



# PROCEEDINGS OF PRAGMATIC CONSTRUCTIVISM

journal homepage: [www.ProPraCon.com](http://www.ProPraCon.com)

## The good, the bad and the ugly – how schools construe digitalization

Michael Paulsen

*Department for the Study of Culture, Educational Research,  
Southern University of Denmark, Denmark  
e-mail: [mpaulsen@sdu.dk](mailto:mpaulsen@sdu.dk)*

With digitalization a new landscape arises. For some it advents *the societies of control* (Deleuze 1992); for others *Technopolies* (Postman 1992) or even *psychopolitics* (Han 2014). Others like Livingstone finds new opportunities for people to *participate, create and connect*, however currently out ruled in reality in British schools, embedding strong *learning behaviour control systems* (Livingstone 2014). Admitting that digital technology carry many “burdens”, Krutka emphasizes that web. 2.0 also entails “benefits”, for instance the possibility of *participatory cultures* on the net, *affinity spaces*, where new energies and democratic deliberation can be fostered (Krutka 2015). Yet this “new hopes” seems to be fragile. It could be argued that digitalization creates *a new wild west*. At least it seems that the norms, laws, practices, theories etc. from *the old world* (before the digital age) vanished to “function” as adequately answers to our new situation and problems (as McLuhan 1964 argued always happens when we enter a new media galaxy). For example: old tax systems do not take account of new digital business models and companies like Google, Amazon and Facebook. Neither does our old material-based understanding of money and market fit to grasp the dynamics of the new digital world economy. The scope of this paper is however limited to investigate how *schools* (and mainly teachers in alliances with others and different technologies) manage to respond to the new situation. The investigation is empirically based on different studies of the Danish upper secondary school from 2006-2018 (but also includes examples from other educational practices). First of all, it is argued that digitalization of society transforms the basis premises of teaching – its “communicative infrastructure”. Before the internet, teaching took place mainly in closed classrooms. This setting underscored both different kinds of educational *control* (Indoctrination) and different kinds of *emancipation* (Bildung). In this *media environment* the “dialectics” between control and emancipation took place (the difference between *socialisation* and *subjectification* according to Biesta 2009). *After* the arise of digitalization the classroom has been opened up communicatively (Tække and Paulsen 2013). This brought out a change in the infrastructure of teaching and thereby altering the “battleground” distributing possibilities and limitations of both control and emancipation. Yet this “ground” is not something completely fixed. Rather it is what we make of it. It is argued that 3 waves of *responses* can be identified so fare. Each response modifies the ground either in the direction of “emancipation” (Bildung) or in the direction of “control” (to oversimplify a bit; in actuality it is always a matter of

combination in specific ways). Thus, different phenomena appear: *The Good Emancipation*, *The Bad Control* and *The Ugly "In between"*. All of them are responses to the new situation and develop new forms of education. The aim of the paper is to outline this new educational landscape, with its actors, problems, possibilities, limitations, values, interpretations, alliances, characters, changing battleground, frontiers, soldiers, outlaws etc. That is to construe digitalization of education as an *event*. Acknowledging that external powers affects "the inside" of teaching" it is only the aim of this paper to portray the event of digitalization "from within" *as if* it creates itself (the description being part of the event too, taking explicitly side).