In America calling, Claude Fisher discusses the different models for how technology and society might shape one another. Since technologies can mean other things for different users and can take on various forms as it’s implications. Fishers introduce the user heuristic concept, which emphasizes the users rather than the technology’s imperative properties. However, I don’t think there’s a difference between adapting technology into our lives versus adapting our life to technology. Fisher’s view that: “the ability to choose of end-users of technology governs the power that they shape not only what they do with the technology, but the final forms a technology will take.” is solely based on the assumption that users have free will over choosing how we want to interact with such technology. Still, our understanding of what we wish to adopt is pre-determined by the amount of information we can attain.

In that sense, Fisher acknowledges that there can be a humiliation, or a deprivation when somebody lacks a material item that has become so culturally essential. There can also be some social status issues, such as exclusion from shared experiences. In my opinion, these limited choices indicate that as individual users, we don’t have the power or agency to shape or decide technology the way that the user heretic theory has suggested. Users are constrained by their skills and ability to adapt and by the distribution systems. In other words, technology is an aggregate structure that even users adapt to them within circumstances; in some cases, technology still leaves us, as Fisher eventually puts it, little choice at all.