: Drama Book Specialists, 1977).
- ³⁵ Richard Schechner, *Performance Studies* (London: Routledge, 2013), 32.
- ³⁶ Ibid., 34.
- ³⁷ Ibid., 36.
- ³⁸ Schechner, *Essays on Performance*.
- ³⁹ James Martin Harding and Cindy Rosenthal, *The Rise of Performance Studies* (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).
- ⁴⁰ Jon McKenzie, *Perform or else: From discipline to performance* (London: Routledge 2001).
- ⁴¹ Schechner, *Essays on Performance*.
- ⁴² Mike Pearson, *Site-Specific Performance* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).
- ⁴³ Ibid.
- ⁴⁴ Ibid.
- ⁴⁵ Schechner, *Essays on Performance*.
- ⁴⁶ Pearson, *Site-Specific Performance*.
- ⁴⁷ Schechner, *Essays on Performance*.
- ⁴⁸ William W. Lewis and Niki Tulk, “Editorial: Why performance as research?” *PARTake: The Journal of Performance as Research* 1, no. 1, article 1 (2016), <http://scholar.colorado.edu/partake/vol1/iss1/1>.
- ⁴⁹ Claire Bishop, *Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship* (London: Verso, 2014).
- ⁵⁰ Jon McKenzie, *Perform or else*.
- ⁵¹ Trott, *Innovation Management*.
- ⁵² Jon McKenzie, *Perform or else*.
- ⁵³ Joan Soler-Adillon, “The Intangible Material of Interactive Art: Agency, Behavior and Emergence”, *Artnodes*, no. 16 (2015), <https://doi.org/10.7238/a.v0i16.2744>.
- ⁵⁴ Lisa Graham, *The Principles of Interactive Design* (Clifton Park, NY: Delmar Cengage Learning, 1998).
- ⁵⁵ Ibid.
- ⁵⁶ Ibid.
- ⁵⁷ Yoon Chung Han, *Biometric Data Art: Personalized Narratives and Multimodal Interaction* (PhD diss., University of California Santa Barbara, 2016), accessed April 27, 2020, <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3t71k2jk42>.
- ⁵⁸ Ibid.
- ⁵⁹ Soler-Adillon, *Intangible Material of Interactive Art*.
- ⁶⁰ Ibid.
- ⁶¹ Schechner, *Essays on Performance*.
- ⁶² Soler-Adillon, *Intangible Material of Interactive Art*.
- ⁶³ Graham, *Principles of Interactive Design*.
- ⁶⁴ Schechner, *Essays on Performance*.
- ⁶⁵ Han, *Biometric Data Art*.
- ⁶⁶ Ibid., 50.
- ⁶⁷ Anil Jain, Lin Hong and Sharath Pankanti, “Biometric identification”, *Communications of the ACM* 43, no. 2 (2000), 92, <https://doi.org/10.1145/328236.328110>.
- ⁶⁸ A. K. Jain, R. Bolle, Lin Hong and S. Pankanti, “An identity-authentication system using fingerprints”, *Proceedings of the IEEE* 85, no. 9 (1997), 1365–1388, <https://doi.org/10.1109/5.628674>.
- ⁶⁹ Han, *Biometric Data Art*, 42.
- ⁷⁰ Idem.
- ⁷¹ Hauser, *Observations on an Art*; Kac et al., *What Bio Art Is*; Paul Rabinow and Gaymon Bennett, “From Bioethics to Human Practices, or Assembling Contemporary Equipment”, in *Tactical Biopolitics: Art, Activism, and Technoscience*, eds. Beatriz da Costa and Philip Kavita (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2008).
- ⁷² Kac et al., *What Bio Art Is*.
- ⁷³ Hauser, *Observations on an Art*; Kac et al., *What Bio Art Is*; Rabinow and Gaymon, *From Bioethics to Human Practices*.
- ⁷⁴ Griniuk, *Performance Pedagogy*.
- ⁷⁵ Cohen, *Stone*.
- ⁷⁶ Alaimo, *Transcorporeality*.
- ⁷⁷ Haraway, *When Species Meet*.

Marija GRINIUK

The University of Lapland, Finland

PERFORMANSO MENAS, KURIAME NAUDOJAMI BIOMETRINIAI DUOMENYS

Santrauka

Tyrime analizuojamas performanso menas, kuriame naudojami biometriniai duomenys, remiantis dviem koncepcijos perspektyvomis – *inhuman* sąsajomis ir transkorporalumu – paremtomis Europos performanso meno pavzdžiais iš Lietuvos, Suomijos, Lenkijos ir Danijos. Terminas „performanso menas“ teoriškai reiškia visą meną, apimantį žmogaus kūną, jo biometrinius duomenis, *inhuman* sąsajas, transkorporalumą ir liminalią erdvę. Šiame tyrime nagrinėjami interaktyvaus meno ir dizaino bei performanso meno su biometriniais duomenimis skirtumai. Taikant autoetnografijos metodą, buvo tiriami projektai.

Straipsnyje pateikti duomenys buvo surinkti per autoriaus performanso meno renginius arba renginiuose, kuriuose jis lankėsi. Atvejai nagrinėti analizuojant kokybinius duomenis, naudojant terminus, apibūdinančius žmogaus

biometrinius duomenis ir interaktyvumą bei pritaikytus interaktyvaus meno ir interaktyvaus dizaino srityse. Tyrimė nagrinėjamas biometrinių duomenų ir meno derinys, siekiant paaiškinti žmonių susitikimo su technologija fenomeną, atskleistą naudojant duomenis, surinktus iš kūno renginio metu. Išvadose apžvelgiami pagrindiniai terminai – performanso menas, biometriniai duomenys, *inhuman* sąsajos ir transkorporalumas – taikomi meninėms praktikoms, kur susitinka performanso menas ir biometriniai duomenys.

Reikšminiai žodžiai: performanso menas, biometriniai duomenys, *inhuman* sąsajos, transkorporalumas.

Gauta 2020-06-10

Parengta spaudai 2021-01-19

Marija GRINIUK

Marija Griniuk is a Lithuanian artist and a PhD student at the University of Lapland, Finland. Her research concerns new channels of performance documentation derived from biometric data, such as brain activity data.

E-mail: mgriniuk@ulapland.fi