

Forum:[Hack Forums](#)

Thread: [\[Help\]Let's Talk Camera Specs](#)

Widow's Peak - March 2, 2014, 4:02 pm

I'm looking to get a first professional camera (currently looking at the Nikon D3100 18-55mm f/3.5-5.6).

I want to make a good decision here as it is a lot of money, and I'm going to be taking photography seriously. Since I don't know much about cameras yet aside from basics like aperture, shutter speed, and megapixels, I was looking to get advice on if this is a good camera to get.

I know with computer hardware there are generally different thoughts about brands. Nikon has seemed to be a good brand for me to go with, as I'll be tinkering a lot with settings along the way in order to get the best picture for each scene. With computer hardware, you can sometimes move up a small amount of money to get something that is several magnitudes better. Might this be possible in this scenario?

I should probably also include some stuff about the photos I'm going to be taking as well. I think it will be a lot of nature stuff, some single subject photos i.e a surfboard on a beach or something like that. Also, I may want to do a little bit of video in the future. Thanks for all your consideration and time reading. If anyone knowledgeable can also chat with me via Skype so I can ask some questions, that would be great.

Fox™ - March 2, 2014, 11:35 pm

I went with a Nikon D3200, and it's more expensive than the D3100, but I suggest the step-up. It's worth it. I'd go on and buy a 55-300mm lens separate, instead of the Kit 55-200mm lens that comes stock w/a D3100.

that1guy2112 - March 3, 2014, 5:48 pm

I have a D3100, and am becoming more and more of a serious photographer, and regret my decision.

I've had it for about 3 years now and it did me good in the beginning, but now, I need more of a real camera. For one, go Full Frame if at all possible. A D3100 is a crop sensor camera (DX for Nikon) and something like the D600 or D610 is a Full Frame (or in Nikon's case FX.)

Second, if you think you will be doing video at any point in the future, consider going Canon. They are more known for their video capabilities.

Next, upgrading hardware with a camera take's alot more money than just buying a new graphics card, or RAM. To improve your hardware, either buying the next camera or a better lens could cost hundred's or more realistically, thousands. Lenses make alot more of a difference to your image than your camera. I use my D3100 and a 35mm f/1.8 for everything and have my kit lens packed away and never touch it. My 35mm f1.8 does great to a certain point, but then I want to be creative and I want a wide angle shot. I can instantly tell the difference between a shot with my 35mm vs a rented \$2000 24-70mm f/2.8.

Like I said I've decided in my life to just take the leap and thinking about making an investment in switching to Canon and getting the Canon 5d Mk3 seeing as I'm wanting to get into Wedding Photography and am doing my first wedding in May. If you think your going to be getting serious

with photography. I would have made the investment when I first started rather than wasting my \$800 at the time for the D3100 and 2 lenses.

This is all in my opinion and will vary on who you talk to. I hope this helps even a little.

P.S. I have a photography website if you care to take a look.

<http://www.timothypridmorephotography.com>

Widow's Peak - March 3, 2014, 7:15 pm

(Mar 3, 2014 06:48 PM)that1guy2112 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I have a D3100, and am becoming more and more of a serious photographer, and regret my decision.

I've had it for about 3 years now and it did me good in the beginning, but now, I need more of a real camera. For one, go Full Frame if at all possible. A D3100 is a crop sensor camera (DX for Nikon) and something like the D600 or D610 is a Full Frame (or in Nikon's case FX.)

Second, if you think you will be doing video at any point in the future, consider going Canon. They are more known for their video capabilities.

Next, upgrading hardware with a camera take's alot more money than just buying a new graphics card, or RAM. To improve your hardware, either buying the next camera or a better lens could cost hundred's or more realistically, thousands. Lenses make alot more of a difference to your image than your camera. I use my D3100 and a 35mm f/1.8 for everything and have my kit lens packed away and never touch it. My 35mm f1.8 does great to a certain point, but then I want to be creative and I want a wide angle shot. I can instantly tell the difference between a shot with my 35mm vs a rented \$2000 24-70mm f/2.8.

Like I said I've decided in my life to just take the leap and thinking about making an investment in switching to Canon and getting the Canon 5d Mk3 seeing as I'm wanting to get into Wedding Photography and am doing my first wedding in May. If you think your going to be getting serious with photography. I would have made the investment when I first started rather than wasting my \$800 at the time for the D3100 and 2 lenses.

This is all in my opinion and will vary on who you talk to. I hope this helps even a little.

P.S. I have a photography website if you care to take a look.

<http://www.timothypridmorephotography.com> Thanks for your lengthy response. Were these shot with the D3100? I'm not sure how serious I'll be about getting into photography. It would be mainly a hobby, and also something I might be able to do when I freelance in web design.

Not sure if I'll be able to get the D3100 as it is a little pricey. Maybe I can get the D3100 and a better than stock lens though? I see you said you never use your stock lenses.

(Mar 3, 2014 12:35 AM)Fox™ Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I went with a Nikon D3200, and it's more expensive than the D3100, but I suggest the step-up. It's worth it. I'd go on and buy a 55-300mm lens separate, instead of the Kit 55-200mm lens that comes stock w/a D3100.

Not sure if I'm able to afford that. Is it really that much better than the D3100?

that1guy2112 - March 3, 2014, 7:42 pm

(Mar 3, 2014 08:15 PM)Dr. Gregory House Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Thanks for your lengthy response. Were these shot with the D3100? I'm not sure how serious I'll be about getting into photography. It would be mainly a hobby, and also something I might be able to do when I freelance in web design.

Not sure if I'll be able to get the D3100 as it is a little pricey. Maybe I can get the D3100 and a better

than stock lens though? I see you said you never use your stock lenses.

Not sure if I'm able to afford that. Is it really that much better than the D3100?

All my pictures have been with my D3100 and mainly with a 35mm f/1.8. I love this lens and yes I have never used my kit lens. I have a 55-200mm lens, which I never have a use for. I like taking wide angle shots of everything and don't have a need for a telephoto lens.

Bass_Drop - March 4, 2014, 4:17 am

Nikon is gay.

If you're going for something near professional, everyone knows you should go for Canon.

If you're going for the overkill beyond professional, you use Hasselblad, so what's the deal with everyone having Nikon

Castro. - March 4, 2014, 3:53 pm

(Mar 4, 2014 05:17 AM)Bass_Drop Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Nikon is gay.

If you're going for something near professional, everyone knows you should go for Canon.

If you're going for the overkill beyond professional, you use Hasselblad, so what's the deal with everyone having Nikon

This just sounds ignorant. I'm bout to get my first camera and from what I've read, Nikon has better and sharper image quality than Canon.

OP I'm in the same position as you, I'm planning on getting a Nikon D5100

that1guy2112 - March 4, 2014, 5:00 pm

(Mar 4, 2014 05:17 AM)Bass_Drop Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Nikon is gay.

If you're going for something near professional, everyone knows you should go for Canon.

If you're going for the overkill beyond professional, you use Hasselblad, so what's the deal with everyone having Nikon

Ignorance is right. Nikon is known for better low light processing, less noise at higher ISO. Canon is known for it's video capabilities. They both have strengths and weaknessess. Go with your preference.