**Questions**

1. *Ends*: What kind of humanity does this technology seem to promote? Identify specific relationships or behaviors as evidence for your answer.
2. *Means*:What type of influence does this technology seem to impose on the human user: coercive, decisive, persuasive, or seductive? What is the evidence for this conclusion?

|  |
| --- |
| **Points of Contact** |
| *Point* | *Form* | *Description* |
| To the Hand | Physical  | When humans physically interact with a technological object  |
| Before the Eye | Cognitive | When humans receive or interpret information provided by a technological object  |
| Behind the Back | Contextual | When technology is part of the infrastructure of the human’s environment  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Types of Relations** |
| *Embodiment* | A relation in which the human and technology temporarily “merge” to interact with the world, like a telephone or a microscope |
| *Hermeneutic*  | A relation in which the human interacts with a temporary “merger” of a technology with the world, like an MRI or a metal detector |
| *Alterity*  | A relation in which the human interacts with a technology while the world remains in the background, like an ATM |
| *Background*  | A relation in which technologies are part of the ambient background of human experience, like the humming of a refrigerator or air conditioner |
| *Cyborg* | A relation in which the human and technology permanently “merge” to interact with the world, such as a chip implanted in the brain (the main difference between an embodiment relation and a cyborg relation is the duration and depth of the merger between human and technology) |
| *Immersion* | A relation in which the human interacts with a permanent “merger” of a technology with the world, such as the internet of things and smart assistants (the main difference between a hermeneutic relation and a immersion relation is the duration and depth of the merger between technology and the world) |
| *Augmentation* | A relation in which there is a simultaneous embodiment and hermeneutic relation, such as with Google Glass |
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|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Apparent | Hidden |
| Strong | *Coercive* | *Decisive* |
| Weak | *Persuasive*  | *Seductive* |
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 *Figure 1. Figure 2.*
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