Emerging Techné, Pedagogy, and Rhetorics (from YouTube *Enframement*)

> "If we are to make this culture our own, render it legible, and make it into a new platform for our needs and conversations today, we must find a way to cut, paste, and remix present culture" (200).
>
> - Yochai Benkler, *The Wealth of Networks*

> "For in operating on society with a new technology, it is not the incised area that is most affected. The area of impact and incision is numb. It is the entire system that is changed" (64).
>
> - Marshall McLuhan, *Understanding Media*

No longer exclusive to industry, now residing at the fingertips of the masses, our media and media production landscapes are radically shifting. We are moving out of the longstanding, industrial-based, consumerist culture and into a culture of digital consumer-producers, or what we might view as a culture industry by the masses for the masses (cf. Hodgson 179-80). As we both consume and produce in this new landscape, and do so at rates and degrees never before seen, we find ourselves in the midst of a radical *reculturalization*: we are moving away from the blinding/binding spectacle of the "big screen" (Virilio)[1] and moving toward more participatory logics and rhetorics of the "small screen," the computer screen, a new breed of interactive spectacle.

These emerging "screen" cultures demand new sets of rhetorical abilities, and new sets of "compositional" skills, in order to (adequately) prepare our future (*electrate*) citizenry. And that is exactly what we are being charged with (or have accepted as part of our task): we digital rhetoricians and 21st century compositionists are working to prepare the masses to actively and critically engage the affordances of digital technologies; that is to say, we are preparing students to contribute to the global, electronic world—a world where participation (both consumption and production) is crucial to digital existence (and digital essence).

While there is any number of social media that we could investigate in regards to these issues, each offering its own issues of *enframement*, there is one current cultural enigma

that has altered this particular landscape perhaps more than most: YouTube. What makes YouTube unique, among other things, is that it houses the mainstream and the mundane, the awe-inspiring and the abject.[2] It gives credence to viewership, not sponsorship. It opens culture to the positive potentials of the viral. And somewhere in the mix is a multitude of rhetorical productions that engage a new set of practices in their creation: with montage, collage, mashup, cut, mix, and remix (among others) moving into the requisite vocabulary of the "digitally literate"—with previous "composing" terms and phrases (like transition, titling, work cited, etc.) also experiencing a transformation in conceptuality, one more applicable to a visual (moving image) culture. Additionally, other important issues like copyright, ownership, and authorship are moving into the muck—taking plagiarism practices/considerations to a whole new level of complexity and impossibility: Who owns a cultural moment? A cultural memory?

With these things in mind, our pedagogical landscapes are radically changing as well. And it is here, in the realm of new media pedagogy, that this paper finds its focus. But this is a very difficult thing to focus on because new media lacks a corpus or a canon of any kind. As Gregory L. Ulmer has told us, "There is no consensus about new media education, about what skills are needed, what practices are available, for citizens to be fully empowered as native producers of digital texts" (*Internet Invention* xii). While this is true, and perhaps must remain that way in the postmodern or even nonmodern (Latour) developing world—a (Lyotardian) world that gives import to connection and not cohesion—I would argue that there are a few touchstones that can be included across the board.

One approach to these touchstones would be *production*, *selection*, and *distribution*, which, according to Henry Jenkins, come together in a single platform for the first time ever

with the development of YouTube (275). Or we could use Jenkins' other tripartite, where he makes connections between YouTube and the larger (Western) culture:

- YouTube as a meeting ground or shared distribution channel for varying groups and content (amateur and semiprofessional [and professional]);
- YouTube as media archive with amateurs bringing media (legally/illegally) to larger public;
- YouTube's content as spreadable and reframeable across networks and publics (and I would add across contexts) (275).

But it is tough to offer either of these sets as a good fit for new media pedagogy, for they favor either industry or cultural hermeneutics. In counterdistinction, following a trajectory offered by Ulmer's work, I believe new media pedagogy should instead be working toward *heuretics*—being less interpretive and more inventive in approach, as there is a limiting, reductive element to the former, while the latter is open to perpetual change (perpetual reinvention).

Thus, following Ulmer's efforts, the *heuretical* (perhaps heretical) turn I am embracing here is not only moving away from *topoi* but toward *chora*: a shift from the fixity of *place* and toward the possibilities of *space* (and *medium*).[3] This movement toward a chora-based method, or what Ulmer terms *choragraphy*, is both timely and important "because hypermedia still lacks a 'rhetoric'" (Ulmer, *Internet Invention* 27). Not only does it lack "a" rhetoric, but it resists "a" rhetoric—giving preference to plurality or multiplicity (rhetoricS), and here *chora* is once again preferable as it does not reduce to the singular but rather is inclusive of a larger register.[4]

What I hope to offer then is not a defined set of categories by which we render YouTube "conquerable," but rather a set of considerations in which we might develop

approaches to understanding some pedagogical possibilities of YouTube—offering not static touchstones per se but rather paths that flow to and through the ephemerality of YouTube. As such, my own approach, developed in full, would also work across three realms of consideration, with the second and third realms palpating issues of accountability/control and engaging social/civic rhetorics associated with YouTube. But for purposes of this article, I will restrict my focus to the first: focusing on rhetorical techné emerging around/with digital video and participatory video cultures. This self-imposed restriction is not a complete severing or separating of the three, as each drifts into and across one another—thus, be aware of wandering intrusions—but I feel rhetorical techné is where conversations on this topic must begin as they grant us access, in particular ways, to the other realms or areas of consideration. I do anticipate, however, that areas two and three will be addressed, indirectly or directly, by the other authors/articles in this issue.

The Techné of It All

In "YouTube Yo'Self: Let's Chart a Course and Then Ignore it," Virginia Kuhn writes, "It has become de rigueur these days to cite one's first 'YouTube moment'—the moment at which one was reeled in by the massively popular video-sharing platform" (8). Hers was "They're Taking the Hobbits to Isengard,"[5] an entertaining example of remediation/repurposing as the video remixes scenes from *The Lord of the Rings: The Two Towers* film along a techno music baseline (or beat line). The video demonstrates a plethora of emerging[6] rhetorical techniques—jump cut, digital anaphora, juxtaposition, etc. (techniques to which I will return),[7] but what is most interesting to me is the way the creator(s) borrowed stylistically from one media realm (that of music—more specifically

from dance/techno/club audio performance) and turned the film into just another element to be mixed, scratched, spun.

This *becoming*, this movement of film into just another compositional element, is a crucial development, and one we need to hold onto dearly, tightly, relentlessly as we move further into cultures of "video writing"—particularly in terms of creating rhetorical discourse in these emerging platforms. The reason is that once a film becomes part of the realm of the Internet (snippets, if not the entirety, made available online) or once it becomes available for private consumption (i.e., sold on DVD), the film ceases to merely be a product, ceases to merely be a spectacle for consumption (created/owned/controlled by the culture industry), and instead becomes part of the "available means" for participating in (electronic) cultural conversations (cf. Lanham, *The Economics* 13). It becomes available for sampling, for appropriation, for repurposing, for reimagining, for (digital) rhetoric. And this small, but important move for composing *with* film/video (i.e., recutting/remixing/remaking original footage) has expanded the "available means" exponentially, opening our (digital) rhetorical discourse to the cinematic archives.

But it is important to note that this *becoming* is not exclusive to Hollywood productions; it is the condition of video creations students produce and make available online, and students should be made aware of this fact early on. Anything made available online can (and probably will) be sampled, borrowed, leveraged, repurposed, satirized, destroyed, and so on. Despite our best intentions to the contrary, despite ongoing discussions about use, ownership, licensing and whatnot, despite a desire to believe in the general good of humanity, if students do it "right," their creations may experience all of these things; once a video goes viral it is likely to be reused, remade, mocked, modeled, martyred. Thus, perhaps we should not view this *becoming* in negative terms, as thievery or shady

production practices, but as one of the positives of video culture. To become part of the "available means" in this type of digital culture is not to be archived in any traditional sense (i.e., locked in a secure room on a college campus), but to be part of a living, fluxuating entity, helping the conversation grow, expand, expound—digital creations waiting for an opportunity to be reviewed (in all senses), or remade, or re-envisioned.

What is at heart here and what seems to proliferate YouTube culture is not only that film, video, motion images are just another compositional element, just another rhetorical element, but also that sampling/appropriating these entities is integral to any considerations of emerging participatory video cultures. This is not to say that all YouTube products engage in this kind of sampling/appropriating, as many are point-and-shoot productions, vlogs, cartoons, skits/shorts, and so on, but any discussion about YouTube culture, or any discussion about making/composing digital videos for a social media apparatus, needs to consider sampling/appropriating because it occurs at so many levels (from production or composition to rights discussions to rhetorical strategies and on down/up the line).

It should be acknowledged, however, that this kind of sampling/appropriating is not a new enterprise; we have been doing this for centuries (if not millennia)—sampling and repurposing what others have said or written. And it is not new to film either, as filmic styles and editing/composing techniques have been borrowed/modeled for decades. But the kind of repurposing done by the "Isengard" video, a type of comedic parasitical remix, opens a variety of considerations, not the least of which includes how these creations affect/effect what we might view as shared cultural memories: How many people saw the film(s)? How many read the book(s)? How many people know the story created by Tolkein? How does this (and other related videos) change these "memories?"

These kinds of remixes raise important issues, important questions that should be pursued further, but those pursuits are simply beyond the scope of this particular investigation. Rather, I want to stay focused on considerations of techné we might view as endemic to video writing.

My approach will be much like that of Jeff Rice in his *The Rhetoric of Cool: Composition Studies and New Media*, where the "point is not to emphasize a given application or approach [in any singularity] but rather to consider rhetorical gestures relevant to new media practices" (7). Thus, we might view the considerations I raise in the following sections as rhetorical gestures relevant to video composition (and/or participatory video cultures). Among those gestures, I will explore sampling/appropriation as a global level consideration, followed by forays into elemental and stylistic level considerations—each level meant to open or begin a conversation, to show a way in, and not as a prescriptive or finite set.

Global Level

While there are any number of global frames we could use for constructing a way into participatory video culture, it is important that whatever chosen should have implications across varying degrees of involvement. One such possibility is the role of sampling or appropriating, which, according to Rice, "reveal powerful tools for composition" (61). This is true both for alphabetic writing as well as for video writing (and participatory video cultures): the ability to appropriate the words/works of others is a rhetorical technique brimming with potential.

Rice extends this line further, arguing that "all writing involves some degree of theft," some degree of appropriation. Following the work of William Burroughs, and situating Burroughs theories and styles amongst a revisionary history of compositions

studies, Rice tells us that the logic of new media is a *logic of appropriation*, where it is the "theft of language, image, and text [that] is the basis of an emerging new media structure" (57). Thus, it would be fairly easy to extend discussions of sampling/appropriating beyond the frame of video writing and into a much wider new media consideration, but there are elements of appropriation most readily grasped in the participatory video culture platform, and it is these considerations I will attempt to palpate below.

At a social/participant level, there is an immense amount of sampling/appropriating that occurs across videos in terms of motif. Take the "Numa Numa" video by Gary Brolsma,[8] not only has this video been viewed over 700,000,000 worldwide (BBC), but there are countless direct imitations of the work—remakes by other YouTubers wanting to participate in the "Numa Numa" phenomenon. And while this kind of mimesis is not typically what we think of in terms of sampling/appropriating, we can nonetheless see the borrowing of elements prevalent in the remakes (like the "Navy Numa Numa" video[9] or the "Numa Numa Lego" video[10] or the "Numa Jesus" video[11]).

But beyond direct imitation, the "Numa Numa" video, like the "Isengard" video introduced earlier, also has its own pseudo-genre outcroppings. These related videos sample/appropriate the song (if not the entire audio), the gestures, even the mood. For example, in the "Numa Numa" spinoffs, you will find many reuse the song "Dragostea din Tei" by O-Zone (it is fairly integral to this pseudo-genre), while others appropriate Brolsma's particular style of dance, facial gestures, and performance, and yet many others (only) appropriate the mood or style of the video: the joyous commitment to performance, the letting oneself get lost in the music. There are even videos not of this pseudo-genre that sample the original "Numa Numa" footage in a more traditional sense, like the video "A

Caring Look a Philosophy,"[12] which repurposes a segment of "Numa Numa" as its own *détournement*.

Whether we label these things as genres (pseudo or otherwise), styles, modes, motifs, the groupings tend to be proliferated with varying levels of sampling/appropriation.[13] For starters, at a most basic level, lip singing itself is not a new phenomenon, just ask Milli Vanilli, and doing it on camera is even less original (see histories/evolutions of Music Television—well, at least back when MTV actually played music videos). But there is something unique to Brolsma's "Numa Numa" production, and that *something* gets perpetually leveraged by the spin offs and spoofs and remixes and remakes, including Brolsma's own remakes and new offerings.

We can further extend our considerations of sampling/appropriating by returning to the "Isengard" video and looking at specific videos who sample/appropriate in different ways: as examples, let's consider the Office version of the "Isengard" video,[14] the "I've Got a Jar of Dirt" video,[15] and the "Why is the Rum Gone? – Remix" video.[16]

- The Office version appropriates the audio (music and "lyrics" from the original "Isengard" video), but 1) its editing is horribly different (and definitely not of the same quality) and 2) the visual imagery is from the TV show the Office (U.S. Version) and not *The Lord of the Rings: The Two Towers* film. What is sampled here is something elemental, something at the production level: the audio/aural component of the "Isengard" video. But also there are attempts to match the scenes of the originally sampled *LotR:tTT* footage with similar scenes from the Office footage, which in a way is an appropriation of arrangement.
- The "Jar" video, in contrast, participates in the same pseudo-genre of remixing Hollywood films—or, we could even say, the remixing of films with Orlando

Bloom in them—to create "music video" mashups, but it does not use the same elements. We can find editing similarities in terms of the techniques involved (jump cuts, montages, digital anaphora [which I will address at the stylistic level]), and a similar film footage/music mashup approach, but the content and elements are very different.

- Moving one step further, the "Rum Gone?" video has different music, different (and more complex) video editing techniques, uses yet another set of video footage, and still we can see appropriations of mood as it feels like the "Isengard" video (despite its own superior editing and altogether different presentation). This conveyance of mood isn't just due to techno-type music driving both productions, but rather is an amalgamation of editing techniques, music, spoken words, and fit (a quality or characteristic that emerges both in relation to and against the original films being sampled; alternately, we could view this as related to Rice's notion of the "found work"[17]).

The "Isengard" video and the "Numa Numa" video (and their various offshoots) are just two example threads we can use to talk about sampling/appropriating, and when introducing any video projects in my courses, particularly projects that may end up online (whether via sites like YouTube, Vimeo, or yet others), I tend to begin my discussions with sampling/appropriating as it allows me to introduce multiple layers of consideration at one time.

First, this pairing allows me to talk about communal/participation aspects associated with participatory video cultures. For example, beyond just commenting on other people's video creations, for participants to really make connections, to really join "conversations" in these communities, they need to *make* videos; for many loosely defined video subgroups,

that means creating a version of these video pseudo-genres.[18] (As example, see the litany of members at You're The Man Now Dog [www.ytmnd.com] who have created ". . . doesn't change facial expressions" productions, a pseudo-genre that began with a compilation of Lindsay Lohan images,[19] and now the sprawl includes versions ranging in focus from Paris Hilton[20] to former First Lady, Laura Bush[21]).

Second, I use sampling/appropriating as an approach to discuss the sampling of specific works, and/or the potentials of students' works being sampled, which allows for useful discussions of ownership, citation, free use, copyright, open source, derivatives, creative commons licensing, and so on. For example, one of my favorite discussions around this kind of traditional sampling has to do with YouTube's Audio ID and Video ID recognition software that allows uploaders and copyright holders to determine how their material gets used (and/or whether they can make money from their work [see http://www.youtube.com/t/contentid]). Should students block the reuse of their work? What happens if everyone blocks/locks their work?

In addition, YouTube has added an audioswap feature to its site, allowing uploaders to swap out the entire audio of their video production for one of the available audio creations housed on YouTube (especially useful if your original audio choice is blocked by the Audio ID recognition software due to potential copyright violations, but horribly problematic if you have voiceovers or native audio you wish to retain). I ask students to consider how these technological advancements, tools, options might protect, limit, alter their own creations: What happens when the only audio you can use is the "amateur," free use options made available by YouTube? More importantly, does this blocking (and its related audio swap feature) violate students' creative/expressive rights by controlling/limiting (access) to the "available means"?

Third, I use sampling/appropriating to discuss technical production considerations: often responding to questions like "How do I pull this video off YouTube so that I can sample this segment right here?" "How can I recut this video in iMovie or Windows Movie Maker?"[22] These questions, of course, lead to other production questions like "Can I separate the (native) audio from this footage?" Additionally, in terms of production considerations, I also address some elemental and stylistic level concerns (e.g., making two unrelated videos feel like related footage, or using transitions between segments to indicate a particular kind of shift).

And lastly, I use sampling/appropriating to talk about borrowing/modeling styles and moods. In terms of styles, we discuss different genres across different mediums, like documentary, horror films, essays, radio commercials, and so on. The idea is to have students think about how these styles of expression (formulaic or otherwise) might be applied to their own video creations: what are the genre's rules, what are its limits, what makes it a genre, and how can we extrapolate that into the expressive medium of video? If time permits, I encourage a few mimetic practices so students see how difficult it is to translate (if not remediate) from one medium to another.

Additionally, I try to get students to be fairly attuned to the mood of various videos, to discuss how that mood impacts the overall production (and its message), and then to identify how one might appropriate a given mood for rhetorical purpose. I use mood in terms not only of the authors' attitude toward their statements (indicative, interrogative, conditional, etc.), but also in Ulmer's use of mood, via Heidegger's work, where mood "is the *Stimmung* (attunement) [. . .] that makes knowledge (*bestimmen*) matter" (*Electronic* 255). Thus, we discuss the role of mood in shaping how people understand/come-to-terms with these creations—first trying to identify moods and then discussing how their appropriations may

help/hinder students own video writing goals. For example, I ask whether a student making a video arguing for the legalization of marijuana should/could use a suspenseful mood, a comedic mood, an interrogative mood? And how do we make these determinations? Content? Audience? Moment? Situation? All play factors in our decisions.

Again, these are just some of the potential considerations for the use of sampling/appropriation as an entry point, and as you can see it quickly gets spread much wider than simply borrowing a segment from another work. We could expand this focus even further and talk about sampling/appropriating in terms of metaphors, puns, and synecdoche, or spin it toward Gunther Kress and Theo Van Leeuwen's sense of provenance,[23] which has relation to Roland Barthes work in semiotics. Or we could play with the multiple meanings of the word "appropriate," and talk about the moral/ethical (and legal) considerations of borrowing others works (i.e., Is it appropriate to do so?)—considered both in terms of the sampling that occurs with video/audio mediums as well as with printed and spoken discourse. But this is just one way into the multiple considerations we need to raise with our students when working with video writing and/or students potential participation with emerging video cultures.

Elemental Level

Moving down a level, though by no means less important, we can approach pedagogical considerations and/or rhetorical considerations of working with video cultures and video writing by focusing on the (possible) elements involved in any given production. The elemental level I am referring to involves any elements that can be included in a given video production and the various (potential) manipulations of those included elements. Thus, many of these elemental considerations can be associated with editing techniques

and/or stylistic considerations, and so have touchstones across the board, including global level considerations as the elements involved, and their *compositing* (to borrow from Lev Manovich),[24] contribute to the construction of mood and/or rhetorical effect. Additionally, there are an immense number of elements that could be considered (i.e., characters/actors, appropriated footage/sounds, scripts, titling, coloring, etc.) and any number of possibilities that are production/software specific (i.e., extrapolations of native audio, playing clips/segments in reverse, varying visual effects, playing multiple feeds at same time [in single production]), but we simply do not have the space or time to cover them all (if such a thing were even possible in a single, printed work). Rather, as a sample or demonstration of working at the elemental level, I would like to focus on transitions, which can be used to introduce specific rhetorical considerations to students—and sometimes the skills students develop here in regards to working with/using/understanding video/visual transitions translate back into their alphabetic writing endeavors.

In video editing/writing/compositing, whatever we choose to call it, transitions occur between two visual (still or moving) segments. Granted, sometimes they occur across visual segments, like the *dissolve* transition, but for the most part they are a "between" element. Which means they are a communicative addition situated between two juxtaposed visual elements. They bind (or unbind) two visual moments. And it should be noted that one of the most prolific transitions is no transition at all: two visual moments simply juxtaposed across (replayable) time (a visual change that functions similar to a jump cut but is not necessarily the same thing[25]).

The juxtaposition of visual segments *without* transitions (as well as the jump cut) is an editing technique students need to be familiarized with (perhaps couched in a discussion of a paratactic video writing style, like Hemingway meets video compositing), but they should

also be made aware that merely avoiding transitions is not always the best rhetorical move; sometimes they need a *fade to black*, sometimes they need a *circle open*. Thus, it serves students well to start thinking of transitions as a conscious choice: Should I use a transition here? What kind? What am I trying to say? Would this be better without a transition?

What is important here, and this is something I find students can more readily see in working with video than in traditional, print writing, is that every element, every moment, every frame in a video composition will be viewed as a choice by the student/creator. Even unintentionally not choosing is a choice, or at least that is how it will be read/viewed, and students need to pay heed to this fact. The real advantage here is that once students start to grasp the level of awareness needed for composing video—an awareness of the impact of choice and the wide array of elements they need to be conscious of—it is fairly easy to extrapolate this level of awareness back to their print writing endeavors: opening layers of consideration (design, style, flow, and the like) as every print element can be viewed in terms of choice (from font to layout to quality of paper).

To make students more cognizant of elements in video writing, I use transitions as a way in and discuss them in terms of their rhetorical possibilities: What effect will a transition have on the target audience, in this situation, in this moment? What about not using a transition? Can transitions create ethos? pathos?

In any given editing software, there are typically between 16 and 30 visual transition options, and this is usually a small enough set to cover in a class period, but for purposes of this article I will limit my discussion to 3 examples: *dissolve* (or cross dissolve), *fade* (to black, to white), *cube*.[26]

Much like in alphabetic writing, transitions help us move from one point/idea to the next and each conveys something different—often having multiple connotations depending

on the surrounding elements and even other transition choices. For example, while we typically expect a variety of transitions in textual practices, to use a different type of transition each time in a video project (image montage or otherwise), changes how each transition is "read." Thus, the potential rhetorical implications of transitions are constructions both at a singular level (the individual transition itself) and at a global level (the set of transitions in the entire production, and their use). If we use a transition over and over in a particular way in a given production, how people "read" it may also be different than its singular level implications; thus, a video production can change and/or reconstruct the meanings of its elements. But for purposes of this discussion, I will focus on the singular level, the sort of denotative meaning of a given transition.

The *dissolve* transition, also known as a cross dissolve, video dissolve, film dissolve, and linear light blend, is designed as a fluid shift, a flowing through, a seamless movement from one visual element to another. In digital applications, the *dissolve* is often created by mimicking a controlled double exposure, with the first visual segment (VS1) gradually fading out while a second (VS2) gradually fades in, or it can also be created by the RGB values of pixels in VS1 gradually replacing the RGB values of VS2, with either technique creating the appearance of one image dissolving into another. This movement can be read in a number of ways depending on the visual elements the dissolve resides between (or across), but at its most basic level it indicates a continuity, a continuance of thought: VS2 is related, perhaps intimately so, with VS1. When we see a dissolve transition occur, we retain, even if only momentarily, VS1 as VS2 appears, and this allows for a perceived relationship and integration between the two. In alphabetic writing, we might think of this type of transition as the concluding sentence of a paragraph being followed by a similar transition sentence opening the next paragraph.

So, as we move from the concluding instance of one to the opening of another, there is a bleeding through, a moment when they are visually intertwined, and this implies a level of intimacy between the elements. Each visual segment enters the other, their pixels penetrate one another, they share a singular visual space, in varying degrees across frames. As such, we can use the dissolve to indicate a closeness between elements, which is probably why this is a commonly used transition for creating personal photo montages as many of the images tend to be personal to the creators, and tend to have intimate connection across the set (a collection of captured memories).

Much like the *dissolve*, the *fade* transition is a continuity transition, designed to help combat the discontinuity that occurs from cutting/editing a film. They both get used to retain a bit of the smoothness we find "natural" to narrative (the naturalness, of which, is also open for discussion), to help viewers move seamlessly through cinematic productions and create a logical coherence between visual segments. But there is more to *fade* than just creating logical coherence or continuity, for a fade (to black, to white) provides a momentary break in the visual. While we can make much from the use of black or white screens, as their shades are fodder for rhetorical considerations, to which I will return shortly, their inclusion interrupts the video (even if unobtrusively).

Thus, any considerations of *fade* need to begin from the point of interruption. But these interruptions are not necessarily Freudian—they are not necessarily the suppressed/repressed (the abjected) rearing their ugly heads, but rather are part of the suppression itself, using absence ("blank screen") to interrupt, to break, to slip into the (narrative) continuity. This particular type of interruption calls attention to that which it suppresses without ever allowing the suppressed (the discontinuity caused by the cut, the marring/marking of the film-strip organism) to return.

And so it is important that students understand that the use of *fade* (to black, to white) is an interruption that breaks into and/or cuts off their flow. These breaks, much like the use of subheadings in texts without textual transitions, are jumps in the flow of the structure, but jumps that are not jarring. In textual practices, we often provide a road map or foreshadow these moves to help control the discontinuity, but the effect is nonetheless similar as we expect (in both mediums) readers/viewers to be able to flow through the discourse we are presenting, a discourse which has been cut/edited and presented as a fairly continuous creation. Of course, not all video productions seek this (narrative) continuity, but the use of the *fade* (to black, to white) lends itself readily to these types of productions.

But the *fade* (to black, to white) is not simply an interruption or a move to create continuity. Whereas the *dissolve* is a fade from one image to the next, the *fade* (to black, to white) is a fade to a solid color screen, and those colors mean different things (not to mention that we can also *fade in from*, which adds yet another layer of complexity, and often this is paired with the *fade to* when situated between two visual segments to maintain seamlessness).

The *fade to black* is often used at the end of a production, signaling a break in the flow, with the ending marker coming when text appears on the black background. The same can be true for the white, but often productions end with *fade to black* (and those that don't fade out at all seem jarring to viewers, which can be a rhetorical choice). The *fade to black* between VS1 and VS2 seems to indicate a moment of closure, a minor ending of sorts. If it is followed by a *fade in from black*, with similar subjects/objects appearing in the visual segments, then it tends to indicate a passage of time—a video writing ellipses of sorts.

The *fade to white* (and *in from white*) can also be used to begin/end a production, and used to signify a passage of time, but where as the *fade to black* feels like a moment of closure

before moving on, the *fade to white* feels like a passage of time within the same moment, the same thought. If we were to liken the *fade to/from black* to the kind of shift that occurs in alphabetic writing with the use of a subheading, then the *fade to/from white* would be like using a space break (without a subheading) to indicate a textual shift—we are moving forward conceptually, but staying within the given frame of thought.

Moving away from continuity transitions, we find transitions designed to indicate a conceptual shifts. The *cube* transition is one such example. It involves VS1 being one plane of a cube and VS2 on another and the planes rotating. The transition occurs commonly with an effect that looks like the entire screen is rotated like a cube, but also occurs with the screen image shrinking to reveal that it is part of a cube (with each plane composed of visual imagery). The shrunken, smaller cube rotates (moving VS1 out of primary sight and moving the side/plane with VS2 into primary sight) and then the screen zooms in (or cube expands) until screen is filled by VS2.[27]

Hearkening back to block-oriented video game structures with cube-like screen shifts (see original *Doom*), the *cube* transition often signifies a planar shift. While these planes are attached to a singular cube, they nonetheless indicate multiplicities—a transition that visually plays/preys on multiplicities—indicating multiple perspectives being offered. *Cube* can be used to indicate a wide array of possibilities, from perspective and ideological shifts to simple topic shifts, from turns, flips, or inversions (especially when the direction of transition can be controlled) to hints of 3-dimensionality. The problem is that the *cube* transition is often used incorrectly, or without regard to these other potential readings.

While it retains a level of connection to a larger framework or premise (as all the planes visible on a cube are still part of the same cube), the *cube* transition indicates a shift in focus. Thus when it used between two directly related visual moments (like beach 1A and

beach 1B images from a personal photo montage), then the transition doesn't fit. Granted, there are times when it could work between 1A and 1B, but the basic premise holds: there needs to be a shift in focus, a shift in conceptuality for the *cube* to be a good choice.

Unfortunately, the negative approach (i.e., seeing when it doesn't work) is often the best option for helping students grasp the implications of certain transitions (also often the case in alphabetic writing). Whether we take a positive or negative approach to discussing transitions, what matters is finding a way into discussing their rhetorical, communicational, discursive possibilities and how they contribute to an overall creation, for if students start to grasp how transitions bind (or unbind) and what role that binding plays in the message being created, they will be all the more equipped for creating effective (rhetorical) video discourse.

Stylistic Level

Style is a difficult thing to pin down in video writing: it can be the result of certain video/visual effects (like the Ken Burns effect[28]) or by using certain footage capture techniques (like Hitchcock's vertigo effect[29]) or by creating a specific mood with a combination of elements (a vignette visual effect accompanied by Johannes Brahms "Piano Concerto No.2 in B flat major Op. 83"[30]). And while we can take any number of approaches to help students grasp the implications of style—including a classical rhetoric approach focusing on the plain, middle, or high styles, or working with figures of speech (loosely connecting us, via metaphor, back to sampling/appropriating), or even by considering styles of dress (personal and cultural visual rhetorics), among others—I find returning to rhetorical (if not grammatical) terms/concepts/constructs is a fairly helpful approach; it allows for a discussion of style in structural terms as well as in terms of impact/effect.

For example, we might discuss palindromes as a stylistic choice. Richard Lanham defines palindromes as "Words, phrases, or sentences which make sense read backwards as well as forwards" (*A Handlist* 106). Following his description, which we might view as focusing on elements within some larger composition (minus the moments when single words, phrases, or sentences stand alone), we might see rolling footage forward and then reversing it back to some previous moment as visually performing a palindrome (here occurring across cinematic time, within a video composition). This happens, of course, in many productions, where clip/shot/scene rolls forward and then backward (see "Communism" by L. Rusty Fausak as containing palindromic elements within the production[31]).

But what if we think of the palindrome as a style for an entire creation? What if we use this rhetorical construct as the guiding structure? What is the effect? The purpose? To answer these questions I have students look at the video "Lost Generation"[32] by Jonathan Reed (posted on metroamv's YouTube channel) or the video whose style it appropriated, the political advertisement "Truth" by RECREAR,[33] as both use palindrome to create their rhetorical message. What never fails to emerge in the discussions of these videos is the "aha" moment, the moment when students realize the reversal and what it is doing. This can be discussed in terms of troping (in Hayden White's sense), in terms of the eternal return, the abject backing up into everything and undoing/unfolding the argument/moment laid before. It can be discussed in terms of *kairos*, creating its own opportune moment, its own *détournement*. It can be approached in terms of argumentation, using a form of delayed thesis or even perhaps Rogerian argument. The palindrome, as a structure, as a style, offers us many possibilities—the full explorations of which can take on any number of looks—but

what is important for the discussion here is that we see how a stylistic concern can have implication at an elemental and global level.

Many of these stylistic constructs (rhetorical, grammatical, literary or otherwise) find application in video writing and the palindrome is not the only rhetorical term we can use. Another example for consideration is anaphora, or what I have previously labeled as *digital anaphora*. In written/spoken discourse, it refers to the repetition of a word or phrase at the beginning of successive sentences, or clauses, or verses: "Today, we will hold our ground. Today, we will stand together, defend out country, our neighbors, our fellow man. Today, we make our mark on the history of the world." A simple enough example, one in which students seem to readily grasp the effect. Beyond my own creation, of course, there are historical and cultural examples to draw from, whether turning to Shakespeare or Martin Luther King, Jr., and these might make more connection with students, but what is important is that they see or get a feel for the style of anaphora and what that style is attempting to do.

In my experience, when students attempt to do this in their video writing they tend to start with audio/oral components to get the anaphora style into their productions. This makes sense as much of what makes anaphora affective and effective is the pacing involved, the verbal emphasis and timing needed to make it impactful, and to translate that into the visual is a difficult thing. But as the elements start to take shape, the students, with varying degrees of success, bring the visual components into the same style. If we look at the "Communism" video I mentioned earlier, we can hear the anaphora in the opening lines with the repetition of the phrase "Here, in Russia," which happens 3 times across successive clauses, but we don't see the anaphora, we don't get the visual anaphora, until the side profile image of Stalin appears at ~00:00:27, which also happens 3 times across successive visual

clauses.[34] These are two anaphoric moments, one aural, one visual, and they are not in sync with one another. And when working in/with multiple elements, this, of course, is not a necessity. If they were to line up, it would change/alter how the production is read/viewed/understood.

Whether the elements line up or occur in disjunctive fashion, the fact that we have multiple layers of anaphoric possibilities is what I mean when I use the phrase *digital anaphora*. No longer confined to a single mode of expression, students working in digital video platforms can make multiple elements use complimentary or contradictory anaphoric styles. And these considerations can be extrapolated beyond just an elemental level to include entire productions, much like we saw with the palindrome.

One last example I will provide here at the stylistic level is the use of aposiopesis, which seems to be used with more regularity in video compositions than it is in alphabetic writing, though perhaps not as much as in spoken discourse. Aposiopesis, which translates to becoming silent, often is understood as stopping suddenly in midcourse, sometimes for effect. In conversation, this occurs quite a bit, whether people get lost in thoughts (or lose their thought) or merely stop to draw attention to a point, a statement, a moment. And it happens a lot in student video productions, though at first this seems unintentional (see previous comments about not *fading out* [audio/video], where things just abruptly stop).

What makes aposiopesis so effective in written and spoken discourse is that it leaves the missing elements, the absence it creates, to be filled in by the imagination of the audience. Or it can give the impression of the author/speaker being unable to carry on. Or it can give the impression of confusion, of the author/speaker searching for a thought, searching for words, that just won't come. In video, it can do these things as well, but it also seems more closely aligned with its translation of "becoming silent." For it is most

recognizable as a stylistic choice when we are engulfed in silence (see the "Ain't We Got Fun?" video by Victoria Elliott,[35] where near the end she uses an audio aposiopesis, in ellipsis fashion, to create the necessary effect, which is then punctuated by the concluding spoken words, "Then, you're on your own").

Of course, in video, there are varying modes available for aposiopesis as the silence can also be applied to the visual as well, to an absence of imagery. Granted, a solid colored screen is still a telling visual element (as discussed with the *fade* transition), but in a series of dynamic imagery the solid-color visual creates a moment of visual aposiopesis. In this sense, we could consider the *fade* (to black, to white) as a form of aposiopesis, but I like to extend this a bit further with students and talk about the effect an absence, pause, unfinished thought has on the audience.

The first issue I raise is that it doesn't have to be intentional to have an effect. As discussed in the transition section, intentional or not, all elements contribute to the overall creation, and having the audio or video at the end just stop will leave the viewers with a jarring, incomplete, unfinished, often reproachful experience. This does not mean that all videos should *fade out*—YouTube has its fair share of videos that do not—but rather that if a video writer is not going to follow the standard approach, if they want the abrupt stop, it should be done for rhetorical purpose. Here I find myself revisiting the importance of choice, of being aware of all the elements and what they are (or aren't) doing, all the way through the last frame.

The second thing with aposiopesis is that I ask students to consider the construct in terms of absence as we can then talk about using the absence of elements rhetorically—creating particular moments in compositions, or generating particular affects on audience, and not just couch this aposiopesis discussion in terms of silence (the absence of sound). By

taking this approach, students start to see how each element has its own life, its own communicative potential, and can be manipulated to create a desired impact, both in terms of itself as an element and in terms of its relationship to the other elements (and the larger guiding framework/presence of the video).

This is perhaps the biggest realization for students as it seems easy for them to understand how the simultaneous aposiopesis of all the elements creates a break, an interruption of absence, a disturbance in a production, and how that interruption/absence might be read—with each student offering his/her own view, which is typically what happens with an audience, who brings a wide array of interpretations/imaginations to these moments of absence. But when students start to grasp how an absence of one element draws attention to others, how it forces viewers/readers to focus in particular ways, in particular areas, the students gain a new set of video writing rhetorical abilities.

For me, this is the goal of introducing video writing and/or discussions of YouTube into a class, into a course, into the curriculum; we have a responsibility to better prepare students for a future where short videos and participatory video cultures may very well be a predominant mode of rhetoric, of deliberative and civic engagement. The more equipped they are at producing and reading/interpreting this kind of discourse (the *heuretic*-hermeneutic pairing), the better (*electrate*) citizens they may be(come).

De Rigueur

As Collin Gifford Brook has recently argued, in his *Lingua Fracta: Towards a Rhetoric of New Media*, we should be preparing students to do more than just examine or interpret "the *choices that have already been made* by writers [video writers included]," more than just helping them become gifted hermeneuts; rather, we should be preparing them to *make their own choices*

(15). The reason is for students to develop a digital essence, a digital existence, they must contribute, produce, *make*. Thus, following this line of thought, which has roots in Ulmerian pedagogy, what I've attempted above is to provide a way into techné associated with *making* videos, an approach that is "actionary" (rather than "re-actionary") as Paul Miller advocates (13). And while I focus on helping students generate their own products and secondarily on helping them interpret/critique the finished work of others (usually with the latter occurring in relation to how it can contribute to students generative/compositional practices), this approach actually does both: helping students learn to "read" others' finished products by understanding the global, elemental, stylistic choices those video writers made.

But beyond the move away from a traditional hermeneutic emphasis (coupled with a shift toward the *heuretic*), I hope readers find the considerations above wrought with tensions, with moments of hesitation, with areas they feel need further consideration. Perhaps an odd statement, but tensions of this sort indicate that there are still multiple conversations to be had about video writing, about participatory video cultures, which I think is clearly a necessity as we 21st century compositionists, we digital rhetoricians, try to figure out the best pedagogical approaches for this blooming (digital) phenomenon. What I have attempted here is to provide pedagogical or rhetorical avenues, glimpses or paths into the techné associated with video writing, places from which we can launch further conversations. And I hope these get challenged, extended, pushed in dynamic ways as we come to grips with emerging digital rhetorics.

I would like to conclude this work by returning to a line of thought I began near our beginning—a quote, in fact, I sampled from Virginia Kuhn: "It has become de rigueur these days to cite one's first 'YouTube moment'—the moment at which one was reeled in by the massively popular video-sharing platform" (8). For not only do I want to stay in keeping

with the etiquette of articles of this sort, but also because I think my own "reeled in" moment may reveal a facet of participatory video cultures that often seems implied.

In contrast to Kuhn's "Isengard" hook, the moment that "reeled me in" is actually a two-part experience, the first of which was viewing Mike Wesch's "Web 2.0 … The Machine is Us/ing Us."[36] This "first" experience provided me with the realization that digital video in general and YouTube in particular could be used for critical scholarship—an important realization to an academic. It conceptually shifted YouTube for me from purely a space of entertainment to a potential source for education, for expressing thoughts, for making arguments, and so on; I began to see YouTube as an entity offering potential discourses that challenge the very ways in which we think or perceive or engage the worlds in which we live. A vital hook, I think. But one which is very specific to me, the viewer, as it fit with my interests (personal and professional). Many others may find this video interesting, but perhaps not quite the hook it was for me.

The second part is even more personal, but nonetheless crucial, for it shifted me out of being strictly a YouTube consumer and into being a YouTube producer. The second is not a particular video itself, but rather the (pending) birth of my son, whose very presence (coupled with the geographical distance separating him and his grandparents), gave impetus to my regularly producing short videos and uploading them to YouTube (and then embedding them on a blog). Thus, I ceased being strictly a consumer and became a consumer/producer; I became part of the production of the mundane—my *topos*, my son, was really only of interest to a small audience, but by posting his videos to YouTube, these creations exposed our private lives to an exponential public (a condition of many YouTube producer-consumers). It was my own uploading of videos (and the prerequisite of making/editing those videos) that was the completing factor to my being "reeled in."

My pair of hooks: the first in terms of being a video consumer where a video made a connection with me the academic, a moment when my interests in video culture merged with my interests in critical scholarship; and the second being in terms of making me a participant, a producer-consumer, where my personal life became fodder and impetus for making videos and using the YouTube platform.

I think these personal connections are crucial to any discussions/considerations of YouTube because it is such a personal (and personalized) experience—a personalized YouTube "history" generated by the Set, your Set, a YouTube of One (to poach the U.S. Army slogan). There are millions of YouTubers out there and each has their own YouTube "history" (and the scary part is that these "histories" are often tracked and stored). This is the exact championing of the "small screen," and its potentialities, that separates YouTube from a variety of other "technologies," including its older siblings television and radio, the Great Mediators of yore.

And unlike these Great Mediators of yore, which dispersed culture in a one-to-many medium, YouTube embraces a many-to-many model for cultural dispersion and thus "challenges traditional 'off-line' formats" (Manovich 333). As our culture continues to be sampled, condensed, reduced to fragments (and fragmentary moments of expression), and as these fragmentary expressions continue to be created by individuals, producer-consumers of one, YouTube will continue to grow in importance and emerge as a massive archive of fictional, factional, fashionable, fantastic, and fantasied *micronarratives* (as opposed to the grand narratives offered by YouTube's media predecessors).

But this change in dispersion, this emergence of the fragmentary archive, is only one of the significant evolutions that stem from the personalized/individualized nature of YouTube. A second is the importance of the individualized viewer experience, which is

most readily seen in the use of YouTube for small audiences, markets of 20 or so, as not all YouTubers want viral videos, not all want 1,000,000+ views. And this change in audience scale/size for a "distribution" media has profound implications on the video production techniques involved (techniques which I have hinted at in this article).

For example, for the audience of 20 or so family and friends that I target with videos of my son, I don't have to worry so much about adding/editing particular effects, styles, tones, jumps, and so on because I know that what my audience is most interested in is the star of the show. They are satisfied with "talking head" type productions, with him and I sitting in front of the iSight camera. But when production focus moves away from that small audience into a larger, more general audience, then different effects/edits begin to move up in importance as expectations (of content, of quality) shit. This, again, is part of why we can approach video writing in rhetorical terms: changes in scale, changes in audience, changes in situation, context, or moments shift all our considerations (global, elemental, stylistic).

These rhetorical shifts are crucial potentialities of these kinds of participatory video culture platforms, but what I hope my "reeled in" pair illuminates is the personal connections necessary to making YouTube succeed. Not only do you have to be hooked as a viewer/consumer, which is a vital step, but what makes YouTube function is the being hooked as a producer. Each registered member now has his/her own channel, which keeps a history of videos viewed, a collection of video uploads, and tracks viewing statistics (and does so way better than the Neilsen ratings). To be (and to belong) in/on YouTube, you need to contribute, which ranges from rating videos, commenting on videos, posting your own videos, or creating video responses to videos. But it begins with the uploader, the producer-consumer, before unfolding in mass, communal (perhaps viral) fashion.

Work Cited

Benkler, Yochai. *The Wealth of Networks: How Social Production Transforms Markets and Freedom.* New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 2006.

BBC News. "Star Wars Kid is Top Viral Video." 27 November 2006. <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/entertainment/6187554.stm>>

Brook, Collin Gifford. *Lingua Fracta: Towards a Rhetoric of New Media.* Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 2009.

Hodgson, Justin. "Digital Spectacle and the Development of the Cultureal." *PRE/TEXT: A Journal of Rhetorical Theory* 19.1-4 (Spring-Winter 1998; in print 2009): 167-84.

Jenkins, Henry. *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide.* New York, NY: New York UP, 2006.

Kress, Gunther and Theo Van Leeuwen. *Multimodal Discourse: The Modes and Media of Contemporary Communication.* London: Arnold Publishers, 2001.

Kuhn, Virginia with Michael Bonifer. "YouTube Yo'self: Let's Chart a Course and Then Ignore It." *PRE/TEXT: A Journal of Rhetorical Theory* 19.1-4 (Spring-Winter 1998; in print 2009): 7-30.

Lanham, Richard A. *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms 2nd Ed.* Berkely, CA: U of California Press, 1991.

-----. *The Economics of Attentions: Style and Substance in the Age of Infomration.* Chicago, IL: U of Chicago Press, 2006.

Latour, Bruno. *We Have Never Been Modern.* Trans. Catherine Porter. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1993.

Lyotard, Jean Francois. The Differend.

Manovich, Lev. *The Language of New Media.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2001.

McLuhan, Marshall. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1994 (1964).

Miller, Paul. *Rhythm Science.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2002.

Mohr, Richard D. *The Platonic Cosmology.* Leiden, Netherlands: Brill, 1985.

Rice, Jeff. *The Rhetoric of Cool: Composition Studies and New Media*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 2007.

Ulmer, Gregory L. *Electronic Monuments*. Minneapolis, MN: U of Minnesota Press. 2005.

-----. *Internet Invention: From Literacy to Electracy*. New York, NY: Longman, 2003.

Virilio, Paul. *Lost Dimension*. Trans. Daniel Moshenberg. Semiotext(e), 1991.

-----. *Open Sky*. Trans. Julie Rose. New York, NY: Verso, 1997.

-----. "The Third Window: An Interview with Paul Virilio." *Global Television*. Ed. Cynthia Schneider and Brian Walls. Trans. Yvonne Shafir. Reprint Edition. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989. 185-97.

White, Hayden. *Tropics of Discourse*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1978.

End Notes

[1] See Paul Virilio, "The Third Window," an interview; *Lost Dimension* 25; and "the third interval" in *Open Sky* 9-21.

[2] It is important to note that the abject here is not without limits. While YouTube includes myriad videos of the utterly abjectional, they do not allow for pornographic content—thus there is at least one category they exclude. But it is also important to note that this exclusion of the pornographic likely is not simply a matter of following the moral majority but has much to do with the potential paralysis the site would face with the tsunami-type wave of input should they allow this type of content—as the porn industry has made masterful use of the Internet.

[3] Ulmer is working from Richard Mohr's work, among others (Julia Kristeva, Jacques Derrida, and so on), in his explorations of chora. What Mohr offers us that Ulmer only partially extends, is the connection between chora and medium. Mohr reads Plato's notion of chora not exlusively in terms of the object, the winnowing basket, but in follows his approach in the *Timeaus*, which Mohr tells us is where Plato offers a group of metaphors that treat chora as "a medium or field for receiving images" (91). Thus, beyond its connectiosn to the winnowing basket, a sorting machine, and as the thing which is between being and becoming, we might also view *chora* as medium itself, or the space of medium.

[4] For more on *chora* and *choragraphy*, particularly its connections to puns and writing with multiple meanings, see Ulmer's *Heuretics: The Logic of Invention*; also, see Jeff Rice's *The Rhetoric of Cool: Composition Studies and New Media* for an expansion/application of Ulmerian *choragraphy*.

[5] http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uE-1RPDqJAY; note: I do not denote authorship for this work for the YouTube member sexypuerto who uploaded this video (May 11, 2006) says this is not his/her work.

[6] I refer to them as "emerging" not to indicate their newness—for many have been fairly mainstream since the avant garde movement swept high/popular culture by storm—but to indicate their emerging presence in today's composition courses (or any course that may tap into new media or digital media "composing").

[7] In addition to performing these "new" rhetorical techniques, this video spawns its own genre or style or motif as a series of performative responses and repurposings are made and posted in relation to this initial video. This stylistic-spawning is fairly endemic to our digitally-viral culture, with perhaps its best demonstrations found in sites like You're the Man Now Dog (http://www.ytmnd.com) and eBaum's World (http://www.ebaumsworld.com/).

[8] http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KmtzQCSh6xk. It should also be noted that this video has achieved such notoriety that the music Brolsma was lip-singing and performing to ("Dragostea din Tei" by O-Zone) has now been digitally remastered over the video. And in addition to others making their own versions of the Numa Numa video, Brolsma himself has sense made a New Numa video.

[9] http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=puVmKfCwb4M&feature=PlayList&p=4DC2E814CA4D4559&index=3

[10] http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xKAoz0kwZ34&feature=PlayList&p=4DC2E814CA4D4559&index=4

[11] http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MCWRurB7VoQ&feature=PlayList&p=4DC2E814CA4D4559&index=18

[12] http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=71DBCIyJBI8

[13] Sampling, at a very basic level, occurs with any digital video, as frames (and frame rates) are instances of sampling (cf., Manovich 27-30). For that matter, as Manovich also points out, cinema or motion images have always been "based on sampling—the sampling of time" (50). But I prefer not to direct our focus here as beyond manipulating frame rates for effect there is not much we can do to change this consideration of sampling. Rather, I want to focus on the parts we can alter, manipulate, play with to create rhetorical video discourse.

[14] http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1C3CnYdtbGY&feature=related
[15] http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gRcj6CAhe7s&feature=related
[16] http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JImcvtJzIK8&feature=related
[17] "The idea of found work (art or writing) is to identify the right fit for a given discursive moment; a piece goes here, a piece goes there, but in any other combination, the pieces might not work together" (88)
[18] The quality of a creation and/or ingenuity of it can gain its author credibility in a given community. It is a way of creating ethos in participatory video communities.
[19] http://faciallohan.ytmnd.com/
[20] http://parisfacial.ytmnd.com/
[21] http://laurafacial.ytmnd.com/. I also want to note the insertion of the image of the Joker (as portrayed by Jack Nicholson in the 1998 film *Batman*) into the sequence of images. Its inclusion offers an interesting commentary on the former first lady.
[22] Quick tip: find the video you want on youtube, click it so that it is playing, then replace the "youtube" part of the URL with "keephd." For example, the "Isengard" video URL is http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uE-1RPDqJAY. Changing the URL to http://www.keephd.com/watch?v=uE-1RPDqJAY opens the video on the keephd website and allows you to choose your downloading format. Click and download.
[23] Provenance, for Kress and Van Leeuwen, refers to the idea "that we 'import' signs from other contexts [. . .] into the context in which we are now making a new sign, in order to signify ideas and values which are associated with that other context by those who import the sign" (10)
[24] Digital compositing "refers to the process of combining a number of moving image sequences, and possibly stills, into a single sequence with the help of special software" (136-7). I would refine this definition to be the combining of a number of elements, visual and auditory, and not just something exclusive to the visual/video.
[25] The jump cut is a particular kind of visual moment where the subject/object appears to jump (move, in a discontinous manner) from one moment to the next, often indicating movement when no such movement has visually occurred for viewers
[26] Of course, in addition to these visual transitions, there are also audio/aural transitions and even textual transitions that students would want to consider, but I begin with the visual and move toward these other modes with my students as skill and time permit.
[27] See http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2X08SW8fok4&feature=fvw for a visual demonstration of a cube. The transitions work the same basic way but replace one visual segment with a second, rather than just the floating example here.
[28] The Ken Burns effect, also known as the pan and scan effect, is where a zoom (in/out) and/or visual movement (over/across) is added to a still image (usually coupled with a *fade* transition). The effect, which predates Ken Burns' work, became synonymous with the documentary film maker not only as a result of his particular (if not prolific) use of the pan

and scan but also because of Apple naming the pan and scan effect the Ken Burns effect in their 2003 release of iMovie.

[29] Hitchcock's vertigo effect, also known as the Hitchcock effect or dolly zoom, made famous in Hitchcock's 1958 film *Vertigo*, is where the camera lens zooms in while the camera itself dollies out (or vice versa), creating a disjunction or unsettling visual effect for the viewer who perceptually tries to reconcile the contradictory movements.

[30] http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Cbktpi4X70s

[31] http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pA3jUMKOdxk

[32] http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=42E2fAWM6rA. This video took 2nd place in the AARP U@50 Video Contest (2008).

[33] http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lFz5jbUfJbk. This video, retitled here on YouTube as "Lopez Murphy for president – Truth (upside down)," won the silver lion in the 2006 Cannes Lion Contest.

[34] http://www.youtube.com/user/TheJUMPchannel#p/a/u/2/pA3jUMKOdxk. It is easier to notice the visual anaphora if the sound is muted.

[35] http://www.vimeo.com/8046989

[36] http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6gmP4nk0EOE; Mike Wesch is Kansas State University Assistant Professor, a digital anthropologist, who was awarded the Professor of the Year award on Nov. 20, 2008 by the Council for Advancement and Support of Education and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.