JCE

Jurnal Civic Education:

Media Kajian Pancasila dan Kewarganegaraan

https://ejurnal.unima.ac.id/index.php/civic-edu/index

2599-1833 (print)

2621-3567 (online)

Digital Pragmatism in Education: Reconstructing Learning Paradigms through Sociological Lens of Digital Platforms

Romi Mesra[1*], Jamaris Jamaris[2], Sufyarma Sufyarma[3]

[1]Program Studi Pendidikan Sosiologi, Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Hukum, Universitas Negeri Manado

[2, 3]Program Pascasarjana, Universitas Negeri Padang

Corresponding Author Email: romimesra@unima.ac.id*

*korespondensi penulis

Informasi artikel

Sejarah artikel
Diterima :12-08-2024
Revisi : 30-12-2024
Dipublikasikan : 30-12-2024

Keywords:
Digital Pragmatism, Education, Reconstructing Learning Paradigms, Sociological Lens, Digital Platforms

ABSTRACT

This study aims to explore digital pragmatism in education through sociological and philosophical lenses, focusing on the reconstruction of learning paradigms in the digital era. Qualitative literature study methods are used to analyze epistemological, pedagogical, and structural transformations in the digital ecosystem. The study uses an interdisciplinary approach, exploring theories from digital sociology, the philosophy of pragmatism, social constructivism, and critical theory. The main findings show that digital platforms are not just a medium, but a complex social space that shapes and is shaped by knowledge practices. Digital pragmatism gives rise to a network epistemology model, transforms the role of educators, and opens up a multi-perspective negotiation space for meaning. The study recommends the development of a responsive pedagogical framework, critical digital literacy, and an interdisciplinary approach in understanding the dynamics of educational technology. The theoretical and practical implications of this study contribute to a comprehensive understanding of educational transformation in the digital era.

Introduction

The digital era has fundamentally changed the paradigm of education, bringing about complex transformations in the way humans understand, access, and construct knowledge (Castells, 2010). The dynamic socio-technological context creates an increasingly fluid and connected learning ecosystem space, where the traditional boundaries between educators, learners, and sources of knowledge are increasingly blurred (Wenger, 2010). Digital pragmatism offers a theoretical perspective that allows for a deep understanding of how digital technology is not just a medium, but an active and transformative space for knowledge construction (Dewey, 1938). The principles of pragmatism that emphasize concrete experience and critical reflection become very relevant in the context of a complex digital ecosystem (Garrison, 2011).

Social constructivism in the digital realm views knowledge as a product of dynamic interactions between individuals, communities, and technology platforms (Vygotsky, 1978). The learning process is no longer linear, but rather a multi-relational network that forms understanding continuously through interaction and negotiation of meaning (Bereiter, 2002).

Digital sociology shows how digital platforms create new social spaces that have unique structures, norms, and interaction mechanisms (van Dijck, 2013). These platforms are not only a medium of communication, but also an arena for the production of complex and multidimensional knowledge (Latour, 2005).

The concept of digital technology affordances opens up new perspectives on how technology is not just a tool, but an environment that has transformative potential in pedagogical practice (Gibson, 1979). Each digital platform has structural characteristics that shape and are shaped by the social practices of its users (Giddens, 1984). Digital pragmatist epistemology emphasizes the practical value of knowledge, where truth is interpreted as an ongoing and contextual process (James, 1907). This encourages a more adaptive, responsive, and experience-based learning approach to learners in the digital ecosystem (Kolb, 1984).

Critical perspectives in digital pragmatism also question power relations in the production of digital knowledge, revealing how algorithms, platform design, and technological structures influence the process of constructing meaning (Feenberg, 2002). This requires reflective awareness from educators and learners. Digital transformation not only changes learning methods, but also redefines the concept of literacy, competence, and human intellectual capacity (Lankshear & Knobel, 2008). The ability to navigate, criticality, and adapt become key skills in the digital knowledge landscape.

The complexity of the digital ecosystem requires a holistic approach that combines pedagogical, sociological, and technological perspectives (Selwyn, 2011). Digital pragmatism offers a theoretical framework for understanding and designing educational practices that are responsive to the dynamics of technological change. The multimodality of digital platforms opens up a complex space for negotiating identities, knowledge, and experiences, beyond traditional geographical, cultural, and institutional boundaries (New London Group, 1996). This demands a continuous reconstruction of the concept of education.

A series of studies such as Greenhow & Lewin's (2016) research on learning in digital contexts, Mirra et al. (2018) on digital literacy, and Buckingham (2015) on digital media and learning have explored various dimensions of digital transformation in education, but have not comprehensively integrated the perspectives of pragmatism, constructivism, and digital sociology. Although there have been many studies discussing digital transformation in education, there is still a gap in efforts to deeply understand how digital pragmatism can bridge pedagogical practices with the complexity of the contemporary digital ecosystem.

This study offers novelty by developing an integrative theoretical framework of digital pragmatism, which synergizes the perspectives of social constructivism, digital sociology, and educational theory to understand the dynamics of learning in the digital era.

Digital transformation in education has created a practical gap between technological potential and institutional capacity. Many educational institutions still have difficulty adapting pedagogical paradigms that are in accordance with the characteristics of digital platforms. The complexity of the challenges of implementing digital pragmatism can be seen from the limitations of infrastructure, low digital literacy of educators, and institutional structures that are still hierarchical and rigid, which hinder the process of reconstructing a more responsive and adaptive learning paradigm.

Method

This study uses a qualitative approach with a comprehensive literature study method, which aims to explore in depth the construction of knowledge in the context of digital pragmatism in education (Creswell & Poth, 2018). Qualitative methods allow researchers to conduct interpretive analysis of various academic sources and digital documents. The data collection process was carried out through a systematic study of scientific journals, reference books, academic articles, and reputable digital sources related to digital pragmatism, constructivism, and the sociology of education (Bowen, 2009). Source selection criteria include the relevance of the theme, the credibility of the author, and the actuality of the publication.

The data analysis technique used the content analysis and comparative analysis methods, which allowed researchers to identify patterns, themes, and conceptual constructions that emerged from various sources (Miles et al., 2014). This approach builds a theoretical framework through a critical synthesis of various academic perspectives. The coding process was carried out manually and systematically, using open coding, axial coding, and selective coding techniques to explore the conceptual relationship between digital pragmatism, constructivism, and educational transformation (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Each source was reviewed in depth.

The validity of the study was ensured through source triangulation, where data and interpretations were crossed from various academic references to ensure the credibility of the findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The validation process involved a critical review of multiple theoretical perspectives.

The limitations of the study lie in the focus of the literature study using English and Indonesian language sources, with a publication range between 2000-2023 (Webster & Watson, 2002). This limitation was made to maintain the actuality and relevance of the research findings. Research ethics are upheld through the principle of academic honesty, by providing proper attribution to each reference source and avoiding data manipulation or interpretation (American Psychological Association, 2019). Every concept and quotation is traced transparently.

Result and Discussion

Result

1. Reconstruction of Digital Epistemology

Digital pragmatism opens up new space in understanding knowledge production. Traditional concepts of truth and epistemology undergo fundamental transformations in the digital ecosystem. The process of constructing meaning is no longer linear, but rather a complex network that continues to develop.

Digital platforms become an arena for dynamic knowledge negotiation. Every individual has the potential to be both a producer and a consumer of information. The boundaries between expert and novice are becoming increasingly blurred, creating an unprecedented democratization of knowledge.

These epistemological implications pose both challenges and opportunities. Criticality and the ability to navigate information become key competencies. Individuals are required to develop the ability to analyze, verify, and reconstruct knowledge continuously.

2. Transformation of Pedagogical Practices

Digital education requires pedagogical design that is responsive to the characteristics of digital platforms. Traditional instructive and hierarchical learning methods are no longer effective. An approach that encourages active participation, collaboration, and creativity is needed.

Digital space opens up the possibility of multimodal learning. Learners are no longer limited to a single learning source, but can access multiple perspectives from around the world. The learning process turns into a complex interconnected network of knowledge.

The role of educators has shifted from "knowledge providers" to facilitators and mediators. They are tasked with guiding learners in developing critical thinking skills, digital literacy, and adaptive capacity in an ever-changing environment.

3. Socio-Technological Dynamics

Digital pragmatism shows how technology is not just a tool, but an environment that shapes and is shaped by social practices. Each platform has a unique structure, norms, and interaction mechanisms, which influence the process of knowledge construction.

Algorithms, interface designs, and digital interaction mechanisms become arenas for the production of symbolic power. They are not neutral, but carry certain values, ideologies, and interests. Critical awareness of this dimension is a prerequisite for digital literacy.

The complexity of the digital ecosystem demands a holistic and interdisciplinary approach. Understanding digital pragmatism is not enough from a technological or educational perspective, but requires a synthesis of various fields of science: sociology, psychology, communication, and information technology.

Discussion

Digital pragmatism in the context of digital sociology shows a fundamental transformation in the production of knowledge, where digital platforms are not just mediums, but social spaces that have complex structures and dynamics (van Dijck, 2013). Actor-Network Theory (Latour, 2005) explains how digital technology becomes an active actor in the process of constructing social meaning.

Giddens' perspective on structuration (1984) reveals the dialectic between human agents and the structure of digital technology. Digital platforms are not just passive infrastructures, but create affordances that shape and are shaped by the social practices of users (Gibson, 1979). This results in a dynamic cycle of structural reproduction in the digital ecosystem.

The philosophy of digital pragmatism refers to Dewey's (1938) conception of experience as a source of knowledge, where truth is understood as a contingent and contextual process. In the digital landscape, epistemology shifts from a linear model to a multi-perspective knowledge network that is always changing (Siemens, 2005).

Foucault's (1980) theory of power provides a critical analysis of power relations in digital ecosystems. Algorithms, platform design, and technological infrastructures are not neutral, but contain symbolic control mechanisms that shape regimes of truth and knowledge practices. This raises fundamental questions about epistemological democracy.

Vygotsky's (1978) social constructivism finds new expression in digital platforms, where knowledge is constructed through technological interaction and mediation. The zone of

proximal development is no longer limited to direct interaction, but extends to digital spaces that enable collaboration without geographical boundaries.

Manuel Castells' (2010) network theory explains how digital society forms a "space of flows" that transforms traditional conceptions of space, time, and social interaction. Digital platforms become infrastructures for the formation of identities, communities, and knowledge production that are fluid and dynamic.

Husserl's (1936) phenomenological approach provides a perspective on digital consciousness, where the subjective experience of users is not simply influenced by technology, but actively shapes technological reality. Digital consciousness becomes a field of negotiation between individual intentionality and platform structures.

Habermas's (1981) critique of instrumental rationality finds new relevance in the digital context, where technology has the potential to degrade public space or, conversely, open up democratic dialogue. Digital pragmatism requires critical awareness to identify the emancipatory and repressive potential of technology.

Conclusion

Digital pragmatism shows a fundamental transformation in the production of knowledge, which is not only technological, but also sociological, epistemological, and philosophical. Education is required to develop a new paradigm that is responsive to the complexity of the digital ecosystem. The implications of this research emphasize the importance of an interdisciplinary approach in understanding digital dynamics, which combines sociological, philosophical, educational, and technological perspectives to produce a comprehensive and critical theoretical framework.

References

Bereiter, C. (2002). Education and Mind in the Knowledge Age. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Buckingham, D. (2015). Defining Digital Literacy. Nordic Journal of Digital Literacy, 10(1), 21-35.

Castells, M. (2010). The Rise of the Network Society. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Dewey, J. (1938). Experience and Education. New York: Macmillan.

Feenberg, A. (2002). Transforming Technology. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Foucault, M. (1980). Power/Knowledge. New York: Pantheon Books.

Giddens, A. (1984). The Constitution of Society. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Greenhow, C., & Lewin, C. (2016). Social Media and Education. Learning, Media and Technology, 41(1), 1-19.

Habermas, J. (1981). The Theory of Communicative Action. Boston: Beacon Press.

Husserl, E. (1936). The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology.

James, W. (1907). Pragmatism: A New Name for Some Old Ways of Thinking.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). Experiential Learning. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (2008). Digital Literacies. New York: Peter Lang.

Latour, B. (2005). Reassembling the Social. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mirra, N., et al. (2018). Developing Digital Literacies. Educational Researcher, 47(9), 577-592.

Selwyn, N. (2011). Education in a Digital World. London: Routledge.

Siemens, G. (2005). Connectivism: A Learning Theory for the Digital Age. International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning.

van Dijck, J. (2013). The Culture of Connectivity. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in Society. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Copy.