**Stage 1:**

Given the technology under consideration, determine the following:

1. What is the point of contact between the human and this specific technology: physical, cognitive, or contextual? What is the evidence for this conclusion?
2. What is the type of relation between the human and this specific technology? What is the evidence for this conclusion?
3. What type of influence does this specific technology seem to impose on the human user: coercive, decisive, persuasive, or seductive? What is the evidence for this conclusion?

**Stage 2:**

Given the technology under consideration, determine the following:

1. Does the technology promote at least one type of desirable human relationship or behavior? If yes, what is that relationship or behavior and why/how does the technology promote it?
2. Does the technology impede at least one type of desirable human relationship or behavior? If yes, what is that relationship or behavior and why/how does the technology impede it?
3. To what extent do you think the designers intentionally or unintentionally designed the technology to promote or impede these relationships and behaviors? Do you think they would make any changes to the technology if you explained your analysis to them? Why or why not?
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|  |
| --- |
| **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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