

6 **Discursive Cyberpsychology: Rhetoric, Repression and the Loneliness of Talking the Internet**

Steven STANLEY

Abstract. A discursive cyberpsychological approach to the study of the internet is pioneered in this chapter. The internet is a discursively constituted phenomena: a collection of talk and texts as social practices. The internet would not exist were it not for conversation, and so the present study reports upon data from face to face interviews. The detailed analysis begins with what is expressed, and then moves on to what might be repressed, by an French international student, as he talks about his internet experiences. The utterances were rhetorically designed to argue against the presentation of the stereotypical identity of the male computer user. There was a rhetorical variability of views, in that both real relationships and virtual relationships were variously argued for and against, and the speaker might have been avoiding this stereotypical identity, by repressing an admission of his loneliness. The internet does not exist outside of social practices, and as such, the author recommends that any theory of the internet must be grounded in the detailed, systematic, empirical analyses of these practices.

Contents

6.1	Introduction	96
6.2	Methodology.....	98
6.3	Analysis	98
6.4	Discussion.....	103
6.5	Appendix	104
6.6	References	107

6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 *Arguing for detailed, systematic, empirical analyses of internet social practices*

In the introduction to the book *Cyberpsychology* [1], Angel J. Gordo-Lopez and Ian Parker stake out their claims as to what “cyberpsychology” is. They argue that it “exists in a field of tense relationships between classic and alternative cybernetics, and between the histories of art, science and technology” [2]. The word “histories” is important. The authors are interested in how technologies have been theorised about in previously published works. A case in point is the work of Donna Haraway [3], and her development of the term “cyborg”. The word is used, by one of the authors, as a metaphor to convey the experience of the human using the machine. The person is part human and part machine, or a cyborg. So, this edited volume “traces the development, history and contradictory understandings of cyberpsychology” [4], the authors are concerned with the “understandings” of academicians and professionals, based upon readings of their written accounts, rather than through the study of people’s practices when they use technology. It seems as though we are being offered a potted intellectual history of the ways in which cyberpsychological terminology has been taken up by authors, across the disciplines. And cyberpsychology, in this instance, is a reflexive enterprise, which, according to the editors, might “self-destruct”, because of their paralysing self-reflexivity. A second author which this edited book draws upon is the cyberfeminist writer Sadie Plant. In her book, *Zeros + Ones* [5], she also gives an historical account, but of the computing age itself, and the recent developments in network technologies. In summary, she claims that the role of women in the creation of these technologies has heretofore been neglected. Using the example of Ada Lovelace, the first computer programmer, and by emphasising the importance of women in the manufacturing process, she argues that rather than being the victims of male-dominated technologies, women are in fact automatically emancipated by them.

These works are good examples of the popular trend in “cyber” writings, because of the kind of rhetoric they use. In fact, the kinds of experiences they describe might be unrecognisable to the uninitiated reader. These books are not about the internet per se, although the internet is variously alluded to, often implicitly. As versions of what it is like to use the internet, they are particularly vague; they variously employ the word “cyberspace”. The main reason that cyberpsychology has come to resemble this is because the authors do not ground their theories in the study of social practices. For example, Plant argues how one individual becomes a “population explosion” on the internet: “many sexes, many species” [6]. The internet only appears to be like this because Plant has not empirically studied, in detail, any individual internet users, what they do, and what they say about what they do. Her book, along with Gordo-Lopez and Parker’s, might be examples of the fashionably critical writings Michael Billig alludes to in his development of the term *depopulation* [7]. Their pages are rhetorically depopulated; they provide accounts of internet social life in which there are no traces of individuals. Actually, most social scientific writing about the internet is theoretical [8]. And when empirical analyses have been carried out, they have often been cursory and unsystematic [9]. To continue along the same path as the majority of “cyber” researchers would be mistaken. The internet does not exist outside of social practices, and as such, any theory of the internet must be grounded in the detailed, systematic analyses of these practices.

6.1.2 *The importance of the off-line*

The majority of detailed, systematic, empirical studies are based upon the study of internet interaction: activities occurring on the internet itself [10]. An example of this kind of work is Nancy K. Baym's studies of fan culture [11]. Taking an ethnographic approach, she studied the on-line practices of a discussion group of mostly women fans of television soap operas. She analysed their postings, and suggested that they were creating an on-line community. The distinction between the on-line and the off-line is apparent in various studies of the internet. Most notably, the dilemmas involved in meeting face to face, after interacting in another on-line discussion group, are discussed by Barnes [12]. She analysed the emails of users, before and after their off-line meetings, and explored how on-lined activities were changed. Lori Kendall [13] has gone further, arguing that the separation between on-line and off-line is not so distinct. People intersperse the two in their activities, so rather than being a strict dichotomy, the two are more closely linked. As such, she argues for the concomitant analysis of both on-line and off-line practices. This kind of approach is rare, although Clark [14], in her studies of teen dating activities on the internet, combines the analysis of on-line chat transcripts with that of face to face interviews. Importantly, she grounds her studies in the social theory of Anthony Giddens, and argues that a re-theorisation of postmodern relationship practices is called for, based upon her analyses.

6.1.3 *Discursive cyberpsychology*

The internet is partly constructed through how it is written, and through how it is talked about. The internet can therefore be conceptualised as a discursively constituted phenomena. To borrow Potter and Wetherell's [15] definition of discourse, the internet is a collection of talk and texts as social practices. But, researchers in the social sciences have almost entirely ignored the importance of how the internet is talked about. Conversation is a fundamental reality of social life [16], and the internet would not exist, were it not for conversation. The present study reports upon data from face to face interviews. The interview is a way of getting at how the internet is constructed, simply by asking someone to talk about it. However, the discourse approach involves the study of the giving of views, rather than the views per se. The tradition of this approach is to argue that people are doing things socially when they tell stories, give accounts, or give descriptions [17]. By taking this approach to the study of language use, we must come to an understanding of the variability of views. How come people give different versions of their experiences at different times, and in different contexts? As argued by discursive psychologists, thinking itself is dilemmatic, in that it contains contrary themes [18]. Thinking, and therefore speaking, are rhetorically designed for arguing, both with oneself, and with others [19]. To give a view is to negotiate the ideological dilemmas of the time; what is normal is in tension with what is taboo. Furthermore, views are both expressed and repressed. By giving one particular view, one is concomitantly not giving a counter view; people avoid discussing particular topics. According to theories of conversational repression, what is said is intimately linked to the unsaid. And what is repressed is likely to be ideologically taboo [20].

The main argument of this chapter, therefore, is that cyberpsychology should be rooted in the study of discursive interaction. The inception of this approach can be seen in an earlier paper, which demonstrated how both face to face talk about the internet, and email texts, are discursively embodied. When one looks at the detail of what people say and what

people type when they use, or talk about, the internet, one can appreciate how “cyberspace” is not a disembodied kind of reality [21].

6.2 Methodology

Steve Jones calls for a reflexivity in academic internet research when he writes “the Internet is both embedded in academic life and owes much of its existence and conceptualization to academia” [22]. Later, in the same edited book, Sterne gives an anecdote of how the internet has become a routine part of a student’s everyday life [23]. The present study takes a more in-depth interest in how students understand their use of the internet. It began with the ethnographic study of Arkwright, the twenty-four hour computer room of a UK university, wherein internet access, along with word processing facilities, are available to all students, all year around. To decide the best method of finding people who would be willing to talk about their internet use, the author became a part of the late night culture of this room. This involved doing work, emailing, and browsing the web between the hours of 10 pm and 2 am.

The individualistic nature of the room as a social space meant that flyers were deemed to be the most appropriate method of finding people who “used the internet a lot”. These were then variously posted, over a four month period, and 13 people responded, either through email or face to face contact. All but one of these people were male, and the majority were international students. A heretofore neglected area of interest is how necessary the internet has come to be for international students, and how they use the internet to relate with family and friends in their home countries. From these volunteers, three male students were followed up, email and face to face interviews were carried out with them, and were analysed in detail. The present study reports upon a face to face interview with one of these volunteers.

In his own words, Jean-Paul is a 22 year old French guy. He had studied Law and Politics in France, and was, at the time of the interview, seven months into his 10 months of studying Philosophy and Politics, here in the UK. He was guaranteed anonymity and confidentiality. As appropriate for the discourse approach, the interviews with Jean-Paul took the form of semi-structured conversations. The author asked him questions about his experiences of using the internet, although he spoke freely, and often changed the topic on his own accord. As such, there was little interviewer intervention. The 90 minutes of talk was digitally recorded, and was listened to repeatedly. The sequences that follow are taken from the second interview with Jean-Paul, as it was during this session that he spoke most personally about his internet experiences. Transcripts are given as Appendices A, B and C, and sequences are referenced in the body of the text, first by letter, and then by line number. For example, A/14-18 refers to Appendix A, lines 14 to 18.

6.3 Analysis

The analysis begins with what is expressed, and then moves on to what might be repressed, by Jean-Paul, in his talk about the internet.

6.3.1 *Avoiding real relationships*

Jean-Paul first mentions the virtual relationship after a brief exchange about Arkwright, and the computer room inside. He makes a contrast between the computer room, and the email relationship, when he says “it’s strange the contrast you can have between the relationship you can have in email with person and the ugly aspect of the room” (A/14-18).

This statement is not qualified in any more detail; it is a general assertion, wherein the email relationship is presumably beautiful. By praising the virtual relationship in this way, so early in the interview, Jean-Paul is doing some identity work. He is constituting the kind of person he appears to be. He presents himself as someone who is generally positive about email relationships.

Jean-Paul then goes on to describe the ugliness of the computer room more specifically. He argues strongly against what he calls the “agitation” of the room. This agitation is embodied in the French students, who are there in the room around him, when he uses the internet: “you have a lot of French people I no want to meet a lot of French people I am not here for that” (A/29-32). Although Jean-Paul is himself French, he distances himself from these others, by referring to them as “people”. His justification for not meeting them is formulated as a choice, he does not want to meet them, and then as a general rule: he is not here to meet with French people. Jean-Paul then undermines them, when he says “they think I can’t understand what they say and I can understand it often it’s stupid thing stupid stuff” (A/34-37). Here, Jean-Paul is constructing the inner mental lives, or subjectivities, of the French people. Actually, Jean-Paul’s utterance involves two subjectivity constructions. The first is marked by “they think”, which is a claim about the French people’s minds, and the second is marked by “I can’t understand”: he is constructing what he thinks they are assuming about his own subjectivity. Basically, he is implying that they think he is English. Potter and Edwards [24] have argued that constructing subjectivity in particular ways gets conversational business done. So rhetorically, Jean-Paul is using this utterance to justify his decision not to talk with them; they are assuming something incorrect. He *can* understand what they say, and what is more, he claims that what they say is often stupid. Why would anyone want to talk with people who are, by implication, stupid?

A common assumption about someone who is lonely is that they have not chosen to be alone, people think that there is something wrong with them, and choose to stay away. In this instance, this assumption is countered by the way Jean-Paul talks about the distancing between himself and the French: it is his choice, not theirs. Jean-Paul then moves on, and gives a fascinating account of his “strange relationship with the machine” (A/39-40), wherein he is with his “friend in France” (A/45). This particular sequence is analysed, in detail, below. But, it suffices to say here, that Jean-Paul is doing two things by claiming to be with his friend. Firstly, he is dealing with the solitariness he has been implicitly working up, and secondly, he is, again, countering the possibly judgement that he is without friends, and resigned to loneliness.

6.3.2 *Arguing against the virtual relationship*

Jean-Paul talks of having a relationship with the machine itself, and characterises this as a “strange” relationship. I will now analyse a short sequence, which takes place five minutes into the interview, in which Jean-Paul describes the machine. It forms part of the “little story”, in which Jean-Paul receives the first email from his mother. The sequence is given, in full, in Appendix B. Jean-Paul complains that he can only react to the machine; he constructs the machine problematically, questioning its status as mediating his relationship with his mother. He then goes on to give several descriptions of the machine. He talks of trying to convince himself that it is “only a machine” (B/9), and then parallels it with books, which he claims are not beautiful, but nevertheless allow a person to imagine so much “behind” them. The machine is then upgraded to a “powerful machine” (B/17-18), which rhetorically works as a factual description. The utterance “just because it’s connected at internet” (B/18-19) is designed to chart the machine’s power: the machine is merely a gatekeeper to the internet. In each of these descriptions, the machine is the

problematic mediator. Soon after, however, Jean-Paul's assessments become more abrasive. The machine is ugly (B/22), and then horrible (B/26).

Jean-Paul's relationship with the machine is strange because, although he is using the machine routinely, in his everyday life, he argues *against* the machine in his interview talk. Why would someone who uses the machine describe it in such negative ways? The present sequence can help us to answer this question. Someone who is using the machine routinely is someone who is not using this time to relate with people face to face. So, Jean-Paul, when he argues against the machine, is not arguing against the machine per se, rather he is arguing against the negative, stereotypical *identity* of the male computer user. Giving descriptions of the machine in these ways does this rhetorical business. Jean-Paul is avoiding the implication that he prefers machines to people.

Jean-Paul then talks about relating with a person through the machine. He refers to this as "this kind of relationship" (B/26-27). What kind of relationship this is, is not absolutely clear, although it is being mediated by a "horrible machine". Seven minutes later, however, he elaborates upon what it is like relating with people through the machine. He gives an account of suffering, from having virtual relationships with his friends:

(contextualised in Appendix C)

65. authenticity . because definitely . I suffer . this
66. year . to have a lot of relationship-only
67. relationship with email with some friend
68. Steven um
69. Jean-Paul . you know some- something uh miss me

These utterances are given in the context of speaking about the authenticity of relationships, a theme which is picked up again later, in the telling of the love story. Lines 65 to 69 are the most explicit denunciations of the virtual relationship, in any of Jean-Paul's accounts. But, they suggest that there is something that he is not telling me, about his use of the internet. Just as Jean-Paul is claiming that he is missing "something", so there is something missing from his talk, something is being left unsaid.

6.3.3 *Trying to forget*

The first sign that Jean-Paul is forgetting something comes after his account of spurning the French people. He himself raises the question of what it means to forget, when he says "in my mind I try and I forgot it I I forget" (A/73). Jean-Paul is expressing the dilemma of repression: Michael Billig asks: "How can one intentionally forget something? The moment one concentrates on accomplishing the forgetting, one is surely remembering the very thing which is to be forgotten" [25]. However, as Billig goes on to argue, the dilemma itself is predicated upon the common sense notion that remembering and forgetting are polar opposites of one another. This is not necessarily the case. What is not said, or forgotten, is bound up with what is said, or remembered. Let us look at the detail of this sequence to see how this actually works.

(2 minutes into interview; contextualised in Appendix A)

65. but but but I have uh strange relationship
66. with the machine
67. Steven yeah
68. Jean-Paul and uh you know sometime I'm not in the

69. Arkwright building
 70. Steven um
 71. Jean-Paul I'm with my friend uh in France sometime
 72. Steven right
 73. Jean-Paul in my mind I try and I forgot it I I forget and
 74. um it's very easy to to to to forget all the all what you
 75. have uh around and I can put music and uh music
 76. it's perfect to to to change the atmosphere

After accounting for not meeting with the French students, Jean-Paul introduces his “strange relationship with the machine”. He then makes two contestable claims: firstly, that sometimes he is not in the Arkwright building, and secondly, that sometimes, he is with his friend in France. Then, he says that he tries to forget. But what? Jean-Paul does not actually tell me what he is trying to forget. He just gives a general rule, that “it’s very easy to forget all what you have around”. But, this does not explain what he is personally doing in the previous line.

It might be that Jean-Paul is repressing particular thoughts or feelings in this very interview. A clue about what Jean-Paul might be repressing is given before the forgetting claim. Instead of following “I am not in the Arkwright building” with “I am in France”, he actually says “I am *with my friend* in France”. By claiming that he is actually with a friend, Jean-Paul might be repressing the feelings of loneliness that he is experiencing in his everyday life. It might seem unusual that one can talk of repressing feelings, in this case, feelings of loneliness. But, as Billig also argues: “Talk about emotions generally concerns more than a description of an internal subjective state. It is essentially talk about social relations” [26]. Loneliness is a good example of this; it is an emotion, which connotes social isolation. I will now go on to demonstrate how such avoidance is practised in two more sequences of talk.

6.3.4 *Saying no to the machine*

Around twelve minutes into the interview, Jean-Paul tells me something more about his strange relationship with the machine. He says “sometime ... I cannot say no to the machine but I can say no to a person” (C/22-26). This statement follows some claims about him being a robot when he is using the machine; he claims that he does not feel himself, because he is only reacting to the “little screen”. It is helpful to use Freud’s concept of negation to analyse the first utterance, about saying no. This idea is that a repressed thought “can make its way into consciousness on condition that it is negated” [27]. To negate Jean-Paul’s utterance, then, would imply that a person can say no to him, but the machine cannot.

One of the dilemmas of being lonely is whether you can actually break out of your predicament, and choose to meet people, or will they just reject you? Thinking back to the situation with the French people, it might be the case that Jean-Paul is repressing the possibility that they would not want to meet him anyway, even if he did choose to meet with them. Them saying no to him is avoided by him claiming to say no to them: he “chooses” the distance offered by the machine, which, implicitly, will never say no to him. I will now look at what happens, in another fascinating sequence, in which a person does actually say yes to him. This will be the final analysis of conversational repression.

6.3.5 *The love story*

Soon after the sequence about saying no to the machine, Jean-Paul talks about an email message, which he has received.

(contextualised in Appendix C)

65. know that and . the the this ye- uh this week
66. I receive an email from uh a girl . and she
67. says she fall in love uh of me . but . by internet
68. just by my message . and uh I feel very bad
69. when I receive that
70. Steven yeah
71. Jean-Paul . and uh what is strange is this girl is romantic
72. girl
73. Steven um
74. Jean-Paul and she fall in love of me just by internet

The story is introduced with little preamble; there is no prior accounting for how they met. This kind of telling reinforces Jean-Paul's subsequent characterisation of the girl, as someone who falls in love too quickly and easily. Jean-Paul reports how the girl "says" she has fallen in love with him, note, how he does not say "she has fallen in love with me". By making the girl's statement a claim, he is doubting her love. He then retrospectively constructs his subjectivity, saying how he felt "very bad" when he received the message. Jean-Paul then continues to undermine the "girl", dismissing her supposed love, when he says "but by internet just by my message", "what is strange is this girl is romantic girl" and "she fall in love of me just by internet". These accountings undermine both the technologies of email and the internet, as well as the subjectivity of the girl. He is questioning whether she really is romantic. Each utterance conjures up phenomena outside of Jean-Paul, things "out there" are the problem, whether that be the technology, or the girl, on the other side of the screen.

When you tell someone that you love them, their response is so very important. There is the expectation that they will reciprocate your feelings. However, in this sequence, Jean-Paul does not tell me how he replied to this girl. The only account of what happened afterwards is that he felt very bad. Furthermore, he does not say *why* he felt very bad upon receiving this email. Why didn't he instead feel flattered, for example? Jean-Paul is avoiding particular kinds of talk about himself. Could it be that Jean-Paul is feeling inadequate, because, no one really falls in love with him. By dismissing the girl's love as being real love, he presents himself as being implicitly unloveable. By redirecting the conversation away from such thoughts, Jean-Paul represses the identity of someone who is emotionally immature, someone who cannot handle being loved. After undermining this virtual relating, Jean-Paul turns to the real relationship:

(contextualised in Appendix C)

65. Jean-Paul now of course I don't want to meet definitely
66. uh of course that's gonna be . very exciting to to
67. to to meet some people very interesting t- you

So, meeting in real life becomes the expected progression of the romantic, virtual relationship. But, Jean-Paul claims that he does not want to meet the girl, "definitely". He counters the possible assertion that he is someone who cannot handle turning a virtual

relationship into a real relationship, by formulating it as a choice, and then by giving a general rule. Who would disagree that it is exciting and interesting to meet certain people?

6.4 Discussion

The main theme of the analysis was to show how accounts are linked to identity. In his expressions, Jean-Paul was countering any possible judgements that he might be the stereotypical, male computer user. He was resisting appearing as lonely, and this was often practised through his arguing against his own experiences. Describing, for example, had a rhetorical import. Negative descriptions of the machine worked rhetorically, and countered any implications that he actually prefers machines to people. It is possible that Jean-Paul was avoiding this stereotypical identity by repressing an admission of his loneliness. The clues pointing to these forgotten feelings lay in what was actually said. For example, in the account of rejecting the French people, the claim about being with his friend in France pointed to possible experiences of being friendless. The signs were then followed up in two further sequences. The sequence about saying no to the machine showed how closely intertwined the said and the unsaid are; repressed thoughts might have entered consciousness in their negated form. In the love story sequence, Jean-Paul was arguing against the girl, and the technology, but, in doing this, he was revealing very little about himself. Might this have been his strategy for avoiding thinking that he cannot be loved, because he is seen as a lonely person?

It is possible that Jean-Paul was using the internet because of his feelings of loneliness and isolation. The life of the international student can often be a struggle: you are in a strange country, without your friends and family, and the compatriots around you are making you feel even more homesick. A possible solution is to log on, and search out that contact with the people you miss most. By attending to the details of talk, one can show how thinking about the internet is dilemmatic, it is partly constructed out of the blurring notions of “loneliness” and “socialness”. Is a person isolated when they are relating with far away family and friends? This is one of the dilemmas that Jean-Paul was dealing with, and in these sequences, his thoughts vary. Although, it seems that, while expressed thoughts can vary, and changed very quickly over a short period of time, feelings tend not to change so quickly. By avoiding feelings, one is only pushing them slightly aside. As this analysis has shown, the feelings come back, often only suggestively, when you least expect them, such as in an interview.

When people talk about the internet, they are doing something very special. They are constituting what the internet is, what kind of reality it is, and what it means to them in their lives. Their talk consists of so much novelty and creativity. On the face of it, Jean-Paul is an example of how new technologies are offering new kinds of experiences. The claims are all there: being with his friend in France, receiving the first email from his mother, and a girl falling in love with him by email. These experiences have only become possible, and recognisable as social practices, within the last 10 years or so. They are examples of the burgeoning possibilities afforded by “cyberspace”, especially in terms of identity, and, as such, they have been praised by many authors, most notably Benedikt and Turkle [28]. However, by attending to the detail of face to face talk about these new experiences, we get a different version of the reality of the internet. The theorising is pulled back down to Earth somewhat. The experience of being lonely, for example, is a familiar one. And so, by analysing the detail of social practices, in a systematic way, as has been done here, we can avoid making one-sided, indulgent theoretical accounts of technology. If we keep close to the people who are actually using the technology, they

become more familiar to us, and their practices start to seem more similar to our own than we might originally have thought.

6.5 Appendix A

00:34 to 03:16

1. Steven um and . let's see . i'm not sure where to start i'm
2. gonna ask um . what do you think of um arkwright . the
3. as a com- as a building and uh
4. Jean-Paul yeah uh so the building i like outside the building
5. of course because uh it's uh i think it's neogothic uh
6. from uh victorian period . normally the last century
7. and uh i like this atmosphere of course because me
8. i don't like the modern building ah an important stuff
9. uh i i don't like the modernity but i i like uh the
10. artistic creation it's different point . ok so uh you
11. have you um know something in this building uh
12. this building uh i can say that has a s- um um has
13. a soul you know and but the computer room inside
14. it's modern only that and uh you know it's
15. strange the contrast you can have uh between uh the
16. relationship you can have in email with person
17. Steven yeah
18. Jean-Paul and uh the ugly uh aspect of uh the room you know
19. and (iszat) perhaps i pass m- um i pass my time
20. uh uh uh longer in uh arkwright building than
21. in my bedroom huhuhuh
22. Steven yeah yeah
23. Jean-Paul and it's very strange it's my second house here
24. and uh but it's ugly i hate the- the atmosphere
25. i i hate all this atgitation around me . and uh
26. Steven what's that
27. Jean-Paul atgitation
28. Steven agitation yeah
29. Jean-Paul you have a lot of agitation and you know you
30. have a lot of french people i no want to to
31. meet a lot of french people i am not here
32. for that
33. Steven huhuh
34. Jean-Paul and i heard the the because they they think
35. i can't understand what they what uh they
36. say and uh i can understand it uh often it's
37. stupid um thing stupid stuff and uh
38. pft- you know it's um not uh it's not good for that
39. but but but i have uh strange relationship
40. with the machine
41. Steven yeah

42. Jean-Paul and uh you know sometime i'm not in the
 43. arkwright building
 44. Steven um
 45. Jean-Paul i'm with my friend uh in france sometime
 46. Steven right
 47. Jean-Paul in my mind i try and i forgot it i i forget and
 48. um it's very easy to to to forget all the all what you
 49. have uh around and i can put music and uh music
 50. it's perfect to to to change the atmosphere

Appendix B

05:31 to 07:00

51. Jean-Paul and uh it's very interesting i was very
 52. surprised of a little story uh i know it's
 53. not the question but i receive an email from
 54. my mother the first email from my mother
 55. and uh i was very surprised . and uh you know
 56. all the reaction i can have the this i can
 57. have uh with this machine only with this
 58. machine and sometimes to to to realise it's
 59. only a machine and it's like you know a book
 60. you can have uh a big sensation a book it's
 61. not it's not beautiful or sometime you know
 62. it's artistic but you know it's not beautiful
 63. the page is not beautiful look the
 64. (stonaticisation meter) is not beautiful i prefer
 65. the natural writing but what you can have
 66. behind that it's incredible you can imagine
 67. all your friend you know and uh it . powerful
 68. machine uh uh and just because it's connected
 69. uh at internet uh i know you know some uh company
 70. some computer company try to have an
 71. (aestheticism) in the computer . you know
 72. because uh . it's ugly actually and uh it's
 73. not beautiful to to to watch that and uh it's a stra-
 74. you know i have the impression with time we
 75. realise in ten years we can say ah how we can
 76. use this t- horrible machine and have this kind
 77. of relationship you know

Appendix C

11:25 to 15:02

1. Jean-Paul you know the freedom . uh it's important
 2. if you have had the basically if you have

3. the (conscious) freedom and i think the majority of
4. the people don't have the (conscious) freedom
5. when they use internet so for me the it's a big
6. aspect and um i have always this impression
7. they are some robot on internet with the
8. mouse . people are s- like a robot i know
9. it's uh it's easy to say that when you don't
10. know the people who all the people who
11. use internet around you but me sometimes
12. i have the impression to be a robot

13. Steven yeah

14. Jean-Paul you know it's very strange

15. Steven yeah

16. Jean-Paul and uh . sometimes i don't have the impression
17. it's me i'm here and i react to to the what i see

18. Steven huhuh

19. Jean-Paul all but it's this little screen it's always the
20. strange relationship with the machine

21. Steven um

22. Jean-Paul sometime i i can say no to the machine i can
23. say no to the machine i can say no i can
24. say uh no to uh i cannot say no to the um .
25. uh yeah i cannot say no to the machine but uh i
26. can say no to a person you know and uh

27. Steven yeah

28. Jean-Paul uh a it's definitely it's important to don't
29. have a confusion between uh person and machine
30. and uh definitely always consider uh it's like uh
31. in music in music . the the problem of authenticity
32. of the music here is the same problem the
33. problem of the authent- the relationship
34. authenticity . because definitely . i suffer . this
35. year . to have a lot of relationship-only
36. relationship with email with some friend

37. Steven um

38. Jean-Paul . you know some - something uh miss me

39. Steven um

40. Jean-Paul and uh it's very strange uh it's um a little
41. story and i know it's a personal aspect but
42. i think for for your project it's important
43. to have personal aspect

44. Steven yeah definitely

45. Jean-Paul definitely because it- uh your project
46. your project if it's interesting . uh .
47. of course i- you have to . it have to try to to
48. be close to the objectivity but with the
49. subjectivity of the (person) of course you
50. know that and . the the this ye- uh this week
51. i receive an email from uh a girl . and she
52. says she fall in love uh of me . but . by internet
53. just by my message . and uh i feel very bad

54. when i receive that
55. Steven yeah
56. Jean-Paul . and uh what is strange is this girl is romantic
57. girl
58. Steven um
59. Jean-Paul and she fall in love of me just by internet
60. Steven . how did you get in touch with
61. Jean-Paul oh it's just uh you know uh so this girl i meet
62. three years uh in the real life you know i say
63. real life
64. Steven yeah yeah
65. Jean-Paul now of course i don't want to meet definitely
66. uh of course that's gonna be . very exciting to to
67. to to meet some people very interesting t- you
68. Steven um
69. Jean-Paul of course i meet you by internet
70. Steven um
71. Jean-Paul . and perhaps i think it's the first person
72. i meet directly by internet
73. Steven um
74. Jean-Paul you know because i try to always to eve- but
75. it's different because we live in the same
76. city
77. Steven yeah yeah
78. Jean-Paul and uh we are in the same university and
79. uh it's not we can perhaps uh we can uh see
80. in the street before you know it's different

6.6 References

- [1] Á.J. Gordo-López and I. Parker (eds.), *Cyberpsychology*. Macmillan Press, London, 1999.
- [2] *ibid*, p. 5
- [3] D.J. Haraway, *Simians, Cyborgs and Women - The Reinvention of Nature*, Free Association Books, London, 1991.
- [4] A.J. Gordo-López and I. Parker (eds.), *Cyberpsychology*. Macmillan Press, London, 1999. p. 18
- [5] S. Plant, *Zeros + Ones - Digital Women + The New Technoculture*, Fourth Estate, London, 1997.
- [6] *ibid*, p. 46.
- [7] M. Billig, *Repopulating Social Psychology - A Revised Version of Events*. In: B.M. Bayer and J. Shotter (eds.), *Reconstructing the Psychological Subject - Bodies, Practices and Technologies*. Sage, London, 1998, pp. 126 - 152.
- [8] For example T. Jordan. *Cyberpower - the Culture and Politics of Cyberspace and the Internet*. Routledge, London, 1999; R. Kitchin. *Cyberspace - the World in the Wires*. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, 1998; B.E. Kolko, L. Nakamura and G.B. Rodman. *Race in cyberspace*. Routledge, London, 2000.
- [9] For example M. Dery (ed.), *Flame Wars - the Discourse of Cyberculture*. Duke University Press, London, 1994; J. Dibbell, *A Rape in Cyberspace - How an Evil Clown, a Haitian Trickster Spirit, Two Wizards, and a Cast of Dozens Turned a Database into a Society*. In: M. Stefik (ed.), *Internet Dreams - Archetypes, Myths, and Metaphors*. MIT Press, London, 1996, pp. 293-315; D. Spender, *Nattering on the Net - Women, Power and Cyberspace*. Spinifex, North Melbourne, Vic., Australia, 1995.
- [10] For example P. Curtis, *Mudding - Social Phenomena in Text-Based Virtual Realities*. In: M. Stefik (ed.), *Internet Dreams: Archetypes, Myths, and Metaphors*. MIT Press, London, 1996, pp. 265 - 292; S.G. Jones (ed.), *CyberSociety - Computer-Mediated Communication and Community*, Sage, London, 1995; S. Kiesler (ed.), *Culture of the Internet*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, N.J., 1995. H. Rheingold, *The Virtual Community - Finding Connection in a Computerized World*. Secker & Warburg, London, 1994. B. Viglizzo, *Internet Dreams - First Encounters of an On-Line Dream Group*. In: M.

- Stefik (ed.), *Internet Dreams - Archetypes, Myths, and Metaphors*. MIT Press, London, 1996, pp. 353-387.
- [11] N. K. Baym, *Tune in, Log On - Soaps, Fandom, and Online Community*. Sage, London, 2000.
- [12] S. Barnes, *Developing a Concept of Self in Cyberspace Communities*. In: S.B. Gibson and O.O. Oviedo (eds.), *The Emerging Cyberculture - Literacy, Paradigm, and Paradox*. Hampton Press, Cresskill, New Jersey, 2000, pp. 169-201.
- [13] L. Kendall, *Recontextualizing "Cyberspace" - Methodological Considerations for On-Line Research*. In: S. Jones (ed.), *Doing Internet Research - Critical Issues and Methods for Examining the Net*, Sage, London, 1999, pp. 57-74.
- [14] L.S. Clark, *Dating on the Net: Teens and the Rise of "Pure" Relationships*. In: S.G. Jones (ed.), *Cybersociety 2.0 - Revisiting Computer-Mediated Communication and Community*. Sage, London, 1998, pp. 159-183.
- [15] J. Potter and M. Wetherell, *Discourse and Social Psychology - Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour*, Sage, London, 1987.
- [16] J. Shotter, *Conversational Realities - Constructing Life Through Language*, Sage, London, 1993.
- [17] See C. Antaki (ed.), *Analysing Everyday Explanation - A Casebook of Methods*, Sage, London, 1988; D. Edwards, *Discourse and Cognition*, Sage, London, 1997; D. Edwards and J. Potter, *Discursive Psychology*, Sage, London, 1992; J. Potter, *Representing Reality - Discourse, Rhetoric and Social Construction*, Sage, London, 1996.
- [18] See M. Billig, S. Condor, D. Edwards, M. Gane, D. Middleton and A. Radley, *Ideological Dilemmas - a Social Psychology of Everyday Thinking*, Sage, London, 1988.
- [19] M. Billig, *Ideology and Opinions*, Sage, London, 1991; M. Billig, *Arguing and Thinking - A Rhetorical View of Social Psychology*, Second Edition, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.
- [20] M. Billig, *Freudian Repression - Conversation Creating the Unconscious*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.
- [21] S. Stanley. *Disembodiment is a Cyberspace Myth - Discourse and the Self in Real Space*, forthcoming in *Cyberpsychology & Behavior*.
- [22] p. 10 in S. Jones, *Studying the Net - Intricacies and Issues*. In: S. Jones (ed.), *Doing Internet Research - Critical Issues and Methods for Examining the Net*, Sage, London, 1999, pp. 1-27.
- [23] J. Sterne, *Thinking the Internet - Cultural Studies Versus the Millenium*. In: S. Jones (ed.), *Doing Internet Research - Critical Issues and Methods for Examining the Net*, Sage, London, 1999, pp. 257-287.
- [24] D. Edwards and J. Potter, *Discursive Psychology*, Sage, London, 1992.
- [25] p. 141 in M. Billig. *Freudian Repression - Conversation Creating the Unconscious*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.
- [26] *ibid*, p. 189
- [27] *ibid*, p. 214
- [28] M. Benedikt, *Cyberspace - First Steps*, MIT Press, London, 1991; S. Turkle, *Life on the Screen - Identity in the Age of the Internet*. Phoenix, London, 1995.