Łukasz Androsiuk
Pomeranian University in Słupsk
ORCID 0000-0001-8087-6464
Małgorzata Obrycka
University of Gdańsk
ORCID 0000-0001-8202-4185

Digital culture in the light of educational processes. Ad vocem for the remarks and musings of Jordan Shapiro concerning the digital childhood

Kultura cyfrowa w świetle procesów edukacyjnych. Ad vocem uwag i refleksji Jordana Shapiro na temat cyfrowego dzieciństwa

Abstract: Digital technologies not only reshape the ways we experience the world but also redefine intergenerational relationships and fundamental educational mechanisms. Their presence in educational and upbringing processes brings both new pedagogical opportunities and challenges related to the algorithmization of knowledge, content personalization, and the impact of digital infrastructures on media literacy. While we acknowledge that pedagogical reflection cannot remain indifferent to these processes, we argue that one of its key challenges is maintaining critical balance—resisting both techno-optimistic and techno-phobic perspectives. The aim of this article is to analyze Jordan Shapiro's concept of digital childhood and to critically engage with some of its fundamental assumptions. While the authors share the conviction that digital culture plays a crucial role in both institutional and non-institutional education, they emphasize, more than Shapiro does, its structural conditions, including algorithmic control mechanisms and the commercialization of educational processes. The adopted method of analytical hermeneutics allows not only for a critical examination of Shapiro's ideas

but also for a reflection on the language used to describe digital education and media culture. The primary research question takes the following form: Does digital childhood, as conceptualized by Jordan Shapiro, still represent a clear opportunity for the development of educational competencies, or does it now require deeper critical reflection particularly in the context of cultural algorithmization and the surveillance capitalism intertwined with it?

Keywords: digital culture, digital education, media education, media archaeology, new technologies, artificial intelligence, digital/video games, paratextuality.

Introduction

The aim of this article is the analysis of the problems related to the presence of new technologies in the area of the loosely defined formative processes present at home, at school and within the community. The main research problem of this text refers to the question about how new technologies relate to the modern educational challenges. The authors take reflections of Jordan Shapiro concerning digital childhood as a reference point.

Let's begin with the issues directly related to the education. Considering the questions contemporary pedagogy posits via numerous works and compilations related to the culture-building impact of the digital technologies and the influence the latter has on educational theory and practice, it is important to note that aforementioned works are more and more often authored by people born and raised in the era they are writing about. And although not always approved by the representatives of the *analog* generation, the changes resulting from this phenomenon are progressively more visible in the area of thinking about the digital technologies and the role the latter do/can/should have to play in the scope of new/novel didactic and formative strategies. Analyses and research made by Jordan Shapiro are examples that are definitely inspirational, brave and worth of study. This article is an *ad vocem* reference to the explanations, theses and postulates presented in his book.

Specifying the research perspective from which we present ourselves, we would like to emphasize the following:

1. As researchers in the field of social and humanities interested in "digital culture", we identify primarily with the pedagogical paradigm. At the same time, our fundamental question and the answers we propose are more closely related to the philosophy of education than to formally understood pedagogy. Therefore,

in order to avoid possible misunderstandings, we would like to especially emphasize that we are closer to - if we may say so - pedagogical philosophers than philosophizing pedagogues.

2. Therefore, in our analyses, we will use a theoretical proposal derived from philosophy, not pedagogy. A proposal that, following M. Przełęcki, we call analytical hermeneutics. We understand this "[...] as a methodology of interpreting texts using tools developed in analytical philosophy. Its use involves interpretation aimed at reconstruction, explication and creative development of the ideas expressed in the texts as well as solving the problems posed therein. We can consider hermeneutics defined in this way in several pragmatic contexts: as a philosophical, methodological, didactic or social program" (Będkowski, 2019, p. 60). Suffice it to say that the knowledge-creating significance of such a methodology consists both in the analysis of specific concepts and categories, and in giving these concepts new, more adequate meanings from the point of view of the researcher.

This remark, that is, in our opinion, not only very accurate but also imaginative, expresses a strong correspondence with the analyses and reflections present in the books *The New Childhood: Raising Kids to Thrive in a Connected World* and *Father Figure: How to be a Feminist Dad* written by a scholar maybe less known and renowned than Zielinski, but still (or only slightly less) inspiring and worth of cognitive effort – Jordan Shapiro[1].

I, researcher

Our expectation, directly shaped by said preferences also explain, at least in our opinion, why the reflections concerning the educational reality is so easily marred by the pathos and ritualistic doomsaying. Meanwhile, able to successfully merge both mentioned perspectives, Jordan Shapiro gives us a brave, and on this account alone, also a cognitively important answer. It is largely caused by the fact that the within the area of autoethnography, „[...] analysis of one's own experience becomes a tool for understanding of the cultural experience. [...] in this way, autoethnography embodies a introspective breakthrough in the research that exposes the subjectivity of the latter. [...] it aims to use the embodied experience and singular personal events as an

---

[1]   Jordan Shapiro, PhD (b. 1977), pedagogue, researcher of the digital culture and its influence on the educational theory and practice. Now a tenured Professor at Temple University's Intellectual Heritage Program.

impulse to the reinterpretation of the earlier assumptions, and in a wider sense, it sensitizes the researchers to theoretical and social categories. It effects the social research understood as sciences that are closer to literature rather than physics" (Filiciak, 2013, pp. 129-130).

And indeed, this literary-narrative formula is what makes the autoethnographical perspective, that is usually attractive to the reader, a topic of controversies related to its potential and actual scientific status, and through the latter, also to its cognitive value. And although it is not possible to bring up all the stances and arguments that are being formulated in such controversies, let us limit ourselves to the remark that both Shapiro and the authors of this paper consider the alternative according to which we need to treat science either in accordance with cultural anthropology or natural sciences as false. Secondly, it is not true that the so-called *cognitive value* can only be applied to science, regardless of the meaning we want to convey using this term (Przełęcki, 1996).

About *old* in a *new* way

Remembering the character of the questions and issues formulated in the research and analyzes of the media culture (of which the term *digital culture* is a common synonym), it is assumed that such questions and issues can stem from three main paradigms, i.e., pedagogical, informational, and communication-cultural one (Ptaszek, 2019, pp. 101–28). Although these paradigms differ in terms of the basic ontologico-methodological assumptions, an interdisciplinary, or rather transdisciplinary character of the analyses applied to such research makes them intertwine in various ways, thus exposing mutual interactions between them, i.e., relations of logical, ideological, factual and pragmatic nature.

The consequence of this state of affairs is therefore the clarification of the meanings of the basic concepts for the problem. In connection with the problem raised here, we take three concepts as basic, i.e. digital culture, education and media education.

Therefore, we assume that by education we will understand a social practice which can offer „(…) to enter the world of many realities. It would develop in us the habit of jumping from theory to theory - jumping from world to world. The new theory would be perceived not as a threat, but as a window, a new landscape, new spaces. It would be treated as an opportunity to enrich existing forms of world representation" (Melosik and Szkudlarek, 2009, p. 29). Education is an extremely subtle process encompassing personality, emotionality, knowledge, needs, desires and relationships (people

- people, people - nature, people - technology). Hence, depending on the chosen subject of education, the adopted goals, means and ideals, we can talk about „education for", „education in", „education through" (Kwieciński, 1998, p. 38). The current era is a unique challenge for educators, because one of the main contexts of our everyday life is broadly understood digitality.

Digital culture is understood as "a cultural phenomenon whose origins are seen with the emergence of hacker subcultures at the turn of the 60s and 70s of the twentieth century. It concerns the humanistic dimension of all forms of production of works of culture created thanks to digital technologies. It is also a communicative activity focusing on the interaction of the producer and the recipient of a work of culture and/or the relationship of the recipient with cultural products present in new media. The creator of the term is P. Lévy, who distinguishes three formative features of c.k.: interconnectivity, referring to the ability of everyone to communicate with everyone; virtual community; collective intelligence. The characteristic features of the c.k. are: autonomy, multimedia, interactivity, specific lexis, immediacy of the message, decentralization, asynchrony (producers of c.k. content operate at their own pace), durability" („Leksykon terminów medialnych", 2024, p. 123)

In connection with media education, we assume that it is "education in the field of reception and use of media. It covers an increasingly wide range of competences necessary for the conscious use of the media as a recipient and creator. The competences of the recipient include the ability to choose appropriate media messages, determine their credibility and reliability, and know the characteristics of individual genres of media statements. A separate set of skills of the media recipient includes: knowledge of communication techniques and the ability to use technical devices, software and practical solutions to facilitate access to media messages and improve this reception [...] These skills can be used both in education, when the media are used to improve the learning process, and in the independent use of the media to create and distribute one's own media content. This dimension of skills consists of: the principles of creating understandable media messages, features differentiating the genres of these messages, techniques of taking photos and films, creating multimedia content, recording and editing sound and image, elements of media promotion and marketing techniques" („Leksykon terminów medialnych", 2024, p. 193). We also accept such definitions because they most fully capture the phenomena Shapiro is talking about.

In the case of the Shapiro's works, even the mere context that forms a basis for the instigations presented in them, clearly demonstrates their formal relation with the pedagogical paradigm and with what is defined

147

as 'media pedagogy' in its scope (although Shapiro himself never uses the expression himself, preferring the term *media/digital education*). Although authored works and compilations, progressively more novel from the perspective of the applied research techniques and strategies are far from scarce also in the Polish pedagogy, we need to stress that Shapiro's investigations are especially valuable because they use an epistemological perspective that is exceedingly rare in the field of pedagogy. It is clearly inspired by an-archeology, i.e. so-called media archeology, author concept of Siegfried Zielinski, already quoted in the first paragraph. It is true that this concept, much better accepted among culture scholars than among pedagogues, is based on the assumption that one should seek *new* in *old* and *vice versa*, what causes Shapiro to assume that the question *how* – is less important than the question *why* (Zielinski, 2010, p. 6)

Shapiro, much as anyone else who is keen to follow Paulo Freire's suggestion to understand pedagogy as a normative process of negotiating conditions and rules, according to which the world is *invading* us, finds it much easier to answer the first, much more intuitive question how to realize specific goals and assumptions of the media education? (Shapiro, 2020, pp. 220). We need to remember that stakes are high, as they revolve around the preparation of a young people to conscious, critical and *suspicious* participation in the world that is mediated by the digital media. Let us immediately add, that we're speaking not about the world was to serve anyone through the application of the commonly accessible Internet that democratizes social life, but about the world that is presently generated by incomprehensible and, even worse, invisible processes of algorithmization and datization. Moreover, this world is being progressively appropriated by the mythical Big Five (Google, Amazon, Facebook, Apple, and Microsoft [GAFAM]) (Ptaszek, 2019, p. 11)

So, if the media education, as understood by Shapiro, aims to save us from the digital illiteracy, and, in consequence, also from the cultural exclusion, then it has to be an education *by media* and *about media*. Shapiro posits that there is no more adequate strategy of coping with the phenomena discussed here than „[…] experiencing the digital rhetoric directly (and as soon as possible). This allows an intuitive understanding of the way media artifacts surrounding said phenomena are created. Let us teach young people how to drive a narrative of their own identity with the use of dominant technologies" (Shapiro, 2020, p. 208)

As the aforementioned dangers make us worry about the future of democratic processes, procedures and values, it is unexpected that Shapiro himself, although most certainly aware the gravity of the problem in

question, in spite of legitimate and didactically approved postulates, does not answer this issue it at length, limiting himself to several generic and contextually dispersed conclusions. Indeed, the term *fake news* appears in his books only twice, and the term *post-truth* is completely absent. It makes us wonder even more, that most meritoric references made by Shapiro refer to the Greek philosophers, especially Socrates, Plato and Aristotle, known as so-called *keepers of truth*, thus stressing their universal and exceptional value to modern pedagogical thought.

The issues mentioned above are addressed in the Shoshana Zuboff's *Age of Surveilance Capitalism*. The eponymous *surveillance capitalism* is treated by the author not a figure of speech but rather as a formal category, what is evidenced by the following statements: „[…] 1. Unjust economic order that treats human experience as a free resource for latent market practices of extraction, forecasting and sales; 2. Parasite economic logic, where production of goods and delivery of services is subordinate to the new global architecture of behavioral modifications; 3. Exploitative mutation of capitalism tainted with consolidation of wealth, knowledge and power […]" (Zuboff, 2020, p. 7).

Unlike Shapiro, Zuboff states that a danger to liberal democracy is posed not by the digital illiteracy itself, but rather by the naïve belief that modern communication technologies support the values this democracy is founded upon. This surveillance capitalism, as Zuboff says, „[...] dispels the illusion that networking has some intrinsic moral core, that being "connected" is naturally pro-social, inclusive or conducive to democratization of knowledge. Digital connection is now a mean to achieve commercial goals of third persons. Surveillance capitalism is naturally parasitic and egocentric. It recalls Karl Marx's old portrayal of capitalism as a vampire feasting on the workforce, but with an unexpected turn. For surveillance capitalism, the source of income is not the exploitation of human work, but rather monetization of every aspect of every person's experience" (Zuboff, 2020, p. 18)

This is why, according to Zuboff, what we should be afraid of in the first place are not the totalitarian tendencies of the states but the digital corporation from Silicon Valley (GAFAM) that are appropriating social space and also monetize and algorythmize our preferences (religious, political, sexual). They also individualize our experience to intentionally suggest that state as such is totalitarian by definition.

Textualization of experience

Even in the times of the education that has been bureaucratized to the core, i.e., one that forces itself to be closed in the areas of instrumentally defined *knowledge*, *skills* and *competences*, we should focus on a person that not only expresses critical thinking and suspicion towards the surrounding world, but also is a person that shapes and creates culture. It is true, that digital tools, thanks to their user-friendly interfaces facilitate *creative expression* (as defined by pedagogues) more than analog ones, and this strongly hints at the answer to a second question asked above, i.e., why media culture research is usually accompanied by the pedagogical context?

According to Shapiro, the assumption that new technologies play an important role in the mechanism described above is corroborated by historical testimonies. Technologies that he proposes to understand as material resource that makes able and willing to textualize and record such narratives. Thus, musing on the role and importance of the new technologies, he says: „[…] let us think for a while about how big revolution it had to be to transition from oral transmission to a written one. [...] Long before invention of telephone, Internet or video games, it was writing that played the role of a viral 'new technology' allowing cooperation defying constraints of space and time" (Shapiro, 2020, p. 13)

If we assume that the effects of the formally understood education are measured by the level of engagement and participation in culture, then, having our everyday practices related to the digital activity, it is reasonable to say that the testimony and an implicit testimony of what is called an informal education can be what long ago Henry Jenkins quite accurately called the *culture of participation* (Jenkins, 2007) The latter is quite elusive to characterize adequately, but can be simplified as a process, in which the reader, spectator, listener or player is enticed to actively participate in the process of the promotion and distribution of specific cultural texts or events. Although this phenomenon is by no means new, as it is has been linked with the cultural industry since times immemorial, but it is, nonetheless, a phenomenon highly facilitated by the digital infrastructure available through distribution channels available on unprecedented scale. It is also important, that the word *culture* does not have evaluative character in this context, and denotes any social practice of mutualization of experiences, regardless of the means of expression. This means any experience, not only those that are considered a part of so-called *high culture* (Carroll, 2011).

The culture of participation, especially in the scope of Polish reality, has been covered in length by by Mirosław Filiciak and Alek Tarkowski,

co-authors of the report titled *Młodzi i media. Nowe media a uczestnictwo w kulturze [The youth and media.* New media and culture participation], and the creators of the *Alphabet of new culture* (Filiciak et al., 2020; Filiciak, 2015). We are referencing Filiciak and Tarkowski chiefly because that author of *New Digital Childhood* is not overly interested in how the digital infrastructures are constantly *upgrading*, although for us, it is an important issue from the perspective of pedagogy, because during the analysis the character of our communication on the Internet it is hard to indicate structurally formal difference between professional, knowledge-based opinion or review, casual comment, and a mere pretext for an online argument. This can be exemplified by the audiovisual content, in case of which the remote and amateur in name only creations can show quality matching that of professional productions. Regretfully, this fact has also clear and sometimes unsettling sociocultural consequences that can be significant from the pedagogical standpoint. The steadily blurring line between professional and amateur content makes it hard to verify the information published on the Internet, thereby invalidating the demand for a classically defined authority. Although such authority is a controversial concept from the pedagogical perspective, it is nonetheless important and necessary in the general scope of education. It is a pity that even though issues addressed by Shapiro in his work are a great basis for the discussion of phenomena described above, he limits himself to short remarks or ignores this problem altogether.

I play, therefore I am

Janet Murray argues that it is impossible to present human experience in a way different that the narrative that is also the most suggestive forms of expression (Murray, 1998). Existentialists have a penchant to think about the human experience as of stage play, where everyone performs an assigned role. These analogies that strongly resonate in our imagination allow us to better understand why „[…] video games can be considered a basic form of narrative in 21st century. Games are a new source of the fables, modern folk tales, new mythologies and maybe even new holy books. They are involve the most modern forms of recorded communication practices" (Shapiro, 2020, p. 13). Shapiro's research can be of special interest to all pedagogues/teachers interested in the educational potential of video games, due to three chief reasons presented by him in the three subsequent chapters of *New Digital Childhood* that are incidentally the most interesting interesting chapters due to the quality of presented arguments and also the best developed part of the book even because of the selected source material alone.

Firstly, Shapiro, using the aforementioned concept of *media archeology*, explains the reasons behind the suspicion towards video games, formulating brave and sometimes openly educationally provocative suggestions. He argues that historical testimonies allow us to assume that „[...] comments regarding loneliness and isolation of experiences resulting from reading, presented by the first critics of printing, make the latter no different from modern parents who are worried about their kids who sit alone in front of monitors or mobile devices and play games or write to friends whom they rarely, if ever see in person. […] It is funny to think how much 20th-century parents have in common with the critics of Gutenberg" (Shapiro, 2020, p. 18). Moreover, if it is true that Socrates was also critical of writing because the script „[...] say one and the same thing over and over [...] whenever you ask them about the matter the speak of" (Shapiro, 2020, p. 14), then it is worth to at least concern the idea, adds Shapiro, that Plato himself could be a proficient game designer or even player, enamored with the level of interactivity provided by this medium.

Secondly, Shapiro treats video games as cultural texts *par excellence*, what means that they are capable of transmitting of the senses and meanings that have *since the beginning* been monopolized by literature and later also shared by audio-visual arts. It is worth stressing here, that Shapiro, contrary to logical but also erroneous intuition, treats video games as procedural rather than audio-visual arts, because the main carriers of aforementioned senses and meaning are not the picture and sound, but rather processes and rules that constitute them. This fact is of grave importance for education, because if rules determine or limit our decisions and behaviors, then we can make a logical and educationally valuable conclusion that „[...] by setting limit, we generate expression. [...] and as verbal rhetoric is an oratory art of persuasion and visual rhetoric is an art of persuasive utilization of an image, procedural rhetoric is, conversely, a general term referring to an art of argumentation through processes. [this is why – Ł. A., M. O] Games create not only sensations but also arguments" (Shapiro, 2020, p. 41–42).

Said procedural rhetoric is a theoretical tool created by Ian Bogost to address the inadequacy of literature analysis tools applied to interactive media research, especially in the field of video games. The tool, the task of which is to expose logical, ideological or political associations and relations between *what the game* is about and which processes and rules (i.e., possibilities and limitations) are used by the game to communicate it to the player. We also need to stress that procedural rhetoric, although known for years among digital media researchers, has been only recently appreciated by educators

and teachers, especially those inspired by didactic assumptions of *edutainment* (Gałuszka and Taper, 2018, pp. 44-66), a method that focuses more on education through games than on educational games as such.

Thirdly, the subject of Shapiro's research is not limited to video games but also encompasses the whole associated culture, including artifacts, social practices and phenomena caused by and referring to games. In consequence, the games are both a text worthy of analysis and a pretext. Heuristic value of such enterprise is based on the fact that by analyzing video games we also reflect on „[...] how they unite people – families, groups of friends, entire communities. […] cultural aspects of gaming – what does it mean to be a gamer – and how the digital entertainment influences our outlook on the world. […] If we take into account that almost all contemporary children play video games, we can easily treat the latter as a basic form of narrative in 21st century" (Shapiro, 2020, p. 15).

Summary – artificial intelligence and intelligent artificiality

The date of 30 November 2022 will pass down in the history of IT culture and new media culture. It was a day of an official premiere of the third generation language model (known as ChatGPT), developed by an American research laboratory OpenAI and based on an artificial intelligence generative system. Although it wasn't the first language model, it was only its third generation that was characterized by the ability to create syntactically formal and substantively correct expressions in natural language that answer questions posed by the users[2].

It is true that *New Digital Childhood*, the first work of Shapiro that is also much more important from the pedagogics point of view, has originally been published in 2018, i.e., four years prior to the event mentioned above, what explains why ChatGPT is not featured in the book itself. It doesn't mean, however, that artificial intelligence (although not specified as *generative*) in the context of educational abilities, challenges, but also threats, is ignored by Shapiro altogether. On the contrary, he focuses on the fact that the artificial intelligence has a real, unprecedented potential to revolutionize educational strategies which, what needs to be stresses, have so far been impossible to implement chiefly due to the cognitive limitations of human mind itself. We're

---

[2] As this paper is not a work belonging to the area of computer science, we encourage anyone interested in detailed knowledge concerning the technical abilities and limitations of present and earlier versions of ChatGPT to consult the official page of the software developer: https://help.openai.com/en/articles/6825453-chatgpt-release-notes (22.10.23)

not only referring to the issue of the elimination of linguistic barriers through the machine learning. Shapiro argues that artificial intelligence, especially through so-called adaptive algorithms can finally realize personalized educational experiences i.e., adapt itself to the skills and abilities of specific student, at the same providing teachers and educators with a real-time feedback. In addition, by diagnosing learning difficulties in the case of the student, it can adequately early suggest proper intervention strategies. Moreover, artificial intelligence can significantly help and sometimes even replace a human in the task of administrative and organizational school management (schedules, syllabuses, evaluation reports etc.) and at least to some extent free people from the arduous bureaucratic tasks.

At the same time – and we need to pint it as especially important – Shapiro notices a specific role that in the incoming decade can or at least should be played by humanities and especially philosophy that expresses interest with artificial intelligence in the context of learning/teaching strategy, but also other forms of participation in the world. It is certain that artificial intelligence „[...] transformed the way we think about work, employment and productivity, [...] upended criteria we use to define the meritocracy and self-worth. Problems with the safety and privacy of data have blurred the limits of personal freedoms. The advances in bioengineering have shaken the very foundations of what does it mean to be human" (Shapiro, 2023, pp. 73).

It is true that these issues directly refer to the fundamental questions explains why, according to Shapiro and also us, philosophy has a special cognitive value and causal power. Asking a question whether artificial intelligence is an intelligence at all we essentially return to a question about the constitutive difference between a human being and everything that is not *human* but aspires to be (ontology). Now, following in Shapiro's steps, we also posit that relying on an artificial intelligence, especially expecting ChatGPT to answer our questions, we should ask the questions between the answer that is psychologically trustworthy but absurd from logical perspective (Chomsky, 2023). Creating new technologies while taking into the account ethical questions we design more just and responsible digital landscape. We should thus be equally – or even more, as argued by Slavoj Žižek – afraid that one day artificial intelligence will begin to imitate humans and humans will imitate an artificial intelligence, devoid of any intellectual and moral doubts (2023).

Ad vocem

On the basis of the remarks and suggestions formulated by Shapiro, there are reasons to say that for the author of "The New..." "Digital childhood" is the result of a necessary (in the historical sense) evolution. An evolution in which new technologies act as a natural prosthesis for phenomena related to education and social phenomena and practices on their border. In this perspective, digital media, as was the case with earlier social revolutions determined by new inventions, offer new possibilities in the field of learning and teaching phenomena. It is therefore difficult to argue with Shapiro's conclusion that in such a perspective the basic task of educators (as well as parents) is to take this fact into account when designing new educational strategies. Criticism of technophobic nostalgia, as well as Shapiro's demand for conscious participation in digital culture, also seem justified.

The problem is that the author of "New..." – at least taking into account the most important works we have cited so far – seems to suggest that the choice we have comes down to either technopticism or technological nostalgia. Meanwhile, digital technologies are indeed constantly redefining our language, also in the cognitive-axiological sphere. In this respect, we are closer to the position of Jonathan Haidt (Haidt and Lukianoff, 2023) who rightly emphasizes that the fact that education in the digital world is not only an assimilation to a new reality, but a process in which political, economic and cultural interests clash. All this means that the cognitive and axiological sphere is reconstructed, constituting a weapon in the fight for short-term political interests. This is a sufficient reason to remain at least suspicious of Shapiro's basic thesis.

Therefore, without remaining uncritical of Shapiro's remarks, in response to the question about the role and importance of digital technologies in the process of culture-formation, we claim that

1. Media education should be a direct response to the "digital childhood" and as such should be free from technological prejudices and naïve techno optimism. At the same time, it should focus more attention – and at the time of writing these words more than ever before – on how digital technologies restrict, modify, and interfere with the lives of their users. The logical consequence of the interactivity of the media is not the autonomy of the user. Ultimately, it is the creators of digital platforms, not the users themselves, who define the rules of their functioning and the limits of creative freedom. This means that it must include not only learning how to use technology, but also the ability to understand

and decode algorithmic processes. Without this knowledge, the user remains a passive recipient of content, the structure of which is subordinated to the commercial and ideological goals of technological entities. It is worth thinking about here, in particular the suggestion of Jan Woleński (*Prof. Jan Woleński - Co to jest logika?*, b.d.) according to whom, it could be particularly useful and useful (after all, closer to our everyday practices) to learn logic, the subject of which would be the formalization of GenAI's algorithmic procedures, or at least an attempt to understand them. Taking into account the role and importance of algorithmic personalization mechanisms and their impact on educational processes is therefore a necessary (although not sufficient) condition for us to succeed in media education.

2. Shapiro suggests that children and adolescents learn naturally through contact with digital media, but his approach devotes too little space to the mechanisms of algorithmic personalization of content. Meanwhile, the fact that algorithms significantly shape what users see, read, and hear affects the nature of their interactions and the way they build their cognitive identity. We claim that it is an expression of nostalgic technoptism precisely the belief that supposedly participation in digital media automatically means the acquisition of critical thinking skills. At the same time, the personalization of content directly determines that users are locked in the so-called information bubbles, which make it difficult or even "lull" vigilance, discouraging them from caring about their uncritical attitude towards the world.

3. According to Shapiro, the fear and anxiety of educators and educational communities about the impact of digital technologies should be understood as a repetition of past fears towards print, television or radio. We consider such an analogy to be cognitively valuable, although formally problematic (just as analogous reasoning itself is problematic and unreliable). Taking into account our own analyses, as well as the comments of the researchers and intellectuals cited in this article, we are of the opinion that modern media and with them the entire infrastructure associated with them function on principles fundamentally different from those of their predecessors. Like Zuboff, we argue that the dynamics of the digital culture ecosystem are inherently dynamic. The commercialization of experiences that are part of the social practices

associated with it causes that it "immunizes" – if we may say so –
attempts to unmask it. As a consequence, it is a qualitatively new
reality par excellence. A reality in which the line between educa-
tion, entertainment and surveillance is fluid. So, if not in contrast,
then we certainly find the fears and fears expressed about digital
culture and digital childhood to a greater extent than Shapiro
himself to be sensible. At the same time, we believe that it is nec-
essary to develop a new language, i.e. one that takes into account
new contexts, in which philosophy (with particular emphasis on
its analytical orientation) can be helpful.

References:

Będkowski, M. (2019). O hermeneutyce analitycznej. Na marginesie rozważań Mariana Przełęckiego. *Edukacja Filozoficzna, 67(1)*, 35–61. https://doi.org/10.14394/edufil.2019.0003

Gałuszka, D., Taper, A. (2018). Badania gier wideo z perspektywy edukacji medialnej. Analiza i rekomendacje. *Homo Ludens, 1,* 43-66.

Haidt, J., Lukianoff, G. (2023). *Rozpieszczony umysł. Jak dobre intencje i złe idee skazują pokolenia na porażkę* (F. Filipowski, Tłum.). Poznań: Zysk i Spółka.

Jenkins, H. (2007). *Kultura konwergencji. Zderzenie starych i nowych mediów.* (M. Bernatowicz i M. Filiciak, Tłum.). Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Aka-demickie i Profesjonalne.

Kwieciński, Z. (1998). Dziesięciościan edukacji (składniki i aspekty - potrzeba całościowego ujęcia). W: T. Jaworska, R. Leppert (red.), *Wprowadzenie do pedagogiki. Wybór tekstów* (s. 37-48). Kraków: Impuls.

Leksykon terminów medialnych. (2024). W: P. Płaneta, R. Filas, K. Wolny-Zmorzyński, K. Doktorowicz (red.), *Leksykon terminów medialnych*: T. I,II. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.

Melosik, Z., Szkudlarek, T. (2009). *Kultura, tożsamość i edukacja - migotanie znaczeń*. Kraków: Impuls.

Prof. Jan Woleński—Co to jest logika? (b.d.). Pobrano z https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OdeWZr2HVDY

Ptaszek, G. (2019). *Edukacja medialna 3.0. Krytyczne rozumienie mediów cyfrowych w dobie Big Data.* Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.

Shapiro, J. (2020). *Nowe cyfrowe dzieciństwo. Jak wychowywać dzieci, by radziły sobie w usieciowionym świecie* (E. Pater-Podgórna, Tłum.). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Mamania.

Zielinski, S. (2010). *Archeologia mediów* (K. Krzemieniowa, Tłum.). Warszawa: Oficyna Naukowa.

Zuboff, S. (2020). *Wiek kapitalizmu inwigilacji* (A. Unterschuetz, Tłum.). Poznań: Zysk i S-ka Wydawnictwo.