"deeper than the eye can see" event, 20 November 2012

with MSc in E-learning participants and Natasa Lackovic

Text chat archive from the event (only a partial record, as much of the discussion was via voice or video). For info, the spaces are where emoticons were!

James Lamb
19:32
Do we applaud as Natasa enters the room?
Jen Ross
19:32
*clap clap clap
James Mackay
19:33

- Sian joined the Main Room. (19:33) -
- Phil D 1 joined the Main Room. (19:33) -
Jen Ross
19:33
hi Sian and Phil!
Silvana di Gregorio
19:33

Sian
19:33
hello
Gina
19:33
hi
natasa lackovic 1 #2
19:33
hello Sian!
Phil D 1
19:33
Hi
Silvana di Gregorio
19:33
Hi Sian
- Hamish Macleod joined the Main Room. (19:33) -
Sian
19:34
hi Gina, hi Natasa!
and hello Silvana
19:34
Phil D 1
19:34
Hi
Sian

19:34
hi Natasa - great to see you again
Christine Sinclair
19:34
Hi Natasa
Silvana di Gregorio
19:35
Hi Natasa
Linda Matthews
19:35
how interesting, we get to pick how we will be communicating
natasa lackovic 1 #2
19:35
Hi everyone! Hi Hamish!
Hamish Macleod
19:35
Welcome
Linda Matthews
19:36

It all new to me!
19:36
Gina
19:37
yes, I do/will
Hamish Macleod
19:37
Does watching animals count?
Jen Ross
19:37

Hamish Macleod
19:37
If I can find the on switch.
Jen Ross
19:37
'talk' button beneath the video window?
natasa lackovic 1 #2
19:37
aaah...
Sian
19:37
perfect
James Mackay
19:37
perfect
Phil D 1
19:37
Ok
Christine Sinclair

19:37
fine Hamish
Gina
19:37
great
Silvana di Gregorio
19:39
In the ethnographic side of my dissertation I hope people will use a digital diary which will involve some taking photos through Evernote.
- Sian left the Main Room. (19:39) -
Hamish Macleod
19:39
The challenge then, is about how you categorise what you see.
Nice use of Evernoet.
19:40
]... note.
19:40
Jen Ross
19:43
motility - interesting!
- Sian #2 joined the Main Room. (19:43) -
Linda Matthews
19:43
Once data is captured I am interested in the cultural aspects of interpreting visual data. 'Ways of Seeing' has forever influenced me.
Sian #2
19:44
sorry I lost connection
Jen Ross
19:44
welcome back, Sian!
natasa lackovic 1 #2
19:44
visual culture reader Mirzoeff
Image studies Manghani
19:44
SAGE Handbook of Visual Research Methods ed. by Margolis and Pauwels
19:45
Jen Ross
19:45
she's got those all in her head!
natasa lackovic 1 #2
19:45
Doing visual research by Mitchell
Sian #2
19:45
I'm on Amazon...

19:45
Jen Ross

19:46

natasa lackovic 1 #2
19:46
Carey Jewitt (ed) Multimodality Handbook
Linda Matthews
19:47
I don't know how to speak in this enviornment!
Jen Ross
19:47
Linda's doing it in type!
if you have a microphone,
19:47
try pressing the 'talk' button
19:47
beneath the video window
19:47
Linda Matthews
19:47
It took me three monthsa to sit down in SL, so I think I will type
Jen Ross
19:47

natasa lackovic 1 #2
19:47

Sian #2
19:48
it's a great one
Silvana di Gregorio
19:48

James Mackay
19:48

Phil D 1
19:48

Linda Matthews
19:48
For me Way of seeing captured the impossibility of viewing the world in a neutral way
natasa lackovic 1 #2
19:48
ah, yes, definately!
Linda Matthews
19:48
Linked to all research methods I suppose, I was curious to know how a visual researcher manages thisw?
Jen Ross

19:49
do images help us to recognise that non-neutrality, or is the temptation to see photos as true too strong?
Linda Matthews
19:49
I am also interested in the power of gaze asnd the impact this has on subject and objectivity
Sian #2
19:49
I don't think we have very well developed critical capacity, generally, for seeing 'through' images
James Mackay
19:50
Hi Natasa, I was wondering if you have ever presented any of your findings in a Multimodal way, and if so how have you ensured that your interpretation was what the reader was also able to access?
Jen Ross
19:50
good question, James.
that's relevant to all of us who attempt digital assignments
19:51
(or who mark them!)
19:51
that would be great, Natasa.
19:51
Linda Matthews
19:52
Is it more tempting to accept image as truth? but every image has edges and the unseen aspoects of the image can give additional context that can change meaning.
Jen Ross
19:53
hey James and Phil, are your hands up for a question? or still from the vote earlier?
Christine Sinclair
19:53
I have a question (maybe after Phil and James) - I'm wondering about your point about intention. Can there be serendipitous aspects of production?
Sian #2
19:53
Interesting Linda - it's about the seeing and the 'unseeing' that that always involves
Christine Sinclair
19:53
Oh, I'd forgotten the vote!
Jen Ross
19:53
ooo - unseeing.
James Mackay
19:53
is my hand up_?
Sian #2
19:54

That's a quote from someone (can't remember who!)
Jen Ross
19:54
(sorry James M - it was James L!)
Christine Sinclair
19:55
Thank you

19:55
Jen Ross
19:55
Phil, did you want to jump in?
Phil D 1
19:55
Sorry!
James Lamb
19:56
James M made the point about multimodality. Natasa - can the image exist in isolation i.e truly separate from of text?
Phil D 1
19:56
Will do in bit
Jen Ross
19:56
okay!
Linda Matthews
19:56
Does unseeing equate to the unsaid, the silence of the viual world?
Jen Ross
19:56
which is obviously great!
James Mackay
19:56
good q James!
- Sian #2 left the Main Room. (19:57) -
James Lamb
19:58
What I mean is, how common do we see image in isolation - in ads, galleries, books, web - the image is often accompanied by text?
Linda Matthews
19:58
Good question James, do the words influence interpretation
James Mackay
19:59
so do we trust text more than images?
Jen Ross
19:59
that's definitely an issue in 'museology' - museum studies.
Linda, I think that there is a lot of 'silence' in and around an image.
20:00

Linda Matthews
20:00
juxtapositions of many images can also creat additional narrative layers that happen
betwwen images as well as within the individual images
Christine Sinclair
20:01
There's a ghostly nature too - I've been reading about 'render ghosts' in architecture
Linda Matthews
20:01
Oooh, I feel inspired to find silence in images
Jen Ross
20:01
I *love* the idea of render ghosts.
Linda Matthews
20:01
and ghosts!
Phil D 1
20:03
Hi Natasha - Love your drunk Octopus! Reminds me of Marcel Duchamp / Picasso
Readymades 1900 ish. Have you an opinion regards digital / Image interpretation ie -
operating systems are a metaphorical interpretation of binary.
Christine Sinclair
20:03
Then what happens to intention?
Jen Ross
20:04
whose intention? or maybe whose/when.
Linda Matthews
20:04
Image oversignification perhaps - in the overuse/multiple use that Christine mentions
Jen Ross
20:05
Phil, are you thinking about the GUI (graphical user interface)
as a 'metaphor' for the workings of the system?
20:05
Phil D 1
20:05
Yes.
Jen Ross
20:05
the system 'beneath' it.
Phil D 1
20:05
yep that's it
Jen Ross
20:05
(btw, I knew you knew what GUI was - but thought others might not!)
Phil D 1
20:06
Soory jumped in

Jen Ross
20:06
no problem! we'll return to that.
Hamish will have a view!
20:06
Phil D 1
20:06
OK
Jen Ross
20:07
we lost Sian - her sound went.
James Mackay
20:07
I think under european law, you are able to remove permision for the use of you in a photo or video - obviously if you dont know then how you dont know you may need to remove permision..
Christine Sinclair
20:07
Che Guavara comes to mind
it's all fascinating
20:08
James Lamb
20:08
Christine - the guy from the t-shirts?
Phil D 1
20:08

Christine Sinclair
20:09

Jen Ross
20:09
lol James.
Hamish Macleod
20:09
Yes. Interesting, if one thinks about what one means by a GUI being "intuitive".
The model is predicated on the idea that we all "see" this in the same way.
20:10
Jen Ross
20:10
that selfe and selfe book about the desktop metaphors and how they include and exclude people is *still* totally awesome.
Hamish Macleod
20:11
@Jen ??
Jen Ross
20:11
oh no - it was a paper, not a book. The Politics of the Interface: Power and Its Exercise in Electronic Contact Zones Cynthia L. Selfe and Richard J. Selfe, Jr. College Composition and Communication Vol. 45, No. 4 (Dec., 1994), pp. 480-504

Hamish Macleod
20:11
Thanks.
Linda Matthews
20:11
What an interesting point Phil
Jen Ross
20:13
lol, the drunken octopus.
(still loving the drunken octopus)
20:13
Christine Sinclair
20:13
Me too Jen - it's like visual twitter
Gina
20:14
for me there is an aethetics of duplication... There is such a mix of everyday images in an aesthetic context, and the way art objects are flattened, especially in an online context. Hope this makes sense....
Linda Matthews
20:14
Well put Phil, visual interpretation is such an individual thing
Phil D 1
20:14
Yes.
James Lamb
20:14
From a multimodal perspective, I love that phrase - 'talk in images as well as sound'!
Christine Sinclair
20:15
We've been text-bound for so long!
Jen Ross
20:15
aesthetics of duplication - trying to wrap my head around that. I feel I love it!
Phil D 1
20:15
Yes - visual languge opens up whole new ways of thinking
Gina
20:16
it is so easy to talk in images, the ease of duplication is amazing
Jen Ross
20:16
maybe that relates to emergent 'remix' culture, too
Christine Sinclair
20:16
And there's synaethesia too
Gina
20:16
indeed, totally
Linda Matthews

20:16

Gina
20:17
what is original meaning though?
Jen Ross
20:17
for the sake of argument, let's say there are original meanings! nice.
gina, that's why I think the notion of 'duplication' is quite vexed
20:17
what is the status of the original?
20:17
Christine Sinclair
20:17
context is all
perhaps
20:18
Linda Matthews
20:18
Is original meaning an impossiblility? As visual texts are always interpretated through
the lense of the receiver
Gina
20:18
differance I believe was some interpretation
Linda Matthews
20:18
Do images actaully have meaning if they are unseen
James Mackay
20:18
interesting tie up, to christine's point on text, simotics being the study of signs and
within that words and text...
Jen Ross
20:18
i *knew* someone was going to bring in Derrida!
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Différance
20:19
Gina
20:19
sorry
Jen Ross
20:19
don't apologise to me - I love Derrida.

20:19
Gina
20:19
me too...
Hamish Macleod
20:21
Original meaning? I am tempted to mention sign stimuli in animals. A red patch on a

gull's beak *means* something.
Jen Ross
20:23
deconstruction is not just one thing - that is useful.
Hamish Macleod
20:24
Affordance?
Linda Matthews
20:24
There is a lot to think about. Will we be able to acess this whole discussion again?
Christine Sinclair
20:24
To another gull - and perhaps something else to a gull-hunter?
Jen Ross
20:24
Linda, I didn't record it - I probably should have, in retrospect! But I will copy the text transcript and that will get us some.
Gina
20:25
and not every gull may agree
Hamish Macleod
20:25
Sorry.
Yes. They will.
20:25
It was a theory of "direct perception".
20:26
Jen Ross
20:26
is 'affordance' another way of saying that there are limits on how something can be interpreted?
Phil found a good paper by Katherine Hayles about... 'constrained constructivism'
20:26
(is that right, Phil?)
20:26
Gina
20:27
I love the concept of affordance. I was looking at the idea of aesthetic affordance and digital imagery
Linda Matthews
20:27

Hamish Macleod
20:28
What about evolution? Do we not *need* to have some point of reference to reality?
Christine Sinclair
20:29
Good point James - and it has a retrospective effect (I didn't know this!)
Hamish Macleod
20:31

Flow!
Christine Sinclair
20:31
thanks for arranging Jen
James Mackay
20:31
yes very interesting - thank you
Hamish Macleod
20:32
Yes, many thanks Natasa.
Silvana di Gregorio
20:32
Thank you Natasa and Jen for arranging this.
Linda Matthews
20:32
Many thanks for an hour well spent! Goodnight x
James Lamb
20:32
Great session, thanks Natasa, Jen and everyone. I've lots of notes and references to follow up here for my dissertation
Phil D 1
20:33
Thank you all
Gina
20:33
thanks !
- Phil D 1 left the Main Room. (20:33) -
- Linda Matthews left the Main Room. (20:33) -
Hamish Macleod
20:33
Bye all!
James Mackay
20:33
Good night all
Christine Sinclair
20:33
Goodnight and thanks.
- Silvana di Gregorio left the Main Room. (20:33) -
- Christine Sinclair left the Main Room. (20:33) -
James Mackay
20:33
another one next thursday please!
James Lamb
20:33
i'm with James