

Chapter 44

Screen Culture

Ana Melro

University of Aveiro, Portugal

Lídia Oliveira

University of Aveiro, Portugal

ABSTRACT

For several years now, technology usage cannot be separated from screens. Examples include television, computer, smartphone, mobile phone, tablet, e-book reader, multimedia player (music and/or audio), camera and camcorder, watch, digital advertising public panels, virtual reality glasses. In fact, if the goal is to understand what can be considered a screen, the examples will not cease to increase. The major goal of the chapter is to explore the screen definition and the way in which it has emerged in society, in a cross way, almost without being noticed, but ubiquitously, even becoming inseparable from most of the necessary activities.

INTRODUCTION

Technology and media usage cannot be separated from screens. Examples such as television, computer, smartphone, mobile phone, tablet, e-book reader, multimedia player (music and / or audio), camera and camcorder, watch, digital advertising public panels, virtual reality glasses. In fact, if the goal is to understand what can be considered as a screen, the examples will not cease to increase.

The major goal of the article is to explore the screen definition and the way in which it has emerged in society, in a cross way, almost without being noticed, but ubiquitously, even becoming inseparable from most of the necessary activities. Thus, after almost 20 years of Levinson's (1998 [1997]) reflection and analysis on the need to define a screen taxonomy, it is increasingly relevant to reflect on the screens' nature and on their effects in individuals' daily life. So, how did media and screens step into peoples' lives in such a way a new culture was created and disseminated?

Despite true ontological differences between the artifacts that incorporate screens, there is a progressive process of dilution of the specificities, with the convergence of functionalities and contents. The television becomes interactive and its consumption is increasingly customizable and individualized; the computer and mobile devices allow access to television. One uses the computer to make phone and video

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-5225-7368-5.ch044

Screen Culture

calls. The screen as a unifying feature turns out to be the visible side of an ongoing process of convergence that in the short term will be felt more systematically in the consumption and sociability logics.

This has a lot of implications in all sort of societal levels. In the political sector (e-governance, active citizenship in political decisions); economic sector (new ways of communication and business structures) and cultural sector (e-museums). But also at a micro level, with the need to reorganize familial, labor, scholar and leisure processes around media.

Nowadays, technology is perceived as extension of man (McLuhan (2008 [1964], p. 82). By recognizing the change enhanced by media one can also recognize the effect in the new medium (Federman, 2004, p. 2). The way the above mentioned societal practices changed are intimately related to the way media (and the perceptions of media) also suffered transformations.

A screen culture arises (Chambat & Ehrenberg, 1988), accepted by individuals as a second culture. Media are included in individuals' lives as a second skin, because they are sensitive, ubiquitous and transparent.

Society had suffered major changes and mutations, in order to include media. People comprise media and use them for him/her best purpose. Cyber and screen culture are becoming the focus of social relations of all types (familial, labor and leisure). These were the justifications for the importance of this reflection regarding screen culture.

The article aims to present a state of the art around screen and media uses, their existence and transparency and provide a definition of the concept.

BACKGROUND

Screen Culture: State of the Art

Considering the importance of screens in individuals' daily lives, it is pertinent to draw a chronological path of the main authors that have addressed the topic of screens and were interested in defining the artifacts that usually arise coupled.

Back in the twentieth century, Lev Manovich (1995), when defining what can be considered a screen, noted that screen characteristics can be attributed to a computer monitor, but also to something more unique, such as a painting or a play. Thus, the screen is the frame that separates two different spaces that coexist in some way (Manovich, 1995, p. 1). This will be the screen definition used here, and for the purpose of this article, screen always appears associated with a technological artifact (television, computer or mobile phone). For Manovich (1995), this screen is not neutral. Instead, it has an aggressive status, "*It functions to filter, to screen out, to take over, rendering nonexistent whatever is outside the frame.*" (Manovich, 1995, p. 2). Thus and complementing the previous idea with Nelson Zalago's (2010) notion of screen (2010), this is the boundary between the device and the individual receiving the transmitted content (Zalago, 2010, p. 35).

For an analysis of the differences between the screens studied here, the prospect of Levinson (1998 [1997]) is a starting point. When the author addresses the issue of the twentieth century screens, he warns of the differences in their nature, in particular between the television and the computer, and in this context it shows the need for a taxonomy of screens (Levinson, 1998 [1997] pp. 199-211).

12 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

www.igi-global.com/chapter/screen-culture/213161

Related Content

A Study of Using VR Game in Teaching Tajweed for Teenagers

Haya Hasan AlKhatib, Evi Indriasari Mansor, Zainab Alsameland Joud Allam AlBarazi (2020). *Interactivity and the Future of the Human-Computer Interface* (pp. 244-260).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/a-study-of-using-vr-game-in-teaching-tajweed-for-teenagers/250756

Experience Prototyping: Gathering Rich Understandings to Guide Design

Ken Keaneand Valentina Nisi (2014). *Emerging Research and Trends in Interactivity and the Human-Computer Interface* (pp. 224-237).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/experience-prototyping/87046

Assistive Technology as Instructional Supports for Response to Intervention

Mary G. Curtis (2016). *Human-Computer Interaction: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 800-824).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/assistive-technology-as-instructional-supports-for-response-to-intervention/139065

Identification of Chronic Wound Status under Tele-Wound Network through Smartphone

Chinmay Chakraborty, Bharat Guptaand Soumya K. Ghosh (2016). *Human-Computer Interaction: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 991-1007).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/identification-of-chronic-wound-status-under-tele-wound-network-through-smartphone/139075

The Evolving Nature of International Collaboration and Partnership

Amanpreet Singh Chopra, Sridhar Manohar, Artur Zawadskiand Mayank Jain (2024). *Digital Technologies, Ethics, and Decentralization in the Digital Era* (pp. 1-21).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/the-evolving-nature-of-international-collaboration-and-partnership/338863