

The standardisation of our individuality, forming through lines of code, is creating the expectancy of what a human is in the 'eyes' of the computer.

The motion detecting sensors in DJCAD are crude in comparison to the sensing machines needed to capture human individuality.

Is that something we even want?

The orange peel research returned some interesting insights so I continued that form of task-based research and applied it to a more immersive media in the form of radio

As a wee guy, I remember listening to Andy Murray on the radio. I would hang onto the commentator's every word- vividly picturing a "back hand down the line", "a forehand across court", or "a drop shot just lifting over the net".

Listening with my brother and sister, I remember wondering if they were imaging the game in the same way I was, I just assumed they must of been - the way I was picturing it seemed obvious... to me.

It was a memory that came back to me after the orange peel findings. The unique outcomes highlighted people's individual interpretations of the same task.

I played the same radio commentary of a tennis point to different people, asking them to react to the commentator's description and draw where they thought the tennis ball was moving.

Unsurprisingly, the responses were similar to the orange peel. To remind you, all six of these tennis 'scribbles' are of the SAME point. Each participant listened to the same 20-25 seconds of commentary, or instructions in this case.

People's interpretations of the same information differed wildly. They all listened to the same information but understood (or misunderstood) it uniquely.

The human element of mis-interpretation is yet another nuance that is discarded in the world of data.

At this stage in the project I had been exploring different forms of media and their structures - trying to develop some form of interaction or immersive experience. In each case, I kept coming across ways computers objectify humans.