

Notes from Reflection on presentation of Dark Talk Time, Association of Visual Pedagogies, June 2019, RMIT University.

Ben Landau
Jalen Lyle Holmes
Sarah Walker

- S: hard to jump in with more questions
- When you can't see the person in the conversation there are fewer conversation gaps
- Jarring for participants - knowing where next question comes from
- Hosts walk loudly
- Need bell for participant
- Convo flowed naturally
- First questions are a bit benign - sets its sights a bit low, and maybe need to aim a bit higher to begin with. Maybe people don't need an introductory question
- Describe a family member was a good question - opens up all sorts of things. A sneaky question
- How you got to know someone
- Investment in the other person, the art of the conversation, how to listen or bring something up
- The guy was comfortable talking, but uncomfortable listening
- One person monologuing
- Face to face would be much better
- S: they accidentally touched and then freaked out - through touching - (something to introduce)
- "Where are you facing me?" orient themselves to each other
- Accidentally said "what do you remember from this conversation" and they listed off the topics
- Ratio
- Stressful to one or many conversations - even two groups would be difficult - attention heavy task
- What would it be like to attend to more conversations
- At the start you need to vibe how the conversation is rolling - no more than 3
- Asking for a new question - stops the flow and externalises the flow
- Every 15 mins a question is available (bell rings) and you can put up your hand if you want it (not compulsory)
- Press a button and hear something in your ear
- No-one asked the other the question - how to get this here. An earphone?
- Avoided the tech side of things - find a system without that. But it is true that the tech would be better. Serves the purpose of no eavesdropping
- Its weird to sense someone's presence, and to know they are listening.
- Would be ok with more people.
- Where they could hear footsteps - then again want to be able hear so you can interrupt
- That hosts have a bell but you can stop the bell from ringing

- Questions were jarring but not badly.
- How to create an environment of deep listening - without being fake profound - they were very aware of the mechanics of it.
- Antechamber beforehand - where you get the questions beforehand but no-one is curating the conversation as it goes.
- Different relationship to 'what's something that's hard to let go of' where someone thought it was obvious and others matter of factly answered it.
- Jalen tossing up between two questions, which would have taken it down very different paths
- S enjoyed diving into conversation and it wouldn't have been as open
- *Maybe the conversation goes as long as it needs to, and doesn't get interrupted. Maybe each conversation is just one question long. Maybe a hand up signals when the conversation is over, or needs to end
- Find a way of
- The human element is good
- Restaurant vibe - bell when you want another question - that way you know someone is listening to you
- Can keep an eye on things and if people are having stupid conversations about nothing hosts can interfere (!)
- We suggest we speak with more than one person - you have one and then maybe speak with someone else. You learn from the first one
- Have to be careful not to make one partner feel bad if the other wants to leave i.e hand up or bell. Is it timed? rejection
- When you hear this chime we'll get you and move you
- People need a way out - people can come back in
- 45 mins flew by. Could have stayed double, but I knew it was ending. Don't know how long I would have stayed if it was open ended. Maybe people stay longer when there is a set time for each conversation.
- Its nice that someone is looking after the time for you. Maybe could have 45 mins and if they want to extend they can?
- Nice that someone else was having a conversation at the same time but not being able to understand it.
- 45 minute chat and then line up again. They could do nine of them
- Ringing the bell if you want something to talk about. They need it or they might just do it to change up the conversation. Like a blind tasting menu
- Waiter comes over and asks 'what have you been talking about'
- Waiters can be reactive to the conversation - thematic
- Something will feel right for them to go on with
- Recommending a wine to go with a meal - go deeper or change it up - they're talking about the past and the future - "what's your relationship to time"
- Do you feel like something Light or heavy?
- Frames it less serious - what burden are you carrying, is a bit too heavy - don't want to be told to have an intense conversation
- Provide a sense of deepening and uncovering and make them feel like they have agency in deciding that change.

- Later: *In a room with windows, use Shadows to show people having a convo, but not their identities*
- People will gravitate in or out of it, with prior expectations
- Timer on each table - give a sense of time - end, swap with someone else or keep going - REJECTION!
- It just ends - framing it as its ended and you can do a new one - do you want to leave this person - makes it uncomfortable - can't give the option in front of someone else to say goodbye
- Like the idea that it goes on for 2-3 hours, but could also chat with someone else
- Can chat in real life
- Ben has a **fear of ending**
- "When you're ready to leave raise your hand" - no-one checks out, but no-one gets blamed
- If you didn't; want the other person in the conversation to know that you've ended it then you'd have to have conversations of random lengths (but then the condition that either of them can end it still puts the pressure on someone to want to get out) from a minute to an hour
- LATER: maybe the trick is finding the length of time which is needed to make it the right amount of conversation but still with a desire for something else... that way people want to have another convo. Think about it in 2-3 acts where any one person can hold a conversation for a certain amount of time.
- Funny not having a conversation when it would end
- No time limit - thinking about time the whole time
- Timed - know that it will end at a point. When that 45 minutes comes
- J: if it was random S: I wouldn't go, because I've got to be somewhere
- Opt out at some point.
- Decide together how long the conversation will be
- TIME
- You've always got to be able to get out of it.
- The fact that someone can get out of it puts pressure on the individual to be engaging or interesting
- Maybe an hour is a good time
- Beautiful about ... the interruption of time. The presentness is nice
- If you move partners, then it would be a blind date situation where you can just go from one to the other.
- Its nice that you're stuck with someone for a certain amount of time who you have nothing in common
- Its better to end left wanting more
- Sarahs pair went in and then one waited for the other - shook hands and smiled and walked off (GIVE THE OPP TO MEET EACH OTHER AFTER?)
- All this stuff happens
- If this is denied what happens - do people try and find each other?
- This version they knew who each other were - they wonder who they were.
- Do we need to keep a record of who was in which conversation and how to

- Tell them when it was the last question - which means they have time to work it out themselves if they want to see each other again.
- Timed is better S - if they are having a really amazing convo they can build it.
- Beauty of the experience is temporality and anonymity
- Not running a dating service
- J: like the ongoingness, but also the question in my mind about where it will end
- Needs an elegant way to leave in order to not reject the other
- "This session goes for as long as you need or want it to, when there is 8 mins left"