Digital ethics, political economy and the curriculum: this changes everything

Citation of the final chapter:

This is the accepted manuscript of a chapter published by Routledge in Handbook of writing, literacies, and education in digital cultures in 2017, available at: https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315465258
© 2018, Taylor & Francis

Downloaded from DRO:
http://hdl.handle.net/10536/DRO/DU:30093745
Table of Contents

Introduction Digital diversity, ideology, and the politics of a writing revolution
Kathy A. Mills & Amy Stornaiuolo

Section I: Digital Futures – Kathy Mills (Section Editor)
Chapter 1 Cosmopolitan practices, networks, and flows of literacies
Amy Stornaiuolo, Glynda Hull, & Matthew Hall

Chapter 2 Sensory literacies, the body, and digital media
Kathy Mills, Beryl Exley, & Len Unsworth

Chapter 3 Experiencing electracy: Digital writing and the emerging communicative landscapes of youth composing selves
Anna Smith & Jon Wargo

Chapter 4 Fostering impossible possible through critical media literacies
Jessica Zacher Pandya & Noah Asher Golden

Section II: Digital Diversity – Jessica Zacher Pandya (Section Editor)
Chapter 5 Digital divides and social inclusion
Mark Warschauer & Tamara Tate

Chapter 6 Beyond the techno-missionary narrative: Digital literacy and necropolitics
Liz Losh

Chapter 7 Integrating and humanizing knowledgeable agents of the digital and Black feminist thought in digital literacy research
Tisha Lewis Ellison

Chapter 8 Global refugee crisis: Literacy concerns and media coverage
Vaidhehi Ramanathan & Ariel Lorin

Chapter 9 Race and racism in digital media: What can critical race theory contribute to research on techno-cultures?
Kathy Mills & Amanda Goodey

Section III: Digital Lives – Anna Smith (Section Editor)
Chapter 10 Embodiment and literacy in a digital age: The case of handwriting
Christina Haas & Megan McGrath

Chapter 11 Playful literacies and practices of making in children’s imaginaries
Karen E. Wohlwend, Beth A. Buchholz, & Carmen Liliana Medina

Chapter 12 Digital geographies
Ty Hollett, Nathan C. Phillips & Kevin M. Leander

Chapter 13 Youths’ global engagement in digital writing ecologies
Donna Alvermann & Brad Robinson

Chapter 14 Literate identities in fan-based online affinity spaces
Jayne C. Lammers, Alecia Marie Magnifico, & Jen Scott Curwood

Section IV: Digital Spaces – Kathy A. Mills (Section Editor)
Chapter 15 Assembling literacies in virtual play
Chris Bailey, Cathy Burnett, & Guy Merchant

Chapter 16 Space, time, and production: Games and the new frontier of digital literacies
Antero Garcia

Chapter 17 Digital metroliteracies: Space, diversity and identity
Sander Dochin & Alastair Penrycook

Chapter 18 Critically reading image in digital spaces and in digital times
Peggy Albers, Vivian M. Vasquez, & Jerome C. Harste

Chapter 19 The quantified writer: Data traces in education
Anna Smith, Bill Cope, & Mary Kalantzis

Section V: Digital Ethics – Amy Stornaiuolo (Section Editor)
Chapter 20 Digital ethics, political economy and the curriculum: This changes everything
Allan Luke, Julian Setton-Green, Phil Graham, Douglas Kelner, & James Ladwig

Chapter 21 Digital youth and educational justice
Lalitha Vasudevan, Kristine Rodríguez Kerr, & Cristina Salazar Gallardo

Chapter 22 Composing as cultivating: An American Indian approach to digital ethics
Kristin L. Arola

Chapter 23 Aesthetics and text in the digital age
Theo van Leeuwen
DIGITAL ETHICS, POLITICAL ECONOMY AND THE CURRICULUM: THIS CHANGES EVERYTHING

Allan Luke, Julian Sefton-Green, Phil Graham, Douglas Kellner, James Ladwig

The ethics of human communications are a core issue in Western philosophy. From Plato to Dewey, from Du Bois to Freire, from Habermas to Benhabib – the powers and abuses of speech and writing have been considered focal in debates around the nature of truth and reality, civility and justice. The institution of modern European/AngloAmerican schooling has evolved for five centuries as a regulative technology in large measure dedicated to the teaching and learning of speech and writing, image and print. The history of language and literacy education offers a further important lesson: that the teaching and learning of communication by definition entails ethical and ideological constraints and conventions, however explicit or implicit these may be to learners.

To rethink current policy and curriculum strategies, consider this alternative proposition: the educational challenge raised by digital culture is not one of skill or technological competence, but one of participation and ethics. Accordingly, digital education would move far beyond the current attempts to expand the definitions of competences and capacities in contemporary curriculum. As a matter of social justice, it requires nothing less than: (1) equitable access; (2) ongoing dialogue over the personal and collective consequences of everyday actions and exchanges with digital resources and social media; (3) the critical examination of the semantic contents of the digital archive and how these may or may not portray the world; and (4) the use of digital media for the exchange of ideas, viewpoints and resources as part of a constructive civic and community engagement.

This chapter makes the case for a refocusing of teaching and learning across the curriculum on foundational questions about ethics in digital culture – and, hence, for reframing classroom practice around critical digital literacies.

Schools and education systems are caught in the headlights of the digital era. For over a quarter century, the field has lived through successive claims of paradigmatic and technological breakthroughs. From 1980s hypercards and CD Roms, to successive waves of packaged curricula for home and school on floppy disks, to digital whiteboards, pens and other ‘tools’, to tablet-based curriculum and online testing, to wholly online face-to-face teaching – each successive technological innovation has been heralded as a revolution in teaching and learning, and then either superseded by the ‘next’ wave of technology or simply forgotten (Nixon 1998;
The results are that schools and school districts have storage rooms packed with out-of-date technologies, teachers are perpetually grumpy at the latest in-service program for technologizing their work (and, increasingly, for mechanizing the regulatory compliance, surveillance and accounting procedures that are the hallmarks of teaching as work in neoliberal schooling), and systems bureaucrats (and many researchers) continuously suffer from policy amnesia as they reinvent a perpetual tradition of the new (Monahan, 2005). In schools and classrooms, researchers report local instances of innovation, of teacher and student digital creativity, of the use of digital resources for community engagement and activism (e.g., Sanford, Rogers & Kendrick, 2014), sitting alongside of compliance-level “adoption”, next to digital versions of retrograde elements of face-to-face and print pedagogy (Cuban, 2003). The situation is further clouded by overlapping levels of commercialization and commodification: with major publishing companies in transition to the provision of digital classroom resources (e.g., Pearson), the major testing consortia moving quickly to provide online tests, digital portfolios and assessment tools, IT and infotainment companies cross-marketing educational commodities with toys, cinema and TV programs, and a largely unregulated market of inservice consultants, technical advisors and firms.

At the same time, in response to increasing public moral panic about digital youth, students’ digital practices increasingly are governed by ad hoc, idiosyncratic blends of prohibitions around pornography and bullying, privacy, safety, risk, and their future “digital footprint” (Selwyn, 2010). The results of the three decade rise of educational technology, (including its latest disciplinary reappropriation as part of the “learning sciences”), are at best mixed, with systems’ investments and aspirations failing to deliver improved learning, achievement and equity (Warschauer & Matuchniak, 2010).

On the ground, the everyday issues faced by digital youth are prima facie ethical matters. How do today’s young people and children deal with right and wrong, truth and falsehood, representation and misrepresentation in their everyday lives online? How do they anticipate and live with and around the real consequences of their online actions and interactions with others? How do they navigate the complexities of their public exchanges and their private lives, and how do they engage with parental and institutional surveillance? Finally, how can they engage and participate as citizens, consumers and workers in the public and political, cultural and economic spheres of the internet? These questions are examined in current empirical studies of young peoples’ virtual and real everyday lives in educational institutions and homes (e.g., Livingstone & Sefton-Green, 2016; Quan-Haase, 2016).

We begin by the chapter by outlining the limits of education with new technologies sans a foundational approach to ethics. We then turn to review, critique and reframe debates over communicative ethics as they apply to the field of education. Our focus

---

1 http://hypecycle.umn.edu
is on building a critical approach to digital media and culture organized around principles of social justice in practical ways for schools and curriculum.

The Problem

There are now almost continuous public calls for heightened child protection and surveillance in response to widespread moral panic around digital childhood (e.g., Havey & Puccio, 2016). To refer to this as a moral panic is not to understate the very real challenges and difficulties that digital technology raises for parents and families, schools and teachers. It is however, to acknowledge popular discourses and widespread generational frustration about the effects of digital technology on everyday life. These range from concerns about the displacement of embodied activity, physical play and face-to-face verbal exchange by compulsive online messaging and gaming, to online harassment, bullying, real and symbolic violence, from sexual and commercial exploitation of young people and children, to exposure to violence, pornography, ideological indoctrination and outright criminal behavior.\(^2\)

Their power to generate fascinating new expressive forms and relationships, to reshape the arts and sciences notwithstanding - digital media are amplifiers of the best and the worst, the sublime and the mundane, the significant and the most trivial elements of human behaviour, knowledge and interaction. How could it be any other way? It is all here online: statements, images, sounds, and acts of hatred and love, war and peace, bullying and courtship, truth and lies, violence and care, oppression and liberation – and every possible third or fourth space, in ever proliferating redundancy, cut through with noise and clutter.

How we can enlist and harness these media to learn to live together in diversity, mutual respect and difference, addressing complex social, economic and environmental problems while building convivial and welcoming, just and life-sustaining communities and societies is the key educational problem facing this generation of young people and their teachers. This is an ethical vision and an ethical challenge.

Many school systems are in shock and denial over this turn of events, especially given the historic use of print textbooks as a practical and effective means for defining and controlling what might count as official knowledge for children and youth (Luke, DeCastell & Luke, 1983). One of the key functions of schooling is its use to shape and enable, delimit and constrain knowledge and action. This disciplinary and epistemic function and all of its well-honed institutional machinery are now directly under threat by a digital access and archive that seems built to circumvent delimitation and undermine control – often with contradictory effects.

Consequently, schools – in loco parentis - have responded with a patchwork of rules governing what kids can and cannot do in their online exchanges and

\(^2\) e.g., [http://www.lse.ac.uk/media@lse/research/EUKidsOnline/Home.aspx](http://www.lse.ac.uk/media@lse/research/EUKidsOnline/Home.aspx)
communications. These emerge in a reactionary and agglomerative way: often in response to incidents of abusive, illegal, or symbolically violent online acts, or to events whose origins are attributed to online actions – from suicides, to gun violence to pedophilia. Schools work from a mix of regional and district-level policies that include constraints on hardware access, proprietary lock-out and surveillance systems, privacy and intellectual property regulations, school-level codes and class rules on everything from texting and screen time to plagiarism and copying from internet sources. These sit alongside of home-based restrictions (or freedoms) on time, access and use in those families that can afford mobile and online devices. This is complicated by increasing law enforcement efforts to prevent online recruitment, exploitation and indoctrination of youth by terrorist groups, financial scammers and criminal organisations. In this thicket of overlapping systems of surveillance, unmediated exchange by youth and children would appear to be the exception rather than the rule (Boyd, 2015).

Taken together, the digital strategies of large public education systems in North America, the Asia Pacific and Europe (including the UK) appear to be at best post-hoc and piecemeal – motivated by genuine concern and real problems, but typically lacking stated ethical foundations and working within prevailing neoliberal policy frameworks. There are instances when this has been driven by the allure of hardware acquisition, exemplified by the Los Angeles Unified School District’s now defunct program for every student to work from a personal tablet. School systems have been struggling for several decades to effectively incorporate digital technologies into traditional curriculum and instruction with mixed results. The principal policy focus remains on the efficacy of teaching and learning as indicated through better comparative results on national and cross-national assessment measures (e.g., PISA, TIMMS), measures which are themselves in transition to online administration. At the same time, the OECD has initiated the standardized online assessment of what are being defined as digital capacities. In a policy context where education is defined as the competitive national production of human capital with technical expertise in STEM, the kinds of social-ethical challenges we have identified here are not primary foci of educational policy or curriculum practice. This underlines what has become a significant (meta) ethical dilemma in-itself: that the policy push for teaching through and about educational technology presents itself as ethically and politically neutral.

Montessori and Steiner schools simply disallow digital technology on a principled basis. Many religious and alternative culture communities in North America remain staunchly anti-technological.

STEM = Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics is the newly founded school subject, with the production of graduate specialists requisite for increased GDP in traditional resource, manufacturing and technology, and in the emergent military/digital/intelligence sector.

The meta-ethical claim is that this particular form of human techne and its affiliated practices are of utilitarian/economic exchange value, and therefore beyond ethical interrogation.

---

3 Montessori and Steiner schools simply disallow digital technology on a principled basis. Many religious and alternative culture communities in North America remain staunchly anti-technological.

4 STEM = Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics is the newly founded school subject, with the production of graduate specialists requisite for increased GDP in traditional resource, manufacturing and technology, and in the emergent military/digital/intelligence sector.

5 The meta-ethical claim is that this particular form of human techne and its affiliated practices are of utilitarian/economic exchange value, and therefore beyond ethical interrogation.
Ethics refers to the codes, norms and procedures that govern everyday life and interaction, civility and exchange in institutions, societies and cultures (Dewey, 2008). Our position is that digital ethics – the normative principles for action and interaction in digital environments – cannot be addressed through a listing of prohibitions for what kids can and cannot do online. For those young people whose families and communities have affordable everyday access to the internet\(^6\) - and in fact, many rural and remote, Indigenous and economically marginal communities do not have such access - knowledge and learning, civic participation, work, leisure and everyday social interaction with their peers and others occurs online. Digital actions - whether clicking or tweeting, posting, sharing or liking – are by definition social actions (Burke, 1967): as such, they are used for goal-seeking purposes with real pragmatic effects and consequences (Wilden, 1972).\(^7\)

Digital actions – even those of children and youth, students and ‘average’ citizens - may carry higher stakes and have amplified consequences that exceed the scope of their actions through speech, writing and other modalities in everyday life. In real human experience and real geo/spatial and temporal contexts, digital actions can be used to launch drone strikes, they can pass on complex technical information for making weapons, they can draw the attention and approbation of millions to shame and humiliate. They can be used for play, to build community, to solve complex problems, to mobilise constructive and destructive social action. As is axiomatic in critical discourse theory, while much of what we know and experience in the world is represented through discourse – some discourse actions don’t matter much, others may kill, wound, maim and desecrate – and, indeed, some may enlighten and heal (Luke, 2004). Digital action is, indeed, discourse, semiotic and social action through a “cognitive amplifier” (Bruner & Olson, 1978) that may have expansive and reflexive, durable and exponential effects across space and time.

In consequence, our case is that a digital ethics – indeed, an ethics of what it is to be human and how to live just and sustainable lives in these technologically saturated societies and economies - is the core curriculum issue for schooling. Nor do we believe that is it an adequate educational or philosophic or political response to current cultural, geopolitical and economic conditions and events for this generation of teachers and scholars, parents, caregivers and community Elders to simply

---

\(^6\) The common claim that the internet is now universal is unfounded. While composite estimates are that 89% of North Americans and 73% of Europeans and Australians have Internet access, global access continues to be below 50%. Quan-Haas (2016) further describes the persistent stratification of Canadian and American access by social class, age and social geography. See: http://www.internetworldstats.com/stats.htm

\(^7\) Dewey (1934) defines art as human endeavor meant to make the world coherent (“cohate”) and to address and resolve problems resulting from “organism-environment disequilibria”. This is comparable to Freire’s (1970) call for education to “problematicise” the world.
document or celebrate the emergence of new digital youth cultures without an attempt to call out ethical parameters and concrete historical consequences for communities, cultures and, indeed, human existence in this planetary ecosystem. This is a generational and pedagogic responsibility as we stand at a juncture where residual and emergent cultures meet, where Indigenous and non-Indigenous, historically colonized and colonizing, settler and migrant communities attempt to reconcile and negotiate new settlements, where traditional, modernist and postmodern forms of life and technologies sit alongside each other, uneasily, often with increasing inequity and violence. Our view is that this is a moment that requires more from researchers, scholars and educators than descriptions of instances of local assemblage or voice. Following on from Naomi Klein’s (2015) analysis of the effects of capitalism, technology and modernity on the planetary ecosystem - our view is that this historical convergence of forces and events has the potential to “change everything”.

Our response is to outline a definition of human ethics in relation to communications media. We describe foundational principles for a broader programmatic approach to digital ethics. In so doing, we make the case for a critical literacy based upon common principles of social justice in relation to all forms of human communication. Our case is that classroom practice – the everyday curriculum enacted through speaking and listening, print and digital reading and writing, signing and imaging - can be refocused to include rigorous debate, study and analysis of digital communications in terms of: their real consequences as human actions; their ideological, scientific and cultural codes, truth claims and meanings; and their everyday possibilities for community-based cultural and social action, for art and science, for human conviviality and sustainable forms of life.

Part of the answer, from our perspective, lies in an ongoing engagement with Indigenous ethics of decolonization and reconciliation, care and healing (Smith, 1999; Martin, 2008) – which are taken up at length in a major chapter in this volume. But also part of the answer, as argued by feminist philosophers Seyla Benhabib (2002) and Nancy Fraser (1996), is to pragmatically revisit and mobilise core democratic tenets of liberal thought and critical social theory, while acknowledging their Eurocentric and masculinist histories - as part of a larger agenda for social justice in pluralistic, democratic societies. This latter task is the purpose of this chapter.

---

8 The Yonglu Aboriginal peoples of Northwest Arnhem use the term ganma to describe cultural contact, blending and, potentially, conflict: this refers to the point in river estuaries where fresh and salt water meets and blends. Its application to Aboriginal “two-way education” is attributed to Mandaway Yunipinnu of Northwest Arnhem Land (see: http://livingknowledge.anu.edu.au/html/educators/07_bothways.htm). See also, Canadian economist Harold A. Innis’ (1951) history of the river as a medium for intercultural exchange, communications and transportation.
Our view is that a central aim of schooling now should be the interrogation of the forms and contents, practices and consequences of digital communications, and that the curriculum should engage developmentally and systematically with the current issues regarding everyday actions and their consequences, corporate and state surveillance, privacy and transparency, political and economic control and ownership.

**Reframing Communicative Ethics**

To speak about ethics is to speak about the moral codes and norms of everyday life. The nominal foundations of Western ethics are attributed to Plato and Aristotle. Yet *all* cultures – Indigenous, African and Asian, historical and contemporary, and Eurocentric - depend upon normative rules, stated and unstated, regarding the rightness and appropriateness of actions and interactions, actions and transactions (*i.e.*, Dell Hymes’ notion of “communicative competence” (cf. Cazden, in press/2016)). That is, the conduct of daily practices, the coherence and cohesion of everyday communications, and the functional survival of communities depend upon shared (and, indeed, contested and dynamic) codes of conduct, epistemic standpoints and world views. Without normative “cultural scripts” (Cole, 1996), everyday problem solving and learning are impossible. Ethical norms are presupposed in every instance of communication and exchange in social fields. Communicative ethics, then, are a kind of master cultural script that sets the interactional grounds and meditational means for building, critiquing and using other scripts. Given the contentious political and cultural issues that schools and communities, teachers and children now face - even where we cannot presume ideological agreement or moral consensus, especially where we are not idealized, rational (white, male, heterosexual, urbane) speakers with equitable access to cultural codes, discourses and knowledge (Benhabib, 1992): How could this *not* be the centre of any curriculum?

New communications technologies have the effect of destablising and reframing social and economic relations, and living cultures and planetary ecosystems. Such changes raise and renew ethical dilemmas. At the macroeconomic and geopolitical levels, the reorganization and compression of space and time enabled by communications (and transportation) technologies have enabled new forms of monopoly, of profit, debt and, indeed, of cultural and economic empire (Innis, 1949). The transitions from oral to literate culture, from manuscript to print culture, and, currently, from print and oral to digital exchange have destabilized and altered relations of power, authority and control. This occurs on several levels: in terms of the actual everyday mediation of what will count as knowledge, action, utterance, and, indeed, in terms of whose collective cultural, economic and political interests actually are served through these interactions. With the coming of the book (and newspaper, broadsheet, treatise, contract and legal brief, domestic manual and romantic novel) and the emergence of nationalism and “print capitalism” (Anderson, 1983) - the question of who owns, regulates and controls, and indeed profits and dominates from control and use of the dominant modes of information
comes centre stage, shifting from religious authorities to the state and, ultimately, to the industrial and postindustrial, national and transnational corporation. Some regimes burn books, others write, print and mandate them; some governments censor the internet, all use it and monitor it; disputes over hate speech, libel and what can and cannot be said in the media-based civic sphere are now daily news – alongside of revelations of the profit structures, labor practices, environmental consequences and taxation schemes of those media and technology corporations that have become arguably the most profitable and dominant businesses in human history. Note that this political economy of communications typically is not studied in schools – even as this corporate order competes for the edubusiness of what counts as knowledge, how it is framed and assessed within these same schools (Picciano & Spring, 2012).

A first task, then, facing institutions is to reframe and renew dialogue over ethics in relation to both changed human interaction, contexts for thought and action, and changed societal, cultural and environmental ecologies. As is painfully clear in the current geopolitical and national debates over borders, terrorism, security, trade and globalization - establishing criterial grounds for adjudicating ‘right’ and ‘wrong’, true and untrue, scientific and unscientific, civil and uncivil, humane and inhumane, private and public knowledge and behaviour is increasingly difficult for adults as citizens, workers, consumers, voters and audiences – let alone for young adults and children. We live in an era of post-truth, truthiness, factoids, and simulacrum where freedom of speech and expression is construed by many as meaning that all spoken or expressed statements or images are equally ‘true’ or ‘right’ or that statements, claims and expressive actions have coequal effects, consequences (Kellner, 2012). That everything is, technically, known via discourse and representation doesn’t exempt that discourse and representation from corporeal, material and bio-ecological effects. Some discourses and images kill people, some don’t matter much.

As this chapter goes to press, the UK Brexit referendum and the U.S. presidential election are test cases for digital citizenship and communicative ethics: with interweaving questions about what might count as truth, how to ascertain the truth, what is real and what is imagined, about control, privacy and transparency of the information archive, an archive packed with trivia, state and corporate secrets, personal actions and images, official and unofficial communications, metadata on human behaviors, wants, needs and actions, communications of all orders – and this is proliferating at a breathtaking rate, even as it is being hacked and mined.

Almost all elements of conventional electoral politics and public discourse in democratic states have been put up for grabs. Even the longstanding conduct and procedures for running autocratic and fascist states have had to accommodate and adapt to the capacity of social media. This includes the shift from television/broadcast and print-based campaigns to the use of social media for instant commentary and mobilization of constituencies. New social movements and
coalitions across political and cultural spectra, and across social strata and regional location have been enabled through social media, including what was termed the ‘Arab Spring’ of Middle East upheavals to the current Black Lives Matter movement (Jenkins, Shresthova & Gamber-Thompson, 2016).

As the 20th century newspaper business and broadcast media struggle to survive, the procedural conventions of the fourth estate have been supplanted by online commentary reliant upon pastiche, forwarded tweets and images, tautological hotlinks, and internet cross-reference for validation. News cycles are continuous, information proliferation, redundancy and appropriating unceasing, the accumulation and analysis of metadata by the state and the corporation omnipresent (Davies, 2009). Further, the making ‘public’ of what were considered governments’, political parties’ and individuals’ proprietary face-to-face and online communications on putative grounds of transparency has confused matters even further. Literally nothing goes unreported, and verification, validation and analytic refutation of claims are, at best, difficult without recourse to other online representation. Signs have been cut loose from the signified, from originary context and place, and the placement, attribution, and location of signs, signifiers and signified is increasingly difficult. While the longstanding principles and strategies of political propaganda remain intact (Graham, in press/2017) – the cognate means for countering deliberate misinformation and untruth have become more difficult to disentangle in a fully mediatized world (Krotz, 2007).

There are, of course, longstanding criteria, standards and conventions for the conduct of face-to-face verbal and embodied interactions, from how we read and interpret deictics, gesture, bodily disposition and eye contact. These are by definition vernacular, local and place-based: they are language and culture-specific and vary by spatial locality and community, time of day, and age/color/gender/sexuality/kin of interlocutors. Nonetheless, there have been attempts from Plato to, notably, Austin (1962) and Habermas (1976) to establish forms of “universal pragmatics”: that is, ethical procedures and criteria for judging both the truth (locutionary) of particular speakers and utterances, and the interactional consequences, intended and actual (illocutionary and perlocutionary) of utterances. These models have been forcefully criticized for their presupposition of an idealized (male, rational, White, Eurocentric) speaker with common and equitable access to discourse resources (Benhabib & Dallymar, 1990). Nonetheless, speech still matters – and we proceed each day to navigate through an array of speech acts and exchanges according to procedural norms both dejure and defacto, stated and tacit, conscious and unconscious. Each vernacular community proceeds under assumptions about the maintenance of “face” in communications (Scollon & Scollon, 1981). Without shared assumptions about the intent of speakers and the consequences of speech acts in place, even the simplest verbal exchange between a parent and a child, or a classmate and teacher on the playground is problematic.

Further, through several hundred years interpretive communities have developed criteria and procedures for adjudicating, judging and making sense of the printed
word. These range from the (written) laws governing what can be said and written, to intellectual property conventions (Willinsky, in press/2016), to fine grained, unremitting debates over how to interpret and value literature and the corpus of written laws. Our point here, hardly original, is that while the rules of exchange for speakers and interlocutors, writers and readers are far from static, always contested and dynamic, culture and community-specific - they are (for better and worse) established and, indeed, institutionalized via schooling and universities, courts and legislatures.²⁰

Three Foundational Claims

To begin to set a curriculum agenda for teaching and learning digital ethics, then, we outline three key foundational claims. These set the curriculum contents for digital ethics as a field or area for teaching and learning.

Our first claim is that digital ethics must operate at two analytically distinct but practically interwoven levels: it must engage at once with now classical questions about ideology (Kellner, 1978) and with questions about social actions and relations. As we have argued, the core concerns of educators about student digital lives concern the ideational and semantic ‘stuff’ – the ideologies, beliefs and values that learners must navigate online. This raises key questions about the truth, veracity, verification and belief, and, indeed, consequences of the information represented online. A recent article by a senior editor of the Guardian put it this way:

For 500 years after Gutenberg, the dominant form of information was the printed page: knowledge was primarily delivered in a fixed format, one that encouraged readers to believe in stable and settled truths. Now, we are caught in a series of confusing battles between opposing forces: between truth and falsehood, fact and rumour, kindness and cruelty; between the few and the many, the connected and the alienated; between the open platform of the web as its architects envisioned it and the gated enclosures of Facebook and other social networks; between an informed public and a misguided mob. What is common to these struggles – and what makes their resolution an urgent matter – is that they all involve the diminishing status of truth. (Viner, 2016)

At the same time, truth claims and representations are themselves social actions – consequential assertions about what is. Hence, our simultaneous and equivalent ethical concern is with the interactional pragmatics of life online. In response to the aforementioned concerns of educators and the public, digital ethics must focus on

¹⁰ These historical dynamics between rule systems and the eccentricities of local practice are, ultimately, the tension between langue et parole, between paradigm and syntagm, between system and practice, between form and function that has driven linguistic science and semiotics since Saussure (Wilden, 1972).
the use of online social media as a primary site for everyday social relationships with peers and others. To speak of ethics, then, refers simultaneously to both the ideational contents – the semantic stuff – of online representations, and the social and interactional relations of exchange between human subjects. Hence, our first foundational claim:

(1) ON IDEOLOGY AND SOCIAL RELATIONS: That digital ethics must address questions about ideological contents – the values, beliefs, ideas, images, narratives, truths, that one produces and accesses online - and questions about social relations that are lived and experienced online, specifically the interactional and material consequences of individual and collective actions.

The ideational contents (M.A.K. Halliday’s (1978) “field”) and the interactional relational protocols and consequences (Halliday’s “tenor”) may appear analytically distinct, but are always interwoven in practice. What we say, write, speak, signify, how we speak, write, gesture, sign and to whom are ethical actions - no matter how conscious, unconscious or self-conscious, explicit, tacit or implicit the intentions and decisions of the human subject may be. In educational terms, then, digital ethics by definition engages both the “classification” of knowledge qua ideational content (whether construed as disciplinary, thematic, artistic, scientific) and the “framing” of knowledge via social relationships and actions (Bernstein, 1990).

Accordingly, our case is that schooling needs to introduce two interwoven strands of digital ethics:

- The teaching and learning of a performative ethics that enables the evaluation and anticipation of real and potential human and cultural, social and economic, bodily and environmental outcomes and consequences of digital actions and exchanges, their real and potential participants and communities; and,

- The teaching and learning of a critical literacy that enables the weighing and judging and critical analysis of truth claims vis a vis their forms, genres, themes, sources, interests and silences.

Our second claim focuses on the political economy of communications (Graham & Luke, 2013): that is, the relationships between state regulation and control, corporate ownership of the modes of information, and their ideological and economic effects. Following the prototypical work of Stuart Hall (1974) on broadcast media, the field of cultural studies has focused variously on audience positioning and responses to media texts (“decoding”), on the actual economic ownership and control of dominant modes of information (political economy) and how these are manifest in ideological message systems (“encoding”). Of course, digital exchanges operate on radically different dimensions of scope and scale, speed and interactivity than the broadcast media studied by Hall and colleagues.
Digital tools have the revolutionary effect of altering the monologic and linear relationships of production/consumption, encoding/decoding established through broadcast radio, television and cinema, leading to claims that social media enables new community, agency and democratisation in ways that were intrinsically more difficult in an era of network and studio-based broadcast media (Jenkins et al. 2016).

For our present purposes, what remains powerful and relevant from Hall’s groundbreaking work is the acknowledgement of the ideological interests at work in the production and reception of screen and image. Where it takes up the challenge of digital content, the tendency in schooling has been to focus principally on student and teacher responses and uses of media texts (through models of viewer and reader response), on the semantic content (through models of comprehension, literary and, to an extent, ideology critique) – and, far less explicitly if ever, on the relationships between ideological content, relationships of institutional control and power, and the corporate ownership of the modes of information.

Consider this analogy. This would be very much if we were to teach – recalling Innis’ prototypical analysis of the “bias of communications” (1951) in pre-industrial mercantilism and industrial capitalism - how to read newspapers or how to use the railroad, without raising questions about who owns the press and transportation infrastructure, whose interests these structures of ownership and control serve, who benefits and who is exploited by these configurations of political economy.11 As Innis’ (1949) discussion of the relationships between “empire and communications” argues, all emergent communications media and transportation systems effectively reshaped human/machine and political economic and geographic ecosystemic relations as well.

The basis of economic rule (and plutocracy) has shifted from those of colonial trade documented by Innis (e.g., the Dutch East India Company, Hudson’s Bay Company) to the owners of elements of the dominant transportation infrastructure (e.g., the railways, steel, oil and auto industries), to the emergence of media empires (e.g., telephone, wireless, newspapers, television networks) – to the current situation, where the world’s economy is dominated by digital hardware/software/information corporations (e.g., Apple, Facebook, Google/Alphabet, Oracle, Tesla, Samsung), and producers of military and advanced technological hardware (e.g., Boeing, Airbus, arms manufacturers).

Hence, our second foundational claim:

11 This is, ironically, exactly how traditional Canadian and American social studies and history textbooks have taught about the railroads, as a celebration of the domination of nature by monopoly capitalists. Until recently, there has been negligible reference to their impacts on Indigenous peoples and their utilization of Chinese labor.
ON THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF COMMUNICATIONS: That in digital culture the political and economic are always personal, with every personal digital action an interlinked part of complex and often invisible economic exchanges that by definition support particular corporate and class interests and by definition have material and ecosystemic consequences.

The educational lesson here is simple: that the media that we use are not ‘neutral’ or benign but are owned, shaped, enabled and controlled, capitalized upon and managed in their own corporate interests (Pasquale, 2015). These interests, social scientists, ecological scientists and community activists are increasingly realizing, have reshaped the transnational and domestic divisions of wealth, labor and power, and have broad, heretofore unexamined, effects on the use and sustainability of finite planetary resources and ecosystems (cf. Klein, 2015).

Our point is that the curriculum should entail both the study of the sources of information and their apparent distortions and ideological ‘biases’ – but that such study can be extended to understanding the relationships between knowledges and global, planetary interests, including the corporate ownership, capitalization and profit from dominant modes of information. There are, furthermore, persistent questions about the complex relationships between digital work and culture and its relationship to carbon-based economy and resource utilisation (e.g., Bowers, 2014).

Our third claim is core to the establishment of any set of ethics. As argued, for many schools digital policy and practice tends to be both prohibitive in reaction to ‘risks’ posed by digital technologies and simultaneously silent about the reconstructive institutional uses of digital technology. Ethics is by definition a normative field: like all education and schooling, ethical systems and claims are predicated upon a vision of what should be, of how human beings can and should live together. The central message of Aristotle’s Nicomachean Ethics (1999) is that everyday judgments about right and wrong are grounded on visions of what might count as the ‘good life’. Ethical judgments are the prerequisite philosophic and practical grounds for civility and justice. Habermas (1996) refers to this as a “counterfactual ideal” that is presupposed in each speech exchange. Our third foundational claims is:

3) ON A NORMATIVE MODEL OF DIGITAL CULTURE: That ethics cannot exist as a set of norms or procedures for everyday life in digital cultures without a shared normative vision of the good life.

In terms of digital ethics, this means that any set of ethical injunctions taught to youth and children by definitions presupposes a vision of ‘what should be’; a lifeworld where digital communications are used for ethical purposes for ‘the good’. Further, this version of ‘the good’, following Behabib (2002), must acknowledge the moral imperatives and challenges raised by diverse communities in pluralistic democratic societies, whether online or face-to-face. Our view, then, is that any school-based approach to digital ethics must move beyond silences, prohibitions and negative injunctions (which, in-and-of themselves, rarely have salience with
youth) to the reconstructive project of modeling and enacting digital citizenship, convivial social relations, and action for social justice in education, economy and culture. Our aim, then, is to reframe digital ethics as part of a larger inclusive and decolonizing educational project that refuses to relegate diversity and difference (including childhood and adolescence) to “second class moral status” (2002, p. 2) and pursues a vision of sustainable forms of life for all.

**What is to be Done?**

We have been here before. Dewey (1907/2012) surveyed the situation wrought by industrial technologies and new communications media, economic globalization, large-scale migration and geopolitical conflict:

> The social change...that overshadows and controls all others is the industrial one – the application of science resulting in the great inventions that have utilized the forces of nature on a vast and inexpensive scale: the growth of a world-wide market as the object of production, of vast manufacturing centers to supply this market, of cheap and rapid means of communication. ... One can hardly believe there has been a revolution in all history so rapid, so extensive, so complete. Through it the face of the earth is making over, even as to its physical forms; political boundaries are wiped out and moved about...; population is hurriedly gathered into cities from the ends of the earth; habits of living are altered with startling abruptness and thoroughness; the search for the truths of nature is infinitely stimulated... and their application to life made not only practicable but commercially necessary. Even our moral and religious ideas and interests...are profoundly effected. That this revolution should not affect education in some way is...inconceivable. (pp. 6-7)

In response to our current, comparable situation - education systems in the "hypercapitalist" (Graham, 2005) economies of North America, Europe and the Asia-Pacific have attempted to respond to fundamental and profound changes in society, economy and culture. Over the past three decades, they first viewed educational technology as a logical extension of school science and mathematics education; that is, as a matter of scientific technology and technique. This evolved into the current emphasis on finding a place for the naming of the digital in the formal curriculum, with the enumeration of lists of digital skills and behaviours, competences and capacities to be taught and learned; that is, as a preparation for work, consumption and citizenship in technocratic society. More recently, it has begun moving towards a begrudging embrace of gaming cultures and creative industries more generally, recognizing that the new pathways to employment and technological competitiveness in the current multinational corporate economy may lie through exploitation and development of media and genres, and their popular cultures that previously were deemed counter-educational. All of these are, in part, attempts to ‘curricularise’ the new, to domesticate it into the institution that, we noted,
developed to ensure the intergenerational transmission of orality and literacy. These are, furthermore, predictable strategies for incorporation and appropriation of digital culture into a now teetering neoliberal project of social class-stratified, free-market schooling designed to serve (digital) transnational corporate capital.

There remains a persistent refusal by educational institutions to take on board larger ethical challenges. Finding a strategy that can cut through this refusal has not been proven easy. Whilst current versions of media literacy or media education are, 50 years after the era of the mass media, just about finding disciplinary respectability, as evidenced by the growth of various handbooks, courses and accreditation\textsuperscript{12}, there are very few examples of national or regional school systems making digital ethics central to their vision of education.

The three foundational claims we have placed on the table here are neither startlingly original nor that different from earlier notions of critical self-consciousness that have been proposed by Dewey or Freire. One productive first step is to revisit and reinvent the longstanding work in critical literacies and media literacy (e.g., Share, 2009; Buckingham & Sefton-Green, 1994). In other words, the new kinds of social actions, political concerns, participatory dynamics made possible by the internet have not erased but rather reframed and negated classical debates around the relationship of truth to untruth, right and wrong and what it means to be a citizen in democratic societies. These things still count – and how they count in a digital culture should be at the core of the curriculum.

Here we have offered a very different view of where digital cultures, capacities and technologies might ‘fit’ in schooling and in the curriculum. Simply, the great unresolved issues of our time should be at the heart of an engaged and relevant curriculum. What better way to educate youth about the powers and problems of digital communications than to make these same forces and problems (and indeed their digital representations) the object of study across the curriculum. We therefore return to the proposition that we began with: the educational challenge raised by digital technology is not one of skill and technique or technology, but of participation and ethics. What might this approach look like in everyday school curriculum and instruction?

The territory is already being explored by teachers and students in the spaces left by what has become an increasingly narrow, test-oriented and instrumental curriculum. Fortunately, this work is already underway in community-based projects. Many of these are contemporary versions of Deweyian “projects” (1907/2012) using digital tools for community engagement and activism (e.g., Sanford et al. 2014, Rogers, 2015), in the use of digital resources for intergenerational and intercultural exchange (e.g., Poitras-Pratt, in press/2017), and

\textsuperscript{12} (http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/57103/1/Livingstone_media_information_literacy_2014_author.pdf)
in larger scale curriculum reform that focuses on the use of digital resources in purposive, real world ‘rich tasks’ for students. Several chapters in this volume highlight yet other cases where teachers and students are using digital technologies (1) for solving and addressing local political, social and environmental problems, (2) for mobilizing cultural resources to connect with and engage with their communities and their histories, their Elders and younger generations, with peers, and with distant cultures that they might otherwise not have contact with, and (3) for the practice of active and engaged citizenship, participation in community projects, social movements and action.

As part of the mainstream curriculum, then, digital resources are being used as a means for engaging with, debating, critiquing and navigating many of the difficult social, scientific and cultural issues faced by students and communities in the face of what are for many difficult conditions of economic hardship, divisive community and intercultural relations, in a world dominated by new corporate/governmental orders whose formations, mechanisms, institutions and reach sit well beyond the reach and comprehension of many. Part of our task is to fight to maintain and expand the remaining unregulated spaces in increasingly narrow and crowded school curricula which are dominated by a ‘teach-to-the test’ accountability.

At the heart of our argument is the need for schooling to realise what children and young people are demonstrating in their rapid creation of their own digital realities. On the one hand, the digital actions of our children represent a clear refusal to accept the 20th century artificial alienation of them from their full participation in ‘the real world.’ In many respects, the bubble of childhood and adolescence has been burst from within. It is no longer sufficient to construct curriculum in preparation for later life. It is no longer sufficient for children to learn about decisions adults make for the planet they will inherit. It is no longer sufficient to allow curriculum and assessment to remain subject to that “incubus of superstition” that educators can be guided by some fiction about the internal capacities of students which we somehow know (Dewey, 1916, p. 172). It is their world already.

At the same time, these newfound rights have unprecedented ethical consequences. One consequence we have placed on the table here is that the current digital corporate order – this political economy of transnational information and technology – runs the risk of a recolonisation of everyday forms of life, both those of adulthood and childhood, work and play without the deliberative democratic dialogue and informed debate about what might constitute a just, ethical and life sustaining world. Let’s have this debate with teachers, children, young people and students – and their parents, Elders and communities. Digital literacies, multiliteracies, and digital and creative arts are necessarily ethical, political and cultural practices – not technical skills or capacities. Nor is it right that schools and

---

13 Queensland’s ‘New Basics’ (1999-2005) reforms introduced curriculum ‘rich tasks’ that required that students use digital tools to address community problems; current Finnish curriculum reforms are making comparable efforts.
institutions cast digital technology as yet another, more efficient means for the production of a post-ethical human capital. This does indeed have the potential to change everything.
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