

# Artographer: a Curatorial Interface for Art Space Exploration

Shm Garanganao  
Almeda\*  
shm.almeda@berkeley.edu  
University of California,  
Berkeley  
Berkeley, CA, USA

John Joon Young  
Chung  
Midjourney  
San Francisco, USA  
jchung@midjourney.org

Bjoern Hartmann  
bjoern@berkeley.edu  
University of California,  
Berkeley  
Berkeley, CA, USA


Sophia Liu  
sophiawliu@berkeley.edu  
University of California,  
Berkeley  
Berkeley, CA, USA

Brett Halperin\*  
bhalp@uw.edu  
University of Washington  
Seattle, WA, USA

Yuwen Lu\*  
University of Notre Dame  
Notre Dame, IN, USA  
ylu23@nd.edu

Max Kreminski  
Midjourney  
San Francisco, USA  
mkreminski@midjourney.org

## The Artographer Interface



**Figure 1: Artographer is an interface for exploring an intentionally curated dataset of ~16,000 historical artworks as an zoomable 2D-map. This similarity-clustered map is constructed from multiple embedding models' representations of each artwork's visual and semantic features. We traced the creative exploration behavior of n=20 participants, including 9 art history scholars, as they used Artographer to discover and collect across art space.**

## Abstract

Relating a piece to previously established works is crucial in creating and engaging with art, but AI interfaces tend to obscure such relationships, rather than helping users explore them. Embedding models present new opportunities to support discovering and relating artwork through spatial interaction. We built Artographer, an art exploration system featuring a zoomable 2-D map, constructed from the similarity-clustered embeddings of 15,000+ historical artworks. Using Artographer as a probe to investigate spatial artwork

exploration, we analyzed how 20 participants (including 9 art history scholars) traversed the map, during a goal-driven task and when freely exploring. We observe divergent and convergent exploration behaviors (Jumping, Wandering, Fixation, Revisiting) and identify values enacted by spatial art-finding (Visibility, Agency, Serendipity, Friction.) We situate spatial maps within a space of Curatorial Interfaces, systems that select and present artworks, and discuss centering pluralism and agency in the design of more responsible AI systems for art curation.

\*Work done as a visiting researcher at Midjourney.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

Conference acronym 'XX, Woodstock, NY

© 2018 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.  
ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/2018/06  
<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

## CCS Concepts

• **Do Not Use This Code → Generate the Correct Terms for Your Paper;** *Generate the Correct Terms for Your Paper;* *Generate the Correct Terms for Your Paper;* *Generate the Correct Terms for Your Paper.*

## Keywords

Do, Not, Us, This, Code, Put, the, Correct, Terms, for, Your, Paper

**ACM Reference Format:**

Shm Garanganao Almeda, John Joon Young Chung, Bjoern Hartmann, Sophia Liu, Brett Halperin, Yuwen Lu, and Max Kreminski. 2018. Artographer: a Curatorial Interface for Art Space Exploration. In *Proceedings of Make sure to enter the correct conference title from your rights confirmation email (Conference acronym 'XX)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 18 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

## 1 Introduction

*What happens when a new work of art is created is something that happens simultaneously to all the works of art which preceded it [...] the past should be altered by the present as much as the present is directed by the past.*

—T. S. Eliot

The world is inundated with images, at least some of which are art. Curation is the act of selecting and presenting artworks; how those selection and presentation decisions are made crucially shapes the creative ecosystem around them, and the kinds of artist support networks and downstream cultural impacts that result [1, 18].

AI is rapidly changing both the *curation* and *consumption* of imagery. As dominant media platforms increasingly use recommendation algorithms to curate personalized content feeds, AI systems are intermediating more interactions with art and imagery than ever before [60]. Widespread mainstream use of Generative AI (GenAI) is rapidly accelerating the production of images; text-to-image models were used to generate over 15 billion images in 2023 alone, exceeding the number of photographs produced in the first 150 years of photographic history [57].

The AI models we address in this context are large statistical models that are, materially, made of *data*. GenAI models, for example, draw from datasets of *existing creative work*; these “reference materials” are latent in the artifacts that they generate [14]. Dependency on existing work is a core feature of human art production, too; several major theories of art define an artwork by its relationship to established art pieces and movements [32, 33]. Relating a piece of media to the space of previously established works is crucial in curating, creating, and engaging with art.

AI models, as systems that excel at synthesizing and surfacing relationships across large bodies of data, are actually well-equipped to support relational art interactions. Using AI to support *expert* interpretation of historical artworks is fairly well-established [56] — but when it comes to *non-experts’* interactions with art, AI interventions are often designed to *automate* interpretation. Examples include models that automate art-style classification [6, 35, 37] or predict visual “aesthetic quality” [8, 49] — both of which can then be used to automatically curate end-user artwork recommendations, or train more “aesthetic” generative models [41, 66].

These interventions tend to, implicitly or explicitly, position AI as a “solution” to the “subjectivity” of human evaluation, or as a means to more efficiently replicate, automate, and replace the labor and expertise of human curators. It is rare that an AI interface is designed to support a key goal of effective art curation: to *empower* viewers with the agency to more deeply engage with artworks [52]. Mainstream AI art interfaces tend to *obscure* relationships instead, presenting images detached from the human contexts they materially derive from.

We see an opportunity to support users with *more direct access to the rich relational information embedded into AI models*, and to study how the affordances of such an interface can influence engagement with artwork.

To explore this opportunity, we built Artographer: a historical art exploration interface. We designed an intentionally opinionated, computational curation approach to assembling a dataset of 15,698 historical artworks, largely in the public domain, selected based on the relational information available for describing them. We arrange this curated selection of artworks into a similarity-clustered spatial map, constructed from the combined vector spaces of multiple embedding models, and present this map for interactive, zoomable exploration through Artographer’s frontend web interface. Artographer also explores an alternative use of GenAI that places it in conversation with established artworks — presenting AI image generation as a *support tool* for navigating art space.

We used Artographer as a probe to study art space exploration. 20 participants (9 with significant historical art expertise) used Artographer to navigate and interrogate this computationally-constructed presentation of art space. Artographer served as an experimental substrate for tracing their creative exploration behaviors, and grounding reflective conversation with our participants, with whom we collaboratively develop insights to address the following research question: **How does an embedding-based, similarity-clustered spatial map interface shape user behaviors and experiences during art exploration?**

We report on four exploration behaviors (Jumping, Wandering, Revisiting, and Fixation) and experiences that characterize the similarity-clustered spatial map as an interface for artwork exploration. We situate this within a broader design space of Curatorial Interfaces — systems that select and present artworks — and consider four values they can enact: Visibility, Agency, Serendipity, and Friction. We consider how these values can guide the design of systems that support deeper engagement with art and media — making creative exploration more curious, joyful, and *visible*. We reflect upon our methodological use of spatial maps as a substrate for creativity research where exploratory behavior is more visible to the researcher and the participant. We envision more responsible AI interventions that counter the automation of human judgment in the evaluation of art, instead centering user agency in the design of flexible systems that facilitate serendipity, interrogation, and pluralistic engagement with artworks.

To sum, this work contributes...

- (1) an intentionally curated, open-source database of public domain historical artworks, featuring ~16,000 images with metadata and ~1,640 artist & keyword text entries, with image, text, and multimodal embedding vectors for every artwork and keyword,
- (2) Artographer, a visual-spatial map interface for exploring historical art space,
- (3) a creative exploration study conducted with n=20 participants, including 9 art history scholars, using Artographer as an experimental substrate to trace and characterize spatial map art exploration,
- (4) values for Curatorial Interface design, as a lens for evaluating systems that select and present artwork,

- (5) considerations for studying creative exploration and designing for responsible AI art curation.

## 2 Background & Related Work

### 2.1 The Role of Curation in Art, as a Collective Social Activity

Social theories describe art as the collective activity of an *art world*: a network of actors and sociotechnical systems performing interdependent, creativity supportive roles [9]. Curation is central to art worlds, determining which artworks are distributed, and how; which artists have the opportunity to thrive and influence the art world, versus those who remain unseen [1].

While human curators continue to serve this role, both on- and off-line, the work of art curation is increasingly being delegated to computational systems. As discussed in the introduction, AI interventions into art curation include models for *automating* the evaluation of art (e.g., art-style classification models)[6, 35] and models for predicting aesthetic quality — classifiers that can then be used to curate art recommendations, and craft “aesthetically” curated datasets, and ultimately train GenAI models to produce more “aesthetically” aligned media[41, 48].

von Davier positions the work of designing for deeper appreciation in the digital presentation of art as a necessary counter to the “contentification” of media: the recommendation algorithms that govern curation on dominant media platforms pressure artists to conform to reductive metrics, posing threats to cultural diversity in artistic expression and public cultural media literacy [59].

### 2.2 Supporting Artistic Engagement in HCI

This work builds on the significant body of work by cultural institutions and HCI researchers studying how people engage with art and cultural artifacts [45, 58], and how we might design systems to support deeper appreciation and engagement with art[20, 25]. This includes systems designed for the unique needs of specific cultural domains[5, 67].

Prior work includes designing and studying the effects of novel applications, devices, and interactive or embodied experiences for museum visitors [12, 28, 29, 43, 51, 61, 62]. Throughout this work, researchers and cultural institutions are notably shifting away simply delivering educational content or suggesting “factually-correct” interpretations of artworks, instead asking questions like, “How can we facilitate *personal* engagement with artworks?” and, “How can we *provoke* and *empower* viewers as relational beings, to bring their own narratives into the interpretation of artworks?”

Digital interfaces can leverage the unique affordances of digital space for unique artwork engagement experiences, while supporting the democratization and accessibility of global artwork collections [3]. Both Meinecke et al. [39] and Meyer et al. [40] experiment with object-detection and similarity-clustering as materials for designing interactive artwork collections. While grouping artworks by similar object detection inherently limits the kinds of relationships that these systems can surface, participants in both experiences valued how a novel lens for engaging with the artworks can facilitate serendipitous discovery and thoughtful reflection.

Our implementation learns from the strengths and limitations of these approaches, employing a number of strategies in designing

our dataset, computational curation system, 2D spatial map presentation of artworks, to support interpretability and sensemaking while embedding a depth of multimodal relationships richer than those achievable by grouping by similar-object detection, metadata, or visual similarity alone.

### 2.3 Supporting Sense-making with Spatial Visualization & Exploration

2-dimensional, freely manipulable spaces are revisited throughout HCI research to enable sensemaking and exploration of large-scale data. One frequently visited interaction approach is projecting higher-dimensional data onto a 2-dimensional space [46, 55]. While dimensionality reduction can risk the loss of important information [15, 27], it remains a widely adopted strategy in many tools for exploratory data sensemaking, due to its ability to leverage human’s intuitive sense of spatial-visual perception to support navigating across many data instances. It is often combined with other interaction techniques to enable more flexible data exploration [23, 64], like *zooming*. Zoomability allows users to move vertically through different hierarchies of a data representation [10, 31]. The rapid advancement in AI for creativity support has facilitated more flexible visualization and exploration of 2-D design spaces. Zoomable 2D space is emerging as a promising substrate for dynamic, AI-supported sensemaking and creative exploration — Senseescape [54] dynamically generates new information structures as users move across levels of abstraction with zoom; Luminate [53] supports creative writing exploration through the dynamic generation of interactive, 2D representations of story design space, constructed from latent semantic representations of AI-generated text. Patchview [19] foregrounds user agency in co-creative exploration of storytelling design spaces: users define the semantic axes they wish to explore, and are provided AI-generated creative data points that they can freely reshape and reconfigure. In this work, we leverage the well-established strengths of zoomable 2D spatial maps for relational sensemaking, towards the design of a novel, yet intuitively navigable, art exploration experience.

## 3 System Design

Artographer is a system for exploring an intentionally curated set of historical artworks, presented as a similarity-clustered, zoomable 2D spatial map. We describe three key stages of system design: data curation (selecting and designing our representation of a rich set of artworks), map-making (constructing the similarity-clustered hierarchical map presentation of the artworks), and building the frontend 3D web interface.

### 3.1 Data Curation

When curating a presentation that can capture a depth of meaningful relationships, not all data can take equal importance. For example, grouping artworks by artist name will produce a different arrangement than grouping by country, or century. What information can and should take precedence is dependent on the curator’s particular goals and priorities, and *the content and distribution of the dataset they are curating from*.

We found that attempting to *avoid* prioritizing *any* relationships led to the construction of spatial maps where positional groupings

were frequently perceptually meaningless or shallow. We designed an intentionally opinionated computational curation approach that depends on how much, and what kinds, of relational information is actually available in the dataset, prioritizing (1) visual similarity, then (2) *salient keyword similarity*, then (3) similarity of other text metadata.

We constructed a historical artwork dataset of 26,886 artworks from WikiArt and Artsy.net. We also gathered a keyword dataset of 1,643 art terms – entries include every artist in the database, as well as descriptive keywords like “*Art Nouveau*” and “*Metallic*” from the Artsy Genome Project, Artsy.net’s system of over 1,000 terms for categorizing artworks. [4]. Each keyword maintains a list of the artworks it describes (i.e., is a tag for), and vice versa.

While several existing “WikiArt” datasets are readily available [63], they are typically curated for training art-style classification models, or similar. As they prioritize collection size over depth, these datasets often lack much of the rich metadata and textual descriptions that are available for many artworks on WikiArt, and that would help construct a more richly relational map. This led us to curate our own WikiArt artworks dataset, and to augment entries with descriptive and contextual tags from The Art Genome Project. ML datasets also frequently exclude rights information – we strived to include only artworks in the public domain or under open licenses (e.g., Getty Trust Open Content Program, Creative Commons) and to ensure that the images retained that licensing information.

We compute a high-dimensional representation of every artwork and keyword entry (See Figure 2 for details). We combined visual embeddings (using artwork image data, via ResNet-50<sup>1</sup>), text embeddings (using artwork metadata, via MiniLM<sup>2</sup>), and visual-text embeddings (using both image and metadata, via CLIP<sup>3</sup>) to ultimately represent each artwork with a 3,456-dimensional multimodal feature vector, where each kind of embedding is weighted with a manipulable parameter, to support dynamic adjustment.

This strategy aligns with prior work that found a fused approach to be more effective at capturing hidden semantic relationships in artwork than using image or text embeddings alone [65].


In selecting metadata to use for each artwork’s text embeddings, we chose a process that prioritizes certain *salient keywords* over others, to intentionally bias the final presentation towards the more meaningful artwork groupings available for representation using our particular dataset.

For each keyword, we calculate a salience score equal to (the number of artworks the keyword describes) \* (the fraction of total artworks it describes):

$$\text{salience} = \text{count} \times \frac{\text{count}}{\text{total\_artworks}}$$

This deprioritizes “niche” keywords (that only describe a few artworks in the dataset) and overly broad keywords (like “painting”, which describes such a large fraction of the dataset, it ceases to be meaningfully descriptive).

We select a representative set of 500 salient keywords using a greedy iterative process: starting with the most salient keyword,



**Figure 2: Each artwork is represented by a multimodal 3456d feature vector that combines visual embeddings generated with ResNet50, text embeddings from MiniLM, and image+text embeddings from CLIP.**

we repeatedly add the next most salient keyword that describes *the largest number of previously uncovered artworks*. This favors terms that provide distinctly descriptive relational information, rather than repeatedly characterizing groups of artworks already well-described by a more salient keyword.

We used the set of artworks covered by these 500 salient keywords to reduce the final dataset from 26,886 artworks, to the final set of 15,968 artworks. When computing each artwork’s text embedding, we first take the embedding representing the salient keyword, and average it with an embedding representing the rest of the artwork’s metadata as text.

The result is a computational selection of artworks that are all described by at least one contextual term that describes a meaningful relation to some group of other artworks.

### 3.2 Spatial Map-making Approach

Our data curation strategy formed a strong set of base materials for a similarity-clustered presentation of artworks that embeds a variety of meaningful relationships.

We use Uniform Manifold Approximation and Projection (UMAP) [38] to project the 3456-dimensional representation of each artwork onto 2-D space. Compared to t-SNE (another common dimensionality reduction technique), UMAP allows visualization designers to balance between local structure (data is well clustered within categories) and global structure (similar categories are co-located), and provides parameters for manipulating this balance [21].

We first use UMAP on the entire dataset to construct a global structure, where groups of related artworks are clustered together. We use k-means clustering to create a Voronoi diagram that contains each cluster within a cell – this forms Artographer’s “regional map.” We iteratively merge these adjacent “neighborhood”-like regions to create the larger, “country”-like colored regions seen when viewing the map at a distance.

We then re-run UMAP on each cluster, recomputing new 2D coordinates for each artwork that contains them to the shape of their “region” – this achieves more meaningful local structure of the data *within* each region when users view the map at a short distance.

<sup>1</sup><https://huggingface.co/microsoft/resnet-50>

<sup>2</sup><https://huggingface.co/sentence-transformers/all-MiniLM-L6-v2>

<sup>3</sup><https://huggingface.co/openai/clip-vit-base-patch32>



Some “outlier artworks” are so distinct from the rest of the dataset, they would be positioned too far to comfortably display or navigate to; we chose a reasonable map size, then iteratively nudge these outliers into the constraints of the map. (We report on interesting tensions and opportunities that arise from this presentation of “marginalia” in Section 5.3.1.

We developed a Flask Server API<sup>4</sup> that can perform each step of the map-making process on demand. The API returns a hierarchical 2D-map representation of the dataset as a nested JSON object, with 2D coordinates for each artwork, and supports changing a number of the variables involved in the map-making process — including the weights that adjust the “strength” of each kind of embedding. This system supports generating a plurality of art-space maps, each capable of emphasizing different design priorities and ways of relating the data. As an example, one can set the weight of text embeddings to zero, to produce a map clustered solely by visual similarity.

For the research questions of interest to this study, we chose to precompute and cache a single map as described, so that all participants navigate the same presentation of art space in Artographer. We discuss in Section 3.2 how this same system might support interactions with a dynamic plurality of maps in future work.

### 3.3 Frontend Web Interface

Users interact with the Artographer frontend interface through their web browser. The colorful “regional map” (see Fig.3 left) is drawn as a 2-D plane in a 3-D scene, rendered in Three.js using React-Three-Fiber. Each artwork is itself a 2-D plane “floating” on the map. Users click-and-drag, or use WASD/Arrow Keys, to pan the map.

The user can scroll to “zoom” into the map, moving the scene’s camera closer to the map. We limit the number of artworks that can be rendered at any time (presenting all 16k artworks would be cognitively and technically overwhelming). At high levels of zoom, we show only “representative” artworks — for each region, we choose the artwork closest to its centroid to “represent” it; we deterministically curate this list of representatives to a selection that is well-spread out across the current view of the map. As the user zooms in, the system renders more artworks into their viewport.

The “Selected Region” menu tab (See “A” in Figure 1) lists all artworks in the currently selected region, regardless of zoom level. Each artwork in this menu has two buttons: the “Focus” button automatically moves the camera to center and zoom into that artwork on the map. The “Pin” button allows users to collect the artwork, adding it to their “Pins” menu. Pinning also makes the artwork visible at all times regardless of zoom level, allowing users to create landmarks.

**3.3.1 Image Generation as a Navigation Support Tool.** Users are provided a text-to-image generator, in the bottom-left corner of the interface labeled “Search / Image Generator” (See “C” in Figure 1. When the user enters a prompt, Artographer makes an API request to a text-to-image model<sup>5</sup> — as soon as the result is available, the system sends the image + prompt to the backend server. The system then extracts multimodal embeddings for the generated

image + prompt, and finds its nearest neighbors in historical art space. Finally, the Artographer interface places the generated image in the 2D map, close to its *visual* nearest neighbors. Generated images also provides “links” that allow the user to quickly navigate to/from the AI image and its nearest visual and semantic neighbors (B in Figure 1) This positions image generation as a navigation support tool; for example, generating with the prompt, “bowl of fruit” will move the user to the Still Life area of the map, and place the generated “bowl of fruit” there as a navigational landmark.

## 4 Method

Our study uses Artographer as an experimental substrate where we can observe, trace, and spark co-constructive conversations with participants about the different perspectives, needs, and interpretations they bring into the act of exploring and engaging with artwork. This directly follows Li et al.’s call for a methodological shift in creativity support tool (CST) research, away from developing CSTs as prototypes of “effectiveness,” and towards using them as probes to study creativity and art-making in collaboration with users [34]. In line with their provocations, and in response to the state of AI interventions into art curation as discussed in our introduction and related work, we approach building this CST as artistic practice in itself, and consider the normative ground it experimentally constructs as a site for counter-hegemony.

### 4.1 Study Design

We conducted a within-subjects study over video call, where all participants used both the Artographer spatial map interface and a Baseline system while sharing their screen. Our study design allowed both the interviewer and the participant to observe *how* they navigated art space, grounding co-constructive discussions about their exploration experiences throughout.

Each participant answered brief introductory questions about their background art experiences, then completed two targeted exploration tasks and a free exploration task, followed by an interview where they reflected on their experiences.

Before each task, we sent participants a web link to access the Artographer or Baseline system. After each task, participants completed a survey form that asked Likert scale questions (drawn from [36] and [17]) and open-ended reflective questions about their experiences. Participants consented to the data collection and use, and were compensated with a \$50 gift card for ~1 hour of their time.

**4.1.1 Recruitment.** To recruit participants in our study, we sought a range of perspectives, including creative practitioners and art history experts, as well as some novices with interest, but limited experience, studying art. We recruited 20 participants; 9 participants reported significant or expert experience in the study of art history. Experts’ relevant background experiences included taking and teaching art history courses, conducting historical art research, and working in a museum; see our Appendix for participant details.

**4.1.2 Targeted Exploration Tasks.** For each of the two **targeted exploration tasks**, participants had 6 minutes to assemble a collection of images to express a particular theme. We asked them to:

- (1) collect as many images as possible,

<sup>4</sup>Demo: <https://data.snailbunny.site/map-check>

<sup>5</sup><https://huggingface.co/black-forest-labs/FLUX.1-schnell>



**Figure 3: Artographer (left) is a spatial map interface for historical artwork exploration. Our Baseline system (right) was a Query-Based Search Interface that mimics traditional interfaces for searching an artwork database, with support for browsing, text-search (including approximate matches), and search-by-image (supported by an image generator.) Both interfaces support exploration of the same database of 15,968 artworks.**

- (2) capture multiple interpretations of the theme, and
- (3) create a collection that could serve as a successful *expressive communication* of their assigned theme.

Participants were told to imagine showing their final image collection to a third-party individual, who should then be able to guess which theme they had been assigned from five possible choices: *Happy, Sad, Peaceful, Conflict, Fear*. Inspired by Louie et al.’s Expressive Communication evaluation [36], this task focused each participant around a common goal, while affording the kind of interpretive flexibility that characterizes creative activities.

Participants completed the targeted task for each of two themes (“Peaceful” and “Conflict”), completing one task with Artographer<sup>6</sup> and the other with a Baseline system<sup>7</sup>.

Our use of a Baseline system was not intended to facilitate collection of directly comparable task-completion data, per se. Rather, completing a task with the Baseline system provided each participant with a common ground for comparison, guiding the interview discussion to focus on the novel strengths and drawbacks of spatial map exploration.

The Baseline system’s design (see Figure 3) recreates common Query-Based Search interfaces used for art databases, with browsing, text-search (including semantic matching), and search-by-image (supported by an image generator.) Participants described that it felt straightforward and familiar; some compared it to interfaces they use to search museum catalogs and other digital cultural archives. Both interfaces supported exploration of the same database of 15,968 artworks.

Meanwhile, the version of Artographer used in this study intentionally limits traditional query-based searching affordances, allowing us to better study the exploration behaviors of interest to our research questions (namely, spatial map navigation, AI image generation as a tool to augment navigation).

We counterbalanced system-order and theme order, evenly distributing participants across the four possible system-theme combinations (see the Participant Table in the Appendix for details.)

**4.1.3 Free Exploration Task.** For the **free exploration task**, participants had 8 minutes to freely explore. They could generate and collect as many artworks as they’d like, and explore as much or as little of the map as they were interested in. At the end of the task time, they were asked to pick their top 3 favorite images (historical or generated) and submit them to a survey form. The form then asked participants to write a brief reflective journal entry explaining how they found and selected each image.

**4.1.4 Post-Task Interview.** After the free exploration task, we conducted a brief semi-structured interview asking participants to reflect on their experiences in both systems, and to help us understand what uniquely characterizes using a spatial-map interface for art exploration.

## 4.2 Data Collection and Analysis


We used Zoom to record and transcribe participants’ interviews, including their think-aloud processes while completing the tasks and screensharing. We logged every artwork that participants interacted with in both systems, as well as coordinates for every artwork interaction and every panning or zooming movement in the spatial map interface.

We used this timed coordinate data to generate exploration trajectory figures capturing each participant’s behavior during each task. We used a collaborative digital whiteboarding platform to create a board for each participant that combined their exploration behavior figures, interview transcripts, artworks collected for each task, and responses to the post-task survey questions.

Two authors led the qualitative analysis of these materials using digital post-its to annotate. We take a reflexive, inductive, constructivist approach to the analysis of our qualitative data – where both

<sup>6</sup><https://image-space-cyan.vercel.app/v8>

<sup>7</sup><https://image-space-cyan.vercel.app/baseline>



**Figure 4: Comparing number of artworks collected in each system (Artographer vs. Baseline) for each of the two targeted task conditions (“Peaceful” and “Conflict”). The difference in collection size between systems is not statistically significant.**

researcher and participant have an role in constructing understanding, and where themes emerge from the creative labor of qualitative coding [11, 16]. We first identified patterns in participants’ exploration data, then used these to craft provisional codes [47] for our analysis of their think-aloud transcripts, interview responses, and open-ended survey responses. We duplicated and clustered post-its in another board to synthesize across data sources, to form the contextualized understanding of the themes that emerged across participants’ creative explorations that guides the findings we report and discuss below.

## 5 Findings

First, we report on creative exploration behaviors and participant reflections that characterize how participants used a spatial map interface to explore artworks.


### 5.1 Characterizing Exploration in Artographer

In terms of supporting *effectiveness* at the targeted task, we found minimal differences between Artographer and the Baseline: participants completed the targeted collection task effectively regardless of which system they used. We found no statistically significant differences in responses to post-task Likert scale questions (see Appendix Fig. A1).


Participants collected slightly more artworks when using the Baseline system for the targeted exploration task, but overall, there were no statistically significant differences in collection size.

However, participants *interacted with* (i.e., clicked on) significantly more artworks when using Artographer to complete the task ( $p < 0.001$  in both conditions). This might suggest that participants curated more *selectively* in Artographer, collecting a smaller fraction of all the artworks they considered. We relate this to Artographer’s more *frictive* interaction design in Section 6.1.3.

Though task *performance* did not significantly differ, participants were clear their task *experience* differed between systems:



**Figure 5: While participants *collected* a similar number of artworks (around 8-13) regardless of system, they *interacted with* significantly more artworks (around 80 vs. around 21) when using Artographer to complete the task ( $p < 0.001$  in both conditions).**



**Figure 6: Comparing the number of images each participant generated with the number of unique artworks they interacted with. Participants who used wandering, rather than AI-generated jumping, explored more gradually, interacting with more images along the way.**

“The [Baseline] interface was actually way better for the targeted task, but the [Artographer]<sup>8</sup> interface was way better for exploration.” (P19)

“I completed the task more efficiently with the [Baseline] interface, but I think this one was just more *fun*.” (P6)

11/20 participants expressed a similar sentiment — that Artographer was *not* as easy or efficient to use as the Baseline system for a goal-driven task — but it was more *fun*, especially for exploration. Our findings that characterize the ways a spatial map interface can impact *how* participants explore provide insight into this.




Figure 7: We logged the 2D coordinates of every event where a participant interacted with an image in the spatial map, and use these to visualize their exploration trajectory. P12 chose not to generate any images during their free exploration task – they instead explored via a great deal of *wandering* with some “manual” *jumping* around the map.




Figure 8: P7’s exploration trajectory during the targeted collection task shows *jumping* to search broadly, then deeper exploration (e.g. a cluster of artworks clicked and collected nearby) once a promising area is scouted. While not all used the image generator to *jump*, this trajectory is exemplary of how participants used Artographer to search for images to complete the targeted collection task.

## 5.2 Creative Exploration Behaviors

We report on four creative exploration behaviors (Jumping, Wandering, Revisiting, Fixation) identified in participants’ exploration trajectories, and contextualized alongside qualitative analysis of their think-aloud processes and post-task reflections.

**5.2.1 Jumping & Wandering for Divergent Exploration.** We identify *jumping* as a large movement across the map; *all* participants “jumped” when using Artographer for the targeted search task, and at least once in their free exploration. In context with participants’ thinking-aloud, we interpret jumping as divergent exploration – often motivated by participants’ desire to collect a diversity of images, or a sense that had not yet explored enough of the map.

“I was trying to look for diversity of things ...kind of jumping around.... these are all portraits of a similar variety, if I want something totally different, I just kind of zoom out and pan to a totally different region, or like, the Image Generator is almost like a roll of the dice, you know? It would help me to get out of a certain area, like, not stay in this region, go to a totally different— portraits, landscapes, to still life.” (P7)

Here, P7 describes both manual jumping, and using image generation for “targeted” jumping – e.g., prompting for “a peaceful lake” to generate an image that would, ideally, place them in an area around similarly peaceful landscape images – without having to locate and navigate to that area manually.


We identified “wandering” behavior in 9/20 participants, characterizing this as a series of small movements across space, visiting nearby artworks. We characterize this as more gradually controlled divergent exploration, compared to *jumping* – as participants wandered, they described their attention being pulled towards nearby artworks that drew their eye. Most participants used a combination of wandering and jumping to navigate distances across the map. Three participants (P12, P14, P8) exhibited the most *wandering* behavior during the free exploration task; P12’s movements in Figure 7 are exemplary. These participants also generated relatively few images (0-1) and interacted with more artworks during their free exploration compared to other participants (see Figure 6.). Jumping is certainly more efficient for quickly exploring many different concepts, as evidenced by *all* participants jumping during the targeted task, wherein they had to collect diverse interpretations of the theme while under a time constraint). Although choosing to *wander* is *slower*, participants who wandered are able to interact with many more artworks, and allow their curiosity or interest lead their navigation. We connect this to the value of *friction* and further discuss supporting curiosity in Section 6.1.3 and 6.2 respectively.

**5.2.2 Revisiting and Fixation as Convergent Exploration.** We identified “revisiting” behavior in 11/20 participants’ free exploration trajectories – participants intentionally returning to an area they had previously visited.

We interpret revisiting as a transition from divergent to convergent exploration: after broadly evaluating available areas, intentionally returning to one they’ve assessed as more likely to yield

<sup>8</sup> participants referred to Artographer as “the first system” or “the second system” depending on system-order condition; for clarity, we replace these instances with the system name.





**Figure 9:** P3, P8, and P9 each described themselves as personally interested in graphic design and abstract art. During the free exploration task, they fixated on the area of the map that contained abstract art and painting, revisiting it after jumping to other areas.

interesting options than others for the user’s particular goal at that time.

In their think-aloud process, participants alluded to using *visual-spatial memory* and cues (e.g., region colors, image “landmarks”) to effectively navigate back to an area. As they showed us how to navigate back to where they found one of their favorite images, P4 described this added dimension as a novel experience:

“It’s like, I *know where I am*. Like, trying to find this Benjamin Franklin<sup>9</sup>, it was in this sort of area, and there’s a picture down here below of the Pylades<sup>10</sup>... there’s this, like, visual memory that I don’t think I’ve had in any other sort of artistic searching or medium before... that was kind of a trippy to have that jog my memory, just coming back to this area.” (P4)

P6 and P1 described wanting more time with the system to build up visual-spatial memories that could help them tacitly navigate the space:

“If I had another half hour to spend with the system, I think I would... start to develop a sense of knowing the landscape, and being like, okay, I’m looking for this, so I know I need to go into the Eastern side of this specific map...” (P6)

“With more use, I would sort of pick up on the different affordances that I could use to keep my place in the map... remember, like, associate, the theme with the color that’s going on there.” (P1)

We identified “fixation” behavior where participants spent a large portion of their time and collected many artworks in and around a single area. In Figure 9, we show the free exploration trajectories of 3 participants (P3, P8, P9) who all discussed a personal interest in abstract art. Paintings tagged “abstract art” and “abstract painting”

are located in a central-westernmost region of the map, outlined in red.

While all three used *jumping* or *wandering* to leave the area, they all eventually *revisited* it, with P8 *only* collecting artworks within this region of fixated interest.

### 5.3 Tensions and Opportunities Surfaced by Spatial Map Exploration

Participants described how exploring a computationally-constructed map of art space surfaced unique affordances and tensions.

**5.3.1 Exploring at the margins.** Most (>80%) of the artworks in the dataset are placed in the center 70% of the spatial map— yet participants collected a disproportionate number of artworks from its marginal edges (See Figure 10). For some participants, this style of exploration was intentional: P4 described an interest in ‘the outer fringes’ and others (P6, P10, P16, P19) intentionally avoided map’s center. (The center is densely populated with Western portraiture, reflecting its over-representation in the WikiArt dataset, and in many historical art collections.)

“I’m trying to stray away from, like, faces. Once I get to the faces, which I’ve kind of hit now, I have to leave.” (P10)

P16, an art historian, aptly notes how data-driven spatial visualizations can reveal marginalization, and the issues that might arise:


“I’m very interested in the, like, center and periphery dynamic that’s happening here... almost any collection you get is gonna put all your non-Western art around the edges, which means you get much less, like, vigorous and interesting connections between it and other things...” (P16)

‘Fringe’ regions present a sparsity of shallow relationships, and risk misrepresenting what is actually a richly diverse group of artworks as reductively similar. When AI models are used to automate art curation, these issues *implicitly* impact viewers’ experiences. Our

<sup>9</sup>referring to *Benjamin Franklin Drawing Electricity from the Sky* (1816) by Benjamin West

<sup>10</sup>referring to *Pylades and Orestes Brought as Victims before Iphigenia* (1766) by Benjamin West





**Figure 10: Participants collected a disproportionate number of artworks from the marginal edges of the spatial map.**

participants' behavior shows that when this marginalia is made explicitly accessible, users *choose* to prod at these edges, and more often find things of interest there.

**5.3.2 Critical Conversations with Map Construction.** Multimodal embeddings allow us to surface visual and semantic relationships between artworks that are difficult to put into words. This does not stop people from trying, however.

“One thing that I feel like I wasn’t super sure about ... how it’s actually placing the different regions, because some of them feel like they’re based on, like....content,

some of them are based around, like, the artist or the time period...” (P6)

Participants used visual-spatial sense to tacitly navigate the map (a well-reported affordance of 2D-spatial exploration interfaces as discussed in Sections 2.3 and 5.2.2), we interpret their *interrogation* of the map’s construction as attempts to gather information that could help them articulate a logic for the map’s structure.

Questioning the “reasoning” behind the map’s structure was common across participants’ thinking-aloud. In their introduction to the system, participants were made aware of the computational systems used to determine the placement of each artwork and region. Still, they expressed *agreeing* or *disagreeing* with the map’s “choices” to place some artworks closer to others:

“I do agree with this characterization that this cat is more in the style of this cluster than this style. However, does this cat relate to Kandinsky at all? I’m going to say no.” (P19)

Navigating the map requires continually sensemaking its underlying structure; participants become attuned to moments of tension — when the map’s construction does *not* align with their expectations. These tensions were particularly noted by art history experts, who bring rich, preconstructed frameworks into the task of navigating a collection of historical artworks. P14 described ‘a need to reorient oneself,’ as the map’s structure defied their expectations:

“The way the map is inherently spatialized... It brings together works by visual similarities that would otherwise not be considered “alike” in typical art historical methodologies.” (P14)

P14 took issue with the map’s structure — then, upon reflection, began to challenge their expectations as *constructed* by traditional art history contexts:

“This is just what I was taught... Art history people...would get really mad if you tried to talk about things just based on visual or thematic similarity, like, “oh, this is ahistorical, that you’re trying to make a comparison between these two things if they happened at different times in different places in the world... but because we’re so focused on Western art history, there *are* actually other connections between these different places, which may not geographically be next to each other...this can create new ways of engaging in art history, and that’s super cool.” (P14)

**5.3.3 Tensions at the juxtaposition of historical and AI-generated imagery.** Artographer presents AI image generation as a tool for augmenting navigation of the art space. It then becomes a uniquely dissonant image presentation, where AI-generated images are visually placed in context with historical artworks. Two art historians (P14, P16) discussed that this could be confusing or contribute to AI-driven media literacy and misinformation concerns. While we adjusted the presentation of GenAI images to visually distinguish them on the map, participants did confuse them:

“I forgot I generated that one. It looks pretty cool, like, in relation to the others, though.” (P18)

Among participants, P3 had the most limited experience studying art, while being very experienced and enthusiastic about AI image

generation. During their free exploration, they prompted for an image of “beautiful nature scenery” — the generated result placed them in an area of the map populated by landscape paintings.

“It almost looks like they’re all Midjourney generated... I’ve seen a lot of AI-generated picture images that now it’s hard to tell if these are AI-generated or not. But... oh, wow. I like these. if you showed me this, I would say that this was AI-generated. I didn’t know that this would be real.” (P3)

Later, all three of the “favorite” images that P3 submitted were landscape paintings discovered in this moment. They explain why:

“It’s interesting how people actually drew this in the past, and these aren’t actually AI-generated, and it looks really, like it really requires talent.” (P3)

Here, P3’s interest in AI-generated landscapes served as an entrypoint to artworks they might not have otherwise discovered. Though these paintings are visually similar to images they encounter frequently, P3 found unique value in them because of their historical context as human-made artworks.

We discuss in Section 6.1.4 how future work might facilitate more serendipitous discoveries by helping users connect AI-generated imagery to rich and meaningful human contexts – while echoing art history experts’ concerns that any presentation of AI-generated imagery should be intentional in its communication and treatment of image provenance.

## 6 Discussion

Here, we discuss four design values enacted by similarity-clustered spatial maps: visibility, agency, friction, and serendipity. We also consider the implications of our results for Curatorial Interface design, creative exploration research, and responsible AI interventions into curation.

### 6.1 Design Values for Curatorial Interfaces

From considering *how* Artographer influenced participants’ exploration behaviors, we identify 4 values enacted by a similarity-clustered spatial map interface that are relevant to designing curated interactions with artworks. We use these values to draw comparisons to two other interfaces used to find and engage with artworks: *query-based search interfaces*, and *recommendation feeds*.<sup>11</sup>

We relate these as *Curatorial Interfaces*: systems that perform *curation* — the work of selecting and presenting artworks for users to interact with.

#### 6.1.1 Visibility.

“Maybe I’ll zoom out to see what else is available to me [...] It’s really cool for just exploration, just seeing all the different artworks that are out there.” (P18)

A spatial map interface provides unique affordances for participants to view what is available. Participants appreciated the ability to zoom out and get a bird’s-eye view of the space of options, and let their eyes guide them into the next area for exploration. Visibility allows users to utilize visual-spatial memory to navigate to and

<sup>11</sup>Many participants described that they typically engage with new artwork on platforms curated by recommendation algorithms, like Pinterest, TikTok, or Instagram.

Design Values	Similarity-Clustered Spatial Map	Query-Based Search	Recommendation Feed
<b>1. Visibility</b> How well can the user can perceive the space of options available?	<b>More:</b> Ideally, the user can quickly gauge what is generally available, i.e., at a distant read.	<b>Less:</b> Ideally, the user rarely sees options outside the specific space that they explicitly expressed interest in.	<b>Less:</b> Ideally, the user rarely sees content outside the space of options algorithmically determined as interesting to them.
<b>2. Agency</b> Does the user have control over where and how to look?	<b>More:</b> Users can, and typically <i>must</i> , directly “move” themselves to the place they want to look next	<b>More:</b> Ideally, the user is able to precisely specify how and where to look for results.	<b>Less:</b> Ideally, the recommendation algorithm takes on the labor of seeking out content on behalf of the user.
<b>3. Serendipity</b> Can the user find interesting things that they were not intentionally searching for?	<b>More:</b> Visibility draws users away from intentions, towards areas of interest; ideally, clustering ensures that other interesting results are frequently visible nearby.	<b>Less:</b> Ideally, the system presents results that are directly related to the user’s intentionally specified search query.	<b>More:</b> Ideally, the user only needs to express minimal or even incidental intention, for the system to then continually present them with interesting results.
<b>4. Friction</b> How much work is required for the user to get to something they are interested in?	<b>More:</b> The user must take an active, reflective role in searching for pieces that interest them.	<b>Less:</b> Ideally, the user can easily and precisely specify what they are looking for, and find it among the top results.	<b>Less:</b> Ideally, the user experiences minimal friction — does not even perceive a “search” is happening.
Ideal for...	Exploration, active discovery	Targeted search	Passive consumption

**Figure 11: This table compares how three kinds of Curatorial Interfaces – systems that select and present artwork for users to view and engage with – compare across the four design values we identified: Visibility, Agency, Serendipity, and Friction.**

from areas of interest (Sec. 5.2.2) and to make choices informed by the map’s visible, global structure (e.g., choosing to explore its edges as in Sec. 5.3.1.)

Visibility is not so valued in AI-curated recommendation feeds, where the space of options, and the underlying structures that relate them, are obscured within “black box” systems. A recommendation is, implicitly, a “nearest neighbor” of some other option(s) the user expressed interest in, but users are not able to interrogate if they disagree with the underlying assumptions that construct this space of recommendations. However, depending on user’s needs, visibility can threaten interpretability — certainly, if a user knows exactly what they wish to see next, it could be most helpful to take them straight there without distraction (as a Query-Based Search interface would); and indeed this difference characterizes participants’ preference for the Baseline system to complete their time-constrained targeted collection task. On the other hand, what to obscure directly shapes users’ understanding of the available options and, consequently, how they can act and explore.

**6.1.2 Agency.** When discovering artworks, being empowered to choose *where* and *how* to look is meaningful. Query-based search and recommendation algorithms seek to present users with an optimal result, but do not allow users fine controls. Recommendation feeds, by design, funnel users towards “rabbitholes” or narrow areas of interest where they are likely to enjoy a lot of the nearby content.

However, as demonstrated in Figure 9, fixated participants *jumped* to other areas of the map, then ultimately *revisited* their area of interest. Designing for visibility and agency empowers users to make the informed decision to stay in a narrow area of interest – the option to explore elsewhere is meaningful, even when rejected.

**6.1.3 Friction.** Participants found the Baseline query-based search system more efficient and better suited for a time-constrained, goal-driven task. Manual navigation of a spatial map requires continuously evaluating the artworks presented to steer the exploration; in Artographer artworks also sometimes clustered and occluded one another.

As reported in Figures 4 and 5, participants interacted with far more artworks in Artographer but collected roughly the same number in both systems, suggesting that users had to put more effort into evaluation and interpretation to achieve similar outcomes.

In contrast, query-based search immediately surfaces what users would assume to be the best options; recommendation feeds optimize for reduced friction by delegating those search, evaluation, and selection tasks to the algorithm. Friction in Artographer could be mitigated by enhancing “jumping” mechanisms. For example, a query-based search feature could highlight all artworks by an artist of interest, allowing more efficient navigation while preserving user agency. However, intentionally **designing for friction** – slowing users down and creating moments where they evaluate, interrogate, and relate the artworks presented to them – may better align with curatorial goals for deeper engagement with artworks, compared to designing for efficiency and ease.

**6.1.4 Serendipity.** Participants found it fun to freely explore in the spatial map interface. They often connected this fun to the feeling of serendipity – delighting in the discovery of something they did not expect to find or learn about.

“I was not expecting to look for something from Dali, and suddenly, I am in Japan...that experience was rich. I liked it a lot.” (P17)

7/20 participants described surprise or serendipity as the reason why they selected one or more of their favorite images at the end of the free exploration task. We suggest that Serendipity is *amplified* by Visibility, Friction, and Agency: when participants must put active effort into navigating a space of artworks, they earn a sense of creative ownership over their path of navigation and any discoveries they find along the way.

Curatorial interfaces might benefit from supporting both recall (jumping directly to known interests when users can articulate them) and recognition (wandering into areas where the eye leads), while still presenting curated guideposts. This balance increases opportunities for serendipitous discovery while preserving agency—a particularly important feature for novices, who may not yet know what they want or how to articulate their aesthetic preferences.

Serendipity has appeared as a value in other engaging curatorial artwork interfaces [24, 40], and notably can facilitate a personal connection and appreciation for art that directs viewers’ attention towards supporting human artistry.

“I found, like, 5 artists today I didn’t know about that I want to research more.” (P4)

P19 describes a new and joyful appreciation for artist Louis Wain:

“...it just had more surprises. I feel like the [map] interface is a really great learning tool... even for me, who I feel like I’m somewhat knowledgeable about art.... it was such a joy for me to learn about these artists, to discover new artists like this person who only drew cats in the mental hospital...” (P19)

P3’s experience discovering an unexpected appreciation for human-made landscape paintings, as described in Section 5.3.3 points to opportunities for future work to help users of AI-image generators better connect the imagery they are interested in to established artworks.

## 6.2 Making creative exploration more curious, joyful, and visible

HCI CST literature has often emphasized *composition tools* that directly support the production of creative artifacts [44]. Artographer does *not* center artifact production, but it is certainly a creativity support tool, and what Compton and Mateas [22] would call a *casual creator*: “an interactive system that encourages the fast, confident, and pleasurable exploration of a possibility space, resulting in the creation or discovery of surprising new artifacts that bring feelings of pride, ownership, and creativity.”

Several participants in our study exhibited behaviors in Artographer that Nelson et al. describe as characteristic of “curious users of casual creators”, e.g., making larger leaps in the design space or prodding at its edges [42]. *Curious use* is motivated by curiosity about the casual creator and the space of possibilities it interfaces, in contrast with more goal-driven or artifact-driven use. As discussed in Section 6.1.3, multiple participants experienced moments of ‘distraction’ in Artographer – moments where, despite being *explicitly* asked to complete a goal-driven, time-restricted task, they found themselves following their curiosity instead. Future work might explore how aspects of interface design itself (e.g., visibility, friction) can create conditions that pique curiosity—scaffolding the creative goals of curious users and facilitating serendipitous discovery (e.g., exposing underexplored areas).

Systems that make creative activities more visible, like a similarity-clustered spatial map, hold *methodological* promise for creativity research. Prior work has proposed the use of *expressive range analysis techniques* to visualize and evaluate how a CST supports access to a possibility space [30, 50]. More visible and tangible evaluation instruments can give researchers *and participants* real-time insights into their behavior as they interact with a system [26]. With experimental systems that make a range of creative behaviors more readily observable, we can build a richer understanding of the vast spectrum of goals, strategies, needs, and attitudes that creative users bring into conversation with their tools. Already, we see that this spectrum is more diverse, dynamic, and pluralistic than artifact-centered CST studies can capture alone.

## 6.3 Designing More Responsible AI Art Curation

What do we lose when we give up human control in curation? As discussed in the introduction, parameterizing artworks and training AI models to automatically evaluate or classify them by “aesthetic quality” risks flattening art into reductive categories. When such

models are then used to curate social media feeds or assemble the training sets for generative AI, these reductive ways of seeing become embedded in the infrastructures that shape visual culture. With Artographer, we explored an alternative: opening up AI classifier models—specifically their embedding spaces—for user-driven exploration and interrogation. We framed AI image generation not as a substitute for artistic judgment, but as a tool to augment navigation through established art spaces.

As a curatorial interface paradigm, similarity-clustered spatial-map interfaces, like Artographer, can support serendipitous art discovery and learning experiences that may be especially valuable for novices. However, we imagine what a broader space of alternative Curatorial Interfaces — designed with commitment to Agency, Visibility, Friction, and Serendipity — could offer.

**6.3.1 Towards dynamically pluralistic, user-driven art-cartography.** As Card et al. note, “Spatial position is such a good visual coding of data that the first decision of visualization design is which variables get spatial encoding at the expense of others” [13, p. 26]. Our initial approach to ML-supported spatialization of art in Artographer represents only a single way to make use of this powerful visual encoding, and one that is ultimately based on the obscure operations of ML models designed for entirely unrelated purposes. In the future, we hope that similar spatial interfaces may not just expose the spatial relationships implied by how existing models happened to be trained, but also empower users to mark up, squash, stretch, and otherwise manipulate spatiality to make the critical decisions of spatial encoding themselves.

To research and design interactions with artwork that present some monolithic “natural” truth is to neglect how different contexts, cultures, and communities shape a multitude of ways of knowing and relating artwork. We draw on Bardzell’s feminist HCI design qualities [7] — the quality of pluralism in particular, and imagine a dynamically pluralistic, user-driven “map-making” system as an opportunity to push against a universalist approach to designing computational systems with and for art data.

The backend map-making system we built, as described in Section 3.2, already supports generating a plurality of map representations. It can readily support parametric interpolation between different spatializations of the same artwork dataset. This powerful flexibility would be valuable for expert art history research, where flexibly restructuring data allows researchers to interrogate a variety of interpretations. But as non-experts are consume more AI-mediated imagery than ever before, and as platforms increasingly use opaque AI systems to control *how* that imagery is curated and consumed — critical future work should consider what kinds of flexible supports can help empower users in their interactions with art and media.

## 7 Conclusion

To complete the T. S. Eliot quote from the beginning of this piece,

*The existing monuments form an ideal order among themselves, which is modified by the introduction of the new (the really new) work of art among them. The existing order is complete before the new work arrives; for order to persist after the supervention of novelty, the whole existing order must be, if ever so slightly, altered;*

*and so the relations, proportions, values of each work of art toward the whole are readjusted...*

—T. S. Eliot

In this work, we presented Artographer, a Curatorial Interface for exploring an intentionally curated dataset of 15,968 historical artworks, placed in a zoomable, similarity-clustered spatial map. We crafted this spatial map presentation from the embedding spaces of multiple models, placing AI generation into a context where it can augment and converse with established art space. We use Artographer as a probe to explore subverting the use of AI models to automate away the work of human art evaluation, and to investigate the effect of presenting the rich, relational information embedded in AI models as a visible substrate upon which users can explore, interrogate, discover, and teach us about creative exploration. In our study with 20 participants including 9 art history scholars, we identified four art space exploration behaviors (Jumping, Wandering, Fixation, and Revisiting). We discuss four key values enacted by Curatorial Interfaces: Visibility, Agency, Friction, and Serendipity — and consider what we lose when the recommendation systems that govern curation of media automate away from those values. We advocate for treating the rich, relational knowledge embedded in AI models not as a “solution” for human subjectivity in curation, but as a flexible material that users might joyfully manipulate, and reflexively interrogate. We draw from hypertext artist Chia Amisola’s framing of media navigation as a form of creative authorship itself [2], and imagine how Curatorial Interfaces might move towards empowering users with the agency to creatively curate and navigate more personal engagements with art and media.

## References

- [1] Shm Garanganao Almeda, Joy O Kim, and Bjoern Hartmann. 2025. Creativity Supportive Ecosystems: A Framework for Understanding Function and Disruption in Online Art Worlds. In *Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '25)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–17. doi:10.1145/3706598.3713734
- [2] Chia Amisola. 2024. Becoming hypertext. <https://everythingi.love>
- [3] Ran An. 2024. Art curation in virtual spaces: The influence of digital technology in redefining the aesthetics and interpretation of art | Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences Studies. *Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences Studies* (Aug. 2024). doi:10.69598/hasss.24.2.267552
- [4] Artsy. 2025. Artsy/The-Art-Genome-Project. <https://github.com/artsy/the-art-genome-project/tree/master>
- [5] A. Avgousti, G. Papaioannou, and S. Hermon. 2024. Enhancing Online Accessibility of Digitized Artifacts from Small Museum Collections in Cyprus: An Empirical Evaluation of the CyprusArk Solution. *J. Comput. Cult. Herit.* 17, 3 (April 2024), 34:1–34:24. doi:10.1145/3648229
- [6] Yaniv Bar, Noga Levy, and Lior Wolf. 2015. Classification of Artistic Styles Using Binarized Features Derived from a Deep Neural Network. In *Computer Vision - ECCV 2014 Workshops*, Lourdes Agapito, Michael M. Bronstein, and Carsten Rother (Eds.). Springer International Publishing, Cham, 71–84. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-16178-5\_5
- [7] Shaowen Bardzell. 2010. Feminist HCI: taking stock and outlining an agenda for design. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '10)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1301–1310. doi:10.1145/1753326.1753521
- [8] Romain Beaumont and Christoph Schuhman. 2022. LAION-AI/aesthetic-predictor. <https://github.com/LAION-AI/aesthetic-predictor> original-date: 2022-05-21T12:36:24Z.
- [9] Howard S. Becker. 1974. Art As Collective Action. *American Sociological Review* 39, 6 (1974), 767–776. doi:10.2307/2094151 Publisher: [American Sociological Association, Sage Publications, Inc.].
- [10] Benjamin B. Bederson and James D. Hollan. 1994. Pad++: a zooming graphical interface for exploring alternate interface physics. In *Proceedings of the 7th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology* (Marina del Rey, California, USA) (UIST '94). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 17–26. doi:10.1145/192426.192435

- [11] Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke. 2019. Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health* 11, 4 (Aug. 2019), 589–597. doi:10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806 Publisher: Routledge \_eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806>.
- [12] Harriet R Cameron and Velvet Spors. 2023. The Museum is Dreaming: Re-Imagining the Museum through Feminist Values and Data Practices in Design Fiction. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Academic Mindtrek Conference (Mindtrek '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 182–194. doi:10.1145/3616961.3616984
- [13] Stuart K Card, Jock D Mackinlay, and Ben Shneiderman. 1999. *Readings in Information Visualization: Using Vision to Think*. Morgan Kaufman.
- [14] Nicholas Carlini, Jamie Hayes, Milad Nasr, Matthew Jagielski, Vikash Sehwal, Florian Tramèr, Borja Balle, Daphne Ippolito, and Eric Wallace. 2023. Extracting training data from diffusion models. In *Proceedings of the 32nd USENIX Conference on Security Symposium (SEC '23)*. USENIX Association, USA, 5253–5270.
- [15] Tara Chari and Lior Pachter. 2023. The specious art of single-cell genomics. *PLOS Computational Biology* 19, 8 (2023), e1011288.
- [16] Kathy Charmaz. 2006. *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis*. SAGE. Google-Books-ID: 2ThdBAAQBAJ.
- [17] Erin Cherry and Celine Latulipe. 2014. Quantifying the Creativity Support of Digital Tools through the Creativity Support Index. *ACM Trans. Comput.-Hum. Interact.* 21, 4 (June 2014), 21:1–21:25. doi:10.1145/2617588
- [18] John Joon Young Chung, Shiqing He, and Eytan Adar. 2022. Artist Support Networks: Implications for Future Creativity Support Tools. In *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Designing Interactive Systems Conference (DIS '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 232–246. doi:10.1145/3532106.3533505
- [19] John Joon Young Chung and Max Kreminski. 2024. Patchview: LLM-powered Worldbuilding with Generative Dust and Magnet Visualization. In *Proceedings of the 37th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology (Pittsburgh, PA, USA) (UIST '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 77, 19 pages. doi:10.1145/3654777.3676352
- [20] Luigina Cioffi, Gabriela Avram, Laura Maye, Nick Dulake, Mark T. Marshall, Dick van Dijk, and Fiona McDermott. 2016. Articulating Co-Design in Museums: Reflections on Two Participatory Processes. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM Conference on Computer-Supported Cooperative Work & Social Computing (CSCW '16)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 13–25. doi:10.1145/2818048.2819967
- [21] Andy Coenen and Adam Pearce. [n. d.]. Understanding UMAP. <https://pair-code.github.io/understanding-umap/>
- [22] Kate Compton and Michael Mateas. 2015. Casual creators. In *International Conference on Computational Creativity*. 228–235.
- [23] Adam M. Fass, Eric A. Bier, and Eytan Adar. 2000. PicturePiper: using a re-configurable pipeline to find images on the Web. In *Proceedings of the 13th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology (San Diego, California, USA) (UIST '00)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 51–62. doi:10.1145/354401.354411
- [24] Sarah Frost, Manu Mathew Thomas, and Angus G. Forbes. 2019. Art I Don't Like: An Anti-Recommend System for Visual Art. Boston, MA. <https://mw19.mwconf.org/proposal/art-i-dont-like-an-anti-recommender-system-for-visual-art/index.html>
- [25] Tim Gorichanaz. 2020. Engaging with Public Art: An Exploration of the Design Space. In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–14. doi:10.1145/3313831.3376640
- [26] Katherine Isbister, Kristina Höök, Michael Sharp, and Jarmo Laakso. 2006. The sensual evaluation instrument: developing an affective evaluation tool. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '06)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1163–1172. doi:10.1145/1124772.1124946
- [27] Hyeon Jeon, Hyunwook Lee, Yun-Hsin Kuo, Taehyun Yang, Daniel Archambault, Sungahn Ko, Takanori Fujiwara, Kwan-Liu Ma, and Jinwook Seo. 2025. Unveiling High-dimensional Backstage: A Survey for Reliable Visual Analytics with Dimensionality Reduction. In *Proceedings of the 2025 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '25)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 394, 24 pages. doi:10.1145/3706598.3713551
- [28] Suzanne Kobeisse and Lars Erik Holmquist. 2023. Moving Inside the Box: Interacting with Interpretation of Historical Artefacts Through Tangible Augmented Reality. In *ACM Multimedia Asia 2023*. ACM, Tainan Taiwan, 1–7. doi:10.1145/3595916.3626408
- [29] Karen Johanne Kortbek and Kaj Grønbaek. 2008. Communicating art through interactive technology: new approaches for interaction design in art museums. In *Proceedings of the 5th Nordic conference on Human-computer interaction: building bridges (NordCHI '08)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 229–238. doi:10.1145/1463160.1463185
- [30] Max Kreminski, Isaac Karth, Michael Mateas, and Noah Wardrip-Fruin. 2022. Evaluating Mixed-Initiative Creative Interfaces via Expressive Range Coverage Analysis. In *Joint Proceedings of the ACM IUI Workshops 2022*. ACM, Helsinki, Finland. [https://mkremins.github.io/publications/ERaCA\\_HAI-GEN2022.pdf](https://mkremins.github.io/publications/ERaCA_HAI-GEN2022.pdf)
- [31] John Lamping, Ramana Rao, and Peter Pirolli. 1995. A focus+context technique based on hyperbolic geometry for visualizing large hierarchies. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (Denver, Colorado, USA) (CHI '95)*. ACM Press/Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., USA, 401–408. doi:10.1145/223904.223956
- [32] Jerrold Levinson. 1979. DEFINING ART HISTORICALLY. *The British Journal of Aesthetics* 19, 3 (Jan. 1979), 232–250. doi:10.1093/bjaesthetics/19.3.232
- [33] Jerrold Levinson. 1989. Refining Art Historically. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 47, 1 (1989), 21–33. doi:10.2307/431990 Publisher: [Wiley, American Society for Aesthetics].
- [34] Jingyi Li, Eric Rawn, Jacob Ritchie, Jasper Tran O'Leary, and Sean Follmer. 2023. Beyond the Artifact: Power as a Lens for Creativity Support Tools. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology (UIST '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–15. doi:10.1145/3586183.3606831
- [35] Weiwei Li. 2025. Enhanced automated art curation using supervised modified CNN for art style classification. *Scientific Reports* 15, 1 (March 2025), 7319. doi:10.1038/s41598-025-91671-z Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [36] Ryan Louie, Jesse Engel, and Cheng-Zhi Anna Huang. 2022. Expressive Communication: Evaluating Developments in Generative Models and Steering Interfaces for Music Creation. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces (IUI '22)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 405–417. doi:10.1145/3490099.3511159
- [37] Mei Luo, Li Liu, Yue Lu, and Ching Y. Suen. 2025. Art style classification via self-supervised dual-teacher knowledge distillation. *Applied Soft Computing* 174 (April 2025), 112964. doi:10.1016/j.asoc.2025.112964
- [38] Leland McInnes, John Healy, Nathaniel Saul, and Lukas Großberger. 2018. UMAP: Uniform Manifold Approximation and Projection. *Journal of Open Source Software* 3, 29 (Sept. 2018), 861. doi:10.21105/joss.00861
- [39] Christofer Meinecke, Chris Hall, and Stefan Jänicke. 2022. Towards Enhancing Virtual Museums by Contextualizing Art through Interactive Visualizations. *J. Comput. Cult. Herit.* 15, 4 (Dec. 2022), 62:1–62:26. doi:10.1145/3527619
- [40] Louie Meyer, Johanne Engel Aaen, Anitamalina Regitse Tranberg, Peter Kun, Matthias Freiberg, Sebastian Risi, and Anders Sundnes Løvlie. 2024. Algorithmic Ways of Seeing: Using Object Detection to Facilitate Art Exploration. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, Honolulu HI USA, 1–18. doi:10.1145/3613904.3642157
- [41] N. Murray, L. Marchesotti, and F. Perronnin. 2012. AVA: A large-scale database for aesthetic visual analysis. *2012 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition* (June 2012), 2408–2415. doi:10.1109/CVPR.2012.6247954 Conference Name: 2012 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR) ISBN: 9781467312288 9781467312264 9781467312271 Place: Providence, RI Publisher: IEEE.
- [42] Mark J. Nelson, Swen E. Gaudl, Simon Colton, and Sebastian Deterding. 2018. Curious users of casual creators. In *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on the Foundations of Digital Games (FDG '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–6. doi:10.1145/3235765.3235826
- [43] Daniela Petrelli and Sinead O'Brien. 2018. Phone vs. Tangible in Museums: A Comparative Study. In *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '18)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–12. doi:10.1145/3173574.3173686
- [44] Mitchell Resnick, Brad Myers, Kumiyo Nakakoji, Ben Shneiderman, Randy Pausch, Ted Selker, and Mike Eisenberg. 2005. Design principles for tools to support creative thinking. In *Report of Workshop on Creativity Support Tools*.
- [45] Kimiko Ryokai, Noriko Misra, and Yoshinori Hara. 2015. Artistic Distance: Body Movements as Launching Points for Art Inquiry. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI EA '15)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 679–686. doi:10.1145/2702613.2702958
- [46] Dominik Sacha, Leishi Zhang, Michael Sedlmair, John A. Lee, Jaakko Peltonen, Daniel Weiskopf, Stephen C. North, and Daniel A. Keim. 2017. Visual Interaction with Dimensionality Reduction: A Structured Literature Analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* 23, 1 (2017), 241–250. doi:10.1109/TVCG.2016.2598495
- [47] Johnny Saldana. 2015. *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. SAGE. Google-Books-ID: jh1iCgAAQBAJ.
- [48] Christoph Schuhmann. 2022. LAION-Aesthetics. <https://laion.ai/blog/laion-aesthetics>
- [49] Christoph Schuhmann. 2025. christophschuhmann/improved-aesthetic-predictor. <https://github.com/christophschuhmann/improved-aesthetic-predictor> original-date: 2022-06-25T20:57:49Z.
- [50] Gillian Smith and Jim Whitehead. 2010. Analyzing the expressive range of a level generator. In *Proceedings of the 2010 Workshop on Procedural Content Generation in Games (PCGames '10)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–7. doi:10.1145/1814256.1814260
- [51] Jocelyn Spence, Benjamin Bedwell, Michelle Coleman, Steve Benford, Boriana N. Koleva, Matt Adams, Ju Row Farr, Nick Tandavanitj, and Anders Sundnes Løvlie.



## A Appendix


2019. Seeing with New Eyes: Designing for In-the-Wild Museum Gifting. In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '19)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–13. doi:10.1145/3290605.3300235
- [52] Ramya Srinivasan. 2024. To See or Not to See: Understanding the Tensions of Algorithmic Curation for Visual Arts. In *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAccT '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 444–455. doi:10.1145/3630106.3658917
- [53] Sangho Suh, Meng Chen, Bryan Min, Toby Jia-Jun Li, and Haijun Xia. 2024. Luminate: Structured Generation and Exploration of Design Space with Large Language Models for Human-AI Co-Creation. In *Proceedings of the 2024 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (Honolulu, HI, USA) (CHI '24)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 644, 26 pages. doi:10.1145/3613904.3642400
- [54] Sangho Suh, Bryan Min, Srishti Palani, and Haijun Xia. 2023. Sensecape: Enabling Multilevel Exploration and Sensemaking with Large Language Models. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology (San Francisco, CA, USA) (UIST '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 1, 18 pages. doi:10.1145/3586183.3606756
- [55] Jerry O. Talton, Daniel Gibson, Lingfeng Yang, Pat Hanrahan, and Vladlen Koltun. 2009. Exploratory modeling with collaborative design spaces. *ACM Trans. Graph.* 28, 5 (Dec. 2009), 1–10. doi:10.1145/1618452.1618513
- [56] Michaela Tuscher, Velitchko Filipov, Teresa Kamencek, Raphael Rosenberg, and Silvia Miksch. 2025. Nodes, Edges, and Artistic Wedges: A Survey on Network Visualization in Art History. *Computer Graphics Forum* 44, 3 (2025), e70154. doi:10.1111/cgf.70154 \_eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/cgf.70154>
- [57] Alina Valyaeva. 2023. AI Image Statistics for 2024: How Much Content Was Created by AI. <https://journal.everypixel.com/ai-image-statistics>
- [58] Elena Villaespesa. 2019. Museum Collections and Online Users: Development of a Segmentation Model for the Metropolitan Museum of Art. *Visitor Studies* 22, 2 (July 2019), 233–252. doi:10.1080/10645578.2019.1668679 Publisher: Routledge \_eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10645578.2019.1668679>
- [59] Thomas Șerban von Davier, Hayoun Noh, Max Van Kleek, and Nigel Shadbolt. 2025. Looking for Art in a Sea of Content: A Human-Centered Approach to Supporting Creativity on Social Media. *Proc. ACM Hum.-Comput. Interact.* 9, 2 (May 2025), CSCW127:1–CSCW127:25. doi:10.1145/3711025
- [60] Thomas Șerban von Davier, Laura M. Herman, and Caterina Moruzzi. 2024. A Machine Walks into an Exhibit: A Technical Analysis of Art Curation. *Arts* 13, 5 (Oct. 2024), 138. doi:10.3390/arts13050138 Publisher: Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute.
- [61] Ron Wakkary and Marek Hatala. 2007. Situated play in a tangible interface and adaptive audio museum guide. *Personal Ubiquitous Comput.* 11, 3 (Feb. 2007), 171–191. doi:10.1007/s00779-006-0101-8
- [62] Alexandra Weilenmann, Thomas Hillman, and Beata Jungselius. 2013. Instagram at the museum: communicating the museum experience through social photo sharing. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '13)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1843–1852. doi:10.1145/2470654.2466243
- [63] wikiart.org. 2025. huggan/wikiart · Datasets at Hugging Face. <https://huggingface.co/datasets/huggan/wikiart>
- [64] Ji Soo Yi, Rachel Melton, John Stasko, and Julie A. Jacko. 2005. Dust & magnet: multivariate information visualization using a magnet metaphor. *Information Visualization* 4, 4 (Oct. 2005), 239–256. doi:10.1057/palgrave.ivs.9500099
- [65] Bereket A. Yilma and Luis A. Leiva. 2023. The Elements of Visual Art Recommendation: Learning Latent Semantic Representations of Paintings. In *Proceedings of the 2023 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (CHI '23)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1–17. doi:10.1145/3544548.3581477
- [66] Jiajing Zhang, Yongwei Miao, Junsong Zhang, and Jinhui Yu. 2020. Inkthetics: A Comprehensive Computational Model for Aesthetic Evaluation of Chinese Ink Paintings. *IEEE Access* 8 (2020), 225857–225871. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2020.3044573
- [67] Shichao Zhao, David Kirk, Simon Bowen, and Peter Wright. 2018. Enhancing the Appreciation of Traditional Chinese Painting Using Interactive Technology. *Multimodal Technologies and Interaction* 2, 2 (June 2018), 16. doi:10.3390/mti2020016 Publisher: Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute.

## A.1 Participant Table

**Table A1: Participant Background Information and Study Conditions**

P#	Experience as a Creative Practitioner	Experience Studying Art as a Subject	Art Study Background	System Order	Theme Order
P01	Significant experience	Moderate experience	experience taking art history courses	Baseline, Artographer	Conflict, Peaceful
P02	Expert experience	Expert experience	Degree in design; teaches art / design courses	Artographer, Baseline	Conflict, Peaceful
P03	Novice-level experience	Novice-level experience	experience taking art practice courses	Baseline, Artographer	Peaceful, Conflict
P04	Moderate experience	Novice-level experience	experience taking art practice courses	Artographer, Baseline	Peaceful, Conflict
P05	Novice-level experience	Significant experience	Art History graduate student researcher	Baseline, Artographer	Conflict, Peaceful
P06	Moderate experience	Moderate experience	experience taking art history courses	Artographer, Baseline	Conflict, Peaceful
P07	Moderate experience	Little to no experience	None	Baseline, Artographer	Peaceful, Conflict
P08	Significant experience	Moderate experience	experience taking design courses	Artographer, Baseline	Peaceful, Conflict
P09	Significant experience	Significant experience	experience taking art history courses, self-study	Baseline, Artographer	Conflict, Peaceful
P10	Novice-level experience	Novice-level experience	experience taking art history courses	Artographer, Baseline	Conflict, Peaceful
P11	Moderate experience	Novice-level experience	self-study	Baseline, Artographer	Peaceful, Conflict
P12	Expert experience	Expert experience	Graduate Degree in Art History	Artographer, Baseline	Peaceful, Conflict
P13	Expert experience	Expert experience	Degree in art practice, took courses in art history, experience working in an art museum	Baseline, Artographer	Conflict, Peaceful
P14	Novice-level experience	Expert experience	Degree in Art History, experience working in an art museum	Artographer, Baseline	Conflict, Peaceful
P15	Expert experience	Moderate experience	Degree in art practice, took courses in art history	Baseline, Artographer	Peaceful, Conflict
P16	Significant experience	Expert experience	Art History graduate student researcher	Artographer, Baseline	Peaceful, Conflict
P17	Expert experience	Moderate experience	experience taking art history courses, self-study to support creative practice	Baseline, Artographer	Conflict, Peaceful
P18	Novice-level experience	Novice-level experience	experience taking art history courses	Artographer, Baseline	Conflict, Peaceful
P19	Significant experience	Significant experience	self-study to support creative practice	Baseline, Artographer	Peaceful, Conflict
P20	Moderate experience	Expert experience	degree in art history, art history research experiences	Artographer, Baseline	Peaceful, Conflict

## **A.2 Likert-Scale Responses**



**Figure A1: Participant Likert responses comparing the Baseline system and Artographer (brown = disagreement, blue-green = agreement). There is no statistically significant difference in responses between the two systems; participants were able to complete their exploration task effectively in both systems.**