We will get turned in just a minute. I'm single, close my window because I realize republican against street noise. We will get started in just a minute. I will just wait for everyone else. Okay. I think we'll go ahead and get started. Welcome back to class everyone. I hope you all had a good lung. We get today we are going to be talking about ICTs and social interactions. But before we get the material for today, I want to share a couple of announcements with you. The first thing, which is not something that's on the slide, but about your reflection essays. I just want to let you all know that the TAs are marking your essence right now. The idea is that they will get the grades and the comments back to me by the weekends and I wouldn't be able to put them up for our class on Monday. So you should have several days to sort of read the feedback and take it in and talk to me about it if you want before your next as these are d here, second essays or do not this Friday, but next Friday, I believe the 29th of May. The dates up on Moodle and on their syllabus. So to recap that, you should get your grades back for the reflection essays before our class on Monday, and then have a few days to take in the comments before your next essay is due at the end of next year. So grades are not a yes, but they should be up within the next few days for your first essays, when you get the feedback, it will be posted as a comment on a mole. So you'll be able to go to the assignment submission on Moodle and look at the feedback. Once it's there, you will get a grade for each of the categories on the rubric. So you'll be able to refer back to the rubric and see sort of which, which general category you're in for that particular component of the assignment. And you will also get sort of a paragraph of general comments from THE I've asked him to be as specific and as constructive as possible. So to give you, not give you general feedback, like you had some grammar errors, but to give you a specific Pointer to at least one example within your essay ever place where you had a certain type of error? And also to be as constructive as possible and to try and give you tips on ways in which you can improve for the next time around. So look for that feedback within minutes to days. If you have questions about it, please contact me. Please don't contact the tiers directly if something is unclear or if you want more feedback about something. Or as always, if you have a sort of an idea for an essay and you want to run it bindings first, you're free to do that. After you get your feedback for this first essay. I'm happy to talk to people if you have additional questions. So that's for the essays. Other two announcements relate to the other two major assignments for the course, which is the information that is on this slide. So first I wanted to give you a little more detail about the quiz, which is going to happen two weeks from today on Wednesday, June third. So we are not going to have the class on that day. So there's no new assigned readings for that day and we are not going to meet for a lecture on that day. Instead, you will have this take-home quiz to rate. I'm going to give you 24 hours to complete it. I want to be very clear that I did not expect you to spend all of that tonight. We're anywhere near all of that time actually writing the quiz. The quiz will be designed to make you about an hour and a half to rate maybe two hours, maybe a little bit longer than that. It seems sort of generally take more time with writing. But if we were running this class under normal circumstances, you would be doing it during class time and I would not expect you to take all of the class time rate. So you'll have 24 hours to do it. That's solely to allow people to be flexible with their schedules. It's not because I want you to send a full day working on this thing. Please don't spend that much time on it. It will cover all of the course material from the very beginning of the class until June first though until the Monday class right before the test. And it will be an open book quizzes. So you will be allowed to refer to any notes that you've taken during class. You will be allowed to look at the readings themselves that are on Moodle. Any slides that I posted, and also the recordings of these lectures. You can look at all of that stuff while you do the quiz If you want to. The only thing is I don't want you to do or to talk to each other about your answers when you're writing the quiz. So this should be an individual assignments and I don't want you to look up other material online while you're doing this, this is not there. There will be written questions that have essay style questions that these are absolutely not research as they, as I absolutely do not want you to refer to anything other than the course material when you're talking about this stuff. So yeah, there will be ethnic style question. I'll, I'll give you more and more detailed picture of what types of questions will be on the quiz. Limit gate gift that, the clothes that I haven't written it yet, so I don't know exactly what's going to be on it, but yeah, there will be a quick couple of ethnic style questions. In essence, will not be as long as your reflection essays will be shorter than that. But there will be a couple of questions that are ethnic style in that I will ask them to write a couple of paragraphs that give me your organized opinion about something or that I wish you compare and contrast different ideas or something like that. There will also be other types of questions. And given that it's an open book tests, you're not going to have a sort of trivial, kind of multiple choice or fill in the blank questions that you could answer just by looking at the slide. The questions will be a bit more complex than that, but sort of a compromise that you get with an open book quizzes, but they won't entirely BY FA questions. There will be some different types of things. There will not be a time limit other than the 24-hour time limits, so you can spend as much time on it as you want. I just want to make it very clear to people that I don't expect you to send more than 1.5 or two hours doing this. But the idea, the reason why we don't need Stern class that day is that I I expect the people we'll have that time set aside, hopefully or they'll at least have a timespan somewhere in that 24-hour period that die you can use to write the test, but know there will be a time limit that's more specific than the 24 hours. In fact, and I haven't quite figured out how I'm going to run it with Moodle. It may just be that I will open up an assignment submission likes the reflection essay is. And you'll just need to submit a PDF or a Word document sometime within the 24-hour period. But I will decide all of this and then tell you in advance of the quiz for sure. But that's the general idea of what you can excite. There'll be an open-book quiz. You just need to do it by yourself and not with a classmate. You should not be reframed to anything other than the stuff that I've listed here. You'll have 24 hours to do it and we won't have class on that day. The other thing that I want to briefly mentioned, and this is sort of going to be less detail than the quiz Libin who's also farther away. But I wanted to give you some idea about what to expect from the final projects. One more question about the cliffs first. Before I do that for the essay questions, do you need to cite? No, you don't need to use formal citations because again, these are not going to be formal essays. And they're not going to be as long as you're reflection essays, I've, I'm expecting the same type of responses that I would expect if this was a test that you are writing in class. So I will give you a little more clarification on that. But, you know, definitely did not have to use formal citations. There may be some cases where it will be important to indicate which texts you're talking about. But you don't need to do that in a formal way with parentheses with the author's name and the date in a footnote or anything like that. Okay. Final projects. So again, I will give you a lot more detail about this. This is just to give you a general heads-up. I will be putting together a sort of a full set of assignment guidelines that are rubric like I did for the essays about the final project. And I will give that to you and posted on Moodle and we'll talk about it during class. So this is not a complete description by any means. It's just to let you know what's coming. Because of the quiz covers sort of about two-thirds of the course material, but it does not cover our final three or four classes. The final project will be sort of more focused on those last few classes, not as directly as the quizzes focused on the previous material. It'll be quite a bit more open. But for the final project, in broad terms, I'm going to ask you to redesign an existing technology with particular parameters in mind. And those parameters will be related to the material that we will cover towards the end of the course. The format that I'm suggesting for the final project is for you to create a five minute video that tells me about your theoretically redesigns technology. No one I think video. I again want to be clear that I don't, you don't need super splitted video editing skills to do well on this assignment. Your video can be like an animated PowerPoint presentation. That's completely fine. But I wanted to give people a chance to create a video as kind of a break from the writing assignments that are generally the assignments that make up most of the rest of this class. So again, I'm gonna give you a lot more information about this next week, or hopefully next week, but definitely well before I expect you to start working on it in broad terms, the assignment is going to be for you to create a sphere, radical redesign of a technology along particular parameters. But I will tell you when I give you the more detailed version of his name. And then create a video or sort of a powerpoint presentation, some kind of visual presentation of what your redesign is. My default assumption is that you'll be doing this alone. If you would prefer to work with a partner, you're welcome to do that for the final project partners only. So no groups that are larger than that. You can do this by yourself where you can do it with one other person. It's frankly not a large enough assignment. She sort of require more people's works in that. So if you want to do it with someone else, you can. You are also very welcome to do it by yourself. I saw a question from in, can we have closed captions for the video? Or must we require voices? You can use closed captioning. You don't have to record your voice. Yeah, that's fine. Yeah. So like I said, I will give you more information about this as, as we sort of start to cover that course material and that sort of beak, it's closer. But this is in general terms what you can accent. I don't expect you to start working on this yet. We haven't covered the course material that's most relevant to that part. Yet there will be sort of a limited amount of research involved in the, I won't even think research really. You'll have to seek information that is not from the course directly. For the final project, it won't be an enormous amount. And other other questions right now, I know you talked about the project. I admit I still have more details to give you and I will, but questions about the stuff that I have told you so far about the quiz or the project or the essays, I suppose. Wait a minute, in case people are reading stuff. Yeah, so for the quiz, I will give you a little bit more information next week in terms of format and types of questions to expect for the final project, I will give you a lot more information in the form of a sort of more formal assignment guidelines and rubric like You gotta be okay. No, doesn't seem like there are other questions about this right now. So I think that I will move on for the time being and we can come back to this later if you need to. Okay, so we're going to talk about IPT than social interactions today. So this class is, again, I know I said this last week too about the fact that we are focusing on computing technologies and ICT's in particular, And that last week was a kind of turning point for the course. This week or this lesson is also a kind of turning points for the course because we are moving from sort of very general topics, more defined topics that we're moving towards kind of issue areas rather than kind of generally larger problems are larger, like basic types of information. So the stuff that we've talked about for the first three or four classes. The idea of defining technology, the idea of technologies being political and being value laden. The idea of there being this thing called Computer Ethics that might work in certain ways or might open up new kinds of territory for us. And even the questions that Peter Denning's brought up, although we didn't talk about them very much, String class about sort of computer science as a field and the identity of computer scientists. These are all things that we are going to build upon for the rest of the class. But the rest of the class, and you'll see this if you look at the syllabus, sort of looked that particular topic areas, sort of particular sub questions. It's slightly more applied in some cases weren't word. We're building upon this foundation, theoretical foundation that we've set in particular directions. So this class is the first class that is going to be like that. And we're going to follow this kind of pattern for the rest of the semester. We'll be talking about different issues, different sets of questions. And each week we'll be, we'll be using this information that we have established as kind of foundation for the course. So you'll see, we'll talk a little bit more in this class, although it's not a focus about it. Sort of ethical issues that relate to the idea of ICTs and social interactions. In future weeks, we'll talk about ethical questions that relate to AI in particular, or ethical questions that relate to big data. We will talk about different ways in which the sort of value-laden technologies or unintentionally bias technologies can have particular effects. Again, in sort of particularly issue areas are relating to particular questions. So that's kind of where we're headed and we're gonna keep that off today by talking about social interactions. I told him about the ways in which technologies change or mediate or modify our social interactions that are emotional relationships. And there are two main ways that we're going to talk about ICT's in social interactions. The first has to do with the Dana Boyd chapter that you read. The first is that we're going to talk about ways in which technologies can adjust or affect or mediate the interactions and relationships that we have with other people. So we're going to talk about social interactions that we have with other humans through ICT. And there are some questions that are related with that second thing. We're gonna talk about our social interactions and emotional attachments that we have with ICTs themselves. So with actual technologies, and that will be sort of in conjunction with the Sherry Turkle texts. We might come back to them with that a little bit when we have our week on AI and identity two weeks from now. So two things, social interactions and ICTs as they relate to our interactions with other human beings and social interactions of whiskey ICTs themselves. And we're going to take those things one by one. And as usual, I'm going to try and give you a little bit of context for the readings. And we're going to start by talking about that first category queries. So social interactions through ICT's, so ways that we relate to and communicate with other humans and the roles that technologies play in those interactions. So there are a set of an area where there's huge amounts of research on between amount of questions and studies and issues that people have with this sort of broad category of how we relate to each other through technology. How does technology change the way that we relate to each other as people? The ways that we communicate through thousands and thousands of studies that had been done about various aspects of that topics. Dana boys chapter that you read today has obviously a particular focus, that particular stamp line, a particular point of view. I think that her piece gets at a lot of questions that it has kind of broadly been asked within this realm. So to provide a bit of context, I want to talk about some justice questions that are common or sort of delineate different kinds of research and different lines of questioning throughout this broader category of how we relate to each other through technologies or how tech technologies affect our relationships with each other. So that's what these next couple slides are trying to demonstrate. Questions that other people ask and have been asking in this round. And then we'll talk about the inner voice texts particularly. So one very common focus sort of within this subfield, are within this realm is the question of how or whether or not human to human interaction is being changed or hasn't changed due to people's increased use of different information and communication technology. So it has the ways in which we relate to each other have been modified because of the technologies that are now widespread. Related to this is the question about sort of whether people are addicted or can become addicted to online interactions. Or two, use of technologies or just sort of kept technologically mediated social interactions and what the potential consequences of that addiction might be. So this is something that people in all kinds of different academic fields have devoted a lot of research to something that we can find a lot of journalistic pieces about as well. There are lots of different takes on this. The quote that I put up on this slide are just one of those takes there from a philosopher of technology. And just as he picks, who wrote this piece in 2011, somewhat provocatively titled Don't talk to me, that is about widespread use of the iPod. In particular, he takes a quick negative view of BI pile, but he's sort of modify that take a bit later on. He starts off at the very beginning of a piece by calling the iPod One of the pernicious developments of recent technological innovation. He said that the iPod has fostered what seems to be the ideal environment for the social. Salt says, solipsism is basically when you consider yourself to be the most important thing in the world, are sort of the only thing that's worthy of focus. Sort of been extreme version of self-centeredness is what solipsism means. So he starts off by saying that the iPad has fostered this environment where people can be extremely socially focused on themselves. Turn the socially inward, sort of like narcissism. Yeah, it's a similar, a similar idea. So he talks for a while about sort of his observations of other people using iPods and how he has observed that leading to a decrease in face-to-face social interactions and the environment that he works in and other environments that he's familiar with. And then he sort of uses this, his own sort of experiences and observations with iPods and people using iPods to make a broader point on, he says at 1 in the piece that social skills are necessary for one to be a productive member of society. At the end, if you take that argument one step further, social skills are necessary for there to be a productive society. And that today, by which he means 2011 when he was writing this piece, we are experiencing an America in which social skills apparently are not deemed important. So once a week on this one, take them on very many On the question of whether or not interaction between people has changed due to widespread and increased use of information and communication technologies is a different but related set of questions has to do with the quality of relationships that are either maintained online or are somehow technologically mediated. So questions like, is there a difference between a friendship that we might have with someone that we've met online and have never known face to face and someone who we see in person regularly. If there are sort of one of these relationships and quality than the other, debates simply have some kind of different characteristics. Do we form these kinds of relationships in the same ways? Do we maintain them in the same way as what happens to a socially at a time like the one we're living in now. Or the vast majority of our social relationships are taking place online or are technologically mediated in some way, including obviously the classroom experience that we're having right now. So another large set of questions, which I would say a lot of people, including researchers, have experienced a sort of new found interest in, over the past couple of months, having to do with the question of sort of what quality does an online relationship, or a relationship that's maintained through technology has? And what are the qualitative differences between technologically mediated interactions, online interactions, and sort of face to face social situation. A third line of questioning has to do with what researchers might call place-making. This gets at a difference that the researchers in this study that I've cited here highlighted, although it's certainly not a question that's unique to them having to do with the difference between a space and a place. So this is kind of a commonly used way of talking about things in the social sciences.  
  
In particular, And the idea that space can be just sort of any physical or virtual thing that exists. Any kind of space where people might potentially gather or where something might potentially happen. And empty building is a space. A sort of a brand new online social media platform is a space. And spaces can become pleases when they start to have meaning attached to them. So at brand new, empty building might be a space. It might become a place if a family moves into it and makes it a home and attaches specific purposes to different rooms and begins to have some kind of emotional attachment to that place and sort of feeling that established norms about ways in which they use it. So the difference being sort of a space as any kind of maybe empty, unused or people don't think about very much or don't think about in a certain way, as opposed to a place which has meaning attached to it, which is used for something by a particular group, people, where people might have emotional connections to it. It has it history. There's more, more meaning, more meaningfulness attached to a place. So there are questions about how we make online spaces into places. How do we, how do we do place-making online? How do we design socially public places in virtual worlds? There are also other questions, as the sort of first photo on the left here indicates about how we might use ICT is how we might use technologies within physical public places and spaces to form part of their social design. So how do people make places meaningful online? And how do we use technologies to make physical places and spaces meaningful? This was at a whole other set of questions. And finally, I want to talk about social norms. Social norms, of course, this is related to the idea of place-making, related to the idea of establishing the meaning. But again, it's a kind of different things. So there's another sort of line of questioning or set of, set of issues that have open questions about how we create social norms and online spaces. How we create social norms and technologically mediated interactions. How we establish what are acceptable and unacceptable behaviors. So this picture that's on here is a set of zoom ground rules frames. Elementary School zoom classroom. We have a slightly different set of social norms for the way in which we conduct our zoom classes, right? I don't expect you to turn on your video. I don't I don't which room you are zooming from. I don't particularly care whether you chat with each other while I'm talking or, or not. But there are some, some things here that are also part of our kind of established that if social norms for this class, there are social norms for different online environments, right? Reddit has different social norms and Twitter does so. How and why we establish what are acceptable and unacceptable behaviors in different spaces and how those norms may differ between online spaces and physical spaces. Then the, another set of questions that one might ask about how we engage in social interactions with each other through ICT Questions about this before we move on to talking about voice text in particular. One of the things I like about this book and this chapter in particular that I assigned to you is that I think she addresses all of these kind of lines of questioning in different ways. She really gets it a lot of difference, kind of fundamental themes within this broad area of socially interacting through ICTs. And she sums them up, I think, quite succinctly and quite elegantly, which is one of the reasons why I asked you to read this. So the chapter that you read was one chapter from this book that Dana Boyd wrote. Dana Boyd herself is a researcher at Microsoft. She is a founding member of this research group called beta and society that involves a lot of different researchers who do research into the all the kinds of questions that I just outlined and more that go well beyond that. But it's sort of people who were interested in doing, generally speaking, the kind of work that we read in this class in different areas. She is part of a group and sort of one of the curators of a group of people that talk about these things and work on them together. She has an undergraduate degree in computer science. So she was trained originally as a computer scientist. She now does more social scientific research. So that's the kinda stuff that she focused on during her graduate training. And the kind of work that she's doing now is largely socially scientific. This book is based on, if you read the preface that I also posted on Google, you will know some of this already, but this book presents arguments that she developed after doing several years of anthropological research. So she spent several years traveling around the US talking to teenagers mostly about their behaviors online. She interviewed a lot of them. She observed people's actions and online spaces. And she talked to these people who were teenagers again, at the time that she was talking to them about the ways that they interact with people, with their friends, meeting with people that they don't know in online spaces, and the ways in which they kind of create and curate those cases. So she did this research from about 2005 to 2012. So she was talking to people who were teenagers within that frame. And the book was published in 2014, a couple of years after she stopped conducted in her H of U. So this is temporally speaking, the contexts that she's writing from. Not quite today's context, but not incredibly far removed. And she did, there were several years of research that went into this book. So the types of technologies and the types of online social spaces that she was looking at also changed sort of even within the time that she was conducting the work. So the book came out in 202014. The chapter that you read is one of the final chapters of the book. So she's not presenting a lot of the details of her field work. In this piece, she refers to a couple of teenagers that she spoke with. But she's not giving you an in-depth look at her data. What she's giving you here is a nice summary of what she's learned overall. So she's trying to wrap up her conclusions from this book in a sort of tidy package and give you give us all that big take home message that she's trying to communicate to people. And we'll talk about what exactly that is. So what are the main things that she wants to say? One of her main big arguments may sound trivial to some of you, especially if you have kind of lived this online social life that void is talking about. But one of her main argument is that teams use online tools to create publics that have their own set norms. This is really one thing that she wants to drive home. Teams are using online tools that exist to establish their own public spaces and to establish the social norms of those spaces. That maybe sounds simple, but I want us to delve in a little bit to what she means here. So some of you may be not used to seeing the word public as a plural. Optimum, you talk about the public. We're talking about just one public. The general public of it encompasses pretty much anyone or at least pretty much anyone within a given region or a given place. She's using it in a slightly more specific way. She's just not just talking about everybody. When she talks about public or a public or several publics, what she's talking about are places that are, first of all, accessible and visible. So they are public in the sense that they're not private, they're viewable there, accessible to lots of different people. So anything that you do or published in the space, you can't have the assumption that that will remain for viewing by only a small group of people. These are public spaces in the sense that lots of different people can see what's going on in them and the upper sensing. But she talked about public's our communities, groups that have some kind of connection between the people who are members of them. Groups that have some kind of established social norms. So the first part of what she's saying is that on many teams have sort of taken to, taken to using ICTs, are taken to kinda occupying online spaces in order to create publics that are difficult for them to create in the real world. So in order to create accessible, visible communities that have connections between the members of the community and have their own kind of established social norms. Lots of teams because struggled to find physical places in which they can do these kinds of things and have started to do them online instead. First, sort of part of what she's saying here. Secondly, just like I outlined in the kind of contextual preamble to this, it's very important to Dana Boyd that we think about how social norms work in these spaces and how these social norms are created. She talks about us and how sort of laws and official regulations can provide specific concrete rules for what is and is not acceptable in a particular jurisdiction, in a particular space. Most individual interactions are not shaped by these laws. In particular, they're shaped by social norms. So kind of think of a good example of a social norm. A good example of a social norm in a, in a physical space, in a non online space, would be how close it susceptible to stand to another person when you're talking to them, right? This is a social norm that can be different in different places and cultures. Some people tend to stand closer to others than other people did. Right now, we're living in a time when Coburn 19 has changed the social norm for us, right? The distance apart that you're sort of now expected to stand from one another is different. This is different social norm that's not encoded in law. I'm not sort of a maybe suggested by government authorities, but you're not going to be arrested for violating this particular social norm, but you might be glared at or frowned upon or even spoken to by someone if you violate it. So she talks about the creation of these kinds of social norms and how they shape online interactions as well. So the first baseline thing, but she's been teaching these online tools to create publics. By publics means places that are accessible and visible, places that incorporate communities, groups that have connections between the numbers of them and have their own social norms that shape what constitutes acceptable behavior with a nice place. Second baseline point that she wants to make, that these online publics, these digital worlds, should count as legitimate public spaces. She really wants her readers to know. And she says in the preface that a lot of this book is directed to the parents and the teachers of these teams that she was talking to, relevant to the teens themselves. Because she would say that the teams themselves already accept the legitimacy of their own public spaces. She wants to convince other people that these digital public, networked publics that she talks about are our public spaces. They're not just places that people are going to try and escape their real lives. They are real lives. Real lives are being lived. Real social lives are occurring in new spaces that teams are creating a inhabiting. So she talks about Second Life, I think at some point in this chapter, contrary to a kind of popular public discourse about spaces like Second Life, at spaces that people go to to escape and to live a different life than the one that they are living the rest of the time. Dana Boyd is trying to say that these spaces, not just Second Life, but in any kind of online public space, is indeed a legitimate public space and should be considered as such. We should not think of these spaces as places that people go to to escape their normal lives, that places that people go to to continue living and just living in maybe a slightly different way. So in order to kind of expand on these two basic ideas, she coined this term networked public. This is one of her ideas. This is one of the sort of major theoretical contributions of this book is to come up with this term networked public. By that she means a couple of different things. So first, she's using networked in a double sense. She says networked publics are publics that rely on networked technologies. So there needs to be a technological network in place in order for the network public to exist. But they also network people. They also allow people to form those connections that she says are important to make up these public places. So networked publics are publics that both rely on network technologies to exist and also network people into meaningful, imagined communities in new ways. So they are publics that rely on network technologies, and they are publics that create or facilitate social networks, networks among members of these imagined communities. Beyond this, she gives us some characteristics of what a network public is or how a network Public Works. The first one being that relating to a network publics or being a part of a network public indicates again, an interest in being part of a public life, not an interested escaping it. So again, she's calling us back to the idea that these are legitimate public spaces. She invokes the idea of a digital fled. So a planner as someone who's not just a lawyer, who wants to see other people engaging in public activities. Not just an exhibit, exhibitionist who wants other people to see them, but someone who wants to see and be seen in public, you know, someone who wants to experience public life and all these different ways just do it in an online, sort of networked capacity. So one aspect of a networked public is that being part of one means that you were interested in being part of public life, not in trying to escape public life. A second aspect of networked publics is that she says the fact that they are networks, that the fact that these public spaces are online can remake what it means to be public. Now I know I've used the word public too many times that it may be starting to lose meaning for people as, as it is for me. But what she means by this is that people use of digital tools matter as much as the design of those tools do. She illustrates this by talking about an encounter, an interview that she had with a young man who was an active user on both Facebook and Twitter. Boyd assumes that the content that he posted on Twitter would be by its nature, more public facing and less sort of personal because of Twitter default settings, right? Because the Twitters architecture, do you let things terminology because by default, Twitter makes all of your posts public as opposed to Facebook, which theoretically as a default, allows you to restrict the audience of your posts. However, she found that for this team it was actually the opposite. He felt like everyone that he knew was on Facebook. And so when he posted things on Facebook, he posted them with the expectation that many different people in his life would see them. In contrast, he tended to interact with a much smaller group of other users on Twitter. So he would post much more personal things with the knowledge, or at least with the expectation that the things he posted on Twitter would not regularly seen by a large number of people that he would interact with in other ways. So Boyd is pointing here to the power of networked publics and people's use of tools within network publics to establish the norms of a place to sort of decide how their community works. She's saying that people's use of tools matters as much as the architecture of the tools themselves. If in other words, she's disputing, let say to some degree here, right, left, and talks about the power of code and the power of Or to dictate people's behaviors or to regulate people's lives in cyberspace. Boyd is saying, not that architecture doesn't matter at all, but that what's more important is the way that people decide to use something and a set of social norms that are established around a tool. She says This is as important or more important to the creation of a network public than the architecture of the tool itself, which is exactly the point that she's making here. It's gonna probably waited till I got to the slide. She says, in this way, the technical architecture of the system matters less than how users understand their relationship to it and how the public perceives any particular sites. So she's downplaying the de-emphasizing the architecture of a system. She's playing up the importance of how users understand their own relationship to this tool and how the public, and by here she doesn't mean, I think the sort of larger general public, what the kind of public perception of a safe is, the nature of publicness. Preteens ends up depending on how the people around them use available tools, which exactly is what she's trying to, to illustrate them in the story of this one teams use of Facebook and Twitter in particular. The final point she makes about sort of a nature of networked publics or use of networked publics that they can be political. And she does not argue that they are inherently political. Definitely not in the way that On that Langdon Winner uses that terminology. But she's, she's, she's not thinking there's a sort of necessary politics or unnecessary structure of power and authority within networked publics. But she's certainly thing that they could be political, that can be used to political ends and they can become political spaces. Sometimes it's unorthodox wage. So she talks about groups of teams sort of using network public spaces to organize protests. She talks about use of means and uses sort of particular online skillsets to convey very complex and sometimes political messages. And I think part of what she's trying to drive home here is that there is skill required to create networked publics and skill required to engage in them. Something like fluency and means and mean culture is something that Boyd wants to present as a skill. And a skill that is sort of under recognized as such by people who are not themselves involved in networked publics. So she wants to the power of these publics and the packet that people who engage in these spaces are not necessarily just sort of and using them blindly, but they're building skills related to the network public spaces that they engage in. And they can be using one, leveraging those spaces to certain ends, including political animals. So she ends up, she takes up fairly optimistic, a fairly rosy view of these spaces, right? As compared to he's talking about something different. But Compared to someone like Joseph, who we saw talking about iPad, iPod and how they are changing and leading to a country that pleases less emphasis over all on social skills. Boyd is making a very different argument. Boyd wants to point out that teams are resilient and creative, just as they have always been. That they are now sort of repurposing technology to fulfill their desires and goals. That through the use of these technologies and through the engagement in networked publics, the people that she's talked to are imagining new possibilities. They're asserting control over their lives and they are finding ways to be a part of public life rather than kind of running from that. So she's quite optimistic, she's quite, this slide. I have not changed from the face to face person in this class. So I'm not going to have you discuss what you think about the difference. Although I think it's an interesting question, I do want to present you with this quote. Technology makes the struggles youth-based visible, but it neither creates nor prevents harmful things from happening, even if it can be a tool for both. I think what she's really saying here to harken back to our last class, is that networked publics are neither good nor bad, nor are they neutral, right? She's placing so much emphasis on the way in which people use technology, while also acknowledging the kind of power of ICTs and the power of these public spaces to be used for different things or just sort of allow for various possibilities. So she's quite optimistic, but she's not, I think naively so. Here she is making arguments about power and technological system and systems and architectures. These are, as I indicated earlier, somewhat different to the conclusions of some of the other authors that we've read. So if we were in a normal class, I would have us discuss these things. I'm not gonna do that now. I will point out that I think this difference could be an interesting kind of territory to explore in a reflection essay if any of you are interested in doing that. Okay, so we're now going to move on from the point P And we're going to talk about I, Sherry Turkle and her article, or actually also a chapter for a book on Benjamin.  
  
Yeah. You had a question or you wanted to say something before we move on? Yeah. I had a question about the boyd piece. Yeah. She says at some point, I think towards the end. And finally, the internet and social media are magnifying glasses regarding what is wrong with our society. Do you think you could talk a bit about that and how that relates to the rest of what she really meant. Yeah.  
  
If I'm trying to remember exactly what section in the texts that come from. I think my recollection is that it's from the same part where she's talking about protests and politics and new spaces, is that, you know, if that's right. Yeah, I think so. Like she was saying it to to emphasize I think she's emphasizing that people will have a tendency to shut down teens because of this. Yeah, but really we should be looking at and what it shows, what's used to. I didn't really fully understand just what I was asked. Yeah. Sure. Yeah. No, I think you're exactly right. I think this is this is part of her discussion on BY political nature or that potentially political nature of spaces like this. A lot of what she's doing in the book in general, but particularly in that one section of this chapter is trying to point out that on Teams who create and inhabit the space. They're not getting enough credit for the work that they're doing. And some of that work is political, not, not, not all of it is, certainly. But she's not getting enough credit for being engaged in public life. They're not getting enough credit for sort of changing people's ideas of what public life can be. And they're not getting enough credit for sort of taking the world's seriously enough because she, you know, she, she would make, she doesn't think it's argument directly, but she would, I think say that sort of, you know, taking political action through means is still taking political action. And it's still sort of a, an expression of trying to change the world or trying to make a statement at least about something in the world that you don't agree with or could imagine in a different way? So yeah. When she says when he talks about a holding up magnifying glasses to the world, I think part of what she's saying is that people who aren't teams or people who were not themselves engaged in these spaces are ignorance to an important part of public life and an important part of political life that is going on kind of under their noses. And that if they paid more attention to network publics, they would sort of be more educated or be more aware of sort of a different kind of public life, but different kind of political action that's happening around them. Because I'm expense, I guess. I mean, in some sense she's arguing for teams to have kind of a political authority in their own right. She's saying that teams, I can do that. Yeah.  
  
That they they are taking political action and that sometimes that action can result in political authority, but that in general, they're not being sort of granted the political power that they should, that they deserve or they're not sort of not enough attention is being paid to their political actions. Or their political actions are being kind of swept aside or downplayed because they take place in online spaces often. Okay. Thank you. Other questions about boyd Or about these things before we move on? I had a question. Means are still pretty relevant in view this mirror of our society today. I'm sorry, I think we talked about texts and how she mentioned social media can be a mirror on the right. You know, memes today are still relevant, I guess our society today. Yeah.  
  
I'm not quite I heard your question that time. I'm not quite sure that I understand what you're asking. So yeah. So this tense is not that it's like six years old that this book came out, right? So yeah, I think a lot of, even though it's a slightly different social and political and technological contexts that she's writing from them. The one that we're living in today? Yeah.  
  
I think a lot of points that are still accurate. I would I would say that because because of the sort of inevitable passage of time that has occurred since she wrote this. Obviously, the people who were teenagers when she interviewed them are now no longer teenagers. There's a larger group of digital natives that exist in the world. There's a large group of people. Is used to engaging in these kind of network public spaces. So I would imagine that if she was to update this book now, she would want to acknowledge that and not just be reading, but teams as she does explicitly here. But talk about other people who were sort of use to you interacting in these kind of, these kinds of network of public spaces. But I do think that her, her points about political action in particular are still relevant. I'm not sure if that answered your question or not. Feel free to follow up. If I didn't. Well, it's kind of hard to define the question actually, so yeah, feel free to email me about it if you want to talk more later. Other other questions about voice and the placement. Okay, we're gonna move on for now. As always, the label hangout after class that people have more questions. Okay, so we're going to shift gears now. I know that was quick, quick. I never have time in this class to give any of these topics the attention that they deserve. But the nature of a kind of survey class. So I'm sorry to move on right away, but we're gonna switch gears, like I said, and we're going to talk about not our social interactions with other people through ICTs, but instead are social interactions, or maybe to put it in a better way, our emotional relationships with the technologies themselves. So here, as with the idea of human to human interactions that are facilitated through technologies, there's a whole host of different really big questions and an enormous amount of research and writing and thinking that has been done on these topics. So the question of whether we can even form any kind of social or emotional attachment with technologies themselves. And then of course, if we can, how and why did these relationships with these attachments, with these feelings develop? And what might their consequences? Is it healthy for us to have some kind of emotional attachment to a technology or not. Do social or emotional relationship with technologies changed the relationships that we have with other people. Debate changed how we relate to other humans. Do they change even maybe our understanding of what it means to be human or our understanding of what it means to be alive. And then finally, when we move into the realm of truly advanced technologies and social interactions or emotional attachments to very advanced technology. What constitutes ethical treatment of those technologies? How should we be interacting with non-human entities that we have some kind of emotional attachment to. And of course, this is territory that's been very richly explored in the realm of science fiction, right, in lots of different ways, in lots of different forms of media. Also books and television and movies and podcasts. And you can, that you can imagine this is a sort of a favorite topic for science fiction author than science fiction creators to experiment with. What does it mean to be human? How to human beings interact with intelligent non-humans? Or even in some cases, technological systems that aren't true artificial intelligence but are simpler than that. How ought we to interact with these things? How can we imagine some kind of ethical treatment or ethical relationships between humans and non-humans. How can those ethics being manifest or not in laws and other kinds of official regulation. Either very common themes that you all will have seen somehow reflected in some kind of science fiction work. There are also various theoretical treatments of these questions and sort of approaches to trying to answer them or trying to explain relationships are the feelings or the emotional attachments that we have towards technologies, towards non-human entities. One of the uses, the idea of the Uncanny Valley. So if this is again, probably something that lots of you are familiar with, but if you're not, this chart here shows on the x-axis the degree to which something looks like a human. So on the left we have something like an industrial robot that's not human-looking at all. And on the far right of the axis, and we have sort of a healthy human person. The y-axis is sort of our level of comfort or the degree of familiarity that we feel toward something. So in general, the more human looking something is, the more comfortable we are with it, unless it is very human-looking. But there's something about it that's not quite realistic or not quite right, or it doesn't move in a realistic way, or there's something about it that's just weird. That's where you get to this sharp dip in the graph, which is the part that is called the Uncanny Valley. So in general, when we talk about the Uncanny Valley, we talk about this space where something is sort of very human-like or very realistic, but there's something that's just off about it. And that's something that often makes us very uncomfortable or very sort of makes it very unfamiliar to us. So these are, these are some ideas that we might return to during our week on AI to some degree. And they're not really in particular the kinds of ideas that Sherry Turkle is concerned with in this piece. She is certainly talking about emotional attachment to technologies. But she's not talking about technologies that are super advanced, right? She's not talking about amazing AI systems, it's actually, it's not talking about AI at all. She's talking about the ways that we can become emotionally attached. Too much simpler technologies. So the reading that I had, you look at it from her is again one chapter from a book that she wrote. In her case, it's slightly older than the Dana Boyd piece. Her book was from 2011. The book is called Alone Together. Why we expect more from technology and less from each other. And one thing that she's interested in doing throughout the book, isn't it telling a kind of a story of change over time? About how over just a couple of decades she sees the people who haven't become sort of more emotionally attached to technologies. And she identifies this really quite profound way that she thinks are thinking has shifted about how we relate to technology is versus how we relate to other people. So this is the thing that she's covering in the whole book. Sherry Turkle isn't MIT professors. She's a sociologist for the most part. She also does some other sorts of humanities based research around technologies. And she's written on lots of other topics. But this particular book of hers, it's quite well-known and very widely cited. So as I said in his chapter that you read, she's not talking about advanced AI. She's actually not talking about AI at all. She's talking about a relatively simple social robot, the Fermi. Here's a picture of Furby for entity who have not seen one before. Little bit of background about for me. They were first released in 1998. And if you were not alive in 1998, or if you were very young, Let me tell you, people were crazy about for bees. That year.  
  
At Christmas in 1998, the Furby was sort of b goto toy. It's sold out all over the place. Parents went nuts trying to get reviews for their kids. You couldn't buy them anywhere. People were crazy for this toy. They sold about 40 million units of these Fermi's of 40 million firms in the first three years, but they were available since then. I think you can still buy them. They're obviously not nearly as popular now, but they'd have new, new designs for fermions and they looked different than they do different things, and there are various iterations of them. Uh, one thing that's very important to note for our understanding of this piece in particular is that the Furby design that she was talking about at the time, the first one that was available in the one that I remained available for years after. That is not an AI system. This is not the movement can learn. It doesn't even have the capacity to hear. For bees do not in fact, learn a language as their sort of child owners teach it to them. They are instead preprogrammed to sort of change their speech patterns at a certain pace. So they start off when you buy them speaking quote, unquote language called forbid, sort of a series of squeaks spends nonsensical words and things like that. And the Furby will eventually, over time, start to speak whatever language it has been programmed to start to speak. So english in the cases that Sherry Turkle was looking at it, but different languages in different places. So it's not actually learning, but it's programmed to give young children the impression that it is learning and the impression that the child is teaching. It's for me to speak as the as the for me sort of ages you are you need to care for a Furby. In some ways, it doesn't have sort of some sensors in it. So sort of like a Tamagotchi. If you're familiar with those in which Turkle also mentioned, you need to, quote unquote, feed the Furby at certain times, it needs to sleep at certain times. You need to do certain things to it so that it remains happy. Also important to understanding her story is that once you take out a forbids batteries, if you remove the batteries from the bottom of the toy, it loses all kind of progress that it sort of loses all of the experiences, experiences that it has had since the child started playing with it and gets reset back to the beginning. So if you take the batteries out and put new batteries back in, the Furby loses its quote, unquote memory. It will go back to sort of only speaking for Biche. And we'll sort of again started the slow track of making it seem like it's learning a language or making it seem like it's progressing in certain ways. So a lot of shared turtles piece is devoted, at least the first Bitter. So it's devoted to describing her observations of children playing with these toys. She crude sort of created a number of scenarios where she would watch kids play with them. She would bring in sort of focus groups of children or she would watch it and go to schools or the carrier then give them for abuse to play with and watch how they interacted with it. She would sometimes give a child's family affirmed me to take home for two weeks and asked the parents and the child together to keep a kind of Fermi diary to talk about the child's relationship with the Furby and the way in which the child is playing with it. And she describes this sort of very strong and great particular emotional attachment that children were able to form with these toys, often very quickly, right? Sometimes within an hour or so among sort of a group of kids playing with it. But she also described the difference between the kind of attachment that children felt to any toy, like a doll or a teddy bear or something. And the particular kind of attachment that came with a Fermi or some other toy that needed feedback, that needed some kind of care, that needed action on the part of the of the well, she described this as a kind of engaged relationship as opposed to a simply attached relationship that you might have with a doll or some other kind of inert toy. And the children had a sense that this Fermi needed them, that it could learn from them that they were really engaged in some kind of give-and-take relationship with this Furby. And that changed the sort of emotional bond on the children were able to form with it. She also highlights this kind of interesting hybrid territory that the forgives We're in for the children when it came to whether or not the children saw them as alive or not. So these were generally quite fairly young kids that she was dealing with, I think sort of between the ages of 58 or so, sometimes even younger than that. They were old enough to know that this was not something that was truly alive, right? They knew that it was not a live pet, like a dog or a cat they might have at home. But they nevertheless sort of interpreted it as being alive in some cases, or at least alive enough with the title of triples chapter comes from a live enough because she describes the Furby as being alive enough that it required some kind of alive and up, that the children had some sense of it being sick or dying when there was a problem with a toy, or when the batteries were alive enough that they could perform these sort of intense, engaged emotional bonds with it. And even though it had no actual intelligence, and even though they were aware that it was not a true living thing. So for most of the Tetris, she's talking about children and children's emotional attachment to these toys. And one very interesting section where she does talk about adults and some research that was done on adults also with Fermi. This was not her own research. She describes this experiment that was done by another researcher at MIT, which this researcher discarded as, quote, a Turing test for the heart. Now again, I think probably most of you are familiar with the idea of what a Turing test is, but if it's not a wave If you're not under the quick recap. This was, this is an experiment that was first put forward as a theoretical experiment by Alan Turing, who sort of a foundational Computer Scientist, foundational figure in the field of computer science for determining whether or not a computer was truly an intelligence. And the idea that he put forth was that if you can have a conversation with a computer and the person would not know whether they were talking to a human or a computer. That was the point at which a computer would be considered truly intelligent if it can fool a human being into thinking that it itself was human, or at least sort of will the human enough that they weren't sure, not something like a computer or a human being visited as sort of a theoretical marker of a truly intelligent machine. Nowadays, there are actual Turing test that people run. As a side note, there's a really interesting book called The Most human human that involves, it's a story of this guy is experienced as being one of the, one of the humans servants during a Turing test. Uh, one of the, when they run these actual Turing test, they have computers that are interacting with humans, and they have humans that are interacting with other humans. So that the people who are conducting the test themselves that will of course not know what they're talking to a human or a real prison. So the book is about the history of these Turing testing experiments that misguided attempts to try and figure out how he will best be able to convince the person that he's talking to, but she's a human and not a machine. Not super relevant for this course, but a really interesting book if you're looking for a fun read anyway, that's the material. So this MIT researcher that Turkle, whose work term triple sites, develop what she called a Turing test for the heart. So this was not meant to test whether or not a machine with intelligent or not. It was meant to test the degree of emotional response that a machine could evoke from a human. The test was that she would have her adult human subjects hold each of these three things that you see pictures of upside down for as long as they felt comfortable doing a Barbie doll, which you see on the left, alive juggle, which you see on the right, and a Furby, which you see in the middle. The results of the test, generally speaking, were that people could hold the Barbie doll upside down for him, sort of nonspecific. But long another time, people did not have any emotional qualms about holding a Barbie doll upside-down? They could hope flipped upside down, they could swing it by its hair, they could throw it across the room. They didn't have any kind of emotional response to it. The gerbil people were not comfortable holding upside down, right? The dribble people would hold it upside down. It would squirm and it would chirp, and they turn it back right? Set up pretty much immediately, the Furby was a kind of interesting middle ground, right? People would hold the Furby upside down. And then generally speaking, after about 30 seconds, they would get fairly uncomfortable and they would turn it right side up again because the Furby would start to moan. And most importantly it would start to say, but it, it hurts, but it was in pain. So Turkle writes about this. She describes the fact that again, new for adults taking this test. So they knew they were well aware that the Furby was not real, but they still got very upset. And this is what she's talking about in this quote here. People are surprised by how upset they get in this theatre of distress, and then they get upset that they are upset. Adults come to the upside down test knowing two things, the Furby of the machine and they are not torturers By the end with a whimpering Furby Intel, they are on new ethical terrain. So these adults are very much aware that they're not actually hurting the Furby, that the baby's not really alive, and then it's not feeling any pain at all. They also come into the test with a sense of themselves as not someone who harms people or things, right? Not someone who tortures animals are especially not somebody who tortures other humans. When the Furby starts to cry, went threats to complain that it's in pain. This creates, I think, exactly the kind of new ethical scenario that Deborah Johnson was talking about in the Computer Ethics piece that we talked about last class. This is a kind of ethical scenario that's created by this, again, relatively simple social robotic technology that creates a very ethically complicated situation. And for the people involved, right? They know that they're not actually causing anyone any pain. But there's still extremely uncomfortable being told that something or someone is in pain due to actions that they are taking. So this is, I think a primary example of the kind of new ethical question. But Deborah Johnson is trying to bring up in her piece, a turtle goes on to describe a couple of other different scenarios where the same type of thing is in play. She talks about this baby doll design that was designed to sort of react as realistically as possible to different scenarios. And she describes the ethical choice that the designers of this dollar had to make about what the baby was going to do when it was subjected to situations that would cause pain or harmed or real life baby, whether it was, you know, been a cry and complain or whether it was going to not react. And all Turkle describes the piece, designers end up making the choice to not have the baby reacts at all. It would just shut down if it was subjected to some kind of treatment that would have hurt a real baby that was thrown across the room or something like that. And she describes the kind of conflicted reactions that parents of children who played with this doll had when they would observe their kids doing things to the doll that would cause the dalda shut down, things that the parents knew they would not want their child to do to a real baby that produce no reaction whatsoever for this doll. Again, a kind of new ethical terrain in terms of how we should treat things that are definitely not alive, definitely not human, but with which we nevertheless have some kind of emotional connection. So the overall point that trip was trying to make here is not just about for views are not just about Tamagotchi. They're not just about this doll. She's trying to make a point. And this is a point that she expands on and the other chapters of the book that we as a society, we as humans have shifted the way that we think about other humans. And we've shifted the way we think about our emotional connections to technologies. She's arguing that there's been a change over time and over a relatively short period of time. So she described the change from the 19 eighties and nineties to the mid to late to thousands. When she's researching and writing this A change in the way that we think about our relationships to each other and our relationships to machine. And she characterized the shifts as a change from what she calls the romantic reaction, which characterizes sort of how people thought about human relationships and human machine relationships in the 19 eighties and nineties. And before them to now, or at least the time that she was writing the book, which is what she characterized as the robotic moment. So these are two different terms that characterize two different ways of thinking about human to human relationships and human to machine relationships be earlier. One, what she calls the romantic reaction is this belief that shared understanding develops from shared human experiences. So in other words, there is something special, there's something unique, there's something inevitable about humanity and the human spirit that technology will never be able to fully replicate, no matter how advanced technology becomes. And this is the belief that there's something that necessarily connect human beings, even though we are fallible and we make mistakes and you don't know everything really, you're still going to have a greater connection to another human being than you're going to have to any kind of technology. This is how she characterizes the way that most people thought about humanity and about technology before the 990s are. So what she then describes is this shift into a different way of thinking about relationships. So a shift away from this kind of romantic view about humanity being somehow special in this way that she described. And rather the development of a belief that if machines, if technologies have enough time, enough data machines could develop enough emotional intelligence to become true human companions. And that the imperfection, the fallibility of humanity, could be a liability rather than an asset. So she describes the shift by talking about two conversations, but she had with two teenage boys who at the time to talk to them were around the same age and from the same part of the US and from a similar kind of social class. One conversation that she had in the 19 eighties and another that she had an elite 2 thousand, which she was researching this book. Both conversations with both boys were about their relationships with their fathers and sort of in general how they thought about the relationships that they had with technologies. The boy that she taught to you in the 19 eighties expressed this idea that, yeah, pretty much exactly as she outlined in this description of what the romantic reaction is. That yeah, he didn't always agree with everything that is said and they weren't always going to have the same reaction to things. And yet his father couldn't make mistakes. But there was something that necessarily connected them. There was something necessarily valuable about the human experiences that they share, that kind of shared understanding that they had as humans. And that he would never be able to get the same kind of relationship where the same kind of Council from a machine that he could get from his father. The other conversations Leader, one that triple had with a different boy who was also a teenager at the time in the late two thousands with quite different. This boy, she says, describes a situation that he had been in where he had a crush on a girl at school and the girl had a boyfriend and he didn't know what he should do. He describes talking to his father about it and his disappointment, but his father wasn't able to engage with the question the way that the boy 12, but his father, had what the boy considered to be this kind of outdated concept of masculinity and relationships. And his father gave him what he considered to be bad advice about what you should do in this situation and that he's he instead would have possibly preferred, if such a machine existed, to have asked advice to advanced technology that had the had had access to data that was relevant to his situation. He expresses the idea that maybe, you know, if you could train an AI to have the kind of knowledge and to have some idea of the experiences that teenage boys have been. Maybe that technology would, would be able to give better advice than his father could that maybe he would prefer to go to something like that for counsel. That he would be this kind of imperfect, fallible human who had these outdated ideas about the world, who was never going to be able to relate to him in the way that he wanted. So this is just an example that turtle uses to illustrate this shift. She's not arguing that all teenage boys in the 19 eighties shared the sort of first reaction and all teenage boys in the late 2 thousand shared the second one. But she's using this to describe this shift. She's using the kind of stories about her views and the doll. And then Tamagotchi is to decide the same shift towards a place where we do have some kind of emotional attachment towards technologies. And to a space where maybe some of us or maybe lots of us believed that he could have true companionship with technology at some points, even if we don't have that. Now this is the shift in thinking that she's talking about, that she's characterizing and that she's trying to argue for in this book and in this chapter and pretty particular. So she closes by saying that she doesn't want us to think too much about technological advances or not that she doesn't want us to think about it, but that's not what her story is about. My story of this moment is not so much about advances in technology. Because again, the technologies that she's talking about a particular or not terribly advance rather I call attention to are strong response to the relatively little that sociable robots offer. So even though Furby, they're not offering us a lot in terms of companionship. We are still able to build emotional attachments to them with each new robot. She goes on to say, there is a ramp up in our expectations. I find this vulnerable, a vulnerability I believe not without risk. This is how she closes the chapter. She doesn't expand.  
  
In particular, schizont tell us in great detail what exactly she thinks this risk is? What exactly she thinks these risks are. I think that we could surmise based on her arguments, that she thinks there's a risk in us losing an idea of sort of the uniqueness of humanity. And she thinks that maybe there is a potential danger in us becoming too emotionally attached to technologies, or perhaps more than that in us moving emotional Attachment among ourselves, moving emotional attachment that exists between ourselves and other humans. But she doesn't spell that out for us. This is just what I'm trying to infer based on her for her other words, I'm going to describe the mini assignment for this week and then we can talk with any questions that you have about Turkle. So this mini assignment was inspired by something that a former professor who used to teach this class Did. He used to have his students pick a 24 hour period of time during which they had to interact with all of their technologies, as if it was the year in 1994, meaning that they were only allowed to use their phones to call people on and only when they were at home that they weren't allowed to use a lot of Internet tools that exist today. I find that to be an interesting experiment, but are rather cruel one and a particularly impossible when to implement now. So I'm definitely not asking you to do that, but I am sort of in the spirit of that, which was to try and get people to think about different ways in which they used technologies, particularly in a kind of social and even emotional wave. I'm going to ask you to conduct what I call an ICT, social self-audits. So this mini assignment involves quite a bit of thinking. And then I'm going to ask you to write about one particular part of it. So I don't want you to rate in great detail your answers to all of the questions that I have on this slide. But I do want you to think about all of them. And then I want you to pick one aspect to write about for the actual assignment. So I would like for us to consider your own use of ICT is over a typical 24-hour period. I would like you to think through your daily routine. I would like to think about which information and communication technologies you regularly use, especially now. And I would like you to think about the social or emotional functions that they fulfill. And remember that a single technology can have multiple functions. What do I mean by the social and emotional functions that they fulfill? That's what the next three questions I makes it describes. So I want you to think about ICT's in both of the senses that we've talked about them during class today. How are ICTs involved in your relationships with other people? Consider the different ways in which you feel a sense of community, a sense of belonging, or in-group identity. And think about how technologies play a role in that. And then finally, how do you feel an emotional connection to ice, to the technologies themselves, to ICT themselves. And when I say emotional connection, it doesn't have to be the same kind of emotional connection that Turkle was describing with the verbiage. It could be, you know, could be technology that frustrates you, one that makes you angry, one that gives you hope. Any kind of feeling, any kind of emotion that you had in connection to a technology itself. This is what I would like you to think about. So thinking part first, you might want to kind of write down a list of things or take some point form notes. But you don't have to put all of this on Moodle. I want you to think through it. After you've thought through it, I want you to pick one way in which you were somehow emotionally connected, connected with ICTs. One particular technology or one group of technologies and the kind of social or emotional function that they fulfilled for you. This can be with the technology itself, or it can be an emotional connection with other people or a group or community that is facilitated through technology. Just pick one thing and then describe this connection in one or two paragraphs and post your response on Moodle. So that's what I want you to do today. Not sort of directly engaging with terminology from the readings, but definitely engaging with the kind of ideas that the authors for this week we're talking about. This is what I would like you to do. So any questions about the assignment or about turtle and her arguments? I will go ahead and give you the reading hints for next week and then I can stick around for questions afterwards if people still have them. So last thing for today, reading hints for our next class, or next class is about, it's called ICTs, computer science and gender. We are going to be talking largely about sort of Computer Science identities and how those professional identities can be gendered. You have to assign the readings. And they are both on historical pieces. They are both talking about particular parts of computer science history. And these stories intersect a bit, but they're about different periods of time and different groups of people. The first one is again a chapter from a book. It's a book called recoding gender that is in general about women's participation in computer science during different eras. If cold seeking the perfect programmer. And it tells the story of not the very beginning of computing professions, but soon after that. So sort of a time during the 19 sixties and seventies when the sort of skill set and identity of a computer programmer in particular, what's kinda had not been defined yet and was being defined. So she talks about how, how programming skills were defined by different organizations and people and through different actions over a period of time. And what that skill definition had to do with gender. The second piece has one of my favorite titles of a piece that I assigned for this class, beard, sandals, and other signs of rugged individualism, masculine culture within the computing professions. So Nathan as manner is talking about slightly later period of time, sort of 19 seventies and 19 eighties, but a very different group of people. He's talking about a particular culture of computer, early computer labs within universities. And he was getting, making an argument about, about sort of culture of computing professions and what that culture has to do with gender and gender roles. So we're going to be talking as the first bullet point here says, not with these tests, not about gender technologies per se, but rather about gendered identities within computing professions and Computer Science. I will say both these tests are fairly long, but they're also both fairly straightforward. They're both historical narratives, they're both talking about tongues, stories about groups of computing professionals in different places and times. So they're relatively easy to get through, but they are fairly long. So give yourself some time and think about how the story than these two texts are similar to and different from one another. Again, they're talking about different contexts, but they're not too far removed in terms of time. And then I would like you to think about the connections that these pieces make between professional identities in computer science or in computing professions and the actual creation or design technology. Because we are going to talk a little bit also about technologies and ways in which technologies can be gendered in addition to professional identity. In addition to these two articles, I'm going to post a very short video on Moodle that I would also, it's like five minutes long, so it's not going to be a big on actually even less than that. I think it's about three minutes long. It's not gonna be a big draw on your time. The video will be about gender technologies.  
  
gender technologies. In particular. Write-up engender professional identities, and will help us sort of have a bit of a discussion about that. I will say the video is intentionally quite over the top. It's got a sort of movie trailer guy voice narration. And it's meant to be funny, it doesn't always work, but it does, I think free. I bring up some interesting game example that interesting points. So just watch it and know that it's a little bit overdone. I think enjoyed these two pieces and the stories that they tell. And I look forward to talking next week. So class is done now. If you don't have any questions, you're free to go. Good luck with the mini assignment. If you do have questions, I will stick around and I'm happy to talk to people.