InMECS 25

2. Uluslararası Medya ve Kültürel Çalışmalar Konferansı

"Dijital Dönüşüm ve Etkileşim"

2nd International Media and Cultural Studies Conference

"Digital Transformation and Interaction."

TAM METİN BİLDİRİ KİTABI

FULL-TEXT PROCEEDINGS BOOK

5-6 Kasım 2025 - November 5th - 6th 2025

ISBN: 978-605-74046-6-4

ISBN: 978-605-74046-6-4

© Hasan Kalyoncu Üniversitesi, 2026

Yazışma Adresi
Havalimanı Yolu Üzeri 27410 Şahinbey/GAZİANTEP
Telefon : +90 (342) 211 80 80
Faks : +90 (342) 211 80 81
www.hku.edu.tr - yayin@hku.edu.tr

Onursal Başkan / *Honorary Chair*

Prof. Dr. Gül Rengin KÜÇÜKERDOĞAN

Editörler / *Editors*

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Buket AKDEMİR DİLEK
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Öznur AKYILMAZ

Düzenleme Kurulu / *Organizing Committee*

Prof. Dr. Gül Rengin KÜÇÜKERDOĞAN
Prof. Dr. Bülent KÜÇÜKERDOĞAN
Prof. Dr. Ayhan ERDEM
Doç. Dr. Atiye GÜNER
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Batu DURU
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Bilge KALKAVAN
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Buket AKDEMİR DİLEK
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi M. Fatih EMİNOĞLU
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Öznur AKYILMAZ

Sekretarya Kurulu / *Secretariat Committee*

Arş. Gör. Dr. Ceren BOZ
Arş. Gör. Barış Can ÇAMSARI
Arş. Gör. Leyla TURĞAL
Arş. Gör. Melike ÇELİK
Arş. Gör. Mahmut CERAN

Kapak Tasarım ve Grafik Uygulama /

Cover Design and Graphic Implementation

Ömür Akın Yan

Bilim Kurulu / *Scientific Committee*

Prof. Dr. Alev PARSA / Ege Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Ali KARADOĞAN / Munzur Üniversitesi
Prof. Anđela Jakšić STOJANOVIC / Montenegro Donja Gorica Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Arif Can GÜNGÖR / İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Ayhan ERDEM / Hasan Kalyoncu Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Ayşe Elif EMRE KAYA / Hacı Bayram Veli Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Aytekin CAN / Konya Selçuk Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Bülent KÜÇÜKERDOĞAN / Hasan Kalyoncu Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Deniz YENGİN / Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Doru NITESCU / Romanya UNATC Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Dragan Milinkovic FIMON / Sırbistan Belgrad Sanat Akademisi
Prof. Dr. Elif Asude TUNCA / Kıbrıs Yakın Doğu Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Emine ŞAHİN / Gaziantep Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Fatime Neşe KAPLAN / Marmara Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Gilman Sanem GENÇTÜRK HIZAL / Başkent Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Gül Rengin KÜÇÜKERDOĞAN / Hasan Kalyoncu Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Gülsüm ÇALIŞIR / Gümüşhane Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Hülya ÖNAL / Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Juliane HOUSE / Yunanistan Hellenik Amerikan Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Kujtim ÇAŞHKU/ Arnavutluk Marubi Multimedya Akademisi (AFMM)
Prof. Dr. M. Emre KÖKSALAN / Necmettin Erbakan Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Nalan Deniz BÜKER / İstanbul Arel Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Nezih ORHON / Anadolu Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Nilüfer PEMBECİOĞLU / İstanbul Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Noemi Del BİANCO / İtalya Macerata Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Ovidiu GEORGESCU / Romanya UNATC Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Özge HACIFAZLIOĞLU / UC Berkeley Üniversitesi, ABD
Prof. Dr. Pelin HÜRMERİÇ / Yeditepe Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Vladimir STOJCEVSKI / Macedonia Uluslararası Europa Prima Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Yusuf YURDİGÜL / Atatürk Üniversitesi
Prof. Dr. Zviad DOLİDZE / Gürcistan Devlet Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Gülsün Bozkurt / Nişantaşı Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Juanjo MENA / İspanya Salamanca Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Selin KİRAZ DEMİR / Amasya Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Yelda YANAT BAĞCI / Amasya Üniversitesi
Doç. Dr. Atiye GÜNER / Hasan Kalyoncu Üniversitesi
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Buket AKDEMİR DİLEK / Hasan Kalyoncu Üniversitesi
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Batu DURU / Hasan Kalyoncu Üniversitesi
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Bilge KALKAVAN / Hasan Kalyoncu Üniversitesi
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Erke KESOVA / Hatay Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi İsmail Erim GÜLAÇTI / Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Mehmet Fatih EMİNOĞLU / Hasan Kalyoncu Üniversitesi
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Muhammet DİLEK / Hatay Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Nicolas KHABBAZ / Lübnan Dame de Sion Üniversitesi
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Öznur AKYILMAZ / Hasan Kalyoncu Üniversitesi
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Pınar TINAZ / Fenerbahçe Üniversitesi
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Saadet UĞURLU / İstanbul Medipol Üniversitesi
Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Yeter BERİŞ / Gedik Üniversitesi
Öğr. Gör. Dr. Andreas TRESKE / Bilkent Üniversitesi

İÇİNDEKİLER *INDEX*

KONFERANS HAKKINDA
ABOUT CONFERENCE

AÇILIŞ KONUŞMASI
OPENING SPEECH

KONFERANS PROGRAMI
CONFERENCE PROGRAM

SUNULAN BİLDİRİLERİN TAM METİNLERİ
CONFERENCE BOOK OF PROCEEDINGS

TAM METİN BİLDİRİLER/FULL TEXTS

TEKNOLOJİK DÖNÜŞÜM ÇAĞINDA SANAT VE SANATÇI: YAPAY ZEKÂ İLE ÜRETİLEN İLK KORKU FİLMİ "MR. PUZZLES WANTS YOU TO BE LESS ALIVE" ÖRNEĞİ

Mislina SÖZER
Prof. Dr. Deniz YENGİN **26-36**

TELEVİZYONDAN YOUTUBE'A: DİJİTAL ETKİLEŞİM ÇAĞINDA KADINLAR ARASI REKABETİN FEMİNİST BİR ANALİZİ (GELİN EVİ PROGRAMI ÖRNEĞİ)

Zübeyde Gamze ŞAHİN
Prof. Dr. M. Emre KÖKSALAN **37-52**

DİJİTAL KOLAJLARDA RENKLERİN TİPOGRAFİK OKUNAKLILIK VE OKUNABİLİRLİK ÜZERİNDEN İNCELENMESİ

Doç. Dr. Atiye GÜNER
Yeter Yelda ŞAHANOĞLU **53-64**

DİJİTAL ÇAĞIN TEKNOLOJİLERİNİN İÇ MEKÂNA YANSIMALARI: SANAL MEKANLAR

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Esra Avlanmaz BİLECEN **65-75**

KÜLTÜREL MİRAS HİBRİT SERGİSİNDE DİJİTAL ANLATI (GÖRSEL VE İŞİTSEL) VE ETKİLEŞİM: YERELDEN GLOBALE GAZİANTEP HİKÂYELERİ

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Saadet UĞURLU
Mahmut Cihan TOKER
Osman AYTEKİN
Celalettin AKTAŞ
Yakup YENER
Mehmet SÖNMEZ
Neslihan KARAYILAN
Yeter Yelda ŞAHANOĞLU
Batuhan Sercan AKBAŞ **76-95**

SHORT-FORM VIDEO ALGORITHMS, THE ATTENTION ECONOMY, AND MARKETING OUTCOMES: A PRISMA-BASED SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ibrahim Halil EFENDIOGLU **96-102**

YENİ MEDYA DÖNEMİNDE REKLAMIN DÖNÜŞÜMÜ: KUZEY KIBRIS ÜNİVERSİTELERİ ÜZERİNE KARŞILAŞTIRMALI BİR İNCELEME

Yrd. Doç. Dr. Elif ATAMAZ **103-115**

ROBOT GAZETECİLİK BAĞLAMINDA SOSYAL MEDYADA YAPAY ZEKÂ HABER SPİKERLERİ: ROBOTV MEDIA ÖRNEĞİ

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Melike SEJFULA **116-128**

DİZİLERDE REKLAM VE ALGI YÖNETİMİ İLİŞKİSİ: GASSAL DİZİSİ ÜZERİNE BİR DEĞERLENDİRME

Rabia ÖREN
Prof. Dr. Deniz YENGİN **129-140**

TAM METİN BİLDİRİLER/FULL TEXTS

THE IMPACT OF SOCIAL NETWORKS ON CULTURAL DIPLOMACY AT THE INTERNATIONAL LEVEL: INFLUENCER MARKETING APPROACH

M.Sc, Esma Nur Cerinan OTOVIC **141-146**

EXPLORING THE INTERPLAY BETWEEN PLAYABILITY AND USABILITY IN MOBILE GAMES

Lect. Dr. Kemal SAHIN **147-155**

WOMEN'S DIGITAL LABOR IN THE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES AND SOFTWARE SECTOR

Prof. Dr. And ALGUL
Ayşegül OZKUL **156-163**

DİJİTAL ÇAĞDA YAPAY ZEKÂ İLE YARATICI İŞ BİRLİĞİNDE SANATSAL ÜRETİM MODELLERİ

Arş. Gör. Dr. Ü. Hazal YAYALAR **164-173**

KISA FORM OYUNCULUĞU: SOSYAL MEDYA KISA VİDEOLARINDA OYUN ANLATISININ MİKRO-DRAMATURJİSİ VE ETKİLEŞİM DİNAMİKLERİ

Prof. Dr. Volkan YÜCEL
Ecem BAŞARIR **174-180**

YOUTUBE'DA GAZETECİ KİMLİĞİ VE İZLEYİCİ ETKİLEŞİMİ: 'THE PHILIP DEFRANCO SHOW' ÖRNEĞİ

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Safa Görkem AKTAŞ **181-192**

FUTURISM AND THE NEW WORLD ORDER: A THEMATIC ANALYSIS

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Dilge KODAK **193-206**

DİJİTAL ÇAĞDA HALKLA İLİŞKİLERDE ARAÇSAL ÇOK YÖNLÜLÜK: HİBRİT İLETİŞİM PARADİGMASI BAĞLAMINDA KURAMSAL BİR DEĞERLENDİRME

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Büşra KÜÇÜKCİVİL
Prof. Dr. Murat KOÇYİĞİT **207-214**

HALKLA İLİŞKİLERDE DİJİTAL ETİK FARKINDALIĞININ YÜKSELİŞİ: LİTERATÜR TEMELLİ BİR İNCELEME

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Büşra KÜÇÜKCİVİL
Prof. Dr. Murat KOÇYİĞİT **215-224**

SOĞUK SAVAŞ DÖNEMİNDE ÇEKOSLOVAKYA'DA KOMÜNİZM PROPAGANDASI

Doç. Dr. Mehmet Barış YILMAZ **225-232**

DİJİTAL İLETİŞİMDE İÇERİK GÜVENİ: YOUTUBE KULLANICILARININ GÖRÜŞLERİ

Öğr. Gör. Dr. İrem Ebru YILDIRIM ŞEN **233-242**

InMECS25
2nd International Media and Cultural Studies Conference
"Digital Transformation and Interaction."
November 5th - 6th 2025

FUTURISM AND THE NEW WORLD ORDER: A THEMATIC ANALYSIS

Assoc. Prof. Dr. **Dilge KODAK**
İstanbul Ticaret University, Faculty of Communication, Department of Visual Communication Design
ID: 0000-0001-5587-3886

Abstract

Although Futurism emerged in Italy in the early 20th century (1909–1920) as an artistic movement, it rapidly evolved into a broader social phenomenon. Rooted in the modernity shaped by the Industrial Revolution and Fordist production models, Futurism centered on technological determinism. The artworks of the period emphasized themes such as progress, mechanization, speed, and the singularity of technology, shifting attention from form to content. As a social movement, Futurism adopted an overtly aggressive stance, at times endorsing war and anarchism as radical extensions of innovation. In the 21st century, the relationship between Futurism and technology has expanded significantly, moving beyond the glorification of speed and industrial progress toward questioning how technology reshapes the world. The accelerated pace of technological development now imposes new challenges on politics, governance, and social structures. Contemporary regulatory frameworks seek to balance innovation with security, human rights, public health, and cyber governance. Yet, the global reach and complexity of modern technologies demand governance models that are inclusive, democratic, transparent, and accountable. Historically, Futurism has also been characterized by a predominantly masculine perspective. Following the Information Revolution, however, female futurists began to propose distinctive visions of technological advancement and social transformation. Despite this, contemporary rankings of the world's most influential futurists remain male-dominated, reinforcing gendered patterns in future imaginaries. This study aims to categorize the technological foresight of the most influential female futurists listed in 2025 and to identify areas in which their visions diverge from those of their male counterparts. The research employs a qualitative design using thematic analysis.

Keywords: Futurism, Digital Culture, Thematic Analysis, Technology, Digital Communication

INTRODUCTION

The rapidly evolving socio-technical infrastructures of the digital age have generated a transformative impact that necessitates approaching future imaginaries not solely through narratives of technological progress but through multi-layered cultural, political, and economic dynamics. Developments in fields such as artificial intelligence, biotechnology, platform economies, and data governance have elevated technology from a mere instrument to a powerful actor capable of restructuring social relations. Consequently, futurism has shifted away from modernity's speed- and progress-oriented discourse toward a more pluralistic, critical, and expansive epistemic terrain—one that examines who imagines the future, with which values, and within what configurations of power. The futurist canon has long exhibited a discursive structure dominated by patriarchal understandings, revealing that visions of the future have historically been produced by a limited set of actors. Male-centered narratives have frequently foregrounded themes such as growth, acceleration, innovation, and increased technical capacity, while issues of social inequality, ecological risk, ethical dilemmas, and lines of vulnerability have remained largely peripheral (Nicholls, 1989, pp. 208–211). In contrast, the increasingly prominent perspectives of women futurists over the past two decades have introduced an alternative epistemic orientation—one that conceptualizes the future not as the inevitable outcome of technological innovation but as a multi-layered arena shaped by the intertwining of social, cultural, ecological, and ethical relations. This study seeks to illuminate the epistemic and normative distinctions that emerge between these two modes of futurist discourse. An examination of women futurists' works reveals that the future is conceptualized not as a technical integration problem but as a complex social structure shaped by relational, ecological, and ethical dimensions. Themes such as algorithmic justice, digital rights, data sovereignty, the care economy, the climate crisis, and sustainability lie at the center of women-led futurist discourse. In this approach, technology is neither neutral nor self-propelling; rather, it is a political actor that shapes social norms, power structures, and cultural rhythms (Merjian, 2025). Consequently, progressivist and neutrality-based assumptions about technology are critically interrogated, giving way to alternative

future models grounded in intersectional justice, ecological interconnectedness, and user-centered experiences. In contrast, male futurist discourse—particularly the kind that enjoys substantial media visibility—tends to reproduce the deterministic and techno-centric paradigm that has historically underpinned modern futurism. Themes such as technological singularity, transhumanism, robotic automation, data-driven rationality, and space colonization have become dominant elements of the male futurist repertoire. This discourse often positions technology as an inevitable, linear, and unstoppable force, which results in the marginalization of social context, ethical concerns, and power dynamics. The heightened visibility of male futurist narratives in popular culture thus produces a unilateral and hegemonic answer to the question of "who constructs the future." For this reason, analyzing futurist discourse through a gender lens is critical not only for exposing representational inequalities but also for evaluating the diversity of future models produced by different epistemic orientations. Comparing women and men futurists makes it easier to understand why debates about technological futures frequently remain mono-centric, progressivist, and often reductionist. This study aims to address this gap by conducting a comparative analysis of the discourses produced by the women included in Forbes' 2025 Top 50 Women Futurists list and male futurists with high media visibility.

In this research, the visibility politics of digital culture, discursive production, gender roles, and the distribution of epistemic power were examined through qualitative content analysis, enabling a methodologically coherent exploration of how futurist discourse diverges along gendered lines. The findings indicate that women futurists predominantly emphasize ethical governance, social justice, ecological sustainability, and relational models of the future, whereas male futurist discourse tends to foreground macro-technological, accelerationist, and comparatively decontextualized frameworks. This study therefore centers on explaining why gender must be treated as a fundamental analytical axis, why futurism in the digital age cannot be reduced to a singular technological vision, and why a comparative examination of competing future imaginaries is essential. The methodology section details how the dataset was constructed and the principles guiding the content analysis, while the findings section discusses thematic intensity, discursive differentiation, and normative orientations in depth.

1. The Past and Present of Futurism

The historical trajectory of futurism spans a broad intellectual landscape, evolving from early modernist utopianism shaped by myths of speed, technology, and progress to the multilayered and critical imaginaries of the digital age. Emerging in the early twentieth century, futurism represented more than an artistic movement; it marked a radical cultural rupture that celebrated the dynamism of modernity, the disruptive force of mechanization, and the elevation of speed as an absolute value. Filippo Tommaso Marinetti's 1909 Futurist Manifesto signaled the beginning of a new epistemic era in which the machine was understood not merely as a tool of production but as a force capable of reshaping human imagination. Its vehement rejection of tradition rested on the notion that the modern individual could reinvent themselves by merging with technological acceleration (Marinetti, 2013, pp. 371–374). For futurist ideology, technology was not simply an instrument of production but a transformative power capable of reconstructing humanity's destiny. In this period, war, industrial destruction, and mechanical rhythm became aestheticized components of a new narrative of "modern heroism." Futurist artists sought not only to depict the mechanized society of their time but to establish a realm in which the boundary between human and machine dissolved. Consequently, futurist figures were rendered in states of perpetual motion, speed, and dynamism. In the works of Umberto Boccioni, for instance, the mechanization of the body underscores the idea that the individual must transform their own integrity to adapt to modern technological rhythms—a distinctly aesthetic reflection of futurism's ideological foundations (Re, 1989, p. 254).

The notion of the "new human," endowed with the speed and power afforded by mechanization, was positioned above traditional human conditions. Yet the most striking aspect of this vision is its near-exclusive centering of male experience. This limitation later became a primary point of critique within feminist technology studies, which emphasized that early futurism constructed a narrow future imaginary by excluding women's experiences and broader gender dynamics. The gender blindness of early futurist thought demonstrates the critical importance of asking who imagines the future. It reveals how gender-based exclusions shape knowledge production processes surrounding futurity. For this reason, the emergence of fields such as feminist futurism and speculative feminism can be understood as theoretical interventions aimed at repositioning historically marginalized perspectives at the center of future-oriented discourse.

The digital age has radically transformed the scope of futurist thought. Unlike the mechanical machines of industrial modernity, today's technological environment is grounded in data flows, artificial intelligence, computational power, and biotechnological interventions. This shift signifies that the future is now shaped not only through physical machinery but through algorithms, automation, and information systems (Potts, 2018, p. 114). Artificial intelligence and machine learning have moved to the center of debates concerning the organization of future social orders. Large datasets, predictive algorithms, and autonomous systems are generating new models of decision-making in both economic and socio-political domains. Ray Kurzweil's (2016, pp. 81–88) notion of technological singularity imagines the future as a linear and inevitable trajectory of technological evolution, whereas Donna Haraway's cyborg metaphor approaches human–technology relations through a far more holistic, ecological, and gender-conscious lens. Haraway's (2006, pp. 63–65) posthumanist perspective does not treat technology as a force surpassing humanity; rather, it conceptualizes it as a complex network in which humans, animals, and machines are deeply entangled. This perspective enables an understanding of technological futures not as a single, forward-moving process but as a contradictory, multidirectional, and contextually embedded field. Contemporary digital culture has likewise diversified the scenarios through which the future is imagined. Issues such as AI ethics, data privacy, surveillance capitalism, digital labor, robotic automation, and the climate crisis demonstrate that the technological future is no longer a monolithic utopia or dystopia governed from a single center, but an open arena in which competing—and at times conflicting—models of futurity are produced. This plurality has expanded the range of futurist actors as well: women futurists, queer futurists, Indigenous future imaginaries, and Afrofuturist approaches all emphasize that the future must be conceptualized not solely through technological lenses but through ethical, social, and ecological dimensions as well. To understand the evolving intellectual architecture of futurism in the digital age, conceptual axes such as speed/ethics, utopia/dystopia, and body/technology become central (Schütze, 2024, pp. 2–5). Together, these axes illustrate that technological transformation is not merely a matter of technical progress but also a profound ethical, social, and ontological reconfiguration.

The tension between speed and ethics represents the most visible manifestation of the widening gap between the accelerating pace of innovation and the demands of ethical governance in the digital age. The well-known motto of technological sectors, "move fast and break things," elevates speed as a cultural value while obscuring the fact that what is "broken" is often social relations, ecological balances, and individual rights. Algorithmic biases, data exploitation, and the lack of transparency in AI systems serve as concrete examples of how speed can outpace and undermine ethical regulation. In this context, ethics should not be understood as the opposite of innovation; rather, it is the fundamental condition for constructing futures that are sustainable and just. The utopia/dystopia binary forms another key axis shaping the collective imagination of the digital age. Whereas the mechanical utopias of the twentieth century once dominated futurist thinking, digital culture has witnessed the rise of dark, pervasive dystopias. Productions such as Black Mirror vividly reveal anxieties surrounding technology, the transformation of data into a new form of power, and the entanglement of individual subjectivity with algorithmic systems. Yet dystopias are not merely narratives of fear; they function as theoretical tools that offer critical insights into the social implications of technological change. Conversely, alternative future imaginaries—such as those developed within speculative feminism—remind us that more inclusive, egalitarian, and solidarity-oriented utopias remain possible through technology. The relationship between body and technology has become one of the most prominent debates within futurism due to the rise of digital and biotechnological interventions (Radzikowska et al., 2019, p. 97). While transhumanist approaches advocate transcending the limits of the human body and enhancing biological capacities through technological means, feminist posthuman literature emphasizes that the body is not merely biological but also shaped by social, cultural, and political meanings (Lykke, 2008, pp. 8–13). The gendered nature of the technological body raises questions regarding whom digital prosthetics, artificial organs, and biosensors serve and whom they exclude (Öngören, 2024, pp. 53–57). In this regard, women futurists demonstrate that alternative futures are possible—futures that foreground bodily vulnerability, care relations, and ecological interconnectedness. Taken together, these three conceptual tensions illustrate that futurism in the digital age must be reconsidered not simply as a technical vision but as a domain deeply entangled with social justice, representation, ethical responsibility, and ontological transformation.

2. Futurism Scenarios in Digital Culture

Digital culture offers a multilayered domain in which future imaginaries are shaped not only through technical infrastructures but also through discursive formations, social practices, power relations, and regimes of representati-

on. Digitalization has produced a profound rupture in traditional futurist narratives, demonstrating that technological futures are no longer solely an engineering-based design field but also a cultural, ethical, and political site of struggle. Digital culture generates a powerful discursive space where gender representations intersect with future-oriented imaginaries. Social media platforms, content creators, digital influencer ecosystems, and algorithmic visibility policies constitute critical structures that determine who articulates the future and how it is narrated (Lazer, 2015, pp. 1090–1091). These platforms simultaneously reproduce male-centered norms and enable counter-narratives that enhance the visibility of women futurists. Thus, digital culture embodies a dual dynamic: it both reinforces hegemonic gender codes and remains open to interventions that challenge them. Gender functions not only at the level of representation but also as a constitutive force within algorithmic decision-making processes. Recommendation systems on social media platforms frequently categorize content produced by women under themes such as care labor, emotional labor, or personal aesthetics—making visible how gender hierarchies are recoded within digital data flows. Feminist technology studies place the notion of "algorithmic subjectivity" at the center of this discussion, arguing that the visibility politics of digital platforms regulate much more than the circulation of information; they also shape the epistemic frameworks through which individuals imagine the future (Åsberg, 2010, pp. 5–13). The digital productions of women futurists challenge these one-dimensional mechanisms of visibility and offer alternative models of the future. Themes such as digital equality, data justice, the digitalization of the care economy, online labor exploitation, the gendered impacts of platform capitalism, and digital safety are identified by women futurists as critical sites of intervention in shaping the future (Doutreligne, 2020, pp. 40–42). These perspectives generate transformative potential within digital culture by emphasizing that technological futures must be conceived alongside ethical, emotional, and social dimensions.

Media culture has become a central domain for producing powerful narratives and images about the future, particularly with the rise of digital platforms. Cinema, the gaming industry, digital streaming services, and speculative fiction genres play a critical role in shaping societal perceptions of futurity. These narrative forms reveal that futurist scenarios within digital culture are not merely technical projections but also political, economic, and cultural modes of interpretation. Dystopian narratives have shown a particularly notable rise in the twenty-first century. Productions such as Black Mirror, Years and Years, and Westworld expose the darker dimensions of technology—surveillance, identity fragmentation, algorithmic governance, and data extraction—thereby challenging futurism's progressivist myths. These narratives go beyond articulating anxieties about the future; they illuminate the fragilities of current social structures, the political implications of the data economy, and the emergence of quasi-state forms of power exercised by major technology corporations. In doing so, dystopian discourse demonstrates that technological development does not inherently produce social benefit and may, in some cases, function as a mechanism that deepens inequality (Harari, 2017, pp. 72–77). In this context, the future is no longer imagined solely as the domain of optimistic utopias but as a political terrain marked by social crises, class tensions, and tendencies toward authoritarianism. Speculative feminism offers a critical alternative to this dystopian dominance. The speculative feminist approach reconceptualizes the future not through technological determinism but through the lenses of social justice, queer subjectivity, politics of representation, and the lived experiences of marginalized groups (Martins, 2014). Within this framework, technology is not treated as a neutral tool but as a force continuously shaped by its social context. Speculative feminist narratives argue that the future can be constructed through ethical norms, values, and forms of life that are deliberately made possible (Radzikowska et al., 2019, pp. 98–99). As such, these narratives become imaginative expansions as well as political interventions capable of questioning and transforming existing power relations.

Digital culture extends the construction of identity beyond the physical world, producing a multilayered structure of subjectivity. Digital identity is fragmented, multiple, and platform-dependent; as such, it raises significant theoretical questions about how identity will be understood in the future. Digital subjectivity signals a new form of self shaped by algorithms, platform economies, and models of data governance. Data sovereignty stands at the center of these debates. As individuals' digital traces become the primary input for algorithmic systems, questions concerning who collects this data and how it is governed constitute a structural dimension that will increasingly define future power relations (Hao, 2024). For this reason, futurism in digital culture demonstrates that discussions about the future must encompass not only technological innovations but also issues of data governance, privacy regimes, digital rights, and digital citizenship. The contributions of women futurists in this domain are particularly significant. Feminist digital culture studies, which examine the entanglement of digital identity with gender, argue that future subjectivity can only be built through policies grounded in representation, access, and rights. Thus, debates over digital identity emerge as a critical intersection between gender equality and digital justice. Algorithmic culture constitutes one of the

most defining structural transformations of the digital age. Algorithms are not merely technical codes; they function as cultural and political actors that mediate information flows, determine visibility hierarchies, and shape what users see. Algorithmic culture can therefore be understood as a new infrastructure underpinning the epistemic regime of digital society. Traditional relationships between knowledge production and power are now reorganized through code, data flows, and platform policies (Striphas, 2015, pp. 404–405). Algorithmic governance is essential for understanding the emerging power arrangements of the future. The opaque decision-making processes of digital platforms generate wide-ranging effects—from individual behavior and economic preferences to political orientations and forms of public discourse (Hallinan & Striphas, 2014, p. 121). The data that algorithms collect, process, and prioritize creates a directed experience to which users are often unknowingly subjected. This raises critical concerns regarding democratic participation, freedom of expression, and the quality of the public sphere (Amoore & Piotukh, 2016). Women futurists' interventions in this field are crucial in exposing the gendered dimensions of algorithmic culture. High error rates in facial recognition systems for women—and particularly for Black women—the tendency of digital platform algorithms to steer women toward content related to care labor, or the design of digital voice assistants with default female voices reveal the structural nature of algorithmic bias. For this reason, feminist futurists place principles such as algorithmic justice, transparency, accountability, and data ethics at the core of future governance models.

3. Method

This study employs a qualitative content analysis design to conduct a comparative examination of two datasets: the Top 50 Women Futurists list published by Forbes in 2025 and a selected group of highly visible male futurists with significant media presence. The aim of the research is to identify how futurist discourse diverges along gendered lines, which themes become predominant within each discourse, and what normative frameworks concerning the future are produced within digital culture. Accordingly, the methodological section is structured around four core components: dataset construction, sampling strategy, coding procedures, and analytical approach.

The dataset was assembled from two primary sources:

1. The Forbes 2025 list of 50 women futurists
2. A purposively selected sample of male futurists with high media visibility, broad digital reach, and strong influence on popular futurist narratives.

The women futurists list compiled by Forbes -based on criteria such as global impact, academic contributions, public speaking engagements, digital visibility, and disciplinary expertise- constitutes the study's primary dataset. The male futurist sample, by contrast, was constructed by considering media representation, social media followership, conference activity, and prominence within the futurism literature. Across both datasets, the individuals' websites, talks, articles, books, media commentary, podcast content, and online profiles were examined, generating a substantial textual corpus that captures the conceptual dimensions through which futurist discourse is constructed in digital culture.

The study adopts a maximum variation sampling strategy. In this context, individuals producing futurist work across different fields -including artificial intelligence, data ethics, digital transformation, sustainability, design thinking, economics, media theory, climate science, and biotechnology- were intentionally included. This ensured the preservation of thematic breadth while also providing a balanced structure for gender-based comparison. Additionally, the selection of highly visible male futurists followed a purposive sampling approach, focusing particularly on figures who have achieved global popularity, whose narratives circulate widely, and who maintain a hegemonic position within contemporary technology debates.

Content analysis was conducted using a hybrid coding technique that combined both conceptual and thematic coding. First, an a priori code list was developed based on the existing literature; subsequently, additional codes were generated through emergent coding as new concepts surfaced during the examination of the dataset.

The main coding categories were as follows:

Thematic Foci: Artificial intelligence, ethical governance, sustainability, data justice, body technologies, climate futures, digital citizenship.

Discursive Features: Deterministic/reductionist discourse, critical/ethics-oriented discourse, speculative discourse, techno-solutionism, emphasis on social justice.

Impact Dimensions: Media visibility, digital engagement, academic output, political influence, sectoral leadership.

Future Models: Transhumanist, posthuman, ecofeminist, singularity-oriented, data-driven, community-based.

The coding procedure was carried out in two stages:

1. Open coding, through which conceptual clusters were identified; and

2. Axial coding, which made it possible to reveal the structural differences between the discourses of women and men futurists.

The analysis is grounded in a comparative qualitative content analysis. The discourses of women and men futurists were compared in terms of thematic intensity, conceptual diversity, normative orientations, and modes of representation within digital culture. Three core analytical axes were developed during this process:

Discursive Structure Analysis: Examined which concepts underpin futurist visions, which social issues they foreground, and which values they prioritize in their imaginaries of the future.

Thematic Comparison: Demonstrated that women futurists emphasize themes such as ethical governance, equality, sustainability, and the care economy, whereas male futurists tend to focus more on technological acceleration, innovation, and transhumanist future models.

Media Visibility and Impact: Compared the Forbes list with the sample of highly visible male futurists in terms of visibility, traceability, the speed of discourse diffusion, and digital reach.

The main limitations of the study are as follows:

- Because the Forbes list is a corporate selection, full representational diversity may not be achieved.
- Since the male futurist sample is based on media visibility, popularity may overshadow actual expertise.
- As the dataset is centered on digital culture, futurists with significant influence in physical, political, or local community contexts but limited digital visibility remain outside the scope.
- Due to the nature of content analysis, discursive production is subject to contextual constraints.

Findings

1. Women Futurists

The content analysis conducted on the women futurists dataset (as detailed in the tables below) demonstrates that their discourse is highly ethics-oriented, socially aware, and distinctly interdisciplinary. The thematic examination of the 50 women futurists reveals three prominent axes:

- Digital ethics and data justice

- Sustainable and ecological futures
- Gender- and intersectionality-centered future models

The conceptual clusters identified in the initial stage of the analysis indicate that women futurists approach the future not as an engineering problem but as a socio-technical network of relationships. The most salient themes emphasized during coding include algorithmic justice, digital rights, AI governance, the climate crisis, sustainable development, community-based organizational models, and the future of the care economy. Another key finding within women futurists' discourse is the rejection of a "singular technological vision" of the future. Instead, their perspectives characterize futurity as multiple, plural, and context-dependent. In particular, future models grounded in posthumanism, ecofeminism, and relational subjectivity reveal that women futurists construct alternative scenarios that reimagine the relationship between technology, humanity, society, and ecology. Collectively, these findings indicate that futurist discourse produced by women is anchored not in the acceleration of technology but in social sustainability, ethical responsibility, and the cultivation of more just and inclusive futures.

Table 1: Artificial Intelligence, Data Ethics, And Digital Policy

Name	Expertise	Thematic Focus	Future Model	Digital Impact
Kate Crawford	AI politics	Data sovereignty	Political-ethical	Very high
Joy Buolamwini	AI ethics	Algorithmic justice	Ethics-oriented	High
Timnit Gebru	AI ethics	Structural bias	Social justice	High
Abeba Birhane	AI & cognitive science	Relational subjectivity	Anti-determinist	Medium
Amy Webb	Strategic foresight	Risk analysis	Data-driven	Very high
Meredith Whittaker	AI governance	Surveillance critique	Digital rights	Medium
Safiya Noble	Digital studies	Data racism	Critical futures	Medium
Ruha Benjamin	Sociology of tech	Racialized technology	Social justice	Medium
Shoshana Zuboff	Surveillance capitalism	Power of data	Critical	High
Cathy O'Neil	Data science	Algorithmic harms	Risk–ethics	Medium
Francesca Rossi	AI ethics	Ethical frameworks	Normative	Medium
Virginia Dignum	Responsible AI	Accountability	Accountability	Medium

Table 2: Speculative Design, Future Imaginaries, and Media

Name	Expertise	Thematic Focus	Future Model	Digital Impact
Anab Jain	Critical futures	Speculative design	Socially oriented	Very high / Medium
Marina Gorbis	Social futures	Community-based models	Post-capitalist	Medium
Jamais Cascio	Scenario design	Climate scenarios	System-based	Medium

Alexandra Deschamps-Sonsino	IoT futures	Internet of Things	User-centered	Medium / Low
Monika Bielskyte	Protopia	Inclusive futures	Protopian	Medium
Vanessa Mason	Health futures	Digital health	Socio-medical	Medium
Leah Zaidi	Narrative futurism	Future narratives	Ecological	Low
Cindy Frewen	Urban futures	Urban & climate futures	Resilience	Medium
Madeleine Ashby	Sci-fi theory	Speculative fiction	Post-human	Medium
Melissa Flagg	Tech security	Security & policy	Strategic	Medium

Table 3: Science, Biotechnology, and Ecological Futures

Name	Expertise	Thematic Focus	Future Model	Digital Impact
Neri Oxman	Material ecology	Biodesign	Nature–technology synthesis	Medium
Jennifer Doudna	Gene editing	CRISPR ethics	Biotechnological	High
Sara Seager	Astrophysics	Search for life	Cosmic futures	Medium
Fei-Fei Li	AI + neuroscience	Visual perception	Human-centered	Very high
Esther Dyson	Health tech	Digital health	Systemic innovation	Medium
Melanie Mitchell	Complex systems	Understanding AI	Critical	Medium
Lisa Randall	Physics	Models of the universe	Cosmological	Medium
Regina Barzilay	AI-med	Medical AI	Clinical futures	Medium
Rachel Armstrong	Living architecture	Biomimicry	Eco-technical	Low
Elizabeth Kolbert	Climate futures	Ecological crisis	Critical	High

Table 4. Economy, Sustainability, and the Future of Work

Name	Expertise	Thematic Focus	Future Model	Digital Impact
Mariana Mazzucato	Economy	Public good	Social	Very high
Lise Kingo	Sustainability	ESG policies	Ethical business models	Medium
Amy Edmondson	Leadership	Psychological safety	Human-centered	High
Ayesha Khanna	Smart cities	Digital cities	Tech–ethics hybrid	High

Priya Parker	Future of community	Community & belonging	Social	Medium
Anne-Marie Slaughter	Governance	Future policy	Democratic	High
Rebecca Henderson	Sustainable capitalism	Reformist economy	System-hybrid	Medium
Sarah Menker	Food futures	Agricultural data models	Global risk	Medium

Table 5. Culture, Identity, Ethics, Society

Name	Field	Thematic Focus	Future Model	Digital Impact
Kimberlé Crenshaw	Intersectionality	Intersectionality	Justice-centered	High
Angela Davis	Social theory	Liberation politics	Political futures	High
Riel Miller	Future literacy	Future literacy	Community-based	Low
Alondra Nelson	Tech & society	Bio-politics	Critical	Medium
Sarah Pink	Digital ethnography	Digital culture	Socio-technical	Medium
Saskia Sassen	Globalization	Flows theory	Planetary futures	High
Rebecca Solnit	Culture & crisis	Collective solidarity	Ethical	Medium
Naomi Klein	Climate & capitalism	Climate justice	Critical	Very high
Arundhati Roy	Politics & society	Anti-colonial	Resistance	High
Zeynep Tüfekci	Digital society	Digital activism	Democratic	Very high

2. Male Futurists

Analysis of the dataset comprising male futurists reveals a discourse that is distinctly shaped by technological determinism, accelerationist thinking, and visionary growth models. The most frequently recurring themes identified during coding include technological singularity, transhumanist transformation, space colonization, robotic automation, data-centric rationality, macro-technological visions, and innovation-driven future models. Male futurist discourse generally positions innovation as a historical inevitability and technology as the "inevitable engine of progress." As a result, it tends to construct a future vision that is more individualistic, competitive, and oriented toward economic expansion.

Axial coding conducted in the second stage of the content analysis shows that the discourse of male futurists leans toward a linear future imagination grounded in engineering and scientific logic, relatively independent from broader social contexts. Furthermore, the narratives of highly visible male futurists are dominated by themes such as technological acceleration, the momentum of innovation, competitive market logic, and large-scale technological investment. This structural configuration facilitates wider media circulation, thereby producing a hegemonic visibility zone in which futurism is predominantly represented by male figures in popular culture.

Table 6. Highly Visible Male Futurists

Name	Field	Discourse Type	Future Model	Media Impact
Ray Kurzweil	AI	Singularity	Technological determinism	Very high
Elon Musk	Tech	Mars colony	Techno-solutionism	Extremely high
Yuval Noah Harari	History	Data-subjectivity	Homo Deus	Very high
Michio Kaku	Physics	Science-oriented	Cosmic	Very high
Peter Diamandis	Innovation	Utopian growth	Abundance	High
Kevin Kelly	Digital culture	Tech evolution	System-based	High
Tristan Harris	Tech ethics	Digital addiction	Ethical reform	High
Jaron Lanier	VR	Digital humanism	Human-centered	Medium
Nick Bostrom	Philosophy	Existential risk	AGI risks	High
Max Tegmark	Physics	AI risks	Future of life	High
Ben Goertzel	AGI	Open-source AGI	Synthetic intelligence	Medium
Erik Brynjolfsson	Economy	Future of work	Data economy	High
Thomas Frey	Futurism	Third-wave innovation	Innovation-centered	Medium
Gerd Leonhard	Tech philosophy	Humanized future	Ethical technology	High
Alvin Toffler (legacy)	Future studies	Third wave	Systemic	Medium
Jason Silva	Media futurism	Transhumanist metaphors	Aesthetic–technical	High
Mark Zuckerberg	Social platforms	Metaverse	Platform futures	Very high
Sam Altman	AI	AGI	Tech-determined	Very high
Jensen Huang	AI hardware	GPU futures	Data-centered	High
Demis Hassabis	AI research	Deep learning	Network-centered	Very high
Geoffrey Hinton	AI	Deep learning	Critical	High
David Deutsch	Quantum	Information theory	Universal	Medium
Hans Rosling (legacy)	Data analysis	Global trends	Data-centered	Medium
Thomas Malone	MIT	Collective intelligence	Organizational futures	Low
Richard Florida	Urban futures	Creative class	Urban futures	Medium

Erik Schmidt	Tech governance	Digital governance	Political	Medium
Noah Smith	Economic futures	Tech economy	Growth-centered	Medium
Balaji Srinivasan	Crypto	Network states	Digital state	High
Stewart Brand	Tech culture	Whole Earth	Systemic	Medium
Andrew Ng	AI	AI applications	Practical-techno-logical	High

3. Comparative Analysis

The comparative thematic intensity table illustrating the discursive differences between women and men futurists reveals a clear gender-based divergence. The results of the analysis can be summarized under three main dimensions:

a. Density of Ethical–Political Perspectives

Women futurists exhibit a pronounced emphasis on themes such as ethical governance, digital rights, data justice, sustainability, and social equality, whereas male futurists display significantly lower representation in these areas. This indicates that women futurists conceptualize the future not merely as a technical matter but as a process deeply intertwined with human rights, social justice, and ecological crises.

b. Technological Determinism and Future Design

Male futurist discourse displays a high intensity of technological determinism and transhumanist acceleration. The assumption that technology progresses independently of social relations constitutes the foundation of male futurist narratives. In contrast, women futurists approach technology as embedded within social contexts and interconnected with political, cultural, and ecological dimensions.

c. Normative Frameworks of Future Models

Male futurist discourse prioritizes macro-technological, colonization-oriented, space-centric, and growth-driven future imaginaries, whereas women futurists produce models that are more inclusive, relational, community-centered, and grounded in ethical norms. This contrast highlights a normative duality in futurist literature shaped by gender.

Taken together, the evaluation of both datasets demonstrates a distinct gender-based differentiation in futurist discourse. Women futurists center multilayered, ethical, ecological, and equality-focused dimensions of the future, while male futurists foreground accelerationist, macro-technological, and innovation-driven models. These findings underscore that futurism is not merely a technological field but one that must be reconsidered across social, cultural, and political registers.

Table 7. Comparative Thematic Intensity (Women vs. Men Futurists)

Theme	Women Futurists Intensity	Men Futurists Intensity
AI Ethics	Very High	Medium
Algorithmic Justice	Very High	Low

Data Sovereignty	High	Medium
Climate & Sustainability	Very High	Very Low
Transhumanism	Low	Very High
Singularity Discourse	Very Low	Very High
Social Justice	Very High	Low
Digital Rights	High	Low
Technological Acceleration	Medium	Very High
Economic Growth	Low	High
Ecological Futures	High	Low
Protopian / Inclusive Futures	High	Very Low
Mars / Space Colonies	Low	Very High
Human-Centered Futures	High	Medium
Community-Based Futures	Very High	Very Low
Data-Centric Rationality	Medium	High
Critical Discourse	High	Low
System–Technical Determinism	Low	High

Discussion and Conclusion

This study has demonstrated how futurist discourse is structured along gendered lines, how women and men futurists construct future scenarios differently within digital culture, and how these divergences shape the epistemic boundaries of futurist literature. The findings reveal clear distinctions at discursive, thematic, and normative levels; these distinctions do not merely concern representational differences but constitute an epistemic shift that fundamentally influences how the future is imagined. In the discussion section, these results are interpreted through theoretical perspectives in the literature and the socio-technical dynamics of the digital age, leading to a series of critical reflections on the future of the futurist field.

One of the most striking findings of the research is the epistemic divergence observed between the discourses of women and men futurists. While women futurists conceptualize the future through ethical, relational, ecological, and community-oriented frameworks, male futurists predominantly construct narratives centered on technological acceleration, large-scale innovation, and transhumanist enhancement. This binary structure explains why technology-driven future imaginaries—frequently critiqued in the literature—often render social dimensions invisible. Feminist technology studies, in particular, emphasize that approaches reducing the future to an innovation timeline risk exacerbating rather than alleviating social inequalities. The present study provides strong empirical evidence supporting this critique, showing that the dominance of male figures in the production of hegemonic futurist discourse constrains epistemic diversity. Consequently, the current landscape of futurist literature remains heavily shaped by a paradigm that can be characterized as a form of "technology fetishism." In contrast, the discourse of women futurists expands the epistemic map of the field by framing the future in more holistic, contextual, and socially responsible terms.

The question of who speaks about the future in digital culture—whose discourses are amplified and which themes are made visible—is largely shaped by algorithmic visibility policies. The findings indicate that the discourses of highly visible male futurists are circulated more widely by algorithms, whereas women futurists who emphasize ethics, social justice, or ecological futures receive more limited digital engagement. This demonstrates that digital platforms exert a direct influence on the production of future knowledge. Because highly visible narratives affect not only popular culture but also policymakers, private-sector actors, and investment mechanisms, the accelerated circulation of

male futurist discourse reinforces the hegemonic position of technology-driven, innovation-centered future models. In contrast, although women futurists receive less algorithmic visibility, their discourse offers a more layered, critical, and multidimensional imagination of the future—foregrounding themes such as digital rights, algorithmic justice, the care economy, and ecological sustainability, thereby making the social burden of technological futures more visible.

Another significant finding of the study is that male futurist discourse is largely anchored in technological determinism. Themes such as singularity, AGI (Artificial General Intelligence), post-human evolution, Mars colonization, and the technological enhancement of biological capacity form the core of this narrative. Women futurists, however, do not equate the future solely with increases in technological capability; instead, they emphasize that futurity must be understood in relation to social equality, environmental resilience, and ethical governance. This perspective aligns with "post-technological" or "protopian" future models that have gained increasing prominence in recent futurist literature. As such, the discourse of women futurists transcends deterministic visions and generates alternative imaginaries of the future. This points to the need for futurist literature to evolve beyond a single-centered technological narrative toward a more multi-actor, multi-dimensional, and multi-value structure.

The findings of this study demonstrate that entrusting the design of the future solely to technical actors, major technology corporations, or popular futurist figures entails significant risks. The democratization of futurism requires not only broader representation but also greater epistemic diversity. Without such diversity, the future becomes structured according to the interests and priorities of a limited group. The ethical, critical, and socially oriented approaches articulated by women futurists provide a strong foundation for the democratization of futurist literature. In this regard, the study shows that the future must be evaluated not only in terms of what is technologically possible but also in terms of what is socially desirable. It further underscores the necessity of positioning gender as a central analytical axis in futures studies and highlights that the democratization of futurist discourse in digital culture can only be achieved by making multiple perspectives visible.

This study reveals that who constructs the future and how it is constructed are fundamental determinants of what the future ultimately becomes. The pronounced differences between the discourses of women and men futurists demonstrate that futurism is neither neutral nor apolitical; rather, it is a field shaped by gender, power relations, and epistemic priorities. The results strongly indicate that in the digital age, the future cannot be surrendered entirely to technology; it must instead be conceptualized alongside its ethical, ecological, social, and cultural dimensions. The pluralistic, critical, and inclusive future models produced by women futurists chart a new direction for futurist literature.