Cultural and Arts Studies, 2026, Volume 2, Issue 3
https://www.bbwpublisher.com/journal/CAS
Online ISSN: 3083-3949
Print ISSN: 3083-3957

Exploring Audience Interaction in Immersive Art Installations

Jingjin Yu

School of Fine Arts, LuXun Academy of Fine Arts, Shenyang 110004, Liaoning, China

Copyright: © 2026 Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0), permitting distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is cited.

Abstract: Immersive art installations have moved from the margins of new media practice to the center of the contemporary exhibition industry, and their rapid rise has changed what audiences expect from an encounter with art. Rather than standing quietly before an object, visitors now walk through responsive environments that sense their presence, respond to their movements, and often depend on their participation to exist at all. This paper examines how audience interaction works inside such installations. It traces the shift from passive spectatorship to embodied participation, distinguishes three broad forms of interaction (sensory immersion, responsive co-creation, and collective engagement), and analyzes the technological, spatial, and social factors that shape the quality of these experiences. Drawing on recent case studies and visitor research, the paper also weighs recurring criticisms, including spectacle-driven design, uneven accessibility, and the pressure of social media documentation. It argues that meaningful interaction, rather than technical novelty alone, should serve as the primary criterion for evaluating immersive art.

Keywords: Immersive art installation; Audience interaction; Participation; Co-creation; Visitor experience

Online publication: June 30, 2026

1. Introduction

Over the past decade, exhibitions built around projection mapping, motion sensors, and spatial sound have grown into a global industry. Venues such as teamLab Planets in Tokyo, which welcomed more than 2.5 million visitors in 2023, and touring spectacles like Immersive Van Gogh have demonstrated that large audiences are willing to pay for the experience of being surrounded by art rather than simply looking at it. Critics remain divided. Some see a democratization of art viewing, while others dismiss the format as a photogenic distraction. What both sides often overlook is the visitor at the center of these spaces: how do audiences actually behave inside immersive installations, what do they take away, and which design choices make interaction meaningful instead of merely busy? This paper takes those questions as its starting point. Rather than asking whether immersive art is good or bad for audiences, the discussion that follows asks a more useful question: under what conditions does interaction inside these environments become meaningful? The paper moves from the historical shift toward participation,

through a typology of interaction forms, to the design factors that shape quality, and closes with critical challenges and practical implications for artists and institutions.

2. From spectatorship to participation

The traditional gallery asks very little of its visitors beyond quiet attention. A painting hangs at eye level, a sculpture sits behind a rope, and the visitor's task is to look. Immersive installations dismantle that arrangement. When a floor of projected fish parts around your ankles, or a wall of flowers blooms where you stand still, looking is no longer enough; the work waits for the body to act, and it answers. Emily Lawhead's analysis of teamLab: Continuity at the Asian Art Museum of San Francisco describes this condition well: the exhibition operated as a digital ecosystem in which every visitor's movement had visible consequences, so that the artwork was never quite the same twice and never complete without an audience inside it.

Historically, the audience for installation art has been drifting toward participation for decades, from kinetic art and happenings to the relational works of the 1990s. What changed in the past ten years is scale and infrastructure. Cheaper projection, reliable computer vision, and real-time rendering engines turned experiments that once filled research labs into ticketed attractions that can process thousands of bodies a day. The audience, in turn, has been trained by smartphones and games to expect responsiveness from every surface. An immersive installation sits exactly at this intersection: it is an artwork that behaves like a device, and a venue that behaves like a theater.

The theoretical stakes of this shift are worth naming. Once the audience becomes a component of the work, the boundary between production and reception softens. Visitors are not merely interpreting a finished object; they are, in a modest but real sense, helping to produce it. Researchers working in the experience-economy tradition have begun to quantify what this adds. In a comparative survey of 356 visitors, Luo, Doucé, and Nys found that sensory-rich immersive exhibitions significantly raised attention and overall satisfaction relative to conventional displays, with the aesthetic and escapist dimensions of the experience doing much of the work [1]. Participation, in other words, is not a gimmick layered on top of art; it changes the cognitive and emotional terms on which art is received.

None of this means that contemplative viewing has been abolished. Many successful installations deliberately alternate between moments of high responsiveness and stretches of slow, ambient change, inviting visitors to drift between doing and watching. The interesting design problem is rhythm: too little response and the work feels like a screensaver; too much, and the visitor is reduced to a switch that keeps the machine running.

A note on scope is useful before going further. This paper uses "immersive art installation" for works that physically surround the visitor with responsive or enveloping media, whether in museums, commercial venues, or public spaces. Virtual reality headsets and purely screen-based experiences raise related questions, but they isolate the visitor from the shared physical setting that, as will become clear, does much of the interactive work in the cases discussed here.

3. Three forms of audience interaction

3.1. Sensory immersion and embodied presence

The most basic form of interaction in an immersive installation does not look like interaction at all: it is the

simple fact of being inside the work. Surround projection, directional audio, scent diffusion, and shifting light wrap the visitor in a sensory envelope, and the body responds before any deliberate choice is made. This kind of engagement is easy to underestimate because it demands nothing from the audience, yet it does something important. It dissolves the psychological distance that a frame or a pedestal creates. Studies of projection-mapped heritage sites show that visitors consistently report stronger emotional connection and better recall when content surrounds them rather than sitting on a screen in front of them [2]. The body becomes the interface, and presence itself becomes a mode of participation.

Sensory immersion has its limits, however. Envelope the visitor in spectacle for forty minutes and fatigue sets in; novelty decays quickly once the eye learns the system's vocabulary. Designers who rely on sensory intensity alone often discover that visitors remember the feeling of being overwhelmed but little of what the work was about.

This embodied mode also explains why immersive installations have proven unusually effective with audiences who feel alienated by conventional museums. Visitors who describe themselves as "not art people" often report that wrapped, sensory environments bypass their anxiety about interpreting art correctly. There is no wall text to decode and no wrong way to stand. The cost of this accessibility is that interpretation can remain shallow unless the work offers hooks for deeper engagement, a point taken up in the following sections.

The sensory dimension also carries mnemonic weight. Visitors asked weeks later about an immersive visit tend to recall bodily moments, such as the floor responding underfoot or the sudden hush when a room changed color, far more vividly than specific images. This suggests that embodiment is not just a delivery mechanism but the principal material from which memorable art experiences are built.

3.2. Responsive interaction and co-creation

A second form of interaction appears when the installation senses the visitor and changes in reply. Motion tracking, computer vision, and touch-sensitive surfaces allow digital elements to follow a hand, avoid a footstep, or bloom beneath a stationary body. The critical variable is legibility: visitors must be able to connect action and response, or the system reads as arbitrary. When the link is clear, something shifts psychologically. The visitor stops consuming the work and starts conversing with it, testing its rules, inventing small games, and often dragging companions into the experiment. Chen and colleagues, applying a service-theater model to digital exhibitions, found that this sense of reciprocal exchange between visitor, environment, and staff was a strong predictor of perceived value and revisit intention [3].

Co-creation extends the logic further by letting audiences leave durable traces: drawings scanned into a shared digital world, messages that become part of a projection, paths that accumulate into a collective composition. The visitor's contribution persists after they leave, visible to the next wave of participants. Interactive storytelling projects in museums, such as the projection-mapped installations built for the mastic villages of Chios, show how responsive techniques can carry real content rather than decorative effect, allowing visitors to trigger narratives that would otherwise sit silently in a vitrine [4].

It is worth distinguishing co-creation from mere customization. Customization lets a visitor select among preset options, the way one chooses a filter on a phone camera. Co-creation, in the stronger sense used by participation researchers, means the work would genuinely not exist in its realized form without the audience's contribution. The distinction matters for evaluation: customized experiences generate brief

delight, while co-creative ones generate attachment, because visitors can point at the environment and say, truthfully, that part of it is theirs.

The pacing of response matters here as well. Immediate reactions delight, but delayed or cumulative responses create anticipation and reward patience, teaching visitors that the environment remembers them. Some of the most affecting moments reported by visitors occur when a long-dormant part of a room finally responds, confirming that their presence had been quietly registering all along.

3.3. Social interaction and collective experience

The third form of interaction happens not between visitor and machine but between visitors themselves. Immersive rooms are shared spaces, and the presence of strangers becomes part of the artwork's behavior. A crowd that gathers in one corner changes the projection for everyone; children chase digital creatures across the floor while parents photograph the chaos. teamLab has built an entire philosophy around this condition, arguing that a viewer inside an interactive work becomes unusually aware of other people's presence, and that the art gains the ability to influence relationships among those present [5].

Recent analyses of immersive exhibitions in interactive scenes confirm that audiences read these spaces socially: interaction with the work and interaction with other visitors continuously feed each other, producing a perception of the exhibition as a collective event rather than a private encounter [6]. This sociality cuts both ways. A lively crowd can amplify joy and discovery; an overcrowded room can just as easily reduce the most carefully tuned installation to a queue for photo opportunities. Managing that tension is now a central operational question for venues.

Designers have begun to exploit this sociality deliberately. Some installations assign visitors complementary roles, so that one person's action completes another's. Others create resource scarcity or shared goals that force negotiation among strangers. Even simple architectural choices, such as circular rooms that face visitors toward each other rather than toward the walls, measurably increase eye contact and conversation. The room becomes a social instrument, not just a display surface.

The social character of immersive rooms also changes how meaning is made. In a conventional gallery, interpretation is largely private; in a shared responsive environment, visitors watch each other succeed, fail, and discover, and these observations become part of their own understanding. A stranger's delighted reaction is itself a kind of interpretive label, one that no curator wrote.

4. What shapes the quality of interaction

4.1. Technological design and system legibility

Technology in an immersive installation succeeds when it disappears. Visitors should not have to think about cameras, projectors, or latency; they should feel that the room itself is alive. Achieving that illusion is a practical engineering matter. Tracking must respond within a fraction of a second or the sense of agency breaks. Projection must be bright and precisely mapped or the surface reminds everyone it is only a wall. Sound must follow the visitor's position or the environment flattens into a film. The best systems also tolerate unpredictability: a toddler's sprint, a group selfie, someone lying down on the floor. An installation that only works when visitors behave correctly is an installation that does not work.

Legibility matters as much as responsiveness. Audiences arrive with no manual. Successful works teach their own grammar in the first minute, through obvious cause-and-effect, through watching other visitors,

or through subtle cues such as darker backgrounds signaling interactive zones. Where the grammar stays obscure, visitors default to passive watching, and the interactive investment is wasted.

There is a cultural dimension to technological design as well. Audiences have grown suspicious of systems that watch them, and an installation whose tracking feels surveillance-like triggers discomfort rather than play. The most trusted designs make their sensing visible in friendly ways: a projected ripple under the feet, a shadow that gains color. Such feedback reassures visitors about what the system sees, and it quietly teaches them how to drive it.

Maintenance is part of design too. Calibration drifts, projectors dim, sensors accumulate blind spots, and a work that responded crisply on opening night can feel sluggish six months later. Because audiences judge responsiveness in milliseconds, technical decay translates directly into experiential decay. Venues that schedule regular recalibration protect the illusion; those that defer it quietly train their audiences to stop trying.

4.2. Spatial and narrative design

Space choreographs attention. Open floors invite wandering and play; narrow passages create suspense; thresholds between rooms let designers reset the emotional tempo. Continuity at the Asian Art Museum used transitions between galleries to shift visitors from disorientation to calm, and the slow seasonal cycle of its projections rewarded those who stayed still long enough to notice. Narrative structure works similarly at the level of time. A loose arc of arrival, exploration, and departure gives visitors a sense of journey without scripting their route.

Content, finally, must be worth interacting with. The strongest installations tie their mechanics to a theme, so that touching, moving, and waiting mean something within the work's logic. When interaction is bolted onto generic visuals, audiences sense the hollowness quickly, and the visit degrades into a hunt for the most flattering backdrop.

Narrative also disciplines duration. Immersive visits typically last between forty-five and ninety minutes, and attention decays steeply unless the environment offers variation. Some venues sequence rooms by intensity, building toward a spectacular climax and releasing visitors through a calm epilogue. Others loop content on fifteen-minute cycles and trust visitors to self-regulate. Neither approach is universally superior, but venues that think carefully about the temporal shape of the visit consistently earn better reviews than those that simply fill a warehouse with projections.

Lighting and sound deserve mention as structural tools rather than effects. A darkened threshold slows visitors down and resets their expectations; a shift from ambient sound to localized audio draws attention to a specific zone without a single sign. These quiet cues organize behavior more gracefully than instructions ever could, and they cost nothing beyond design attention.

4.3. Audience differences and prior expectations

Not everyone arrives equally equipped. Younger visitors who grew up with touchscreens test interactive elements almost reflexively, while older visitors may wait for permission or instruction. Cultural expectations about museum behavior also shape participation: visitors trained by decades of "do not touch" signage often need visible proof that touching is allowed. Social context matters too. Families interact collaboratively, couples photograph each other, and solo visitors often engage most deeply of all, free of the pressure to perform for companions.

Prior exposure recalibrates expectations. First-time visitors tend to be dazzled by the sensory envelope alone; repeat visitors, who have seen the trick before, demand subtler forms of responsiveness and stronger content. Venues that ignore this learning curve find that novelty audiences and returning audiences want quite different things from the same room.

Practical design responses follow. Simple demonstrations by floor staff during the first minutes of a visit dramatically raise participation among hesitant visitors. Children's behavior, meanwhile, often functions as unintentional instruction: adults watch a child stomp on a projected koi pond and learn the rules without reading a word. Smart venues treat these social learning channels as part of the design rather than as accidents.

Socioeconomic background shapes participation as well. Visitors for whom museums are familiar territory tend to treat novel formats with confidence, while first-time cultural visitors often look for explicit cues about what is permitted. Clear, low-pressure invitations, such as staff who demonstrate rather than instruct, narrow this confidence gap without condescending to anyone.

Age, culture, confidence, and social context therefore act as invisible co-designers of every immersive exhibition. Designers who assume an average visitor design for no one; those who provide multiple entry points, from quiet observation to full physical play, give each visitor a way to find their own level of involvement, and the resulting variety itself enriches the collective atmosphere of the room.

5. Critical challenges and open questions

The rapid commercialization of immersive art has produced a legitimate backlash. Ticketed spectacle venues charge premium prices, and critics argue that many of them offer a thin artistic product wrapped in expensive technology, optimized less for meaning than for shareability. The Instagram economy amplifies the concern: when a significant share of visitors experiences a room primarily through their phone screens, interaction risks collapsing into content production. Visitor analyses of popular immersive exhibitions indeed show "photo-taking" and "check-in" among the most frequent behavioral keywords, a reminder that documentation can crowd out attention. Yet it would be lazy to dismiss the entire format on this basis. The same survey data also show high levels of reported engagement and positive sentiment, suggesting that audiences are perfectly capable of taking their photographs and still having a genuine aesthetic experience.

Accessibility raises harder questions. Sensory-dense environments can exclude visitors with photosensitivity, hearing impairment, or mobility limitations. Dark floors, uneven standing surfaces, and long periods without seating quietly filter who gets to participate. Cost filters further: with single tickets commonly priced between 26 and 40 dollars at commercial venues, immersive art is hardly the democratic medium its promoters describe. If installations genuinely depend on collective participation, then the composition of the crowd is part of the work's meaning, and exclusion is an artistic failure as well as a social one.

There is also a sustainability problem on the production side. Interactive systems require constant calibration, maintenance, and staff mediation; a broken sensor silently turns a responsive room into an expensive slideshow. Institutions adopting the format sometimes underestimate this operational burden, budgeting for the opening-night effect rather than the thousandth-day reality.

Finally, evaluation remains underdeveloped. Venues count tickets and hashtags because those numbers are easy, while the harder questions, such as what visitors learned, felt, or carried home, are rarely measured

systematically. Until evaluation moves beyond attendance metrics, claims about the educational or transformative power of immersive art will rest more on intuition than evidence.

A further challenge concerns authorship. When thousands of visitors co-produce a work, whose artwork is it? Institutions struggle to credit, preserve, and collect pieces that change with every crowd. Conservation departments built for static objects now face environments that exist only as software, sensors, and accumulated visitor behavior, raising questions about what exactly would be preserved for future audiences.

Measurement tools are catching up slowly. Some venues now experiment with computer-vision analytics to study how crowds actually move and dwell, complementing exit surveys that rely on fallible memory. Used transparently and with privacy safeguards, such data can reveal which interactive zones genuinely engage people and which are walked past, giving designers an evidence base that the field has historically lacked.

The economics of the format create their own distortions. High fixed costs push venues toward blockbuster programming and aggressive merchandising, which in turn shapes artistic choices toward the safely spectacular. Independent artists working at smaller scales often produce the most conceptually adventurous interactive work, yet they struggle to access the expensive infrastructure the form requires. Bridging that gap, through shared production facilities, touring partnerships, or modular open-source toolkits, may determine whether immersive art develops a genuine artistic culture or remains a branch of the attractions industry.

6. Implications for designers and institutions

The analysis above suggests a few working principles. First, treat interaction as content, not decoration. The rules by which a work responds to visitors should express its theme, so that participation itself carries meaning rather than merely triggering effects. Second, design for legibility before complexity: an installation whose grammar visitors grasp in the first minute will be explored more deeply than a technically richer system that stays opaque. Third, compose rhythm deliberately, alternating responsive peaks with ambient rests, because attention is a resource that exhausts and recovers.

Fourth, plan for the social life of the room. Capacity management, sightlines that let visitors watch each other interact, and spaces for companions who prefer to observe all shape the collective experience as much as the projection system does. Fifth, build accessibility and pricing decisions into the concept stage rather than retrofitting them, since who participates is inseparable from what the work becomes. Finally, institutions should invest in evaluation that goes past the ticket gate, combining observation, interviews, and digital trace data to understand what actually happens between visitors and works.

None of these principles requires rejecting spectacle. Sensory pleasure is a legitimate artistic currency, and the popularity of immersive venues has brought art-adjacent audiences into cultural spaces they would never otherwise enter. The goal is to spend spectacle in the service of engagement rather than letting it become the whole budget.

One more implication concerns staffing. Front-of-house teams in immersive venues do far more than check tickets; they model interaction, rescue confused visitors, and translate between the artwork and the audience. Training these teams, and treating them as interpreters rather than guards, is among the cheapest and most effective investments a venue can make, yet it is routinely neglected in favor of hardware upgrades.

Artists, for their part, face a discipline of their own: resisting the temptation to add one more sensor, one

more projection surface, one more effect simply because the technology allows it. Restraint is increasingly a marker of maturity in immersive practice. The works that linger in memory are usually those in which every interactive element answers to an artistic intention.

Institutions should also be honest in how they market these experiences. Promotional imagery that promises solitary wonder in an empty infinity room sets visitors up for disappointment when they arrive to a crowded floor. Venues that communicate the collective, sometimes chaotic reality of participation, and frame it as a feature rather than a flaw, tend to earn more forgiving and more engaged audiences.

7. Conclusion

Audience interaction is the engine of immersive art, and also its most fragile component. When presence, responsiveness, and social encounter are designed with care, installations can offer forms of participation that conventional displays cannot match, turning spectators into co-creators and strangers into temporary communities. When design chases novelty or photogenic effect alone, the same spaces flatten into expensive wallpaper. The distinction rarely lies in the technology budget; it lies in whether designers respect the audience as thinking, feeling participants rather than sensors with wallets. As the format matures, the venues that endure will be those that treat interaction as a question of meaning, measure what visitors genuinely experience, and keep widening the circle of who is invited to take part.

Disclosure statement

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

[1] Luo D, Doucé L, Nys K, 2025, Immersive Art Exhibitions: Sensory Intensity Effects on Visitor Satisfaction via Visitor Attention and Visitor Experience. Visitor Studies, 28(2): 272–293.

[2] Li H, Ito H, 2023, Visitor's Experience Evaluation of Applied Projection Mapping Technology at Cultural Heritage and Tourism Sites: The Case of China Tangcheng. Heritage Science, 11(1): 1024–1049.

[3] Chen SX, Wu HC, Huang X, 2023, Immersive Experiences in Digital Exhibitions: The Application and Extension of the Service Theater Model. Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 54: 128–138.

[4] Nikolakopoulou V, Printezis P, Maniatis V, et al., 2022, Conveying Intangible Cultural Heritage in Museums with Interactive Storytelling and Projection Mapping: The Case of the Mastic Villages. Heritage, 5(2): 1024–1049.

[5] Lawhead E, 2023, Continuity: Sharing Space in teamLab's Digital Ecosystems. Arts, 12(2): 74.

[6] Li Z, 2024, Digital Media Intervenes in an Immersive Exhibition in Interactive Scenes: Mode of Perception and Interaction in the New Era. Applied and Computational Engineering, 99(1): 1–6.

Publisher's note

Bio-Byword Scientific Publishing remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.