Quiz 2

Gender & Tech

Intersection of gender & tech: 4 different ways in which gender and technology are associated with one another. Familiar with each one of them and examples

1. Tech association with gender: tech as masculine, natural as feminine, that giving rise to other assumptions about how the role of gender plays in our thinking about technology, so if tech is masculine and progress depend on tech then progress suddenly relies on this masculine identity what it is to be a man, etc…but if tech turn out to be bad, and causing the kind of progress we don’t like, like say if your cancer is progressing well and what is natural going back to nature becomes a good thing, suddenly that is feminie
2. Tech reinforcing gender system:

Reinfication -> process of tech reinforcing gender sys

* Pre-existing social context:
* The introduction of a tech into that social context:
* Reification, reproduction, amplification of a new social context in which the seen values from the earlier context are reinforced

Ex: vaccum cleaner, children toys

1. Tech subverting gender stereotypes: mechanization of certain technologies which allow for more equity across different genders. EX: mechanization of airplanes, the pilots needs to have enough upper body strength, with mechanization, everyone can fly a plane.
2. Tech disrupting our very notions of gender itself: distinction between sex and gender, sex is binary, gender -> more fluid, more or less feminine, man who is more feminine….

Why? Gender socially constructive

Gender-> socially constructive

Sex-> natural

However, even notion of sex can be socially constructive, ppl who are born with non-specific sexual organs, that are forced into either male or female by their current medical institutions, good example of scientist, medical scientists, forcing nature to fit preconceived notions that turns out to be socially constructive such as human beings only come in male and female

History of feminism: 1st 2nd and 3rd wave of feminism, the defining characteristics of each one,

Stuck in the shallows: race and gender work very similarly, issues of access of ICT’s across different races, digital divide, how it influences ppl’s future career path, gender and race affect how ppl think about ICT’s in general, not about ppl not having access, but they didn’t want to,

ICT to reduce poverty in India: discussion about 3 main areas where ICT’s might be able to help ppl in developing countries. Familiar with the 3 and examples of each

Generally familiar with the kinds of ICT’s

Solutions of getting around a lack of connectivity-> the person who has a transmitter, village to village, collects data, dumps on the internet, gets response back from village

Tech policies: 4 functions

What it means for an industrialized western country to have a tech policy

Ad hoc : only deal with problem after they rise

The whole point of the 4 functions of tech policy is make what already exist a better a more reflective, more productive and constructive way of doing things

Tech assessment: 5 paradigms ->

Classical tech assessment paradigms why they fail, calling rip dilemma

OTA model defining points of each paradigms and be able to compare and contrast them

OTA paradigms involve stakeholders and an attempt to address the main issues on the colling rip dilemma, and some political legitimacy, that is exported to Europe, where it still lives today, but most of them transformed to a participatory tech assessment paradigms, this tries to involve stakeholders and the members of the public in a more direct way, that give rise to the more extreme the far less popular notion of constructive tech assessment paradigms

Diff kinds of Democracy:

1. Aggregative
2. Representative
3. Constitutional
4. Deliberaty

Many of them are incompatible, when talking about democratizing expertise, or sc and tech policies, you have to be far more specific about what you mean. One guy means aggregative and another means representative

Public tech assessment, perhaps the constructive tech assessment, perspectivism: strong objectivity. Constructive tech assessment. Ex: with a phone, everyone has a different perspective of the phone, but combined together, more objective stronger objectivity description of the problem. That is the result of looking at the difference between trying to justify democratic participation and tech assessment both epistemically and politically (democratically). Ppl having a direct say or participatory say about policies which affect their lives is democratic, therefore automatically good but strong objectivity perspectivism also may clear an epistemic part, the idea is that we’ll have better more rational policies if we include more ppl and therefore more diverse views

General theory of social constructivism-> tech started out to value neutral, and that politics have a strong role to play in technological artifacts, if those are true, society is constructing values embodied in tech then democratizing that process is not just important but impossible, if tech is going to do whatever it’s going to do, then there is no point trying to assess it because you can’t do anything about it. Connect everything we talked about!!!

Technology Assessment Paradigms

1. CLASSICAL TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT PARADIGM

The systematic identification, analysis and evaluation of the potential secondary consequences (whether beneficial or detrimental) of technology in terms of its impacts on social, cultural, political and environmental systems and processes. Technology assessment is intended to provide a neutral, factual input to decision making.

However, two major problems arose. First, the impacts of technology can only very partially be foreseen. Second, it was shown to be more problematic than originally thought to address the issue of impacts impartially; technology assessments did not provide decision makers with neutral, let alone objective, information.

2. OTA PARADIGM

OTA assessments were no longer so much directed at early warning, but at the development of policy alternatives. Three interrelated factors were crucial for the perceived success of such assessments: the committee primacy principle, stakeholder involvement, and quality control of the final reports.

The crucial characteristics of the OTA paradigm can be summarized as in-depth assessments leading to reports that provide a thoroughly informed analysis of a policy area in a scientifically valid, nonpartisan way, providing options for policy development. generated in a process involving stakeholders and tied in particular ways to a legislative client.

3. PUBLIC TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT

In the development of parliamentary technology assessment, not only did the balancing of power between the executive and the legislature play a role, but wider thoughts of the democratic control of technology did as well. There is a widely held feeling that technology assessment is meant to empower democracy in influencing the directions taken in technological development.

One of the most important issues is the role of representation in the democratic process.

4. CONSTRUCTIVE TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT

Early in the history of technology assessment, it became clear that future effects of technology are not easy to forecast, let alone direct. The Collingridge dilemma is often used to refer to the fact that forecasting unknown future effects of technology is difficult, whereas well-developed technology is difficult to direct, because it has become embedded in society. Schot and Rip (this issue) describe constructive technology assessment as a new design practice--which include tools--in which impacts are anticipated, users and other impacted communities are involved from the start, and in an iterative way that contains an element of social learning. This line of thinking led to the idea of constructive technology assessment, an active, positive form of shaping technological development in reaction to the original "early warning" approach.

5. AD HOC