Cullen Lawson
01027198
3/26/2023
CYSE 201S

Reflection 3

The concept of what mass collection of data means doesn't seem like a big deal. Indeed, it's a very natural phenomenon to categorize information, and to collect vast quantities of it as a means of understanding. After some deliberation, and the consideration of what all these things mean, socially, I think I see what the point of all of this might be. Data science in cyberspace is a double edged sword; It provides, takes, presents, removes, encourages, and discourages, all at the same time. What data science fails to take into account is that everyone is an individual in their own right. Even so, in spite of this, it still makes some correct presumptions. It's how willing you are to trust data, that is how it gets you.

Data science seeks to improve; it's collection of data as a means of understanding where the faults lie, where the improvements can be made, and where the business can grow, at its base level. But what does this good mean? To whom is it good? The answer is, really, anybody. The idea of business is the creation of goods and services as a means of generating wealth, and should a business do well, wealth is created. Workers have access to this wealth, and so it is spread around within the community. Data science also lends itself to education, as well. The thought behind it is that through intense study, you might be able to discover better ways to have people retain knowledge from lessons, in ways that are tailor made for someone like them, whoever it may be. Socially, it's an improvement to all that are willing to learn. Perhaps even with the right level of study, you might find a way to make people who don't wish to learn, learn. Even healthcare and crime have places within the collection of science en masse. Healthcare benefits from the understanding of disease and sickness in certain groups, as well as the treatments that might follow for them. Crime itself can be tracked and predicted by means of collection, nabbing those who exist outside the system itself. In cyberspace, the idea is that it is easier to connect people to what it is that they are trying to get to. By connecting all elements of a persons

likes and dislikes, its easier for algorithms to get people to what it is that they want, and in the way that they want it. All these things sound well and good, and yet, data science has a seedy underbelly. As logical as it all is, life itself is sometimes devoid of logic, and you can't count on numbers alone to make decisions.

The fact of the matter is, people are individuals. I don't presume that any two are the same, but I suppose in a world of many billions, it's inevitable that some are going to be rather similar. Even so, in spite of this, you shouldn't judge people based upon data statistics and readings. Insurance companies are always on topic when discussing American life, and they are surely one of the largest patrons of data science. As it goes, if you could study a group of people for common diseases or disabilities that they might acquire, wouldn't you perhaps want to increase costs for coverage of people who are more likely to be sick? Consider someone who might work within a nuclear power facility, with common exposure to radioactive materials. It doesn't make sense to charge them the same as anyone else in terms of insurance related to radioactivity and cancer sickness; they constantly expose themselves to it. While you might say “it's expected of someone in a nuclear power facility to deal with radiation, if you don't like it get another job”. This only applies to jobs, as you see, and doesn't relate to people and their genetics. Nobody chooses who they are born as, nor should they be subject to hereditary disease, but alas, they are nonetheless. It appears as a form of predation for people who already exist as at risk individuals. This continues onward into genetic evolution over time; individuals are born with randomly changed genetics, sometimes, and might therefore no longer be included with those who are subject to such issues. It's a shame, but when you read the data and the data alone, you can't really see the full picture. It might be a good guideline, but it can't be the determining factor by itself, alone, for everything. Just because data informs you that a certain group might be less inclined into learning, or that they are less inclined to get jobs, or more inclined to donate to charity, doesn't mean that everyone from said group is this way. People should be judged on a person to person basis. In terms of cyberspace, the very same thing comes into play, but a little more so. It's easier for people to get

connected with things that are bad for them, and steer people into groups that are inherently harmful to the world at large. Sometimes, the service of making connections can get the wrong people together, and from such unions is hell born.

So these were my thoughts on Data Science, and some of the social implications of it. While it is a good guideline as to some of trends and method of people as a whole, when it comes to individuals, you can't judge them on this alone. People deserve a fair shake and an honest chance, something that which you might not receive from a statistic alone.