

## Critical studies on education and technology: paths taken and futures imagined. A Dialogue with Neil Selwyn

Estudios críticos sobre educación y tecnología: caminos recorridos y futuros imaginados.  
Dialogo con Neil Selwyn

Neil Selwyn\*, Pablo Rivera-Vargas\*\* y Gustavo Herrera-Urizar\*\*\*

**Abstract:** The growing *enshittification* of school digitalization—marked by the expansion of platformisation, datafication, and algorithmisation of education, together with the consequent loss of the pedagogical and transformative value of digital technologies—has reignited the debate over who designs, governs, and benefits from the development and widespread distribution of digital platforms and devices in the school context. In this context, the present article presents a dialogue between Professors Neil Selwyn and Pablo Rivera-Vargas, focusing on the meaning and challenges of critical studies on educational technology in the so-called postdigital era. The conversation underscores the need to envision more sustainable and context-sensitive digital futures, grounded in small-scale, situated, and pedagogically meaningful technologies. It also highlights the importance of co-constructing digital alternatives from within school communities. Finally, the dialogue addresses pressing issues related to teacher professionalism, the role and growing influence of technological corporations in shaping global education systems, and the conditions required to foster a critical and empowered understanding of digitalization processes among citizens.

**Keywords:** educational technology, post-critical critique, deskilling, enshittification, critical studies

---

\* Australian. Professor at the Department of Education, Monash University (Australia). Associate Researcher at the Centre for Research in Digital Education, University of Edinburgh (United Kingdom). He has been a visiting professor at universities in the United Kingdom, Sweden, and the United States. Email: [neil.selwyn@monash.edu](mailto:neil.selwyn@monash.edu), <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5938-9079>.

\*\* Chilean. Associate Professor at the Department of Didactics and Educational Organization, University of Barcelona (Spain). Visiting Professor at the Faculty of Education and Social Sciences, Universidad Andrés Bello (Chile). Email: [pablorivera@ub.edu](mailto:pablorivera@ub.edu), <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9564-2596>.

\*\*\* Lecturer in the Department of Didactics and Educational Organization, Faculty of Education, University of Barcelona (UB). PhD in Educational Policy and Management. Member of the ESBIRNA Research Group, “Subjectivities, Visualities and Contemporary Educational Environments” (2021SGR00686). Member of the REUNI+D Excellence Network (<https://reunid.eu/>). Email: [gustavo.herrera@ub.edu](mailto:gustavo.herrera@ub.edu), <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3546-8976>

**Resumen:** La creciente *enshittification* de la digitalización escolar, caracterizada por su avance hacia la plataformización, la datificación y la algoritmización de la educación, junto con la consecuente pérdida de valor pedagógico y transformador de las tecnologías digitales, ha reabierto el debate sobre quién diseña, gobierna y se beneficia del desarrollo y la distribución extendida de plataformas y dispositivos digitales en el ámbito escolar. En este contexto, el presente trabajo presenta un diálogo entre los profesores Neil Selwyn y Pablo Rivera-Vargas, centrado en el sentido y los retos de los estudios críticos sobre tecnología educativa en la denominada era postdigital. La conversación subraya la necesidad de imaginar futuros digitales más sostenibles y sensibles al contexto, apoyados en tecnologías pequeñas, situadas y pedagógicamente pertinentes. Asimismo, se enfatiza la importancia de la co-construcción de alternativas digitales desde las comunidades escolares. Finalmente, el diálogo aborda desafíos actuales vinculados con el profesionalismo docente, el papel y la creciente influencia de las corporaciones tecnológicas en el diseño de los sistemas educativos globales, así como las condiciones necesarias para favorecer una comprensión crítica y empoderada de la ciudadanía frente a los procesos de digitalización educativa.

**Palabras clave:** tecnología educativa, crítica postcrítica, descalificación, enshitificación, estudios críticos

Recibido: 13 de mayo de 2025 Aceptado: 31 de julio de 2025

## 1.- Introduction: from technological enthusiasm to critical urgency

Over the past decades, digital technologies have been promoted as transformative tools for education. From the school computerisation programmes of the 1990s to the rise of platforms during the COVID-19 pandemic, the dominant narrative has presented EdTech as a promise of efficiency, access and modernisation<sup>1</sup>. However, the technocratic enthusiasm has, in recent years, given way to a growing wave of questioning. Unfulfilled promises, teacher overload, algorithmic surveillance and data collection practices have made it clear that educational digitisation is neither neutral nor inevitable, but deeply political<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cobo, Cristóbal. *La innovación pendiente: reflexiones sobre educación, tecnología y conocimiento*. Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2019.

<sup>2</sup> Cobo, Cristóbal y Pablo Rivera-Vargas. «What Is “Algorithmic Education” and Why Do Education Institutions Need to Consolidate New Capacities?» In *The New Digital Education Policy Landscape*, edited by Cristóbal Cobo and Axel Rivas, 210-225. Londres, New York: Routledge, 2023.

The pandemic acted as a catalyst. Within months, millions of teachers and students were pushed to use videoconferencing systems, tracking platforms, automated assessment systems and generative artificial intelligence tools, many of them run by large corporations. This abrupt shift revealed structural inequalities: problems of access, gaps in teacher training, and a heavy reliance on private infrastructures without clear regulation. As Dussel and Trujillo<sup>3</sup> point out, what was presented as an emergency solution also revealed an educational model increasingly colonised by commercial interests and technocratic logics.

In this context, critical proposals emerge that invite us to question the dominant paradigm. The concept of "*enshittification*", coined by Cory Doctorow<sup>4</sup>, describes the progressive degradation of digital platforms: services that were once useful become intrusive, extractive and focused on maximising profit at the expense of the user's well-being. In the case of education, this translates into platforms that prioritise data analysis over meaningful learning, transforming the student into a user and the teacher into a systems operator.

Authors such as Selwyn<sup>5</sup> have led a line of thought that seeks to go beyond conventional criticism. Aligned by proposals such as those of Naomi Hodgson<sup>7</sup>, Juliana Raffaghelli<sup>8</sup> and Felicitas Macgilchrist<sup>9</sup>, he proposes a post-critical turn: it is not enough to denounce, it is necessary to imagine and construct alternatives. This approach does not deny the importance of critique, but enriches it with affirmative, speculative and reparative dimensions. It is a matter of thinking about what digital tools could be like if they were at the service of the common good, care and social justice.

This article is framed in that perspective. We present an extended conversation with Neil Selwyn, Australian researcher and central figure in Critical Studies of Education and Technology (CSET). The interview explores key concepts such as deskilling, enshittification, teacher autonomy and local alternatives to corporate EdTech. Throughout the dialogue, Selwyn articulates a critical view but also a commitment to action: it is not only about

---

<sup>3</sup> Dussel, Inés, and Mariana Trujillo, coords. *Educación y tecnologías en tiempos de pandemia: reflexiones desde América Latina*. Buenos Aires: UNIPe, 2020.

<sup>4</sup> Doctorow, Cory. *The Internet Con: How to Seize the Means of Computation*. London: Verso, 2023

<sup>5</sup> Selwyn, Neil. "The Critique of Digital Education: Time for a (Post)Critical Turn." In *A New Repertoire for Critique in Contemporary Education*, edited by Rekha Gorur, Paolo Landri and Romuald Normand, Routledge, 2022.

<sup>6</sup> Selwyn, Neil. "Digital Degrowth: Toward Radically Sustainable Education Technology." *Learning, Media and Technology*, 2023.

<sup>7</sup> Hodgson, Naomi. "Post-Critique, Politics, and the Political in Educational Philosophy." *On Education* 3, no. 9 (2020).

<sup>8</sup> Juliana Elisa Raffaghelli, «Pathways for Social Justice in the Datafied Society: Reconsidering the Educational Response», *Media Education* 14, no. 1 (30 January 2023), <https://doi.org/10.36253/me-13383>.

<sup>9</sup> Macgilchrist, Felicitas. "What is 'Critical' in Critical Studies of EdTech? Three Responses." *Learning, Media and Technology* 46, no. 3 (2021): 243-249.

analysing, but also about co-designing different futures, from below, from schools, from communities.

This dialogue is also part of a Latin American genealogy of critical thinking on education and technology. Since the early warnings about digital determinism<sup>10</sup> a corpus of situated knowledge has been built that dialogues perfectly with the global concerns of CSET. The commitment to a fair, contextualised and emancipatory educational technology is not exclusive to any one hemisphere, but a shared urgency.

In the following sections, the interview with Selwyn is included in full, followed by an analytical conclusion that takes up the main points of meaning. This structure responds to the desire to articulate critical thinking with accessible narratives, and to build bridges between academic reflection and the pedagogical struggles that, day by day, take place in classrooms, collectives and school networks.

## 2.- Interview with Neil Selwyn:

The full interview with Neil Selwyn is reproduced below. The conversation, which took place within the framework of the activities of the CSET (Critical Studies of Education and Technology) collective in Barcelona, seeks to delve into the current challenges of digital educational technology from a critical, situated and constructive perspective. Rather than merely offering a diagnosis, Selwyn articulates a range of proposals that invite us to imagine alternative futures from the educational community and the territories.

PRV: Pablo Rivera Vargas

NS: Neil Selwyn

### *From technological euphoria to situated criticism*

PRV: It is interesting to see how the critical perspective on educational technology has grown and become more relevant. Some 20 years ago, when programmes such as One Laptop per Child and other similar initiatives were being discussed, criticism of educational technology was not a central issue; it was mostly limited to certain academic circles. Today, almost two decades later, this critical view has gained visibility, not only in universities, but also in schools and in various educational spaces. What do you think about this growth? What do you think has been the main reason for this change?

NS: I think that, to a large extent, this change can be explained by the saturation and maturation of the debate on technology in education. For a long time, an enthusiastic view

---

<sup>10</sup> Lugo, María Teresa. "Pensar la tecnología desde América Latina." Red Universitaria de Tecnología Educativa, 2006.

prevailed, where technology was seen as synonymous with progress and educational improvement. However, over time, both teachers and researchers have found that many of these promises have not only not been fulfilled, but have generated new problems.

Cory Doctorow's notion of "enshification"<sup>11</sup> helps us understand this moment. It is the idea that technologies are progressively degrading and starting to work worse, becoming more intrusive, less usable and more oriented towards data capture and value extraction, rather than supporting genuine educational processes. I think this has generated a collective awareness that we need to rethink our relationships with technology and look beyond the official discourses of EdTech.

In addition, the massive entry of large technology corporations into education has been very evident in recent years, which has also raised red flags and generated new critical questions not only in academia, but also in schools, unions, families and students.

*The post-critical stance: imagining futures from care*

PRV: In one of your recent texts<sup>12</sup> you mention Bruno Latour, and recover a central idea both for thinking about knowledge and for thinking about activity. Latour says that everything we build is fragile and needs to be taken care of. In your reading you mention issues such as digital platforms, algorithmic governance, the commercialisation of education<sup>13</sup>. And while it is important to critique these dynamics, it is also essential to understand their social and political contexts. This means not only looking at the effects, but also exploring how they could be reframed and regulated to promote social justice, equity and open access to knowledge. From this perspective, how do you see this idea of a post-critical stance today, why do you think it is important at this time, and what do you think should be the first step for academics, policy makers and activists to move in that direction?

NS: I think we really need to think carefully about how we might build different forms of technology. Universities, for example, have always been spaces where technologies have been developed; it was universities that invented the first forms of artificial intelligence. So I think universities should be actively involved in the development of public digital tools. I would like to see governments and public organisations getting much more involved in these

---

<sup>11</sup> Doctorow, Cory. *The Internet Con: How to Seize the Means of Computation*. London: Verso, 2023.

<sup>12</sup> Selwyn, Neil. "The Critique of Digital Education: Time for a (Post)Critical Turn." In *A New Repertoire for Critique in Contemporary Education*, edited by Rekha Gorur, Paolo Landri and Romuald Normand, Routledge, 2022.

<sup>13</sup> Latour, Bruno. "Why Has Critique Run Out of Steam? From Matters of Fact to Matters of Concern." *Critical Inquiry* 30, no. 2 (2004): 225-248.

kinds of developments, but doing it in collaboration with the communities, with the students, with the schools.

It need not only be the responsibility of large technology companies. It can be led by small local companies, by citizen collectives, by the students themselves, by universities.... It has to be a collective and plural effort. We have to think about how to build something new that does not repeat the mistakes of current educational technology.

This is where adopting a post-critical stance, as articulated by Naomi Hodgson, becomes particularly relevant<sup>14</sup>. That is, it is not enough to denounce what does not work or to point out the flaws of current platforms or algorithms. We already do that quite well in the field of critical studies of education and technology. What we need now is to start constructing other narratives, other imaginaries and, above all, other practices that allow us to think about educational technology from the perspective of care, equity, sustainability and the possibility of imagining fairer futures.<sup>15</sup>

As Macgilchrist<sup>16</sup> or Emejulu and McGregor<sup>17</sup> have shown, we need approaches that not only dismantle the dominant techno-solutionism, but also work with communities to design situated, careful and thoughtful alternatives from the margins.

This post-critical turn does not mean abandoning criticism, but rather enriching it with an affirmative, restorative and creative dimension. It means moving from criticising from a distance to participating from within, to working with and not only on educational communities, helping to imagine and assemble technologies that serve to nurture, to strengthen collective processes, to open spaces of solidarity and joy, as some feminist authors also propose.<sup>1819</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Hodgson, Naomi. "Post-Critique, Politics, and the Political in Educational Philosophy." *On Education: Journal for Research and Debate* 3, no. 9 (2020). [https://doi.org/10.17899/on\\_ed.2020.9.3](https://doi.org/10.17899/on_ed.2020.9.3)

<sup>15</sup> Selwyn, Neil. "Digital Degrowth: Toward Radically Sustainable Education Technology." *Learning, Media and Technology*, forthcoming. 2023.

<sup>16</sup> Macgilchrist, Felicitas. 2021b. "Rewilding Technology." *On Education: Journal for Research and Debate*, no. 12. [https://www.oneducation.net/no-12\\_december-2021/rewilding-technology/](https://www.oneducation.net/no-12_december-2021/rewilding-technology/)

<sup>17</sup> Emejulu, Akwugo, and Callum McGregor. 2019. "Towards a Radical Digital Citizenship in Digital Education." *Critical Studies in Education* 60 (1): 131-147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2016.1234494>.

<sup>18</sup> Boler, Megan. "Feminist Politics of Emotions and Critical Digital Pedagogies." *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 130, no. 5 (2015): 1489-1496.

<sup>19</sup> Bell, Genevieve. "Touching the Future." *Griffith Review* 71 (2021). <https://www.griffithreview.com/articles/touching-the-future/>.  
<https://www.griffithreview.com/articles/touching-the-future/>

This implies recognising, as Latour reminds us<sup>20</sup>, that everything we build is fragile and in need of care, but also that the role of the critic is not only to dismantle, but to bring together, to accompany processes that care for and strengthen that which deserves to be sustained<sup>21</sup>. In short, I believe that the first step is to create spaces for dialogue, collective imagination and co-construction between academia, schools, social actors and critical technologists, in order to try out new forms of digital tools that serve the common good and not private profit.

*What is 'critical' in critical educational technology studies?*

PRV: What are Critical Studies of Education and Technology and what have they contributed? And, in your opinion, what is really critical in EdTech studies?

NS: That's a very good question. I would argue that Critical Studies of Education and Technology, or CSET, has been a stream of thought that has allowed us to look more broadly at educational technology, taking us beyond techno-optimistic enthusiasm or fascination with innovations. What is critical here is not simply to point out what does not work or to enumerate technical failures, but rather to explore in depth the social, political, economic and cultural implications of these technologies in educational contexts.

As Macgilchrist<sup>22</sup> and other colleagues explain, the critical has never been a static or monolithic concept; rather, it has been transformed according to the fields that dialogue with EdTech: from sociology, cultural studies, media studies, to philosophy and political science. Currently, the critical moves along three main axes: on the one hand, observing the transformations that new technologies are producing in educational practices, policies and processes; on the other, analysing how these same technologies contribute to reinforcing structural inequalities and reproducing social and educational injustices; and finally, opening speculative and generative spaces, where alternative, fairer and more equitable futures can be imagined.

In other words, it is not just about criticising for the sake of criticising, but about asking uncomfortable and necessary questions: what do we mean by good education when we work with digital technologies? What kinds of subjects, citizenships and communities are being shaped by these platforms and algorithms? What political economies are behind EdTech and how do they shape the decisions that are made in schools?

---

<sup>20</sup> Latour, Bruno. "Why Has Critique Run Out of Steam? From Matters of Fact to Matters of Concern." *Critical Inquiry* 30, no. 2 (2004): 225-248.

<sup>21</sup> Selwyn, Neil. "The Critique of Digital Education: Time for a (Post)Critical Turn." In *A New Repertoire for Critique in Contemporary Education*, edited by Radhika Gorur, Paolo Landri, and Romuald Normand, 87-102. London: Routledge, 2022.

<sup>22</sup> Macgilchrist, Felicitas. "What Is 'Critical' in Critical Studies of EdTech? Three Responses." *Learning, Media and Technology* 46, no. 3 (2021a): 243-249. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2021.1958843>



Therefore, what is critical in EdTech today has to do both with the rigorous analysis of what is happening, and with the ability to imagine and construct other possible ways of understanding education in digital contexts.

*Teacher autonomy, local resistances and critical global community*

PRV: On the role of education in detail: what do you think it would be important for the CSET community -Critical Studies of Education and Technology- to contribute to this debate on the role of education? I mean not only from academia, but also from school communities, even thinking about how to work with technology companies without losing a critical perspective.

NS: I think a lot of people who work in tech companies are critical, political and have great values. There are many wonderful people in the tech industry who are also pushing for these changes.

I think schools can work with that perspective, and I really like the idea of local technologies. I have no problem with Microsoft or Google, and if I want to search for something on the internet, I usually use Google or DuckDuckGo. I'm not against big companies in general.

But in education, I think we need technologies developed for our local schools, for our specific contexts. Local educational technology is much richer in context and meaning.

Rather than having a single platform designed in San Francisco that everyone must use, I prefer to see technology developments that respond to local needs, supported by universities, school systems, governments, communities... by everyone.

PRV: Throughout our conversation you have emphasised the importance of keeping educational technologies small, local and contextualised, avoiding universal solutions imposed by large global corporations. I think this is one of the key ideas you raise today and, in my opinion, it opens up new perspectives for rethinking not only technologies, but also ways of teaching and learning in the digital society.

In this sense, and thinking specifically about the impact on teachers, I would like to delve into a question that raises many concerns. We know that one of the most recurrent discourses around artificial intelligence and digital technologies is that they are designed to free teachers from routine tasks, allowing them to focus on more creative and meaningful pedagogical work. However, several studies warn that the reality seems to be going in the opposite direction. How do you think these technologies are currently affecting teachers' professional autonomy and identity?



NS: Yes, that's a complicated question. In theory, as you rightly mention, artificial intelligence and other emerging technologies are presented as tools to lighten teachers' workload, allowing them to spend more time on actual teaching, on the emotional support of students, on more personalised didactic planning tasks. This is the recurring promise.

But what we are seeing in practice is something quite different. Many of the artificial intelligence and automation systems that are being implemented in schools - and here I am not just talking about generative AI, but a whole range of algorithmic systems for management, monitoring, evaluation, adaptive platforms, etc. - are actually generating more invisible work for teachers. These technologies, instead of streamlining educational work, often introduce further layers of bureaucratic complexity, data tracking, system maintenance, constant review of tools, which ends up extending the working day, even extending it into spaces such as evenings and weekends.

This is especially problematic because many of these tasks do not have a direct impact on the improvement of the educational process, but rather respond to the logic of control, monitoring and compliance with external standards, often imposed by the technological platforms themselves or by the educational authorities.<sup>23</sup>

In addition, there is a deeper effect that needs to be clearly pointed out. These technologies are quietly but very effectively redefining notions of teacher autonomy and professionalism. By introducing systems that prescribe tasks, automate pedagogical decisions or standardise teaching processes, teachers' room for manoeuvre is being limited, pushing them into roles that are more administrative, more vigilant, less creative and less centred on the human relationship with students. This is a form of covert deskilling that has very damaging effects on teachers' professional identity, weakening their capacity for agency, pedagogical judgement and resistance in the face of increasingly datified, controlled and algorithmically governed educational models.

That is why I believe it is essential that teachers, schools and educational communities as a whole regain the confidence to say "no" when a technology does not add value to them, when it does not improve their work or the educational experience. We need to strengthen this critical capacity and collective agency, and this is only possible if we generate spaces for dialogue, training and reflection that allow teachers to appropriate these technologies from a position of power, not subordination. As we have said before, if we are not able to imagine and build educational technologies based on teacher autonomy and the common good, we will continue to be trapped in this spiral of overload, surveillance and de-professionalisation.

---

<sup>23</sup> Selwyn, Neil. "Digital Degrowth: Toward Radically Sustainable Education Technology." *Learning, Media and Technology*. 2023.

PRV: OK, Neil, I would like to close with one last question focused on an initiative that you have recently promoted and that I think connects with many of the ideas that we have discussed today. During this year 2025, Critical Studies of Education and Technology meetings, known as CSET, are being promoted in different parts of the world. These meetings are emerging as local spaces for reflection, dialogue and critical action around educational technology.

From your perspective, what exactly are these meetings looking for, what specific needs are driving them, and why is it important that these conversations are taking place at the global level, but from the local level?

NS: Yes, these CSET meetings are born precisely out of the urgency to create autonomous, situated and critical spaces where educational communities, researchers, teachers and activists can come together to discuss the challenges we face in our own local realities in the face of the global expansion of educational technology.

We live in a time when decisions about how we use technology in education are being dominated by global actors, by corporations, by techno-optimistic political agendas that, in many cases, do not understand, respect or value local contexts. Faced with this, we thought it was necessary to provoke a reverse movement: to create strong local networks, where communities can think together, from their territories, what it means to make a fair, critical and democratic education in a deeply digitised society.

The idea is not to replicate major international conferences or to impose universal discourses. On the contrary. We want these meetings to be spaces for horizontal dialogue, where diverse voices are heard, where problems, tensions, concerns and also hopes that are specific to each context are put on the table. Because we know that the problems faced by a school in Barcelona are not the same as those faced by a school in Melbourne, Nairobi or Mexico City.

But, at the same time, these meetings allow us to weave a global network of critical solidarity. We want these conversations not to remain isolated, but to form part of a wider network of actors committed to rethinking and reimagining educational technology from a more humane, just and emancipatory social, political and pedagogical perspective.

In short, CSET is not a series of events. It is an invitation to build community, to strengthen alliances, to share struggles and learning, and to demonstrate that it is possible to confront the extractivist, colonialist and dehumanising logics that today permeate global EdTech. And to do so from below, from the collective, from the situated.

### 3.- Final thoughts

The conversation with Neil Selwyn offers a lucid, provocative and committed synthesis of the current state of educational technologies. Throughout this interview, a series of problematic nuclei have clearly emerged that require urgent attention from public policies, school communities and the academic field. The following is a summary of the main lines of analysis and action that emerged from this dialogue:

#### *From critique to imagination: the post-critical turn as horizon*

One of Selwyn's greatest contributions has been his defence of the post-critical turn. Unlike traditional critique, which focuses on dismantling and denouncing, the post-critical perspective proposes a critique that also constructs, that accompanies, that repairs. This position is aligned with feminist<sup>24</sup>, philosophical<sup>25</sup> and pedagogical proposals that call for a shift from analysis to design, from observation to prototyping.

Criticism should not end with diagnosis, but should open up horizons of possibility. This implies linking up with educational communities, listening to their knowledge, working on the basis of their needs and avoiding reproducing extractive academic logics. As Selwyn rightly points out, it is time to think with schools and not only about them.

#### *Against enshitification: decommodification of EdTech*

The term "enshitification"<sup>26</sup> encapsulates the drift that many digital technologies have undergone: from being useful tools to becoming opaque, intrusive and subordinated to market interests. In the field of education, this drift jeopardises not only pedagogical quality, but also the digital sovereignty of teachers, students and institutions.

Against this backdrop, it is essential to build a public, open source, democratically governed technology infrastructure focused on educational value rather than data monetisation.

#### *Revaluing teaching professionalism in the face of deskilling*

The automation of teaching tasks, far from freeing up time and strengthening pedagogical creativity, has brought with it new forms of deprofessionalisation. As Selwyn warns, many current technologies intensify invisible work, reduce professional autonomy and transform the teacher into an executor subordinated to algorithmic systems.

---

<sup>24</sup> Boler, Megan. "Feminist Politics of Emotions and Critical Digital Pedagogies." *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 130, no. 5 (2015): 1489-1496.

<sup>25</sup> Hodgson, Naomi. "Post-Critique, Politics, and the Political in Educational Philosophy." *On Education: Journal for Research and Debate* 3, no. 9 (2020). [https://doi.org/10.17899/on\\_ed.2020.9.3](https://doi.org/10.17899/on_ed.2020.9.3)

<sup>26</sup> Doctorow, Cory. *The Internet Con: How to Seize the Means of Computation*. London: Verso, 2023

This deskilling process requires an urgent response: strengthening professional agency, building ethical frameworks for the use of AI in education, guaranteeing spaces for critical training and promoting teacher participation in the design of technologies. It is not a matter of rejecting technology, but of contesting it from an emancipatory perspective.

### *Small, local and localised technologies*

Selwyn's insistence on "small and situated technologies" reminds us that not every educational problem needs a global solution. Instead of applying homogeneous platforms with a global reach, it is a matter of promoting technological solutions designed from the territories, respecting the rhythms, languages and practices of each school community.

This commitment to the local is not nostalgia, but a political strategy: it allows us to resist the concentration of technological power and build more sustainable, accessible and fair alternatives. As the CSET movement has shown, critical networks can be born from the micro and scale up to the global, without losing their territorial anchorage.

In sum, this interview with Neil Selwyn not only provides conceptual tools for analysing contemporary EdTech, but also opens up ways to act from a pedagogy of care, social justice and political imagination. Faced with the extractive and dehumanising logic of many platforms, we need to cultivate a relationship with technology that is not based on efficiency or control, but on dialogue, co-creation and hope.

Education cannot simply "adapt" to technological change. It must actively participate in defining them. As an academic community, as teaching professionals, as citizens, it is up to us to reclaim the essential question: what educational technology do we want and what future are we building it for? As Selwyn suggests, the answer will not emerge from top-down mandates, but from within classrooms, from the margins, and from the solidarities we are able to forge collectively.

### **References**

- Bell, Genevieve. "Touching the Future." *Griffith Review* 71 (2021).  
<https://www.griffithreview.com/articles/touching-the-future/>.
- Boler, Megan. "Feminist Politics of Emotions and Critical Digital Pedagogies." *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America* 130, no. 5 (2015): 1489-1496.
- Cobo, Cristóbal. *La innovación pendiente: reflexiones sobre educación, tecnología y conocimiento*. Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 2019.

- Cobo, Cristóbal y Pablo Rivera-Vargas. «What Is “Algorithmic Education” and Why Do Education Institutions Need to Consolidate New Capacities? » In *The New Digital Education Policy Landscape*, edited by Cristóbal Cobo and Axel Rivas, 210-225. Londres, New York: Routledge, 2023.
- Doctorow, Cory. *The Internet Con: How to Seize the Means of Computation*. London: Verso, 2023.
- Dussel, Inés, and Mariana Trujillo, coords. *Educación y tecnologías en tiempos de pandemia: reflexiones desde América Latina*. Buenos Aires: UNIPe, 2020.
- Emejulu, Akwugo, and Callum McGregor. "Towards a Radical Digital Citizenship in Digital Education." *Critical Studies in Education* 60, no. 1 (2019): 131-147. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2016.1234494>
- Hodgson, Naomi. "Post-Critique, Politics, and the Political in Educational Philosophy." *On Education: Journal for Research and Debate* 3, no. 9 (2020). [https://doi.org/10.17899/on\\_ed.2020.9.3](https://doi.org/10.17899/on_ed.2020.9.3)
- Latour, Bruno. "Why Has Critique Run Out of Steam? From Matters of Fact to Matters of Concern." *Critical Inquiry* 30, no. 2 (2004): 225-248.
- Lugo, María Teresa. "Pensar la tecnología desde América Latina." *Red Universitaria de Tecnología Educativa*, 2006.
- Macgilchrist, Felicitas.
- "What Is 'Critical' in Critical Studies of EdTech? Three Responses." *Learning, Media and Technology* 46, no. 3 (2021a): 243-249. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2021.1958843>
  - "Rewilding Technology." *On Education: Journal for Research and Debate*, no. 12 (2021b). [https://www.oneducation.net/no-12\\_december-2021/rewilding-technology/](https://www.oneducation.net/no-12_december-2021/rewilding-technology/)
- Raffaghelli, Juliana E. «Pathways for Social Justice in the Datafied Society: Reconsidering the Educational Response». *Media Education* 14, no. 1 (30 January 2023). <https://doi.org/10.36253/me-13383>.
- Selwyn, Neil.
- "The Critique of Digital Education: Time for a (Post)Critical Turn." In *A New Repertoire for Critique in Contemporary Education*, edited by Radhika Gorur, Paolo Landri, and Romuald Normand, 87-102. London: Routledge, 2022.
  - "Digital Degrowth: Toward Radically Sustainable Education Technology." *Learning, Media and Technology*. 2023.

**Funding:**

This study was partially funded by the transnational cooperation project "ETH-TECH: Anchoring the Ethics of Educational Technology (AI and Data) to Educational Practice", ERASMUS+ / COOPERATION PARTNERSHIPS IN HIGHER EDUCATION (KA220-HED): Project 2024-1-IT02-KA220-HED-000255527 "ETH-TECH".

**Disclaimers:**

Conflicts of Interest: The co-authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

**Contributions by author:**

Neil Selwyn (co-author): Conceptualisation, theoretical analysis, writing (review and editing).

Pablo Rivera-Vargas (co-author): Conceptualisation, theoretical analysis, writing (review and editing).

Gustavo Herrera-Urizar (co-author): Conceptualisation, theoretical analysis, writing (review and editing).