

Speaker 1:

Mmm I, I am thinking about one of the questions that you offered us, which was this question of how the digital experience works. And, I think that connects to this other proposition you offered us of proposing research questions within a context. And, as I think with the question of technologies in Canada and Canadian early childhood, I want to think about a research question or you're making me think about a research question that I think is kind of re-imagining a different proposition you offered us, so you talked about how threaded through this, this history of Reggio, is this proposal that art is an escape from rhetoric and stereotype. That, art is a move against the status quo. And, when I think about proposing research questions within a context with technologies, I want to think about how we can also think about digital media as an escape from rhetoric and the status quo and digital media as a step against what is taken for granted in early childhood.

Speaker 1:

And, I think that part of those status correlations are ones Rachel mentioned, these relations of protection. Also these relations of curation. We need to carefully monitor what children do with digital technologies and also mitigation. We need to control and limit how much time children spend with technologies and those are I think largely quite paternalistic but also quite panic driven. There's not really anything hopeful about them. They're about this scared other world where we need to control and resist it. And I think that, what you're making me think about instead is thinking about escaping from as you said that that status quo, panic driven, moralistic, protectionist relation with technology. And you talked about technologies and process and I think that that links for me to what Sylvia and Boston were saying about aesthetics as an experience and when we think about technologies and process, it makes me think about things like unfolding.

Speaker 1:

But also as you talked about, intentions and specificity. Technologies aren't any process and are open to all processes. We make choices around technologies, we make decisions. And, what that really makes me think about is sort of the work of thinking with technologies, with children. I think that we've inherited this discourse of technologies that technologies are, are an instrument of progress there to make things easier. They're interested in relation to the efficiency and efficacy. And I think that you're proposing for us, that technologies can be interested in different kinds of relations. They can be interested in relations of connection, or relations of entanglements or even when Christina interjected and said she's interested in thinking slowly. It made me think how technologies can be interested in relations of slowness. And I think that that, that makes me think about how we need to think with these relations is not just something inherent to the technology, but something made through choices and research questions and relations and through documenting, through getting to know an event spent with documentation, an event through documentation instead of an event, kind of mediated by documentation.

Speaker 1:

Like, those are important differences. And, that makes me think about sort of responding that that tech is something to respond to with children. That children don't just respond to technology in this back and forth, one-to-one um post-human interface. But that there's something quite, um, quite to borrow a word Christina uses and taught me intimate about relations with technology, quite entangled. And then to circle back to something we talked about at the very beginning that I'm kind of thinking all of these questions that you're, you're making me think alongside, I'm thinking about how Tammy talked about

how we have a Twitter account for the center and how we have a hashtag for the center. And I'm thinking about this question of like what it would be for us to take Twitter as a pedagogical question both amongst this group of adults and this connection of pedagogists that we're trying to build in the province but also with children.

Speaker 1:

Um, and, and I'm thinking about that as a connection to, to a material and to what we notice of those technologies. I'm thinking about how you talked about sort of how aesthetics isn't just about beauty. And I'm thinking then about the relations that Twitter and smartphones bring with aluminum mining or with underground cables across the Atlantic. Um, and then I'm thinking also about community and Twitter as a common project. And you mentioned that you're interested in how technology's redefining learning space. And I think it's interesting to imagine the work it would take a best for Twitter to do some of that work or for us to do that work with Twitter. And, I guess sort of a, I'm rambling, but I thought to, to leave with is to think what, what would it be for us to think Twitter as a pedagogical commons, as more than just an exchange of information or as more than just um tweeting to contribute to a hashtag, but to think of it as sort of deep work that that gets to this question of how the digital experience works, how the Twitter experience works, in pedagogical commons. So, thank you.

Lorenzo:

(Chuckles) Um, you, you said it much better than I did and I think what you said is very uh, interesting and um, to refer to a research project I was part of. Um, something that was interesting, I think in relation with what you just said is that, um, how children perceive interfaces for example. So, um, very often they just use an interface, um, without a critical approach. So what we would do would like to uh maybe take a screenshot of an interface video projected, uh, and start asking questions about the interface. So what does this symbol, uh, how can we change this symbol? How can we uh redefine it? How can we change the interface? Then of course, it doesn't lead to actually changing, uh, an interface, but it just about critically start to think critically about our relationship with interfaces. And, uh, so how can we connect this interface with something else?

Speaker 2:

What could we add? And so they started making drawings, and then making a thought disease. And also we have, um, had an experience with a a platform where children from different uh, preschool schools, could uh, send messages that were, of course, not written, but just pictures or audio recordings. And so then the question wouldn't be much about what are we sending to the other groups. But, the question was what, um, like what are they experiencing when they get a picture that is coming from us? What are they understanding? How rich, uh, is that experience for them and how can we uh make it as rich as possible? And, uh, eventually, there's time to think about all of these questions because, uh, of course, uh, goose would design, uh, apps and websites, they try to make it the most attractive, and so that people spend as much time as possible, uh, on the app or on the software per se.

Speaker 2:

But, uh, instead, I think we as educators, as teachers, uh, should think more as you said about how can we make this app, uh, on their pedagogical point of view, the use of this app as rich as possible. So I think it would be very interesting to start, uh, thinking about, like you said, let's use Twitter in a different and innovative maybe a way and not just to such a polarized a way and how can we use it with children? How can we propose it and start to think critically about it? I think these are all, uh, complex, uh,

projects that take time. But, uh, like I think they're very interesting in one or two years, where implement, a research with a small group of children about a topic like that and and try to, and reach a that experience as much uh as possible. And make time well spent whe- and not, uh, uh like a poor experience for them. Yeah.