1. **O'Neill uses baseball as an example of a domain that has been "long ruled by the gut". Do you think such domains, like baseball, benefit from predictive models? Are there some domains that you think models should not be applied to? Or if models are already applied to such domains, do you wish they had not been applied? Explain your reasoning with examples.**

I think that domains such as baseball can benefit from predictive models but it depends on circumstance. For example, If a team(team 1) has consecutively won every game in their season went against a team(team 2) that has consecutively lost every game it can be safe to assume the first team would be victorious. But the outcome of the game can be affected by many factors which introduces a margin of error. Like if Team 1's star pitcher is hurt or if Team 2 practiced everyday since their last game in preparation. Prediction models can help guide an algorithm to an assumption but it does not consider the factors that could lead up to it. I most definitely think that predictive models in court and the justice system should be not applied as much as it is. Predictive models sway opinions to convict those without considering their backgrounds or other factors. From the reading, the author detailed how race played a factor in unfair imprisonment or death. This predictive model used was and is detrimental for how justice is perceived.

2. **Based on your experience with social media (or the experiences of your friends/family/others), what models do you think are used in social media? Would you consider these models WMDs? Here are some questions from the chapter to help you form your answer: "...is the model opaque, or even invisible?", "Does the model work against the subject's interests?", "In short, is it unfair?", "Does it damage or destroy lives?", and "...can it scale?" Cite at least one source to support your claims.**

With my expereince with social media, I think that the models used in it would be something like the family meal model the author discussed in the chapter. The algorithm is usually modifying to my own interests and shows me adjacent things to what I like. If I do like it, then it reoccurs in my social meda, if not, it is usually never shown again. I think that the models could be considered WMDs. Though it does not normally work against a subject's interests, the algorithm could show something maybe triggering to an individual which would work against the subject. The model also can damage or destroy lives, like celebrities who are very prevalent on social media are often recommended to everyone on these platforms. An impressionable young child could see a celebrity and become unhealthy obsessed and harm themselves to look or act like them. Described on the Novak Djorkovic Foundation, "Some actors who play roles in teen TV show may dress inappropriately in their free time or on the red carpet contributing to a wrong body image or outward appearance for youngsters"(https://novakdjokovicfoundation.org/influence-of-celebrities-childrens-upbringing/).

3. **What else struck you about this chapter?**

What else struck me about this chapter is the real world applications of these models. I feel like when I am often learning about things in class or reading about them, it can be hard to visualize

them in context. The examples the author presents are clear and helped me easily understand the themes of this chapter. It also helped me understand the weight of what we are learning in this chapter. Seeing the real life implications that these models can cause was very eye opening. In the future I will definitely be looking at the world through more of a model perspective and see how it has affected us as a society.