

This project was shared with three viewers outside of the GCD context: a 24-year-old female architecture student, a 21-year-old male medical student, and a 54-year-old male non-design audience member. None of them had seen the project before or knew the idea behind it. I asked them to interact freely with the flipbooks first, and then answer a few questions, such as: What do you think is happening? What is controlling the movement? and What is changing as you flip through the book?

All three viewers were immediately drawn to the physical interaction. They picked up the books and started flipping them without hesitation. The flipping action became the main way they explored the work. However, the motion was not always smooth. The pages sometimes felt slightly stuck, and the speed of flipping was hard to control. Because of this, they often had to flip the pages multiple times, sometimes slowing down and sometimes speeding up.

This repetition became important. Through flipping the books again and again, the viewers began to notice more details. They realised that each book was not just an animation, but was connected to a specific gesture, such as pause, zoom, or rewind. The labels on the cover helped them identify this from the beginning, but it was through repeated interaction that they started to understand how each gesture affected the image.

The viewers also described the gesture as something that “controls the progress” of the image. For example, the younger participants were more likely to experiment with speed and quickly compare different books, while the older viewer spent more time on each book and flipped more slowly. Despite these differences, all three eventually recognised that the image was not fixed, but changed depending on how it was viewed.

This suggests that the project successfully communicates the idea that meaning can shift through different modes of viewing. However, most viewers still described this change mainly as visual movement, rather than a change in interpretation.

A clear limitation appeared when it came to content. Although the viewers could see that the image was changing, they mostly understood the work as a form of hand-controlled animation. The idea of the male gaze was not immediately recognised, especially by those who were not familiar with the original film. One viewer only began to question the image after noticing repeated focus on certain parts of the frame, while others did not connect this to a broader concept.

Importantly, all three viewers said that the project only fully “make sense” after reading the short description on the cover. This shows that the meaning of the work is not fully communicated through the visual system alone, but depends on text to explain its intention. This reveals a gap between how the work is experienced and what it is trying to communicate. While the gesture system works well in showing interaction and movement, it does not clearly communicate the critical meaning behind the chosen footage.

In the next stage, I will focus on how to guide the viewer more clearly without relying on written explanation. This could include adjusting the visual structure, highlighting specific

moments more clearly, or designing the interaction in a way that directs attention to how the image is being viewed, rather than only how it is changing.