

TRANSCRIPT WITH COMMENTARY
*Amber G.: A college senior
and
DES practice for a graduate student*

Amber Interview 9

Below in black is a word-for-word transcript of the June 9 introductory interview with Amber that is available on YouTube at <https://youtu.be/yc5kcYJNsg8>.

In green are comments about and explanations of the Descriptive Experience Sampling process.

This interview serves as practice for a DES graduate student, Cody Kaneshiro. A masterclass conversation can be found at <https://youtu.be/0tin-YGiky8>.

If you have corrections, suggestions, or questions, please post them as YouTube comments.

RTH = Russ Hurlburt

CK = Cody Kaneshiro

Amber = Amber G.

0:02 RTH: So this is going to be Amber 8, Amber 9?

0:06 Amber: 9, 9.

0:06 CK: 9.

0:11 RTH: And anything we should be talking about before we...?

0:14 Amber: Um, I just wanted to mention, so once the beep went off while I was writing down stuff for beep 5, so I omitted that [RTH: Good.] one. And then, um, what would've been beep 4 went off while we were doing some kind of like sensitive information stuff. So I skipped that one and then I just took another one.

0:35 RTH: Okay.

0:36 Amber: Cuz I, yeah.

0:37 RTH: And by sensitive information, you mean things that are none in my business, basically?

0:42 Amber: Yeah. Things I just can't share, but I took another beep so that we could still have six.

0:47 RTH: Okay. That's, that's fine. [Amber: Okay.] The, the object of DES is not to pry into, into [Amber: Yeah.] things that we have no right to pry into, yeah. Um, and, and so you get a, you have the right not to talk about that. I, I am interested in those kinds of situations, whether the, whether the beep that we're gonna skip is we're skipping because of

problematics of the method. So if it has nothing to do with the method—it has to do with the content that's none of my business, then I'm totally happy to skip that, but.

1:19 Amber: Oh yeah. Yeah, it was more just, yeah, it was more just what was going on at the time. Um, yeah.

1:27 RTH: Okay. Fair enough.

1:28 Amber: It wasn't anything. Yeah.

1:30 CK: So Amber, you collected, s, or the beeper went off seven times while you were wearing it, is that correct?

1:35 Amber: Um, it went off [RTH: eight it sounds like.] eight times.

1:36 CK: Eight times, okay.

1:37 Amber: Yes, but I still com, completed, uh, collected six beeps [CK: Okay.] that I can write down and I can, uh, bring here and we can talk about.

1:47 RTH: Eight times skip one because it's none of our business and one, because it went off while she was writing down the previous beep.

1:52 CK: Okay. Yeah.

1:52 Amber: Yes.

1:57 RTH: And we, we've just found it about, about that last, we've just found that it's more, it is complicated enough to try to get down what's in experience about one beep, let alone, when you got one beep that's about another beep, then you got...

2:08 Amber: Yeah. [RTH: ...the same.] Yeah. I even actually kinda wrote it down, but I was like, I better just skip it cuz I just was like, I mean, I just wrote down mainly for my records rather than....

2:18 RTH: It's, it's pretty complicated. [Amber: Yeah.] There are, we have some critics who think that we ought to do that, that kind of thing all the time, that we should beep, we should beep people while they're engaged in the sampling process and look at, look at the sampling process. I think that's more difficult than it s...

2:36 Amber: ...Than it sounds, yeah.

2:38 RTH: ...sounds, yeah.

2:39 CK: There's a reason that, uh, there are monks out there who spend many decades of their life trying to learn to be present in the moment, right?

2:47 Amber: Right, right.

2:48 CK: Not that that's entirely the same as, y'know, what we do here, but y'know.

2:52 Amber: Right.

2:56 RTH: Okay. And then I think I'm ready to move on to number 1.

2:59 CK: Yup. So am I.

SAMPLE 9.1 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

3:00 Amber: Okay, so beep 1, I was, uh, eating like a sushi roll. And it was like kind of a long hand roll. And for whatever reason, like I was nearing the end of it. And I guess I had bit into it a certain way that like the contents of it, so you have like the nori and you have the rice and you have like the stuff inside. It was like pushed out the other end, like the opposite end, almost like a, when you eat a hamburger and it starts to fall out. And at the moment of the beep I was seeing the contents outside of this *boundary*, like I guess the boundary of the rice. And, um, I was just seeing that. I was really like focused on just that aspect of my visual field. Um, I said I was seeing it as it is, I didn't really have any distinct quality. Um, I remember it being kind of a funny color just cuz it was two things kind of mixed together, but other than that, that was it. But I was really focusing on the contents of it, not really the rest.

3:00 Russ comments: Amber says "I was just seeing that. I was really like focused on just that aspect of my visual field." The two *justs* suggest that Amber was seeing *only* the stuffing and *nothing else*, which would make this experience similar to the no-background seeing of sample 8.6. The present interview doesn't follow up on that (a pity, but interviews are performance art, and some aspects get overlooked).

4:03 RTH: So it had a funny color, but the color I'm gathering was not the most important thing or not even *an* important thing it was just one of the features?

4:10 Amber: Yes. Yeah.

4:10 RTH: Okay. And, and I got distracted or missed, the garbled or something. So what, what are you eating?

4:18 Amber: A California Roll, it's a, it's like a hand roll, like a sushi roll.

4:22 RTH: Okay. And your aim, and your gaze is aimed at the end of the California Roll?

4:30 Amber: Yeah. So if it's like, you know, the role obviously has two ends, right, there's one end I was eating and the other side was like the flat clean end, right. I had turned it over and I was looking at the clean end with the contents kind of like poking out of it almost, like past the rice boundary is what I would call it.

4:48 RTH: And the, and the rice boundary is the boundary that's maintained by the end of the California Roll, is that?

4:56 Amber: Yeah. Like the contents, so it's like, it goes seaweed, then it goes rice. Then the middle is like the meat and the avocado. And then yeah, it was just for whatever reason, it was just pushed like past it like.

5:09 RTH: So the rice had pushed past the seaweed?

5:11 Amber: Well the contents, the contents had pushed past the rice. [laughs] It's kind of a hard thing to.

5:19 RTH: I'm not a, I'm not....

5:20 CK: Lemme try and Amber, for when you is this I'm, I'm seeing stuff pushed past some other stuff, or is it I'm seeing the middle of the California Roll past the rice?

5:40 Amber: Um, the latter, like, yeah, I'm seeing the stuff past the rice. Like cuz um, *before* this moment I was like, oh, I feel like it's gonna fall out and I like turned it over to look at it and I was looking at the stuff kinda like poking out.

5:54 CK: But it's not that I'm just seeing like forms, right, is what I take you to be saying. I'm, I'm like accurately seeing the, again, if we broke it down the avocado and stuff, that's not all part of it though, right, [Amber: No.] this is just, but I'm seeing the filling of the California Roll...

6:09 Amber: Yes.

6:10 CK: ...kind of pushed out of the roll?

6:13 Amber: Yeah like kinda like about to fall out, but it's not falling out, but it like could I guess.

6:19 CK: And you said *boundary* before is, [Amber: Yeah.] is there something about like that this is a *boundary* that's part of the seeing?

6:26 Amber: No, I wouldn't say that, I think that's just how I would describe the structure that was going on. Like it being the way it was is not how it should be. Does that make sense? [CK: Mm hmm.] Like there, because that's why I was drawn t, I was drawn to the contents because of the, its state. Not necessarily because it was outside of a boundary, whether it's like its state was beyond a boundary.

6:52 CK: Okay.

6:55 RTH: So the way it's supposed to be is seaweed, rice, [Amber: Then like the meat and...] like what's in, what's inside it?

7:04 New Speaker: Yeah.

7:04 RTH: And the problem is that the meat has pushed out past the rice portion? [Amber: Yeah.] And yours...

7:11 Amber: Like it's in the middle of rice and it's kind of like come out like that.

7:15 RTH: Okay. And you're examining that, that?

7:18 Amber: Yeah. And I, I'm really focused on just that portion, um, compared to everything else in my visual field.

7:25 RTH: Okay. And I'm gathering that the, that the motivation for this interest is possibly this center stuff is gonna fall out?

7:36 Amber: Mm hmm.

7:37 RTH: But I'm not thinking that, I mean I'm not?...

7:40 Amber: No. Not at this moment.

7:42 RTH: Okay.

7:44 CK: And I take it that, or one thing I wanna ask Amber is, is like the, the fact that it's not supposed to be there, it's not supposed to be pushed out, is that part of this seeing or is it just, is that context as well?

7:58 Amber: That's, that's context.

8:00 CK: Okay.

8:02 RTH: So I'm looking at it the way it is? [Amber: Yes.] And I've zeroed, I'm zeroed in on this spilt piece of it?

8:08 Amber: Yeah, and I'm zeroed in on like the stuff kinda coming out.

8:11 RTH: Okay.

8:11 CK: Yeah.

8:11 RTH: Okay.

8:11 CK: I'm good for that beep.

8:16 RTH: Me too.

8:18 CK: Alright. Beep number 2, Amber.

SAMPLE 9.2 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

8:19 Amber: Okay. So beep 2, I was picking an olive off of a pizza and um, at the moment of the beep I could physically feel the olive between my two fingers. Like the edge of it, cuz it was

like not flat. It was like, y'know, when you put on a pizza, it kind of gets a little slant. I could feel the edge of the olive in between my fingers and that was it, I could just feel it. I couldn't, there was, I wasn't looking at it, that wasn't present. It was just my feeling of it between my fingers like physically.

8:56 CK: And when you say the edge, are you talking about like, like at the moment of the beep I'm picking it off the pizza I've already picked it off and so I just am holding the olive?

9:04 Amber: Oh I see. Oh no, I was like in the process of like pulling it off, so it's still attached. [CK: Okay.] And I was like pulling it and I could feel, I was like gripping it, but I wasn't, it wasn't off yet.

9:17 CK: And is this an experience, is this a, I'm feeling the round edges of an olive or is this I'm just kind of feeling round?

9:27 Amber: I'm feeling an *edge*. Like there's something about the edge; it was like a distinct edge to it. Um, yeah.

9:36 CK: And I see you doing it was like your thumb and your?...

9:39 Amber: Yes, it was like this. [CK: ...pointer finger?] Yes.

9:49 CK: Dr. Hurlburt, do you have any questions you wanna ask about that?

9:52 RTH: And is this, is this about the olive? I feel the edges *of an olive*. I happen to be feeling it with my thumb and finger, but that's, I'm not really feeling my thumb and finger. What I'm focusing on is the olive. Is that right? As opposed to, I feel in my, I feel this pressure on my thumb and finger that's caused by an olive.

9:52 Russ comments: RTH is making a distinction between feeling the *olive* (an external perception) and feeling the *pressure* (an internal sensation in her thumb and finger). His question is misleading because Amber's experience is neither one of those: it is about the *edge*, not about the olive and not about the pressure.

10:11 Amber: Oh, I see, okay. The, um, olive wasn't really in my experience, the idea of olive was not, but the I, but the edge, like just the feeling of the *edge* was. I dunno if that make that helped, but it was.

10:11 Russ comments: Amber is not misled. She says, in effect, "C'mon—I told you it was about the *edge*!" That is evidence that Amber knows what her experience is.

10:27 RTH: So, so it's the edge of this thing, which happens to be an olive, but the edge, [Amber: Yes.] what I'm feeling is edge-ness? [Amber: Yes.] I'm not, I'm not feeling pressure on my fingers, on my thumb. I'm feeling edge-of-this (olive)?

10:40 Amber: Yes. Yes. It's like, yeah, edge.

10:43 RTH: Okay. Obviously it's my fingers and thumb, which are, transducing the pressure and conveying that this is an edge of something, y'know [Amber: Mm hmm.] But as far as my *experience* is concerned, it's of the thing, not of my fingers and thumb?

10:57 Amber: Yes, it's of yeah. This edge.

11:00 RTH: I feel this edge?

11:02 Amber: Yeah! Cuz the olive, olive, the idea of olive was not there [said quizzically].

11:07 RTH: Okay.

11:09 Amber: And I wasn't seeing it either, which is kinda crazy. Yeah.

11:15 RTH: Okay.

11:16 CK: Okay. Anything else in your experience, Amber at the moment?

11:19 Amber: Nope.

11:21 CK: Then, I think I'm good.

11:22 RTH: Me too, number 3.

SAMPLE 9.3 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

11:24 Amber: Okay. Okay. So number 3, I had just said the word "niece" and that was still kind of like, it was at the end of the word "niece." Like that was it.

11:34 RTH: What's, what's the word? I, I can't hear the word.

11:36 Amber: Niece.

11:36 RTH: Niece, like nephew and niece?

11:38 Amber: Yes. [CK: Yeah, okay.] And um, I was talking to my dad and my eyes were aimed at him and I was seeing him, but I was also eating ramen. And I was like picking it up with chopsticks and it was just coming into the, this is all at the moment beep, sorry, I didn't make that clear. But this is all, um, and it, this was just coming into my vision for, I guess I had just lifted it high enough that it was just coming into my vision. Um, and it was like the ramen noodles, the ramen noodles were at the bottom-right field of my vision. They were like coming into this image of my dad and the noodles were starting to come in and they only was in the bottom right. And that was it that was the entire moment of the beep right there.

12:28 RTH: So there is, I'm not sure that I understand that the, the "niece" portion of this, [Amber: Okay.] so are there two aspects of my experience, there's the visual thing and the saying of "niece"?

12:39 Amber: Yes. Like I, yeah, I had just finished saying “niece” and it was kind of, yeah, that was still, that was still like, that was ending. And then the noodles and all that stuff was beginning.

12:50 RTH: So “niece” is *still* present to you? [Amber: Mm hmm.] Even though in the physical world, the utterance of it has, is done [Amber: Yeah.] like half a secondary quarter or second or a second or something before?

13:02 Amber: Yeah.

13:03 RTH: Okay. And, and you had said that?

13:07 Amber: Mm hmm.

13:10 RTH: And yet it’s still somehow present in your experience?

13:14 Amber: Yeah! Yeah, it was the idea of “niece” because I was describing, um, (well, I mean, this is context) but I was describing, um, we were watching *The Office*. And he wanted to know why they named the, (Jim and Pam have a daughter) and they named the daughter Cece, and he wanted to know why. And I was saying, because it was named after Jenna Fischer’s niece. And then so the idea of “niece,” that was the main idea of the whole thing. So that was still, the idea of niece and the, the idea of the word “niece” was still there. Like, and then, um, yeah, that was the saying part.

13:49 RTH: And, and is it the *word* “niece” that’s there or is it the sentence “they named it because it’s Jennifer’s niece”?

13:58 Amber: No, it was um, um, um, the word “niece.” It, it wasn’t the rest of the sentence, it wasn’t about Jenna Fischer, it wasn’t about Cece, it wasn’t about the characters, it was about “niece.” Like that was it.

14:12 RTH: So your experience, your experience at this moment is of *one word*?

14:15 Amber: Yes.

14:15 RTH: That word “niece”?

14:16 Amber: Yes.

14:16 RTH: Not *the word at the end of the sentence happened to be the word at the sentence*, [Amber: Yeah.] but your, but your experience is not of the end of a sentence, it is of “niece.”

14:26 Amber: Mm hmm.

14:26 RTH: Okay. And that is as a *word*, not I'm gathering, that is, that is a word? [Amber: Mm hmm, yes. It was of the word.] Not the concept of niece as being, y'know, my sister's daughter or whatever.

14:40 Amber: Yeah, yeah. Or not even the fact that it was the name. That's how the name was related, nothing like that. It was just the word "niece."

14:47 RTH: The word "niece"?

14:49 Amber: Yeah.

14:50 RTH: As a, I don't wanna say meaningless, but is it, is it like a meaningless, like this is a word "niece" and it, but the, the semantics of it, the meaning of it, the context of it is not present to me anymore, just the word?

15:03 Amber: Yeah! Yeah. It's like the definition, the meaning the, all of that stuff. It was just "niece." It was like an objective "niece," I guess. [RTH: Okay.] Yeah.

15:15 RTH: Like an abstracted away word? [Amber: Yes!] This is the word, the word "niece" is present, but all of the semantic hooks or tendrils or connections or whatever are gone?

15:27 Amber: Yeah.

15:28 RTH: Okay. And then I'm seeing my father?

15:35 Amber: Mm hmm.

15:37 RTH: And that's in my experience?

15:39 Amber: Yeah.

15:41 RTH: And I see ramen come into my visual field?

15:45 Amber: Yeah. Like as part of, um, like almost as if that was starting to *interrupt*. I don't know why, I mean, that's more metaphorical than it is really experiential, but it was coming in like, that's how I would describe it cuz it wasn't here. It wasn't, it was just starting to kinda come in.

16:05 CK: Can I, can I ask a question here? [RTH: Sure.] [Amber: Yeah.] Or Amber, what, what is it that, what, what do you see?

16:12 Amber: I see, okay, so I see like if I had to like paint a picture, I see my dad, right, like he's staying there and then I'm starting to, I see like noodles [laughs] in like the right, bottom-right off my visual experience, like on my visual look, yeah, my visual.

16:30 RTH: And, and noodles on chopsticks or just noodles?

16:32 Amber: Just noodles. But I understand them to be lifted by chopsticks cuz they're like in the air, if that makes sense.

16:44 RTH: So what I'm trying to, what I'm trying to understand here is, is, the noodles are on chopsticks, I understand that.

16:51 Amber: Yeah.

16:51 RTH: Okay. And, and do you see the noodles with the chopsticks abstracted away I guess?

16:59 Amber: Yeah! Almost. Yeah.

17:03 CK: Or is it that the noodles are positioned in a way, right, cuz if you have noodles on chopsticks, not saying that it has to conform to reality, but it's like, right, like the noodles are on top of the sticks when you're pulling them up.

17:14 Amber: Oh, I understand. No, in, in, in real, realistically, if you were to take a picture, [CK: Right.] chopsticks would've been in it.

17:25 RTH: So in the, in the real photons coming, coming from the chopstick noodle thing, you're getting photons coming from the chopsticks, but you're not, [Amber: (inaudible)] but you're not getting experience coming from the chopsticks, you're getting experience coming from the noodles, is that right?

17:44 Amber: Yes. Yes. Yes.

17:48 RTH: And, and, and then I'm, I'm interested in this disturbance thing, which is sort of meta, metaphor or semi metaphor. And I can't even even remember whether that was exactly the right word, but I'm, I'm gathering that it's not just, I see the noodles entering, that there's something that, there's something about this enter that, that is not just the appearance of the ramen. [Amber: Yeah!] Is that right?

18:23 Amber: Um, yeah! I, yeah, there's something about it. It's like disrupting this thing that I am looking at.

18:29 RTH: And is that disrupting an experience? Like I feel a disruption?

18:36 Amber: What did I write down? Um, no, I didn't, no, I, I wouldn't, no, I didn't *feel* a disruption. It *was* a disruption, but I didn't experience it, I guess, if that makes sense.

18:53 RTH: So it would be possible (I could imagine), it would be possible cuz I'm seeing my dad and then for whatever reason I'm gonna, and he's been the figure of my visual world. [Amber: Right.] And, and for whatever reason, I'm gonna make the ramen of figure of my next, the next figure in my experiential world. [Amber: Right.] And so the, in the real, in, in this perceptual space, you, you have to sort of destroy the old figure to make a new figure, right, that's that's the way figure / ground works, we think. [Amber: Uh huh.] And, but, but most of the time that doesn't happen. People don't experience that happening, but I want, are you saying I'm, I'm sort of experiencing this disruption?

19:39 Amber: I, guess, yeah, but I wouldn't say it like, I, I wouldn't, I would say I experienced a disruption, but the *idea of disruption* wasn't present to me?

19:50 RTH: Okay, that, that I understand that I think.

19:53 Amber: Okay.

19:54 RTH: But I'm, I'm noticing a disruption. It's not *just* that my gaze has gone from my dad to the ramen. [Amber: Oh.] It's that I feel a disruption as the ramen, is that right?

20:10 Amber: Yes. Yeah, cuz I wasn't turning my head, it was coming in. Like I was, it was like going like that. Like if I'm focused on you, it was coming in like that. [motions upwards] Like into my, it, the noodles came into my visual world, [RTH: Right.] rather me trying, turning my visual world to noodles. Okay.

20:35 RTH: So I don't wanna make too more of this, but I don't wanna make less of it either. [Amber: Okay.] So, so I can have something enter into my visual world [raises his pencil slowly to next to his face] and I don't feel any disruption. I just feel, I, y'know, there's something rising up in my visual space.

20:53 Amber: Oh, I see, okay.

20:55 RTH: Or I could somehow as, as if I was seeing my dad and now *suddenly* I'm, it, it's in the physical world it's rising up, but I'm in, [Amber: I see] but I feel a disruption as I move from one perception to the next, I guess.

21:15 Amber: Yeah, I, okay. Yeah that, that latter statement made more sense, that second statement. Yeah, that's, that sounds, that's more, it, that is more it than the first.

21:27 RTH: So I *do* feel something of a disruption of perception as I visually acknowledge the appearance of the ramen?

21:37 Amber: Yeah. For lack of a better description and a lack of a better way to put into semantics, definitely, yes.

21:47 RTH: Okay. And that, and so wanna make, make one more time to make sure that I understand it. It's not just that my gaze is shifting from my dad to the ramen, it's that my gaze is *disruptively* shift, shifting. I feel a disruption as the ramen enters my experience. Is that right?

22:08 Amber: Yeah. The ramen disrupted my visual experience.

22:15 RTH: And I *felt* the disruption? As opposed to, well, I just, now I'm uh, I'm zooming in on the ramen?

22:25 Amber: I don't wanna say I felt disruption, but I wouldn't describe it as *no* disruption. I dunno if that makes sense, but that's.

22:37 RTH: Well, we, we don't, that's the reason why we do this thing more than once, [Amber: Right.] so we can, we can try to figure out what we're talking about.

22:45 Amber: Right.

22:46 CK: I can, lemme try to see and take a pass at it, y'know, we may not get there with this beep and that's fine, but Amber, is this, uh... I can imagine a couple of ways might present itself, right. One might be, I'm seeing my dad, I'm just, I'm *seeing*, right, my eyes are pointed somewhere. And in that process I see something come into my visual field, right. And in one manner speaking, it's disrupting, right, it's changing, right, what I'm seeing is changing. And so it's disruptive in that regard. *Or* I can see it as sort of a fact of the universe, yeah, my visual field is being disrupted by my chop, my ramen coming into my seeing. But all this really is, is that I'm seeing my dad and I'm seeing the ramen come up into what I'm seeing. So in other words, is the disruption something that's like directly part of this, of what's present to you at the moment? Or is it more just a, that's a, that's a context. It's a description of what's happening, but what I really just is, I see my dad and I see ramen?

22:46 Russ comments: I think the CK 22:46 question is problematic from two perspectives. First, it fails to maintain the distinction between experience and the real world. When CK says about his first option, "I'm seeing my dad, I'm just, I'm *seeing*, right, my eyes are pointed somewhere," that implies that "seeing" is the same thing as "my eyes are pointed somewhere." That is not true, because "seeing" is an experiential thing, and "eyes pointed" is a physical thing. My eyes can be pointed somewhere without experiencing in the slightest the thing that my eyes are pointed at. And "visual field" is ambiguously an element of experience or of the external universe.

Second, it doesn't honor the power of Amber's word choice. She uses *interrupt* and *disrupt* to describe her experience. Those are exceptionally forceful words, but CK gives her only the weakest of options: *come into my visual field* or *my ramen coming into my seeing*.

It is entirely fair to inquire about whether by *interrupt/disrupt* Amber intends to describe something that intrudes, or barges in, or dislocates; or something that changes, or alters, or adjusts, or arrives. But CK 22:46 doesn't give that choice.

23:48 Amber: Yeah. I guess that makes more sense. Yeah, I guess that's just what I was seeing, now that I think about it. Because like the feeling of disruption is not there. Like the word "niece," it's not there like that. "Niece" is there, that idea is there, not the, not the disruption.

23:48 Russ comments: I think Amber and CK are talking past each other. I hear Amber as understanding that she must choose between *disruption* being an organized element of experience (as was "niece") or being context. Disruption was not an organized element, so "I guess [context] makes more sense."

24:08 CK: Like, and so my question, I wanna just make sure I'm, I'm that I, I'm saying this clearly, as clearly I can. Disruption then is more of is that context of like, cuz obviously right, like there is something that is disrupting my visual field, this is something that's entering my

visual field. [Amber: Yeah.] Is it that? Or is it that somehow like my, my, like the disruption is something that's present to me in, in the, seeing in the however, y'know, in some manner, in some way disruption is present to me?

24:40 Amber: Um, I cannot confidently say disruption was present, but I also can't confidently say that it wasn't.

24:52 CK: Yeah. And that might be very well where we [Amber: Okay.] leave it or, y'know, I think we're pretty, we're making some pretty fine-grain distinctions here. Um.

25:00 Amber: Right, right. This one was kinda crazy, there are a lot of things happening here. [laughs]

25:06 CK: What's.

25:07 RTH: The, so lemme, lemme make a theoretical com, commentary here, which I don't wanna, I don't want it to, us go to go look for this theoretical thing, but [Amber: Okay.] but, so when you see the ramen, what we've decided is that I see the ramen and I've abstracted away the chopsticks. I have.. So my, my perception is not, my experience perception is not accurate to what, what is falling on my retina, [Amber: Yes.] I'm, I am, I am erasing something that's on my retina, experientially or failing to see or something. I shouldn't say era, but

25:45 Amber: Yeah!

25:45 RTH: But there's that there's chopsticks and there's ramen and they're both on my visual field, but I'm not *seeing* the chopsticks. I'm only seeing the ramen.

25:53 Amber: Yes.

25:56 RTH: So there, there is something that is, you could say *disruptive* about that. My visual field is disruptive in the sense that the chopsticks, I'm not seeing; the ramen, I *am* seeing. I'm

26:09 Amber: Mm-hmm <affirmative>

26:11 RTH: But what I understood *that* to be saying about that was, well, I just didn't, I just didn't see the chopsticks. I didn't feel any *disruption* about the lack of chopstick-i-ness. I, they just, I just didn't see it. All I, all I saw was, was ramen as if that was all it was there.

26:26 Amber: Right! Yes. The, the, the disruption, whoa, the disruption is more like the ramen was disrupting my dad rather than the chopsticks and the fine-tuning parts of the ramen. It was more that it was disrupting what me looking at my dad. Cuz I was speaking to him.

26:49 RTH: [pause] So that makes it seem like there is *some* experience, Amber is having *some experience* of disruption. It's not just my gaze is shifting from my dad to the ramen. It's that I feel something of a disruptive shift. Is that right?

27:19 Amber: [scratches her head (in distress?)] I guess so, yeah. I just, I just, at that moment I didn't pick that out. [RTH: Alright.] Yeah.

27:19 Russ comments: RTH takes “I didn’t pick that out” to be an affirmation that she experienced disruption as a powerful transitional aspect which did not become a t=hematic entity. However, he is not confident about that because the water has been substantially muddled.

27:27 RTH: Well maybe we’ve worked as hard as we can at this and we’re gonna end up being not, I’m not sure what happened, what, what happened about this and [Amber: Okay.] maybe we’ll figure it out some, some somewhere down the road, maybe we won’t.

27:37 Amber: Yeah, I would, I would, I would guess that if this, if the disruption was present, it’d be again, like in-the-weeds kind thing.

27:47 RTH: Okay.

27:48 CK: I have a question, Amber, about the ramen Is that in motion? Like I’m lifting it up and I’m seeing that lift or is this like a snapshot? I see my dad, I see the ramen.

27:57 Amber: Oh, okay. Okay So this is kind of interesting. Yes, *he* is not moving, but the ramen is moving slowly. Like it’s like coming up slowly, yeah.

28:08 CK: And is that, is that, [pause] is that a reflection of reality? That like, is that to say I’m seeing the scene accurately? My dad’s not moving cuz he’s sitting and watching TV and I’m lifting the chopsticks or is, y’know, my dad’s moving, my dad’s talking, I don’t see any of that motion, but I do see the chopsticks rising?

28:33 Amber: I, okay. The chopsticks were as a fact of the universe rising. My dad as a fact of the universe was probably not sitting perfectly still because he was eating something as well. Like he wasn’t looking at me, he was looking like straight in front of him at stuff. I don’t know what it is, I can’t remember, but he was like, he, he was moving and doing something. But to me, he was still, as if I took a picture of him.

29:02 CK: Okay.

29:03 Amber: Mm hmm.

29:06 RTH: So I see my dad still, [Amber: Yes.] even though he’s not in reality still?

29:11 Amber: Yes. He’s, he’s making sure he’s making like micro movements. He’s not like doing like a big [gestures], but he’s definitely moving, there was no...

29:21 RTH: And I don’t see it?

29:22 Amber: Yeah, I don’t see it.

29:24 RTH: Okay. You you’ve had other examples like that, [Amber: Yes.] fairly, fairly common, I think.

29:28 Amber: Yeah.

29:29 RTH: And I see, I see the ramen?

29:32 Amber: The ramen is moving though. It's like, it's like just slowly kind of coming into the, oh it's yeah, like on the corner.

29:41 RTH: Okay. [Amber: Yeah.] And does that motion seem like the right speed at all? Like probably what was actually happening?

29:51 Amber: I would think so. I would think so, yeah.

29:56 RTH: So I see my dad who is actually moving, but I don't see him moving. And I see the ramen coming in, which is actually on a chopstick, but I don't see the chopstick. So I have actually perceptually distorted, if you would wanna use that word, or creatively seen [Amber: Yeah.] both aspects of this, of this scene?

29:56 Russ comments: DES prefers to call this phenomenon *creative seeing*, rather than "perceptual distortion." We prefer *creative* because it doesn't have the pejorative connotation of words like "distortion" or "wrong." See the discussion at 43:35.

30:17 Amber: Mm hmm.

30:18 CK: Reminds me a bit of the text files, I think from last time, right. Like the highlighting of the files, [Amber: Yeah!] the few bars, but I'm just not picking up the words even though there's obviously text.

30:28 Amber: Yes. Or what I, yeah. Or when I've snapshotted the TV (I know I've had a few of those) where I'm watching the TV and people are moving, but.

30:37 RTH: Right. [Amber: Yeah.] But they're not moving in your perception, for whatever reason.

30:39 Amber: Yeah, I've frozen it, yeah! [laughs]

30:43 RTH: Which is interesting.

30:45 CK: Sorry, maybe this will clarify some of our, maybe the issues here that we had in here [Amber: Yeah.] Is, are either of these things, Amber, like the "niece" and the seeing, are either one more present to you, you know, 50-50, 90-10?

30:59 Amber: Yeah. I wanna say the, the, I wanna say the seeing was more present, simply because "niece" was on the, kind of on the tail end again. We're kind of ending that and then the visual was starting, but I'm trying to think maybe 70-30. [CK: Okay.] Yeah. So, uh, the seeing was 70, [CK: Yeah.] if that wasn't, if I didn't make that clear.

31:31 RTH: Okay. Number 4.

SAMPLE 9.4 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

- 31:32 Amber: Okay. Okay. So number 4, I was walking over to unplug my iPad from the charger. And at the moment of the beep, I was seeing the pink case against like the white wall it was leaning against. Um, I also, that's what I was seeing at the moment of the beep. However, um, I wanted to note that actually I *was*, the, the iPad was *not* leaning *completely* against the white wall. The wall is like, has like a border to it. It's like this wooden border. So it was leaning halfway into the wall and the border. And then the other half, it wasn't touching anything. But in my visual experience, it was against just the white. And then, um, yeah. I just wanted to note that, cuz I real, I realized all of that later, I was like, *whoa!* Cuz I wrote down blah, blah, blah. I went to sit down and write that. Then I stood back up to go and get it and I was like, oh it that's not even *close* to what's going on here, so yeah.
- 32:42 CK: So at the moment of the beep, is it that I'm seeing the, my pink iPad leaning against the white wall or the, the iPad leaning against white?
- 32:56 Amber: Okay, I see a pink rectangle [CK: Mm hmm.] leaning against, a pink rectangle with these black circles in the corners like this, cuz that's, it looks like actually I have it right here. It, it looks like, see how it has these black. It was like this, but they were on all four of them cuz it wasn't this tablet. And um, and then it was like straight. It was actually leaning slightly. But in my experience it was straight against like this kinda off white color.
- 33:29 CK: So it's not really, even that I'm seeing, it's not as discrete as I'm seeing my iPad against the wall. It's I see this like pink rec, the what is a accurate reflection of the case, right, the pink rectangle with the black dots against an off-white leaning against an off-white?
- 33:48 Amber: Yeah. It's like against it, but it's *straight*, it's not angled. It's like, it's like a, yeah. It's like a rectangle I understand to be my iPad, but really it's just the rectangle pinkness. Well, yeah, that color, that rose gold pinkness color with the black dots coming in, as compared to my iPad as leaning against the wall, this wall with, y'know, all of that other stuff.
- 34:17 CK: And that's something I take you to be seeing like, like I'm seeing, it's not that I'm imagining this, right, in my imagination, y'know, and maybe it is, that's where I wanted to ask. Llike, you know, is this like a real life I'm seeing this thing, or am I *innerly* seeing this, seeing that I've created?
- 34:33 Amber: Okay, yes. So my eyes are pointed at it. I'm looking at it, but I've *totally* changed the image. [laughs] Like, I've totally changed the image like those, that thing does not have four black dots on it, it was *not* straight, it was *not* completely against the white wall. Like I have totally, so I don't know if that's con, if you would consider that *imagined* or what, because a lot of it was imagined like I was filling in things to make it, I guess, more perfect.
- 35:03 CK: But this feels sort of like I'm, it's not like I'm right, like I can, in my imagination, I can imagine what the psychology building at UN, UNLV looks like or something like that, right? This is not that I'm not looking at, y'know, it's like, I'm looking and I'm right...

35:16 Amber: Oh, yes! I'm looking at it and I'm changing...

35:18 CK: ...But seeing something that's not, yeah. What I'm seeing is inaccurate per se, [Amber: Yeah.] from what the real life things would be.

35:23 New Speaker: Mm hmm.

35:24 RTH: Well, I lemme make sure I understand. I see my iPad leaning against the wall, but what I see is not an accurate representation of what is actually there? [Amber: Yes.] But the experience, the experience is of seeing the iPad against the wall, is that right?

35:41 Amber: Yes. Mm hmm.

35:44 CK: What's the wall and the...

35:44 RTH: But the iPad, but the real iPad only has two feet instead of four and it's really not straight, but I see it straight?

35:50 Amber: Yeah. It wasn't even really against the fully white wall actually either. Can I say that I see it like a pink rectangle that I understand to be my iPad? If like, to be really specific, can, can I say that or is that the same thing?

36:05 RTH: Well, it depends on what your experience is. Do you, is your experience of seeing a pink rectangle? Or is your experience of seeing my iPad?

36:12 Amber: Oh! It's of seeing the iPad. That happens to be a pink rectangle.

36:16 RTH: And, and you have, you have distorted or creatively improved or whatever your, your iPad, but it, what you see experientially, is I see the iPad? [Amber: Yes.] When, when, when we examine the details of that, we can see that it's a pink rectangle instead of all the rounded corners and whatever of the, [Amber: Yes.] of it have been. [Amber: Yeah.] But my experience of seeing the thing, which is the iPad?

36:41 Amber: Yes. Against the wall, like that wall, yeah, was a big part of it too, cuz it was like white, but it wasn't actually wasn't actually that.

36:50 CK: And is the wall because you'd said it, you know, like it's against an off an off-white it's the pink iPad against an off-white. Is it that I also, like I see the wall and when we examine what I'm seeing, it's, I'm seeing just this off-white color. Is the *wall* somehow present or is it just, I'm seeing this, I'm seeing the iPad against sort of a white background? The wall's not really, that's not really part of my experience, right. Obviously in the real world, there's the wall and stuff, right, but.

37:16 Amber: Yeah, it's like a, so like it's like this, like it's you have the, a white and then you have white, like to kind of make this kind of corner and it's against it like that. It's angled cuz I'm coming at it angled, but it's like, so I guess it was, it was not really a wall, but it, but it *is* a wall.

37:39 RTH: So the, the question is about the wall, the same as the question about the iPad, does it seem like you're seeing the, uh, does in your experience, are you seeing an iPad leaning against the *wall*? Or am I seeing a pink rectangle leaning against the white expanse?

37:57 Amber: Oh, a white expanse. Or like that is the color of the wall, yeah.

38:06 RTH: So the, so we answered the question the other way around for the, for the iPad? [Amber: Mm hmm.] The iPad was, I was seeing the iPad, [Amber: Mm hmm.] not a pink rectangle.

38:17 Amber: Mm hmm. Yes.

38:21 RTH: And so is my experience is, I'm seeing the iPad leaning again, I'm seeing an iPad leaning against the white expanse?

38:29 Amber: Yeah. Cuz it didn't end. I, I, I, I think I, I am saying that it's the wall, because it *was* leaning against the wall. *Not* because in my experience it was leaning against the wall.

38:47 RTH: So the, the distinctions are interesting and, and difficult here. [Amber: Yeah.] So let's [pause] let's back up to the iPad again. [Amber: Okay.] Let's go, let's go through the iPad again. [Amber: Okay.] So there's a, there's the iPad of the physical world, [Amber: Mm hmm] and there is an iPad that Amber *sees*, and there is an, an iPad that Amber could imagine. Like I, I imagine I, you could close your eyes and form an image of the iPad I could ask you to do that and you could probably do that.

39:23 Amber: Uh huh.

39:23 RTH: And, and Cody's and my line of questioning before about the iPad was that, as I understood it, you, well, maybe I should ask again.... So in, is at the moment of the beep is your experience of seeing the real iPad regardless of whether it's accurate or not, is my experience of seeing the iPad leaning against the wall, but I'm seeing the iPad?

39:51 Amber: Mm hmm. Yes.

39:53 RTH: Yes. And what, so that's the, what I took it, the answer before, and the, and, and so then we went on to say, well, I see the real iPad, but it's actually what I see what it, what I experience is not the way the iPad is, it has four feet instead of two, and it's leaning instead of, it's straight instead of leaning?

40:09 Amber: Yeah.

40:10 RTH: But it, but my experience is of seeing the real iPad?

40:15 Amber: Yes. Mm hmm.

40:18 RTH: Now the question is about the wall. So does it seem like the real iPad is leaning against the real wall, even though the, just like the iPad is not seen accurately, the wall is not

seen accurately? Or does it seem like the real iPad is leaning against the white expanse, and I don't actually even see the wall, I just see a white expanse?

40:40 Amber: Oh, okay. Now I understand. Okay. No, it's leaning against the *wall*, but the wall, but it was like against, I guess, just white of the wall. Not all that other stuff that I initially said it was against just white or off-white, against the color of the wall.

41:02 RTH: So let's so let, let's use the word *wrong* just because it's a, uh, quick word, but I don't, I don't wanna have any of, any [Amber: Yeah.] critic, critical. So, so we, we *see* the iPad, but we see it wrong? [Amber: Mm hmm.] Is that, does that seem like a fair way to, to say it?

41:22 Amber: Yes. Yes.

41:22 RTH: And it, and is it the same thing to say, well, I see the wall, but I see it wrong? [Amber: Oh, got it, okay.] It presents itself as a wall, but the details of it are wrong?

41:34 Amber: Yes. And then the position of the iPad against the wall was incorrect...

41:38 RTH: ...Was also wrong.

41:39 Amber: Yeah. Like it was, it was, it was actually here, but really I experienced it here, if that helped.

41:49 RTH: So what I've got about that is that what I see is a real scene. I see an iPad leaning against the wall. [Amber: Yes.] And all of it is wrong [Amber: Yeah [laughs] in the sense that the iPad isn't really has features that, that it doesn't have, and the angle is, has features that it doesn't have and the wall has features that it doesn't have?

42:10 Amber: Yes. Mm hmm.

42:23 RTH: And, and was there anything more to that experience other than I'm seeing it?

42:30 Amber: Um, I did mention that I understood the iPad to be upside down, but I don't, I don't know if that's important. Like that's just a detail of the seeing it was like the orientation of it, it was upside down and backwards because I plugged the cord in and I was using the, gravity to keep the cord there. Um, that's it. Yup, that's it.

42:57 CK: So I'm seeing my upside down, iPad, standing straight up against the off-white wall? [Amber: Yeah.] Again, the fact that in reality, the, the real iPad is, is against the edge, goes past the edge of the wall and like?

43:12 Amber: Uh huh. There are other colors involved in the background and it didn't have perfectly those black dots in the corners, but yeah, I was seeing it that way for, in my experience for whatever reason.

43:35 RTH: Alright. Then I think I'm good.

43:35 Russ comments: We have spent a long time teasing apart some important aspects of Amber's experience. It seems like those aspects ought to have names; here's our current lexicon:

Essential figure: conveys the fundamental, focal, organizational aspect of the experience.

- My iPad leaning against the wall

Experienced aspect: A feature or detail of what is experience, which is not itself the essential figure

- A pink rectangle with four dots
- An off-white expanse
- Straight up and down against wall
- Upside down

Real substrate: aspects or features of what is accepted to be an undistorted apprehension of the real world that is parallel to or underlies the experienced figure and its aspects.

- iPad features (rounded corners, two dots)
- Off-white wall with wooden frame
- Leaning half against wall, half against frame

Expected percept: what an external observer might think the person is perceiving (the kind of thing we refer to when we write "Her eyeballs were aimed at...")

- Not relevant in this sample

43:35 CK: And I wanted to confirm, Amber, you said the case that you were the, the real iPad right, only has two black dots on the, is it, was it that case right there?

43:43 Amber: Yeah. It, yeah.

43:43 CK: Okay, okay.

43:45 Amber: Yeah. It has two on the sides.

43:48 RTH: But I saw four.

43:49 CK: But I yeah.

43:50 Amber: But I saw four. Yeah, I think in the beginning, I didn't say that, but no, that's correct.

43:55 CK: Okay. Okay.

43:55 Amber: Yeah. This, that's a correct statement, yup.

44:02 CK: And I think Amber, I know we're making some pretty we're, we're getting some pretty weird territory, not weird in a bad way, but um doing good.

44:09 Amber: Yeah, that, no, that one was fun like that, I, I didn't think that that one would be extremely interesting when I first, when the beep first went off and then after I looked at it again and I wrote everything down, I was like, okay, this one's gonna be kind of interesting. [laughs]

44:25 RTH: What I would, I would say, we, we are discovering that your percept., the, the world that you see is perceptually different from the world that is actually there.

44:35 Amber: Yeah!

44:37 RTH: And pretty, pretty often, [Amber: Yes.] like the previous, the previous beep, I don't, I don't see the chopsticks that aren't, [Amber: Mm hmm.] that are, that are, that are actually there to see, and my, my dad is still and he's really moving stuff.

44:49 Amber: Yeah.

44:50 RTH: And, and so it's not, it's not just that Amber has a sort of a gloss on it, you know, the humanists would say, well, y'know, everybody's got their own perception. [Amber: Mm hmm.] But Amber's perceptions are, are distortions of the world or they're, they're, they're different from the, from the world, for better or for worse, right.

45:12 Amber: Yeah. Cuz okay yes cuz I remember I had one where I was watching TV and I had frozen the characters, right. And, um, that was so wrong, I went back and watched the scene again, I was like, what was I looking at? That wasn't even correct! [laughs] [RTH: Yeah.] It was kinda funny, yeah.

45:31 RTH: So the only, the only way that one can discover this is by the kinda careful cross-examination kinda question that we're, that we're, that we're [Amber: Right.] engaged in here and that doesn't happen very often, so. [Amber: Right.] So we're, I think what we're describing is probably something that happens modestly frequently, but we don't know about it because we, nobody asks about it.

45:51 Amber: Right. Yeah. I was.

45:52 CK: I was, I was gonna fill in, and I, I feel like, and Dr. Hurlburt, you can correct me on this. I feel like it comes up actually more often than you would anticipate, right, like, I don't mean to like pooh pooh you in that way, Amber, but it's like, in that way, like the creative seeing is not unique to you. Like that's something that does come up more frequently than you would imagine. [Amber: Uh huh] Or is described elsewhere, right, but it's not common, but.

46:12 RTH: It's certainly more, certainly more common than described elsewhere, but I would say it's still fairly rare.

46:17 CK: Yeah. Yeah. What I meant yeah. What I meant to say is that it's not, it comes up som, rar, it comes up semi-frequently in DES. Nowhere else, anywhere else, but it's not something that's, um, hasn't been described ever before, I think.

46:29 RTH: Right.

46:30 Amber: Right, right, yes.

46:31 RTH: Amber is not the Lone Ranger.

46:34 CK: Yeah, yeah.

46:34 Amber: [laughs] In this experience, got it, okay.

46:37 CK: But within psychology are one of maybe the right, like the 10 people that [laughs] we've right, you know what I'm trying to say? Like in psychology, yeah. No one's ever really talked about this.

46:47 Amber: That's so cool, yeah. I dunno.

46:49 RTH: Number 5.

SAMPLE 9.5 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

46:51 Amber: Okay. Number five. So I had pasted, a URL into a search bar.

46:56 RTH: Say that again.

46:57 Amber: Oh, I pasted a URL into a, into the search bar on my computer. Like I don't, yeah I guess that's the search bar. And um, I was starting to, I had like pressed Enter. And at the moment the beep I was starting to like read it for whatever reason I don't know why I was reading it. It wasn't an intentional reading, but I was reading "drive.google" cuz there was a Google Drive link. And um, I was paying more attention to the word "drive" than anything else. But I was like unintentionally reading that whole thing. Just that portion, not the rest of it. Just "drive.google."

47:33 RTH: That's the, that's a piece of the URL? The piece of the URL is [Amber: Yes.] drive.google.com or whatever. [Amber: Yup, yeah.] Okay. And, and when you say you're reading that, what is, what do you mean I'm reading it?

47:46 Amber: Um, honestly I'm not sure cuz it was an unintentional reading of it. Like I don't know, it was like, I was just looking at it. Um, I guess I was just looking at it, like I put it in just to make sure that it was correct and there were no errors with it and all the stuff like that, but I.

48:07 RTH: Does, does reading it mean I'm *saying* it, [Amber: Oh, no.] or does reading it mean I'm just seeing, I'm, I'm tracking across these words or?

48:15 Amber: Yeah, I'm tracking across these words.

48:17 RTH: So I'm not saying to myself or out loud "Google," "drive.google," but I am somehow taking in, in the, in the sense of reading, [Amber: Mm hmm.] "drive.google"?

48:35 Amber: Yeah. I'm like examining it, but my attention is more towards the word "drive" for whatever reason.

48:45 RTH: And, and so does it, is it, is it the case that I am examining the word "drive"? Or is it the case that I'm reading the word "drive"?

48:58 Amber: I'm reading it. I know, well, I'm reading it, but I'm reading that whole I'm reading "drive.google." I read that. But my attention was toward just the word "drive." I don't know.

49:20 RTH: And, and is reading.... Do you mean by *reading* something beyond just my attention is now at "drive" and then it will be at "." and then it'll be at "Google"? And so my attention is saltic, saltotory?...

49:38 Amber: Oh, I see. [RTH: celtic or?] No, I had read "drive.google," but my attention like my focus, I guess, I don't know what a, a better word to use, but something like that was on "drive."

49:51 RTH: Still on drive?

49:52 Amber: Yeah.

49:53 CK: And they're both happening simultaneous, right, at the moment of the beep, Amber, right? Like you're both reading "drive.google," and somehow also focused on "drive."

50:02 Amber: Drive. Mm hmm.

50:07 RTH: And the reading, I'm gathering, doesn't have any perceptual characteristics. It's not like, there's a voice involved, it's not like there's a highlighting involved, there's just, but [Amber: No.] somehow I have read, "drive.google."

50:19 Amber: Yeah. It, it was just weird because it was, it was unintentionally reading. Like I wasn't reading that like I'd be reading a book. I was, I was just reading it. I don't even know *how* I was reading it. I just kind of was doing it.

50:33 RTH: And, and in this, how in this kinda reading, is it one word at a time "drive-dot-google" or is it the whole, I scoop up the whole "drive.google" thing?

50:44 Amber: Um, "drive.google." It's that whole little block of words and that yeah.

50:53 RTH: Not sequentially, not one at a time?

50:56 Amber: Not one at a time. Well, I mean, okay, sequentially though, cuz it was in that order "drive.google" but.

51:03 RTH: On the page or on the [Amber: Yeah. In my reading.] the text box it's in order, but that the question is [Amber: oh.] whether you scoop that up as a unit—all at once

“drive.google”—or whether you have reading is an unfolding over time: first the “drive,” then the “dot” then the “google”?

51:22 Amber: Got it. No, I just scooped that all at one time, one block of words.

51:26 RTH: So I read the whole phrase “drive.google,” but I’m somehow focused on the “drive” portion?

51:32 Amber: Yes.

51:35 RTH: And none of this is a ver, vocal thing: I don’t hear it, see it? I don’t. I don’t hear it I guess?

51:45 Amber: No.

51:52 RTH: And it’s, there’s doesn’t, there’s no per, perceived reason for you to do this. You just mindlessly reading it?

52:02 Amber: Yeah. I like, where it’s mindlessly just reading it for whatever reason. And I was also mindlessly focusing my attention on “drive” I’m not even sure why all that was going on.

52:14 RTH: Okay.

52:14 CK: Well I have a question maybe that might help. Um, is, are these words meaningful to you, Amber? Like I’m reading with comprehension? Or it’s sort of like, I’m just. Obviously in the real world, I’m reading “drive.google,” but I could very well have been reading gibberish and I, it just, y’know. I’m obviously reading it, but there’s sort of no semantic understanding or me, meaning behind the words?

52:41 Amber: Yeah. There was no deeper meaning to it other than “drive.google.” It wasn’t even like, the deeper meaning wasn’t even that it was a URL, wasn’t that to a Google Drive link. It wasn’t any of those things, it was just, yeah, just that.

52:58 CK: And the word “drive,” too? Is the, is that like sort of like “niece” in beep 3 where it’s just the *word* present, but there, you’know like [Amber: Yes.] or, or is there something more to be said about “drive”? Like is there, y’know, is, yeah?

53:17 Amber: No, there wasn’t any deeper meaning to the word “drive” than that. And it wasn’t, I wouldn’t even say it’s as, uh, clear and specific as “niece.” It was just, my attention was just happened to be on that word or that portion of the group of words that I was reading. [CK: Okay.] But I wouldn’t even say *visual* attention. Almost like *mental* attention. Like I was *mentally* attending to “drive.” Like I was mentally focused on it not really even visually focused on it, or anything like that.

54:07 RTH: I think I’m good.

54:09 CK: And I’m good as well.

54:11 Amber: Okay. Okay.

54:14 CK: Think we got one more, right, beep 6?

SAMPLE 9.6 DISCUSSION STARTS HERE

54:16 Amber: Beep 6. Okay so beep 6. I was looking at a FaceTime call, uh, that at the moment of the beep I was looking at the FaceTime call. And uh, as context I was being asked to do something that I didn't really wanna do. And I was, I guess again, at the moment of the beep, I was kind of in a state of like blocking out the environment around me. Um, I said, I also wrote down that I was feeling similar to the frustration I described in 8.2. Like this might be a better way to describe *that*, even, but it was like, yeah, I was just looking at my phone. Um, there were no real details to that. Um, and then I was like blocking out the world, I guess. [laughs] Yeah.

55:10 CK: So is there sort of three things going on? I'm looking at my phone, I'm kind of in this I'm blocking things out, and I'm frustrated?

55:20 Amber: Yeah.

55:23 CK: All equally present?

55:25 Amber: Yes.

55:26 CK: Okay.

55:28 RTH: Before we go down any further roads, can I ask? Cuz I'm looking at my phone and blocking out the rest of the world, is this just a figure ground thing? I'm, I'm looking at my phone and I'm just not attending to whatever else is there? Or does it seem like I'm actively blocking out the rest of the world?

55:49 Amber: It felt like I was actively blocking out everything else going on.

55:55 RTH: You *do* feel that?

55:56 Amber: Yeah, because my attention was being diverted from all these other things to like this idea of like an, like annoyance, I guess like, um, that frustration feeling like *now I gotta deal with this*.

56:21 RTH: Hmm.

56:24 CK: And so for, for context, right, Amber, you referenced, um, 8.2 and that was the carrying the stuff down the hallway, right? [Amber: Yes.] Okay. And so when you say this is similar?

56:38 RTH: So let's not go there, let's just, let's start with how this was. [Amber: Okay.] [CK: Yeah, okay.] And then later we can figure out whether it's more.

56:38 Russ comments: The general DES strategy is to try to get as high-fidelity as we can about one particular experience, bracketing all else including other of Amber's experiences. *Then*, if the current experience seems similar to some other experience, it is fair game to explore the similarities and differences. It is often quite informative to compare and contrast specific experiences: it allows us to fine-tune our descriptions—it's like *this* but not like *that*.

However, if we *start* by noticing a similarity, then the interview is likely to fall into the confirmation-bias trap.

56:44 Amber: Okay.

56:46 CK: So what was present to you in this beep?

56:48 Amber: Um, okay. So it was just, it was almost like, uh, yeah, so I felt like I was kind of like closing off the outside environment, almost, to other things. I don't even, I, I can't even be specific about what I was closing the world off to; I was just kinda doing it. And then, um, this feeling was coming up while I was looking at my phone. While my eyes were at looking at my phone and I was seeing kinda not distinctly what was happening on there, but it was like, yeah.

57:25 CK: And I see you like pointing, is that like, is this like a physical kind of a thing, like a physical sensation or is this a, you know, something else a?

57:35 Amber: It's so it's more mental, it's definitely mental. Um, but physical or like physically, even in the mental world? Not really. This one not really, no.

57:47 CK: So this is like a, a mental or more mental blocking?

57:53 Amber: Yes.

57:54 CK: And by blocking: is that a, y'know, I, I can imagine that might be like, I'm just focusing my attention on one thing and on other things, or I'm actively kind of like, you know, I'm actively pushing away these things coming up. I mean, that can show up a lot of different ways?

58:24 Amber: Yes. Um, I would say I was getting my focus and kind of almost like just trying to close off everything else so I could keep my focus on this one thing going on here. So one kind of chaotic [laughs] thing going on here.

58:44 CK: I'm sort of mentally zeroing in on the, and that, and is the, is it that specific I'm zeroing in on something? Or just, I'm just trying to mentally block these other things that are coming up?

58:59 Amber: Yeah, yeah. I guess. Yeah. No, it wasn't even, yeah, it wasn't even specific like that. It was just, yeah, I'm just blocking out distractions and, and it wasn't even like anything was distracting me. It was just like a vague, like I, I'm closing off distractions.

59:17 RTH: So I'm understanding you to be saying this is *not just* a zooming in, this is a *blocking out*.

59:24 Amber: Yes.

59:25 RTH: *Experientially* blocking out?

59:27 Amber: Yes.

59:34 RTH: Okay.

59:38 Amber: If I had to metaphorically describe it, I would almost describe it like, um, um, like if experience was all in color [laughs] it would be, it'd be, everything is black, like just dark and then you have this one thing that is lit up. [laughs] But I, that's super metaphorical. And I was just, yeah, I don't know if that helped.

1:00:04 RTH: So, so lemme stick with your metaphor. So is it, is it just that there's one thing that's clear and everything else is black? Or is it that I'm *trying* to make this thing clear and in doing that, I have to *create* the blackness, I have to block everything out so that it *stays* black, I have to, I feel myself blocking it out?

1:00:32 Amber: Yes. That, yep. That second point there. Yep.

1:00:34 RTH: So it's not just naturally that those things get blocked out because I'm focusing in on this interesting thing. It's that I have to erase everything else so that this thing can be interesting?

1:00:45 Amber: Yes. So that this thing can be instead of maybe like a little again, metaphorically, like a little piece of color. It can be a whole thing.

1:00:56 RTH: Okay.

1:00:58 Amber: That's super metaphorical that wasn't really in the experience, but that's how I would describe that.

1:01:02 RTH: So I, I understand that, but, so let's make sure we get the metaphor out. So without the metaphor, [Amber Uh huh.] what we're saying is that I have, *in my experience at this moment*, I am somehow actively blocking out the stuff that is not of primary interest to me?

1:01:22 Amber: Mm hmm.

1:01:24 RTH: As opposed to just zooming in on what *is* primarily interesting?

1:01:28 Amber: Yes.

1:01:28 RTH: Okay.

1:01:31 CK: And I also told, heard you be saying Amber, that, that thing of interest isn't really specified at this moment. It's, it's more so the, is that correct?

1:01:38 Amber: Yeah.

1:01:39 CK: It's more so that I'm actively, I'm actively blocking out?

1:01:45 Amber: Other indiscriminate things, yes.

1:01:50 CK: Okay. And is all of that, what we had previously called the frustration, the 8.2 stuff, or?

1:02:02 Amber: I guess in hindsight that, it is a little bit different than that.

1:02:05 CK: I mostly don't care about the 8.2 stuff, [Amber: Yeah.] but I'm just trying to get a feel though is that of what was in your experience at this moment?

1:02:11 Amber: The physicalness of 8.2 was not there. No. [CK: Okay.] It was more the blocking out and, and I was looking at the phone still.

1:02:21 CK: Yeah. And so what do you see?

1:02:24 Amber: Phone. Just an indiscriminate person, I guess an indiscriminate picture on the phone.

1:02:39 CK: And the whole phone? Like, I'm not just seeing my, the person on the screen, I'm seeing the borders of my phone and?

1:02:45 Amber: Yep. But nothing else, like not my hand, not the background. [CK: Okay.] Yeah.

1:02:53 RTH: And there was a portion of this where you said that you were being asked to do something that you didn't want to do. [Amber: Yeah.] Is that in, is that context or is that what you experienced?

1:03:02 Amber: That's context. That's kinda what brought on this whole situation in the first place, yeah.

1:03:11 RTH: So at the moment of this beep my experience is I am mildly seeing, but not very differentiatedly, my phone and I am *more* involved in *excluding* anything else that might compete with this?

1:03:28 Amber: Yeah! Yes! And I mean that, okay, yeah. That the experience-ness is indiscriminate, but the reason can... Can I say the reason or is that gonna, is that not relevant?

1:03:41 RTH: As long as we keep it separate it's alright.

1:03:43 Amber: Okay. Yeah. Okay. So the reason is like, okay. So I was being asked to do something that I didn't wanna do. That was like an inconvenience at the time cuz I was sampling. So I was like, um, I, I need to finish sampling. So I was, but, but at that point I was kinda, oh, whatever. So I was walking to go and do what I had to do. And

then I was like, nope, nope, I'm gonna finish sampling. So I turned around and I was going back and I was starting to block everything out. And then the beep went off and I, y'know. Afterwards in retrospect it was kinda like, oh, how ironic? I didn't wanna go and get distracted so that I could finish sampling and sample accurately, not be distracted. And then it went off, like after I had made all that, those decisions. I, I dunno if that helped anything, but that's, [laughs] that's kinda what happened.

1:04:40 RTH: So at the moment of this beep, there are two things: I see my phone and I'm blocking out the rest of the stuff?

1:04:52 Amber: Yeah. Blocking out all that chaos that I described, yeah. I'm beginning to do it. I'm beginning to do, or I'm in the process of doing it, I don't even wanna say I was beginning to do it, I was in the process.

1:05:03 RTH: Does it seem like more of my perceptual interest or whatever is on the blocking out than on the phone? [Amber: Yes.] You seeing, and by "more," do we mean 51-49 or 99-1 or?

1:05:14 Amber: Oh my goodness, yeah. I'm not even too sure. I guess 90-10?

1:05:20 RTH: So a *lot* more?

1:05:22 Amber: Yes, a lot more,

1:05:23 RTH: A lot more on the blocking out than on the seeing?

1:05:26 Amber: Yeah.

1:05:29 RTH: Okay.

1:05:30 CK: Okay. I think I'm good.

1:05:33 RTH: And is, is, is your sense of what you know about Amber, now this is an aside basically, but, but if the beep had come a little bit later, you would've blocked that out and then we would've, we would've gotten a beep that would've been about you and the phone?

1:05:48 Amber: Oh, but yeah, if I took a guess, I would think that it would've been more, I think that it may have been more of like, uh, *I was right* [laughs] kind of a feeling. Because the reason I was starting to block everything out was because I was getting irritated that I was like, I was like getting irritated cuz I *knew* that if I had gone to do what I was gonna do, I would have totally screwed up this beep. Totally screwed it up because I would've been, I would've had to, I would've been walking, and I would've been doing something and I would've had the beeper and I would've had a notebook, and then I would've had to *stop* in the middle of what I was doing to try and write things down. So if we had caught me later, it would've been kind of like a vindication, cuz I had made the executive decision myself to say, no, I'm that is gonna wait, I'm gonna

finish sampling so I can accurately get something here. And yeah like, well like maybe two steps I turned around and made two steps and then it went off. So I was not in the process of being like, I knew it. But I don't know if that's relevant, so.

1:05)48 Russ comments: Actually, we would have been happy if Amber had gone about her business, walking or whatever. Beeping during such occasions is just as interesting to us as the more student-oriented samples.

1:06:56 RTH: You, you used the word in there, which I can't remember what it was, but there were, [pause] I've lost my train of, train of thought.

1:07:10 Amber: Okay.

1:07:10 RTH: Oh well.

1:07:14 RTH: Then I think I'm good. And we gonna do this again?

1:07:19 Amber: Sure.

1:07:19 Russ comments: They compare calendars.

1:09:17 CK: So

1:09:17 Amber: I have a question just overall. So, um, you had mentioned before that we were gonna like stop soon. I, I was like, who makes that decision? [laughs] Just wondering.

1:09:28 RTH: We, we make that decision.

1:09:30 Amber: Oh, all of us?

1:09:31 RTH: Yeah.

1:09:31 Amber: Okay. I'm gonna be biased that's why.

1:09:34 RTH: And, and, and, and I would, I would say we make it, but you have 51% of the vote.

1:09:39 Amber: Oh.

1:09:40 RTH: So if, if you would, if you were to say, I don't wanna do this anymore, then we would not do it anymore. If you were to say, well, I wanna do it anymore. Then what, what, I guess I, what I should say is you have 51% of the vote pf saying when we want *discontinue*, if you say I wanna *continue*, then we would have to agree with it that we all have time to do it, whatever.

1:10:00 Amber: Okay. I was just wondering, cuz I was like thinking the other day, I was like, I can't even imagine not wanting to continue. Cuz every time I'm bringing something different, I'm like, I really wanna figure out what was *going on* or like yeah.

1:10:15 RTH: It's all interesting. It's all interesting.

1:10:17 Amber: Yeah.

1:10:18 CK: Yeah. Especially, I mean, not that it, especially after I think today's beeps, not that today's beeps were any, I think extraordinary than the others, but I think the patterns that we've been noticing over the past few times, at least I'm pretty, I'm curious to give it one more day to see what we might find.

1:10:32 Amber: Yeah. Cuz I feel like there were like things that I've said in the past that weren't, that had just, just for whatever reason of the universe, they just haven't been revisited yet. So I was wondering if that is, y'know, we haven't catch those things.

1:10:47 RTH: Well, I would say let's do it another time or two and then, and then we can determine what we're gonna do with it from there.

1:10:52 Amber: Okay. Okay. Yeah.

1:10:54 RTH: If you get too many days, then you get overwhelmed. So it's....

1:10:58 Amber: Yeah.

1:10:59 RTH: ...so there's diminishing returns and whatever.

1:11:01 Amber: Right, right, right, right. Mm hmm.

1:11:04 RTH: Alright.