

# Reflective Responses

Due in Canvas by class time, Word document  
1 point each

These are reflective summaries that you will complete for readings this semester to help scaffold you into major assignments. They are **at least 200** words long (although they may be longer to fully answer the question), and they are graded on completion (e.g., full points for completing all parts, no points for not turning one in or missing parts, or not answering all of the questions in the structured responses). Most will be free responses, although you will have structured responses due **August 31, October 12, October 19, November 9, and November 14** (Questions on the syllabus and below)

They include:

1. An end of paper reference.
2. The claim/argument/thesis of the paper in your own words.
  - a. Remember that claims are (1) arguable, (2) specific, (3) backed by evidence and (4) all points in the paper go back to the main claim.
  - b. Sometimes authors will have multiple claims; focus on the claims that will be the most useful for your major assignments.
- 3a. On some days, you will have “free responses,” where you will respond to the reading by:
  - a. Reflecting on your own experiences. Examples include thinking about how your own experiences align with what the author has said or thinking about how your experiences add to or complicate what the author has said. Be specific.
  - b. Thinking about how the author might “talk” to one of the other authors that we read this semester. Examples would broadly follow the format: “Author A says X. Author B says Y. Y adds to/complicates X in Z ways.”
  - c. Explicitly outlining how you can apply what we read to your upcoming major assignments. I have intentionally included readings throughout this course that offer frameworks for analysis and application. You can (and should!) use these as places to start writing your major papers. How do the frameworks or claims from our readings apply to the interfaces that you will analyze or that you are building?
- 3b. On other days, you will have “structured responses” where you will respond to specific questions. These will be noted in the syllabus, and I have included the list structured responses, due dates, and questions below here. These responses should also be at least 200 words long, although you might exceed the word limit to fully answer all of the questions.

## Structured Responses:

### Wednesday, August 31

- **Response to:** Sasha Costanza-Chock (2020). *Design Justice*. [Introduction](#) and Sasha Costanza-Chock (2020). *Design Justice*, and Chapter 1 [Design Values: Hard Coding Liberation](#)
- **Questions:** What are [affordances](#), disaffordances, and dysaffordances? What is the difference between [intention and impact](#)? What is [discriminatory design](#)?

### Wednesday, October 12

- **Response to:** Costanza-Chock (2020). *Design Justice*. Chapter 3: [Design Narratives: From TXT Mob to Twitter](#)
- **Questions:** Define [scoping and framing](#), and please briefly outline the issues that Costanza-Chock identifies with “problem framing.” Define “asset-based” approaches versus “deficit-based” approaches. In your own words, what was the issue with the Gates Foundations’ toilets, according to Costanza-Chock?

### Wednesday, October 19

- **Response to:** Costanza-Chock (2020). *Design Justice*. Chapter 1 [Design Values: Hard Coding Liberation](#) (Read from “[Related Approaches: Value Sensitive Design, Universal Design, and Inclusive Design](#)” to the end of the chapter.)
- **Question:** What are the tensions between [Design Justice and related approaches](#), according to Costanza-Chock? How will you navigate these tensions when you design your interfaces?

### Wednesday, November 9

- **Response to:** Sasha Costanza-Chock (2020). *Design Justice*. Chapter 2 [Design Practices: “Nothing About Us without Us”](#)
- **Questions:** Why is the unmarked user a problem? What are “[Stand-in users](#)” and “[user personas](#)” and why does Costanza-Chock say they are a problem? In your own words, please explain the phrase “Nothing About Us without us.”

### Wednesday, November 14

- **Response to:** Anna Everett (2016). “Toward a Theory of the Egalitarian Technosphere: How Wide is the Digital Divide?” (PDF in Canvas).
- **Questions:** First, how is Everett complicating simple ideas about the digital divide? You might usefully answer that question in light of Costanza-Chock’s points about an asset-based approach and a deficit-based approach. Who was imagined to be deficient and how? Or you can think about Costanza-Chock’s point about having “unmarked” or stand-in users. Second, I would like you to think about your own interface; *how* do you imagine that people will use your interface and for what purposes, and can you imagine how people might use your interface in other ways?