

Zooming Into Zoom: How Zoom Dissolves Boundaries, Ushering in a New World

Hope Tsai

POSC-262: The Affective Interface

Professor Falk

December 9, 2021

Referencing at least 5 authors we have read, discuss how and why the affective interface (or one of its transpositions) may be relevant to an individual or a body politic in relation to 21st century life. Focus on 1, 2 or (not more than) 3 characteristics of the affective interface that are especially compelling to you. Attach relevant images that are properly labeled.

In a new world dominated by COVID-19 lockdowns, Zoom emerged as the favorite teleconferencing application. Even though many countries are now on the path to normalcy, it remains popular, and continues to host college lectures, happy hours, and even weddings.¹ Zoom has fully integrated into present-day society. At first glance, the application may seem to be a tool with no agency; created by human beings, it exists solely to be used. This view of Zoom reinforces the hierarchical boundaries between human beings and objects, with the former creating, using, and impacting the latter without being impacted in return. Though this view may be intuitive and easy to understand, it is rejected by closer inspection. Zoom then transforms into an *affective interface*, wielding power and affecting its user just as the user affects it. This paper will examine how seeing Zoom as a being with agency encourages a post-humanistic world with a growing “interconnection between human and nonhuman environment.”² Boundaries disappear, leaving its bios, zoe, and techne inhabitants to merge and interact with one another in a more authentic and productive way, ever mindful of one another’s power and might.

Zoom: An Apparatus or A Thing-Power?

Rising in popularity during COVID-19, which was a time when normalcy could neither be found nor defined, Zoom is “a product of cultural, social and political practices...embedded in social and cultural contexts.”³ Regarding pre-pandemic social practices, the application connects people; regarding the pandemic social context of quarantines and lockdowns, Zoom connects people *from all around the globe*, adjusting its video quality in order to minimize lag and giving everyone a seat at the metaphorical table by offering free accounts. Those who want to contribute their thoughts can speak into a microphone or type into a chat. Following the cultural practice of showing respect by remaining silent while a person is speaking, Zoom has “mute” and “raise hand” features. These practical functionalities are combined with “nice-to-haves,” such as the “Touch Up My Appearance” feature (which “[smooths] out the skin tone of [one’s] face”) and virtual backgrounds.⁴ While the “nice-to-haves” may seem to be merely fun or even superficial, they are actually meaningful, allowing users to follow cultural practices of looking professional

¹ “Q&A With Wedfuley: Zoom Weddings During Covid-19 & the Future of Virtual Ceremonies.” Zoom Blog, April 7, 2021. <https://blog.zoom.us/wedfuley-zoom-weddings-during-covid-19-future-of-virtual-ceremonies/>.

² Rosi Braidotti. *Transpositions*. Malden, MA: Polity Press, 2006, 26.

³ “Day One.” In *The Bioapparatus*, Catherine Richards and Nell Tenhaaf, eds. Banff: Banff Centre Press, 7.

⁴ “Compare Zoom Features: Complete List of All 42 Zoom Features,” TechBoomers.com, accessed November 24, 2021, <https://techboomers.com/t/zoom-features-list>.

or “at one’s best” while entertaining a guest in their home or space. Thus, societal contexts and practices can be thought of as an actant, acting on and influencing Zoom’s features.

However, Zoom does not only exist as a useful tool; it is also an affective interface that engages in a close relationship with its users. One way to categorize Zoom is to see it as an apparatus, which Agamben defines as “a network established between elements” such as discourses, institutions, and people. As a network, Zoom has elements that include the whole of technological science and history, its founders, and its users. Agamben further states that an apparatus has “a concrete strategic function.”⁵ As the previous paragraph has demonstrated, Zoom helps people communicate audibly and visually in real time, no matter the distance. Thus far, an apparatus resembles a tool. It is used, but it does not tangibly affect its users. Agamben thus distinguishes between apparatus and tool by adding one more criteria: humanity must use an apparatus to obtain some type of happiness, thus making itself vulnerable to the apparatus’ “capacity to capture, orient, determine, intercept, model, control, or secure the gestures, behaviors, opinions, or discourses of living beings.”⁶ While most of these verbs are of the receptive, almost passive variety, the verbs “control” and “secure” indicate that an apparatus *acts back* on the user. In Zoom’s case, its webinars force attendees to be invisible and inaudible, only allowing them to watch the host and type into a chat.⁷ While this behavior seems reasonable, as webinars are speaker-focused events, Zoom thus controls the “discourses of living beings.” This phenomenon also occurs in more insidious and less reasonable cases. For example, Zoom once suspended an activist group’s account for holding a meeting to commemorate the Tiananmen Square Massacre.⁸ In an attempt to find happiness via connection, human beings have adopted Zoom as an apparatus without being aware of the application’s tangible effects and power.

Viewing Zoom through the lens of Agamben’s apparatus may result in a wary attitude towards the application. After all, Agamben spends the rest of the piece arguing for the “profanation” of an apparatus, that is, the “[reversion] of what the apparatus has done.”⁹ By the

⁵ Giorgio Agamben. “What Is an Apparatus.” In *What Is An Apparatus (and Other Essays)*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009, 3.

⁶ Agamben, 14.

⁷ “Compare Zoom Features: Complete List of All 42 Zoom Features,” TechBoomers.com, accessed November 24, 2021, <https://techboomers.com/t/zoom-features-list>.

⁸ “Zoom Suspends Account of US-Based Chinese Activists after Tiananmen Meeting,” BBC News (BBC, June 11, 2020), <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-53003688>.

⁹ Ayomide Eniola, Danny Jeong, and Sachin Nambiar, “Historical Moment” (presentation, The Affective Interface, Amherst, MA, September 8, 2021).

apparatus' definition, then, Zoom must have a dangerous and unwanted effect that must be reversed. The effect could be a monopoly on communication technologies or even a newfound preference for the application over phone calls or face-to-face meetings. It could also be the restriction of speech, as seen in the suspension of the activist group's account. In any case, Zoom forcibly alters the way humanity communicates, thus straining Zoom and humanity's relationship as the latter fights to resist the former's control while remaining trapped in the relationship by its search for happiness (connecting with others). Viewing Zoom as an apparatus, then, may lead one to reject Zoom and break off the relationship, dooming Zoom and humanity to live in a world full of suspicion and boundaries. Does a relationship of entities with similar power have to become harmful? Does it have to end? The optimistic answer is, "No," and suggests a different relationship, one in which the entities act on each other, understanding and utilizing one's strength where the other is weak. In such a relationship, new possibilities and ways of life emerge; as the entities interact, they become "open to the world," rather than rejecting its inhabitants.¹⁰ Could the relationship between Zoom and human beings be like this? If one views Zoom through the lens of Jane Bennett's thing-power, it could.

The main difference between an apparatus and a thing-power lies in the morality of the object. As examined previously, an apparatus controls and manipulates living beings. If a being wishes to live a free life, it must profane the apparatus. However, a thing-power does not necessarily operate with malicious intent. It simply is an "object-turned-thing that has traces of independence or aliveness," which enables it to affect others.¹¹ Such traces cannot be found in the initial discussions of Zoom's impact on meeting attendees, which ignore the fact that human beings still make the decisions. Though it may seem as if Zoom itself makes webinar listeners silent and invisible, and suspends accounts, human beings are still behind the wheel. Webinar hosts can move the event to a regular Zoom meeting, thereby giving voice to the attendees. The company's founders, not the software program, were the ones who chose to shut down the activist group's account. The founders could easily reinstate the account. Therefore, while the initial discussions serve to illustrate the impacts of Zoom, they do not clearly reveal the traces of independence or aliveness inherent in a thing-power.

¹⁰ Brian Massumi. "Preface" and "In lieu of a conclusion." In *Politics of Affect*. Polity Press: Malden, MA, 2015, ix.

¹¹ Jane Bennett. *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2010, xvii.

Instead, these traces can be found in how Zoom affects a different area of society: slang. Before the pandemic and rise of Zoom, to “zoom in” meant to enlarge a photo, or “to examine the smallest details of a subject.”¹² Nowadays, there are additional meanings to the word, “Zoom.” After ensuring that they are “Zoom-ready,” people can “Zoom into” a meeting. The issue of “Zoombombing,” which is the act of “disrupting video calls with violent, pornographic or offensive content,” has emerged and resolved in the past year; the term remains.¹³ The thing-power that is Zoom actively created these words, thereby changing culture and influencing the thoughts and words of human beings. Thus, the “strong bio-power effect” of this technology has “[rewritten] issues of power,” toppling human beings from their imaginary pedestal and instead placing them on the same level as Zoom.¹⁴ Now, both affect and are affected by the other. Zoom is not a tool, but an affective interface with agency and independence. By realizing Zoom’s true status, humanity becomes aware of the impacts of Zoom and can interact with Zoom more authentically, respecting the application for its function and helpfulness, as well as its power and influence on humanity.

Allowing Extensions Beyond the Physical Body

Once Zoom-as-affective-interface is revealed, the boundaries between human beings and Zoom fall; next to fall are the boundaries of the physical human body. Examining another communication device, Steven Hawking’s computer and speakers, Sandy Stone wonders, “Where does [Steven Hawking] stop? Where are his edges?”¹⁵ Does he stop at the skin, or does he continue to the computer and the sound waves emitted by the speakers? Stone concludes that “a serious part of Hawking extends into the box in his lap.”¹⁶ Similarly, where does a user of Zoom stop? Though the physical body is in front of the computer screen, the user’s senses of sight and hearing extend into the computer, reaching the environments of the other users in the meeting. The user can see a family member’s home and hear the roar of a garbage disposal

¹² “Zoom in Definition & Meaning,” Dictionary.com (Dictionary.com), accessed November 24, 2021, <https://www.dictionary.com/browse/zoom--in>.

¹³ Barry Collins, “Zoom Zings into the Oxford Dictionary Words of the Year,” *Forbes* (Forbes Magazine, November 23, 2020), <https://www.forbes.com/sites/barrycollins/2020/11/23/zoom-zings-into-the-oxford-dictionary-words-of-the-year/?sh=608dcb81a465>.

¹⁴ Braidotti, 30.

¹⁵ Allucquère Rosanne Stone. “Split Subjects, Not Atoms; or, How I Fell in Love with My Prosthesis.” In *The Cyborg Handbook*, Chris Hables Gray, ed. New York: Routledge Press, 1995, 395.

¹⁶ Stone, 395.

thousands of miles away; the user can tour a college campus or foreign city. The user can even do these simultaneously, experiencing multiple environments at once. Just as Hawking extends into his prosthesis, a user of Zoom extends into the different windows of a Zoom meeting. The user does not stop at the skin. Instead, bios/zoe merges with techne, and a new definition of “a self” emerges. This extended personhood has tangible consequences in society. For example, now the law must reckon with a broadened scope for bystander responsibility. If a meeting attendee (the bystander) sees a crime take place in a Zoom window, how responsible is the attendee for not calling the police or an ambulance? Due to the extended personhood, the law cannot easily dismiss this question.

With Zoom, the user gains additional sets of eyes. More specifically, the user gains one set of eyes for every attendee in the meeting. Thus, once in a relationship with Zoom, the user receives more information than before, and uses it to make sense of the expanded world. The numerous eyes become “active perception systems, building in translations and specific ways of seeing, that is, ways of life.”¹⁷ A certain camera angle can make a home seem cleaner than it actually is; a new set of eyes may not reach far enough to see the pile of laundry by the door or behind the computer. A certain angle can also make a city seem uninteresting, as the owner of the device focuses the camera on the pavement or the shoes of passersby. Thus, just as a user’s “organic” set of eyes interprets the world, discarding certain pieces of information while keeping others, so do the additional sets of eyes. Even though the human being extends beyond the physical body, similar limitations apply. As such, the user cannot completely trust these new eyes. In order to see the world as authentically as possible, the user must be vigilant to potential manipulations of the camera, as well as the fallibility of the user’s organic eyes.

Once a human being merges with Zoom, adopting the application’s additional senses, it may be tempting to conclude that, though the boundaries between Zoom and technology and between Zoom and humanity have fallen, the boundaries between humanity and nature are reinforced. It may seem as if humanity drifts further away from nature, thus weakening the two’s relationship. However, this is not the case. Instead, in the past year, people have “[ventured]... into the heart of ‘tech’ in search of nature.”¹⁸ Quarantined at home, they have adopted virtual backgrounds of the San Juan National Forest and Glacier National Park, “losing [themselves] in

¹⁷ Donna Haraway. *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. Routledge, 1991, 190.

¹⁸ Allucquère Rosanne Stone. "Collective Structures." In *The War of Desire and Technology at the Close of the Mechanical Age*. Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1995, 38.

the great outdoors without leaving the indoors.”¹⁹ Local Parks and Recreation departments and nature centers even host “animal encounters” and trips to nearby woodlands, forests, and trails through Zoom.²⁰ Rather than abandoning nature for technology, humanity has embraced both. In turn, this virtual nature (such as Zoom backgrounds) embraces and acts back on humanity, “[eliciting] heightened creativity during videoconferencing.”²¹ Thus, not only has humanity embraced nature and technology, it has also embraced virtual nature as an actant, entering into a relationship in which it can affect and be affected. Life in the 21st century is increasingly seeing the disintegration of boundaries between bios, zoe, and techne. Instead of relying on itself to solve its problems, or blaming itself for its problems, humanity can interact with the other inhabitants on Earth and find productive or sustainable ways of living. As the previous example demonstrates, chastising oneself for being uncreative does not magically prompt one to become creative. Rather, as humanity merges with zoe and techne, it can be positively influenced. Humanity does not need to tackle issues alone.

The Process of Becoming

As seen previously, just as the boundaries between bios, zoe, and techne disappear, the boundaries of the human body are not as rigid as they appear; the human body can extend into Zoom. Now, one arrives at another question: can the boundaries of the human body disappear entirely? Can an individual embark on Braidotti’s process of becoming, “approaching what [he or she] is”?²² Through technology, it is easily possible. Zoom has both native and third-party filters, which transform the user into anything the imagination allows. The user can become a cat, or even a potato buried in the dirt.²³ In this process of becoming, the user is not merely “[imitating] or [identifying] with something or someone.”²⁴ The user is not looking upon a

¹⁹ Andrea Sachs, “Even If You Can’t Travel, Your Zoom Meetings Can,” The Washington Post (WP Company, April 15, 2020), https://www.washingtonpost.com/lifestyle/travel/even-if-you-cant-travel-your-zoom-meetings-can/2020/04/14/d6be8eba-7aab-11ea-a130-df573469f094_story.html.

²⁰ “Virtual Experiences,” Wildlife Discovery Center Virtual Experiences | Lake Forest Parks & Recreation, accessed November 24, 2021, <https://lfparksandrec.com/wildlife-discovery-center-virtual-experiences>.

²¹ Adam Palanica and Yan Fossat, “Effects of Nature Virtual Backgrounds on Creativity during Videoconferencing,” ScienceDirect (Elsevier, November 11, 2021), <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1871187121001917>.

²² Braidotti, 68.

²³ “When You Don’t Want to Be a Cat: How to Use (and Remove) Meeting Filters,” Zoom Blog, March 10, 2021, <https://blog.zoom.us/how-to-use-remove-meeting-filters/>.

²⁴ Braidotti, 68.

potato, and imagining how it must feel to be buried in the dirt, nor does the user become a cat through imitation, meowing and sleeping through the Zoom meeting. Instead, one embarks on the process of becoming by beginning with oneself in the Zoom camera, bare and vulnerable and open to new possibilities.

To proceed, one must “actually be attracted to change, to want it, the way one wants a lover--in the flesh.”²⁵ The user must want the filter. With Zoom, the flesh is a digital one, but important and tangible nonetheless (as the news of the distraught lawyer who was stuck on a cat filter demonstrates). Once the user activates the filter, the filter transforms the user, pixel by pixel. Indeed, when the two enter into one relationship, the user allows Zoom to “extract particles between which [Zoom] reestablishes the relations of movement and rest, speed and slowness.”²⁶ When the user moves, the filter moves, and the user remains that which it has become; when the user moves quickly, the filter follows. Even though the filter only lasts as long as the Zoom meeting, it nonetheless helps the user along the path of becoming via temporary transformation.

As human beings affect the Zoom filter by creating and using it, and as filters affect human beings by altering their perceptions of themselves and effectively creating new beings, the distinction between tool and maker disappears. Now, “it is not clear who makes and who is made in the relation between human and machine.”²⁷ The two are no longer in a hierarchical relationship, in which the human resides above the machine. Instead, they are in a relationship of equals. Both see and respect the power of the other party, and continually affect and are affected. Thus, as they understand each other’s authentic selves, the human’s “sense of connection” to the machine increases.²⁸ Rather than being terrified at the idea of merging with an “other,” technology, humanity becomes curious and receptive and technology is no longer an “other.” Boundaries continue to fall, allowing a world of new possibilities and various entanglements to emerge. New worlds even emerge, as the artist Neil Harbisson’s antenna (which allows him to see color) demonstrates.

Additionally, once Zoom is seen as an equal and a thing-power, not as a tool, human beings shift from approaching Zoom with a work ethic to approaching Zoom with a “play ethic.”

²⁵ Braidotti, 70.

²⁶ Braidotti, 68

²⁷ Haraway, 177.

²⁸ Haraway, 178.

Instead of solely using Zoom as a way to communicate while under lockdown, human beings also view it as “loci, places, forums, agoras, arenas—arenas for social experiments, for community and its discourses, for the messy evolution of prosthetic sociality.”²⁹ The previous discussion of filters, in which people experiment with different appearances, is one example. Another example is the invention of virtual town halls, an arena for community, some of which also became arenas for experimentation. Most notably, a council meeting for a parish in the United Kingdom began as a space for discussing issues regarding the parish. It quickly became a space for messy experimentation, as the councillors began to “trade insults” until being “booted off the Zoom call by the clerk.”³⁰ The meeting resumed its status as a space for community and discussion once a recording of the call was uploaded to the Internet and went viral. Viewers from all over the globe bonded over the video and the subsequent compilations, watching them more than three million times and even creating merchandise with favorite phrases.³¹ Zoom has transformed from a tool with one unlikable use (virtual communication when face-to-face communication was impossible) to a thing-power that can be approached with a “play ethic.” The focus on play, rather than work, prompts authentic experimentation in the name of curiosity, not profit. Thus, the increased level of experimentation allows one to “find oneself” and one’s place, values, and beliefs in an expanded world.

However, the expanded horizon and possibilities of Zoom do not come without drawbacks. The virtual space invites experimentation, which in turn invites deception. Attendees can join Zoom meetings, on mute and off-camera, “playing a role, adopting a persona.”³² They may take aliases, or even masquerade as people whom the other attendees know. With the help of filters and virtual backgrounds, they may convincingly adopt personas even unmuted and with the camera on. “Thanks to pseudonymity, the space for deception may well be larger” on Zoom.³³ This risk must not be neglected or ignored, and Zoom continually strives to enforce

²⁹ Stone, “Split Subjects, Not Atoms,” 402.

³⁰ “Insults and Expletives Turn Parish Council Zoom Meeting into Internet Sensation,” *The Guardian* (Guardian News and Media, February 5, 2021), <https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2021/feb/05/handforth-insults-and-expletives-turn-parish-council-meeting-into-internet-sensation>.

³¹ “You Have No Authority Here Jackie Weaver, Handforth Parish Council Classic T-Shirt,” Redbubble, accessed November 24, 2021, <https://www.redbubble.com/i/t-shirt/You-have-no-authority-here-Jackie-Weaver-Handforth-Parish-Council-by-memeasaurus/70039281.WFLAH.XYZ>.

³² Steven Shaviro. “Pavel Curtis.” In *Doom Patrols: A Theoretical Fiction About Postmodernism*. New York/London: Serpent's Tail, 1997.

³³ Shaviro

security. Now, meetings are automatically associated with a password, so only people who are meant to attend can enter. Hosts can kick unwanted visitors out of the meeting. Zoom also continually strives to leave room for experimentation. Filters, virtual backgrounds, and the choice to mute and turn off the camera all remain. In this way, users of Zoom can communicate and experiment in a safe space. Though there are dangers that come with this technology and its ability to help human beings along the path of becoming, Zoom mitigates them and thus keeps the good impacts of Zoom while managing the bad. Humanity can continue to explore via Zoom.

Conclusion

Though Zoom may first be seen as merely a tool, closer examination redefines the application as a thing-power, dissolving the boundaries among bios, zoe, and techne in the process. As Zoom continues to influence and be influenced by its users, a post-humanistic world is nearing as the “sense of interconnection between the human and nonhuman environment” grows and grows.³⁴ However, society is not guaranteed to continue along this path. Though Zoom can be better thought of as a thing-power, not an apparatus, it must be said that other technologies *are* apparatuses, used by companies to control human beings in the pursuit of profit or other selfish gains. For example, Facebook began as a site that “compared the pictures of different Harvard students’ faces and allowed users to rate them for attractiveness,” offering temporary, superficial fun in exchange for the reinforcement of certain beauty standards (controlling a “discourse of living beings”).³⁵ Now, Facebook serves as an echo chamber whose sole purpose is to keep users clicking and “doom-scrolling” so that it can generate profit.³⁶ It is evidently wise for humanity to be wary of Facebook.

Though Zoom is a platform for communication, it is possible for the application to change its stance on certain topics once it has monopolized the teleconferencing industry. The activist group that commemorated the Tiananmen Square Massacre now has access to a Zoom account, but who is to say that Zoom will not suspend them once again? Zoom may become an apparatus which “controls” the “discourses of living beings” in the future. If technologies tend

³⁴ Braidotti, 26.

³⁵ Christopher McFadden, “A Brief History of Facebook,” Interesting Engineering (Interesting Engineering, July 8, 2020), <https://interestingengineering.com/history-of-facebook>.

³⁶ Caroline Newman, “How Facebook Pushes Users Into Echo Chambers,” UVA Today, November 18, 2020, <https://news.virginia.edu/content/study-how-facebook-pushes-users-especially-conservative-users-echo-chambers>.

more towards being apparatuses than thing-powers, then humanity may become wary and suspicious, choosing to strengthen boundaries instead of breaking them. Humanity may retreat into a human-only bubble, isolated from the rest of the world's inhabitants. Thus, progress to a post-humanistic world is precarious. Individuals cannot become complacent. Instead, they must recognize the power and might of technology, profaning apparatuses while embracing thing-powers. They must not generalize technology as one or the other. Then, and only then, can society march towards a post-humanistic world of new possibilities, interconnections, and authentic relationships.

Bibliography

Ayomide Eniola, Danny Jeong, and Sachin Nambiar, “Historical Moment” (presentation, The Affective Interface, Amherst, MA, September 8, 2021).

Bennett, Jane. *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2010, xvii.

Braidotti, Rosi. *Transpositions*. Malden, MA: Polity Press, 2006, 30.

Collins, Barry. “Zoom Zings into the Oxford Dictionary Words of the Year.” Forbes.

Forbes Magazine, November 23, 2020.

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/barrycollins/2020/11/23/zoom-zings-into-the-oxford-dictionary-words-of-the-year/?sh=608dcb81a465>.

“Compare Zoom Features: Complete List of All 42 Zoom Features.” TechBoomers.com.

Accessed November 24, 2021. <https://techboomers.com/t/zoom-features-list>.

"Day One." In *The Bioapparatus*, Catherine Richards and Nell Tenhaaf, eds. Banff: Banff Centre Press.

Giorgio, Agamben. "What Is an Apparatus." In *What Is An Apparatus (and Other Essays)*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009.

Haraway, Donna. *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. Routledge, 1991.

“Insults and Expletives Turn Parish Council Zoom Meeting into Internet Sensation.” The Guardian. Guardian News and Media, February 5, 2021.

<https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2021/feb/05/handforth-insults-and-expletives-turn-parish-council-meeting-into-internet-sensation>.

McFadden, Christopher. “A Brief History of Facebook,” Interesting Engineering

(Interesting Engineering, July 8, 2020),

<https://interestingengineering.com/history-of-facebook>.

Massumi, Brian. "Preface" and "In lieu of a conclusion." *In Politics of Affect*. Polity Press: Malden, MA, 2015.

"Meeting and Webinar Comparison – Zoom Support." Accessed November 24, 2021.
<https://support.zoom.us/hc/en-us/articles/115005474943-Meeting-and-Webinar-Comparison>.

Newman, Caroline. "How Facebook Pushes Users Into Echo Chambers," UVA Today, November 18, 2020,
<https://news.virginia.edu/content/study-how-facebook-pushes-users-especially-conservative-users-echo-chambers>.

Palanica, Adam, and Yan Fossat. "Effects of Nature Virtual Backgrounds on Creativity during Videoconferencing." ScienceDirect. Elsevier, November 11, 2021.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1871187121001917>.

"Q&A With Wedfully: Zoom Weddings During Covid-19 & the Future of Virtual Ceremonies." Zoom Blog, April 7, 2021.
<https://blog.zoom.us/wedfully-zoom-weddings-during-covid-19-future-of-virtual-ceremonies/>.

Sachs, Andrea. "Even If You Can't Travel, Your Zoom Meetings Can." The Washington Post. WP Company, April 15, 2020.
https://www.washingtonpost.com/lifestyle/travel/even-if-you-cant-travel-your-zoom-meetings-can/2020/04/14/d6be8eba-7aab-11ea-a130-df573469f094_story.html.

Shaviro, Steven. "Pavel Curtis." In *Doom Patrols: A Theoretical Fiction About Postmodernism*. New York/London: Serpent's Tail, 1997.

Stone, Allucquère Rosanne. "Split Subjects, Not Atoms; or, How I Fell in Love with My Prosthesis." In *The Cyborg Handbook*, Chris Hables Gray, ed. New York: Routledge Press, 1995, 395.

Stone, Allucquère Rosanne. "Collective Structures." In *The War of Desire and Technology at the Close of the Mechanical Age*. Cambridge and London: The MIT Press, 1995: 38.

Victor, Daniel. "I'm Not a Cat,' Says Lawyer Having Zoom Difficulties." The New York Times. The New York Times, February 9, 2021.

<https://www.nytimes.com/2021/02/09/style/cat-lawyer-zoom.html>.

"Virtual Experiences." Wildlife Discovery Center Virtual Experiences | Lake Forest Parks & Recreation. Accessed November 24, 2021.

<https://lfparksandrec.com/wildlife-discovery-center-virtual-experiences>.

"When You Don't Want to Be a Cat: How to Use (and Remove) Meeting Filters." Zoom Blog, March 10, 2021. <https://blog.zoom.us/how-to-use-remove-meeting-filters/>.

"You Have No Authority Here Jackie Weaver, Handforth Parish Council Classic T-Shirt." Redbubble. Accessed November 24, 2021.

<https://www.redbubble.com/i/t-shirt/You-have-no-authority-here-Jackie-Weaver-Handforth-Parish-Council-by-memeasaurus/70039281.WFLAH.XYZ>.

"Zoom in Definition & Meaning." Dictionary.com. Dictionary.com. Accessed November 24, 2021. <https://www.dictionary.com/browse/zoom--in>.

"Zoom Suspends Account of US-Based Chinese Activists after Tiananmen Meeting." BBC News. BBC, June 11, 2020. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-53003688>.