

HOCHSCHULE FURTWANGEN UNIVERSITY

**Mastercourse Computer Science in Media**

**“CINEMA VS. MOBILE DEVICE”**

*Body, space and perception*

Professor Daniel Fetzner

*Advances in media production*

Professor Nikolaus Hottong

Mónica S. Martínez Gómez

January, 2009

## **Index**

Introduction	3
Development	
<i>The cinema and the perception of spectator</i>	4
<i>The Xda Orbit</i>	7
<i>The New media</i>	10
<i>The differences</i>	16
Conclusion	22
Bibliography	23

## **Introduction**

The present essay has as aim to analyze the existing variations between to appraise one film in a cinema, with to appraise of the same one but sight in a mobile device, more in specific in an Xda Orbit, a smartphone based on Windows Mobile 6.0. To discern the variations I will discuss the physical and mental space that is on each of one. I will discuss the perception quality on the cinema and in this mobile.

The offered perception quality of cinema is tied to aesthetic concepts and spatial practice, and it has a develop background. To analyze the differences in the perception between both media, I will start with the development of cinema and then I will explain the capacity of the Xda mobile. The idea is to discern the aesthetic qualities of the cinema in general and later to see if the above mentioned qualities are kept or get lost at the time when one sees a movie in a mobile device.

For this project, I'll focus in a specific topic: the discussions about the new media, in this case the digital film and mobile device, with its influence in the conception of the spatial practice.

## **The cinema and the perception of spectator**

There are two kinds of spaces that have influence in perception, the first one is the physical space, in this case the cinema theater created by different aspects; the big screen with its size takes all the attention of the spectator during the film, the sofas, the darkness, the audio; and the second one is the space of the film itself, in other words, the space inside the screen.

For to explain the film space, I need to refer the early cinema. At the beginning, the film only focused in to show the image in movement, and the concern was, not about the narrative quality of the *new media*, but it was about the technology by itself; and this is the same principle for any *new* technology, to surprise you with *new* possibilities, even if they only can join together a different kind of media. But, turning back to the film space, one of the most important thoughts about it, was its possibility to show images giving to the spectator the feeling of reality. During the first projections, the spectator was surprised and sometimes he felt panic; as an example we can remember the famous scene of *L'Arrivée d'un train á La Ciotat* of Lumiere's brothers in 1895, when some of the public went out of the theater.

When the narrative form was integrated to the film, the filmmakers followed the theatrical way in different aspects; the sense of reality was kept by full shots without camera movements representing all the action in one place (scenario/location) and in one scene. The actors had to watch the camera/spectator very often for make him feel part of the action and the actors had to move horizontally because the spectator didn't have the deep perception of the film; "(...) [they] did not think of off-screen space in the same way as we do (...)" (Persson 2001:42), the sense of continuity on early cinema is given by open captures and without change of shots, the camera had to show the whole person and the actor could not turn out to be mutilated by the camera because this would generate in the spectator the wrong interpretation and the absence of realism in the action. The film was accompanied with an orchestra. All this aspects had formed the aesthetic of the early cinema, and the cinema had to educate the eye of the early spectator so that he could appraise filmic action. The spectator could understand the film space.

In the decade of 1920's, "(...) the Soviet montage school and classical film language were the new languages for film media (...)" (Manovich 2002:2), the cinema generated a new perception in the spectator via cutting the shots and creating the idea of montage, which not only included the understanding of the continuity of the shots and the story, it included as well, a different thinking and a reflective process. At this time, the spectator changed his idea about the spatiality of the film, he started to conceiving a "(...) surround space of cinema (...)" (Persson 2001:49) and also "(...) creat[ing] an immersive space (...)" (Persson 2001:49) during this time the audio changed the film space, the filmmakers took out the narrator and the orchestra and they integrated the audio into the film. The audio was part of the new perception of the cinema, by generating emotions. The spectator started to think of something or somebody who is not in the image but is there in somewhere.

The spatial perception of the cinema was modified, the spectator was deleted of the film, the actor never again saw the camera and the darkness of the cinema contributed with it as well. The spectator was immobilized; the camera is, until now the spectator's eye, as a voyeurism practice.

The next step was the change of black and white to the color film, which increased in the spectator the sense of reality and with that the perception change, once again. The spectator can not only watch images of the real life, in real color, and through this he can have an immersive process. He can feel that is part of the movie, he is who is playing the act and having all this experiences.

The editing process, as well, suffered a change. At the beginning the filmmakers used to cut the video on linear editors, this is called linear editing because the medium of tape forced things to be edited sequentially; but when the non-linear platforms of cutting came out, the cinema suffered a radical transformation, the filmmakers can place clips anywhere within the final video, and they can move them around as much as they want, rearrange them in a completely different order. The filmmakers start to modify the images and to integrate the digital animation. After a while, the digital camera came up and it presupposes itself in a constant renovation trying every time to improve the quality of these images and this step too, reduce the high cost to the cinematography industry because the traditional developing process is expensive.

The specialists of creating the film sound are still working very hard in to arouse feelings in the spectator and to contribute to his sense of spatial immersion. With this, the aesthetics ideas changed, the spectator mind and eye was reeducated and he starts to appraise this *new* cinema. Nowadays we think that this kind of language (camera, photography, sound, narrative, acting, etc.) makes of a film a piece of art.

Following the last sentence, one can say that the main idea that we have about the cinema space is still the same; even if the development of digital technology can create a 3-D images and show them like something real. The digital cinema always uses the same language like the analogy one; the same camera movements, the sound, the narrative (maybe less narrative and more spectacular images); everything is the same except for one *new* aspect, we are been educated, once again, for appraise the ability of the technology for create everything and make it, every time, more real. And now we can start thinking in this like an art.

The unquestionable particularity of cinema is the moving image, it's historical process show us an object of transformations, having the same principal idea, namely to be more real for the spectator's eye. With this historical process of cinema, we can see how the cinema space was created for the filmmakers and how it has influence in the spectator perception.

## **The Xda Orbit**

If I want to expose the development of this technology, I have to write the history of different technologies that are integrated in this mobile. This mobile combines telephone, a small computer running Windows, internet connectivity, camera, MP3 player, etc. this mobile is pretty similar to the iPhone (watch the video attachment).

The Xda Orbit is a mobile who offers different kinds of possibilities for being connected with the world and making your work easy. The space perception on this mobile, depends on the user, the user starts to be the space of the technology. The user, already knows, almost all the functions of this mobile, he knows how to work on internet, he knows the language or the logic of Microsoft, etc., he only needs to start working on it and in a bite he will know all its possibilities, maybe at the beginning, he can think that to write in Word is not that fast as to type in a laptop; but if we remember when we start to write messages via cell phone, at the beginning we were very slowly but with practice we start to write faster and with the integration of the predictable text it became better. This mobile has a touch screen that we can manipulate with a finger or with a special pen, if we want to write in Office we can make appear a keyboard with the same logic of the PC keyboard, or you can connect one external keyboard. Maybe in a few years, the keyboard will be like a hologram that will follow the movement of your fingers.

The camera has 2.0 megapixels, is not the best definition, but this mobile is almost *new* and maybe in the future it will have more definition. When a *new* technology appears, it doesn't mean that it is already finished, it is always in constant renovation, searching to be the best one. Another aspect of this mobile is that it has its own internet company, you don't have to pay the internet rent in your home, because with this mobile you can pay the internet too in the same cell phone bill and connect the mobile in your laptop and have access to the internet or wherever you are.

Every time, the *new* technology is renovating and changing the old technology, with this mobile you don't need to take your laptop with you, you don't need to have a map with you, or an iPod, or a radio, or a DVD reproducer, etc. you have everything on the same machine. It reduces the space, and put it all together in the same device, wherever the user

is. It offers the user more interaction in every step, and the same time it gives the user the possibility to save his time.

In the last part of this project, I will discuss I will discuss how this mobile changes people's perception of space.

## The New media

The discussion about the differences between old media and *new media* have been object of many essays, I want to refer to such discussion for two important reasons. The first one is, for to explain the differences between cinema and Xda Orbit (big screen / small screen), I need first to refer to what kind of media are each of one. The second reason is, because I think that using this mobile for watching movies our awareness is been readapted, reeducated, increased.

For this discussion, it is impossible to let out McLuhan's approach to media; his works are well known for the media philosophers, and he is still a central point of discussion in many essays. What it follows, for the evolutionary analysis, is to study recent authors who are living, interacting and practicing with the *new media*; like Lev Manovich, David Bolter and Richard Grusin.

McLuhan's idea was that technology is not a simple instrument separated of us; the technology is in fact an "extension of *ourselves*" (McLuhan 1998:7), and *technological extensions* of us "(...) *accelerated* and *enlarged* the scale of previous human functions (...)" (McLuhan 1998:8), and the content of any technology is not some narrative message, but "(...) the medium [by itself] is the message. This is merely to say that the personal and social *consequences* of any medium – that is, of any *extension* of ourselves – result from the new *scale* that is introduced into our affairs by each *extension* of ourselves, or by any new technology (...)" (McLuhan 1998:7), these media are changing our perception of life and are modifying our social relationships, and they are *mutilating* our functions. The cinema made a change not only in the perception of humans, expanding their capabilities to understand the meaning of the cinematographic language, it became a social ritual where people has to go to a special place, take a seat in a dark room and eat whatever they can buy, and this is the content of the message, all the changes in human life induced by cinema. We can say that the cinema is an *extension* of our own feelings, emotions, wishes, etc. (like being in the deepness of the sea, or traveling around the world in Baraka's film).

McLuhan also claims, that "(...) the 'content' of any medium is always another medium. The content of writing is speech, just as the written word is the content of print, and print is the content of the telegraph." (McLuhan 1998:8) This sentence "(...) the

‘content’ of any medium is always another medium” (McLuhan 1998:8), is for David Bolter and Richard Grusin the beginning of their work, “(...) [they] call the representation of one medium in another *remediation*, and (...) [they] argue that remediation is a defining characteristic of the new digital media (...)” (Bolter, Grusin 2000:45), and for the old media too. To explain *remediation*, they start from two basic concepts *immediacy* and *hipermediacy*, and they claim that these two concepts articulate the double logic of the *remediation*.

*Remediation*’s main idea is that a media stems from another media, therefore *new* media do not exist as such, and they are only interpretations, variations and renovations of the old media. Bolter and Grusin, claim that “*remediation* did not begin with the introduction of digital media (...)” (Bolter, Grusin 2000:11) by explaining the process in which the computer remediated the photography, and the photography is a *remediation* of the painting; and they say “(...) the goal of the computer graphics specialists is to do as well as, and eventually better than, the painter or even the photographer” (Bolter, Grusin 2000:11) Every *new* medium promises more reality than its predecessor; and this promise take us to the next term *immediacy*.

*Immediacy* refers to the capacity of medium to make feel the spectator or user, part of it, and for one moment the spectator or user forget momentarily that is having mediation “(...) by ignoring or denying the presence of the medium and the act of mediation” (Bolter, Grusin 2000:11) and it doesn’t apply only for the user, it apply too for the media itself, because every media who is formed by different kind of old media, is deleting the old media as well, because the media is not only the machine (in this case the cinema projector) is all the things that form part of it, the photography, the book, the architecture, the music, etc. and everything is deleted in the mediation process, for make you feel, every time, more real. You are not focus only in the music when you see a movie, you are perceiving everything at the same time.

The *immediacy* is not a characteristic only of the *new media*; it is part of the early media who “(...) sought immediacy through the interplay of the aesthetic value of transparency with techniques of linear perspective, erasure, and automaticity, all of which are strategies also at work in digital technology.” (Bolter, Grusin 2000:24) They use these

values for make possible the appraise of the spectator, like we see on the aesthetics concepts, these values are searched by the educated eye.

This aesthetic concept *Immediacy* looks for the transparent experience, and one defect can break up this experience because it remember you the medium itself. This is one of the goals of the *new* technology, and if we take this concept to the Xda Orbit, we can say that this mobile is deleting a different kind o Medias that are part of it (since a pen who was deleted by a touch screen, to a big cinema screen who is now deleted for a small screen).

Let's apply the *immediacy* concept to the cinema and to the Xda Orbit. But first, we have to situate each media in its time, the cinema was born in the XX Century and this mobile has only 2 years ago.

On the first part of this essay, I talked about the understanding of the film's spectator, in the early cinema, the spectator understand the film language because its similitude with the theater. The early cinema had the *immediacy* logic because it showed real thinks of life and the transparency was able because the shots' continuity.

The cinema is a *remediation* medium, because it remediates painting, photography, book, music, theater, architecture, etc. By searching the reality, the cinema deleted all these media, as independent media, and it created a *new* one: the cinema itself. The transparency of the cinema is obtained by the representational techniques, like the point of view of the camera, which gives to the spectator the opportunity of imagine what will happen in the next scene. When the narrative and music were integrated, the spectator already knew this medias and maybe they make him comfortable and they teaches him to understand the whole cinema mediation.

Then, the digital technology was integrated to the cinema, and with this step had eliminated the analog technology, “[s]ince the electronic version [digital film] justifies itself by granting access to the older media [analog film], it wants to be transparent. The digital medium wants to erase itself, so that the viewer stands in the same relationship to the content as she would if she were confronting the original medium” (Bolter, Grusin 2000:45) The conception of the cinema is kept by the idea that we are in the same dark space (theater), watching a movie, with all its elements; but in reality we are watching now something that can be created whit a 3d platform and still looks real, or we are hearing a digital sound than can be created as well. And this is a contradiction, because is not the

same as it was, but looks and sounds better, and is not something totally *old* but is not completely *new* because it use the same camera movements, the audio, etc.; the digital cinema is a *remediated* cinema.

Now, the Xda Orbit is a mobile which obviously *remediates* different kinds of media; for going to the grain, it *remediates* the computer who *remediates* all media (old and new ones) it *remediate* the tv, the film, the radio, the news paper, the phone, etc. and you can have access to the internet in this mobile too, who *remediate* as well all media. As a *new* medium, the Xda Orbit is the *extension* of a different kind of functions, and the same time this mobile is *deleting* every medium that is part of it; by this point we don't need the computer as we know it (PC or laptop) for having access to the internet, or for working in Microsoft Office, or we don't need a separate cell phone, or ipod; or games (by the moment they are a simple games, like solitary, but in the future maybe we can have a very structured games), and we don't need a big screen (cinema or tv) for to watch a movie, we already can watch on it.

Now, going back to the computer *remediation*, the Xda Orbit doesn't *remediate* it in all its aspects; for example a designer needs to work in a design platform, and by the moment it is not possible to have it in this mobile; but it *remediate*, until now, the language and the logic of computer (Microsoft) with a different kind of software (audio, video, office, etc.)

But for making possible the analysis of *immediacy* in this mobile, I need first to explain the second logic of *remediation* that is *hypermediacy*. This mobile is quite similar to the computer, this is a hypermedia who like all hypermedia applications that "(...) import early media into a digital space in order to critique and refashion them (...)" (Bolter, Grusin 2000:53); the problem now is like a hypermedia application, this mobile can't be a transparent one at all, and with that, we can say that it doesn't keep the *immediacy* logic, but we can argue that the real can be "(...) defined in terms of the viewer's experience; it is that which would evoke an immediate (and therefore authentic) emotional response (...)" (Bolter, Grusin 2000:53) and it works because it multiply the mediation by different media "(...) crea[ting] a feeling of fullness, a satiety, of experience, which can be taken as reality" (Bolter, Grusin 2000:53), the user has a closer relationship with the mobile, he manipulate it and he has the point of view.

Not only in this mobile, both logics of *remediation* can coexist, the cinema as well, has *hypermedicity*, it joins together different digital media. Bolter and Grusin explain that “[i]n the effort to create a seamless moving image, filmmakers combine live-action footage with computer compositing and two- and three-dimensional computer graphics” (Bolter, Grusin 2000:6) and when we are watching this kind of movie, we already know that this animation is not real, and we still have the feeling of *immediacy* because we believe in one moment that it can happen. And the cultural relation manifested in Medias is that what makes possible to have an authentic *hypermediacy* experience.

The authors claim that these both contradictories logics of *remediation*, *immediacy* and *hipermediacy* “(...) not only coexist in digital media today but are mutually dependent. Immediacy depends of hypermediacy (...)” (Bolter, Grusin 2000:6) and all *new* digital media are in constant dialectic with the old media.

This dialectic between the *old* and *new* media's, is like a circular dialog, like Bolter and Grusin explains with an example; the tv shows the Mikey Mouse cartoon, and then the cinema makes a movie and Disneyland offer to you the possibility of to know Mikey Mouse and its world, everything is connected and they have the same idea to sold you the whole packet.

The Company of the Xda Orbit says that this mobile will be the future, if the people who can afford it buy it, it will be the future as well. And this is the beginning of the reeducate culture.

For to make the comparison between cinema and the Xda Orbit, is important to understand that the cinema is now been *remediated* by this mobile, and I aim that this mobile will *remediate* the cinema as well. The computer is *remediated* by this mobile, and then this mobile is *remediating* the cinema because it takes films made for cinema. This mobile needs film that can be more appraisals on it and with that new kind of film the cinema will be *remediate* for this mobile.

## **The differences**

As we saw in the first part of this essay, the cinema has its own spatial and perception construction. This mobile is a general device for doing very different things; and one of these is the possibility of watching a movie on it, with that the Xda Orbit is changing the film perception with a small screen and auriculars. In the cinema, the spectator is only that, in the mobile, the user can be too a spectator.

The Xda Orbit can't offer to us the physical space for to watch the movie, you don't push one button and the comfortable sofa appears and the light is off and the image grows up to a real size in front of you. This mobile is making the user participate in the construction of this space by deciding when, where and how to watch the movie. The user has the possibility to decide the physical space.

Is not the first time that the technology wanted to create a new physical cinema space, we already have this when the beta format appears and make possible to watch a movie in your home. The development of the technology in this aspect doesn't stop, now you can have a home theater and a big TV screen. If you google it, you can find a few different companies who offer to you the best screen with each time more resolution and size, etc. Each technology creates its own physical space, the home theater give its space by the possibility of watching a movie in your home, and you decide when you want to watch it. The appearance of this technology didn't change, the way that the filmmakers made the films, but it make possible to have a circular remediation, because you can't watch a movie in your home if this movie is still showed in the cinema, but you can watch it after that by renting it or buying it. The whole packet is done, for to see a new movie you have to go to the cinema, for to watch it a lot of times without spending a lot of money you can buy it and it will be yours the rest of your life (of the DVD life) without depending of the "film on cinema theater life". This is the circular consumer world.

Every aspect is fully in off, a new movie on cinema theater offers to you the experience of watching this movie near to the time that it was made, seems to us when we have a movie of the 2000 is now for us an old movie, as if the near of the time in which it was made make it more real; the possibility of having this movie in your home make you

feel it again or if you haven't see this movie is your time for watch it. These are the *immediacy* and *hipermediacy* effects.

Now, we have the Xda Orbit, the size of this mobile is obviously smaller than the cinema screen, and is obvious too, that to watch a movie in this mobile is not the same that to watch it in the cinema theater and is not the same that to watch it with home theater; but let's see what is happening with the perception.

In my first experience, I watched *Girl with a Pearl Earring*, I didn't have seen this movie before, and I decided to watch this movie in the mobile before to watch it on a bigger screen (TV) for to see if I understand everything of I miss something. Like an educated' eye, I know how to appraise the beauty in the film image, I understand the language of almost all the shots, I follow the music and it makes me feel in some way, etc. And I can say that the movies, until now, they were made for been showed in a big screen. The *Girl with a Pearl Earring* follows the baroque chiaroscuro of the painting, and it has more silence with image details than dialogs of the characters; these images are completed by the music. We can see a dramatic sexual tension between the characters made it by good acting and specific shots.

I watched this movie in a train. At the beginning, takes time to understand what is about, because I was thinking in my travel, in my place, in the time, and I had to use to the language because is not possible to use subtitles (I could never read them). Then I note that I have been reflected by the screen and I began to think that this is my own experience with this movie and with this mobile. I stop it and start it again, I was able to decide everything, and I was the only one who chose the moment for watching it and could change the train without losing the continuity in my mind. One important fact is that when I was watching the movie, the reality momentary get lost because the quality is not good and it makes droops, the mobile doesn't has the capacity for to reproduce it in real time. At the end it doesn't matter because I have been entertained.

As we see in the *remediation* topic, the Xda is trying to delete a different kind of media, and it becomes a small media that need physical space in the user body and with it a mental space too. The physical space in this mobile means that the human body now is been integrated to the interfaces, these interfaces have been created thinking in the human body. It is possible that the perception of the user is growing up with this mobile, not only

because it joins together a different media that he already knows the language because he understand the logic of each *remediated* media and he already manipulate them; is as well because the Xda has its own *remediated* language that makes possible to manipulate all the media in one.

Y-la Kotola in *The Integrated media machine*, talks about the interfaces like the The Xda Orbit, and says that this kind of interface is a media environment which by virtual data is increasing the spatial conscience of the user, starting with already known languages from the media that are part of it, and with these languages the user is oriented to a *new* environment. As we saw, the early cinema, the filmmakers used the theater language for to guide the spectator to the understanding of the *new* medium (cinema).

We already know the cinema space, this space is already legible for us, we understand the space inside the screen and we think in the physical cinema space with the big screen, the dark room, etc. The cinema shows movies every day and it doesn't depends of us in the sense that the cinema is showing the movies and we only have to go into the movie theater for experiencing the mediation. The mobile' physical space, is the human body, the user is who decides when he wants to activate it and it goes wherever the user is. And this technology implementation depends on the user, in the sense that if he already knows how to use all the media that are *remediated* on it, the mobile will be useful for him. It refers that the user has the information inside as imaginative potential.

The user or the spectator uses to be static (in front of the computer, in the cinema seat, etc.) and is concentrated in the media and with it is easy for him to remember the information or the language of it. Now, this mobile is in continuous movements, depending on the user desires; maybe the user can be in movement like traveling in a train, but he is still static; the important change on using this mobile is that the watching space or physical space is changing; is not like been on cinema theater, is not a social practice anymore, is used in an occasional moments.

The mobile depends so hard of the background media knowledge of the user, and the user is increasing his awareness in a mnemonic way by interacting directly with the mobile. This *corporal mnemonic* is, for Jussi Angesleva in her article *Body Mnemotecnics. Interaction design concept for portable devices*, the physic representation of the system. The user has the real reference in this body for the device, the device was created

depending on the background knowledge of the user and it creates via user's interaction its physical space.

Another topic for to discuss is the user or spectator imagination, in *Ecologies of the Dynamic Cinema's Emotion*, Pia Tikka explains that the cinema is an interactive process, which makes the external appearance of the mind, the spectator interact with the story via imagination. The narrative is a socio-emotional interaction and it always is dealing with the "other"; who refers to the phenomenological sources of the subject consciousness; where the subject is trying to imitate the "other" in a neuronal level; the user imagines that what is happening on the film is happening to him. This narrative cognition is simulated via emotions; the spectator takes part of the construction of the narrative with or without conscience, the integration of different sensory experiences is part of the imagination. The emotions lead the recognition of organism's patrons in continuous interactions with the environment. The cinema screen creates another space where the life can be represented, this space is dynamic, because request the participation of the spectator, and this participation is via imagination.

Tikka makes reference to Merleau-Ponty who explains that humans are able to imitate or simulate, and this capacity is followed for the ability for change the behavior oneself in relationship to the other. This simulation of the "other" can be possible with a film, the spectator via mental simulates to be living the film story.

The Xda Orbit is the "other" as well, it can be considered as such because the user has a relationship with this mobile; the user imitates it by learning its language, it requires the user's ability to handle it and in the same time the user convert's this mobile into him; the user's body is the environment of this mobile. The user copies the ability of the mobile and changes his behavior, with this ability I mean that the user doesn't need to be in his home for to have access to the internet, or for to watch a movie, etc. everything seems be more easy and fast, and as a result the user changes his behavior.

When one watches a movie in the Xda Orbit, the imaginative capacity is different from the cinema space. The imagination starts when we make the story like our own story and we try to figure out what will happen; with the Xda Orbit the imagination changes when we are watching a movie, we think in the same way that we use to think when we are in a cinema in the sense that we know the film space (inside the screen), because this is a

already construction to understand the film, but our imagination will have more time for working, if we are watching the movie in a train and we need to change the train, we need to stop it and have contact with our exterior world, and this external world is mixed with our understanding of the movie, we take this narrative to our life and it has influence in all senses of our environment at that time, we create a new vision of life: what I am imagining about the movie and what I am living and imagine about my life.

We already have two different concepts, the information of the technology is the user knowledge for to manipulate it, and the imagination is the capacity of the user or spectator for to feel part of the story and with that create its own immersion.

In the cinema space, we can't stop the movie, and then all the time we are thinking in the film and imagining, the images are running so fast that we have to be concentrated on that. In the Xda Orbit, you can stop it and have more time for the imagination, but we cannot forget that our attention is been distracted for the external world. Our perception of the movie in a big screen gives to us the directionality of our look, even if we can look in different parts of the screen, we are looking the movie all the time with its details, we think that the bigger screen is better because of it, we can have the real size of the reality and with that be able to have the *immediacy*. In the small screen we have to concentrate not in the details, but in the main action of the characters; and at the same time we are looking, in some way, our external world as well. Our mind starts working in two different ways, and we still have *immediacy*. We can't appraise the image, but we are following the story and with that we are having imagination, maybe more because we can't see everything and we have to fill the empty spaces in different senses: empty image, empty audio and narrative intermittent. At the same time, one can have access to the internet and search for everything about the movie, like the circle *remediation*.

We don't need to appraise the artistic film image in this mobile as we use to do, the aesthetic experience refers to what is happening within the space of the media, and the space of the spectator. The message is now changing, our way to watch movies in this mobile is different, we are not focused anymore in only the movie, we are concentrated, too, in our real world. We are mixing both incomplete worlds, and they are working together filling the empty spaces of each of one.

The art is now concentrated in showing the way that we live, we are living in a consumer world, some artists paint or photography everything that is in our environment like a trash world where everything is related with the consumer society. The cinema also reflects our world, and with the Xda Orbit mobile we are reflecting this too. That's why, maybe, the film industry will create a new kind of genre that can match the small screen as well. Following the *remediation* concept, the cinema is borrowing its movies to this mobile and this mobile will borrow the cinema a new language.

## Conclusions

The appearance of *new* technologies bring to us reinterpretations of the *old* technologies, and it will may be applied in a short time in the way that the film industry will produce a movies for been watched in a different devices. Each *new* technology gives to us as users, the possibility to improve our perception; as far as us practices and interacting whit the *new* media, it will became part of our life. The *new* media create new information in our mind. This mediated space is not only a mental space is too a physical one, our body is the environment for the *new* technology.

The user or spectator with this mobile is changing its own immersion, he is playing the role of outside of the screen, and the screen is moving in different places. And we can live whit this, maybe in the beginning we don't think that something *new* will be possible, every media is the same, they are been mixing and recreating but the main fact is that our perception is increasing and is been discovered, we are been trained for to use the *new* devices and in the same time we are been released, in the sense that we don't need a big machines for to do something, like been on internet. We use to think that when something is big (like a big screen) we have a good extension of our self and with that we have the feeling that is working, but with a small extensions or devices we don't feel satisfaction because we are not yet trained for that. The big screen can be considerate like a small screen and our perception need to be adapted, educated, increased like if it (perception) takes the place of the big screen.

Not only the technology is been developed, we are like an *old* media (body-mind) and we not only have *new* extensions; we are developing our perception of the world and increasing our abilities. We are been *remediated* as well.

## **Bibliography**

**Bolter, David and Grusin, Richard**, *Remediation. Understanding New Media*. Cambridge, Massachusetts 2000.

**McLuhan, Marshall**, *Understanding Media. The Extensions of Man* (1964). Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 1998.

**Manovich, Lev**, “*The Language of New Media*”, MIT Press, Cambridge, 2001.

**Munt, Sally R. and contributors**, *Technospaces, inside the new media*, CONTINUUM London and New York, 2001.

**Sturken, Marita and Cartwright, Lisa**. *Practices of looking, an introduction to visual culture*. Oxford University Press, New York, 2001.

**Ylä-Kotola Mauri, Inkinen Sam, Isomäki Hannakaisa (eds)**, *The Integrated Media Machine Aspects of Future Interfaces and Cross-Media Culture*. 2005.