"The More We Connect; The Better It Gets:" Examining the Cyber Rhetoric of "Global" Literacies

Lama Alharbi[1]

Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, PA, US

Abstract: This article aims to excavate nuances about the cyber/digital rhetoric and its impact on conceptualizing "global" literacies to emphasize the importance of reimagining these literacies from a sociocultural perspective. Therefore, with a particular focus on power relations, social issues, and inequality as an under-explored area in the expansion of digital/"global" literacies, this article explores the techno-utopian underpinnings of the cyber narrative. This narrative is implicated in the Facebook-led initiative to spread "connectedness" to the two-thirds of the world who, according to Internet.org (2015), are not "connected" yet. In focusing on the Facebook-led initiative in this article, I am not attempting to promote this initiative as the only option to examine the cyber narrative, but to reveal with great specificity in what ways the current cyber narrative repackages the "autonomous" model of literacies that emphasizes the dualistic ideology of "literate" vs. "illiterate." This article also uncovers serious implications of this cyber narrative on people from economically disadvantaged nations and communities in terms of reinforcing a sense of dis-citizenship, marginalization, disempowerment, and inequality.

Keywords: Digital literacies, cyber narrative, global literacies, power relations, inequality

---

[1] Lama Alharbi is a Ph.D. student in Composition and TESOL at Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, PA, USA. Email: vsqs@iup.edu

Introduction

In a short documentary about the lives of a group of American and European expatriates in Saudi Arabia, an assistant professor of the Middle Eastern Studies at King Fahd University of Petroleum and Minerals (KFUPM), Mark Thompson (2015), described Saudi people as "very well educated and *online* [emphasis added]." Such a description that suggests another hue in becoming literate perpetuates questions about the ways in which, under the banner of globalization, being educated and literate is equated with being "online." This equation also stimulates exploring the ways in which the paradox of "online" vs. "offline" implicitly recycles the paradox of "literate" vs. "illiterate." A similar observation is echoed in the debate between Collin and Street (2014), where Street noted that the current techno-centric discourse in educational contexts parallels the literacy-centric discourse in which literacy is configured as a technology that shapes and transforms everything it touches. In that sense, the techno-centric discourse relies heavily on the technological dimensions of literacies and uses web-based technologies as a driving force in conceptualizing "global" literacies without coevolving the sociocultural aspects of these literacies (Collin, 2013; Collin & Street, 2014; McKenna & Hughes, 2013).

Covering similar ground, research in the New Literacy Studies (NLS) has shown that defining and "legitimizing" certain types of literacy practices might be heavily inscribed in ideological power structures that determine "whose literacies are dominant, and whose are marginalized or resistant" (Street, 2003, p. 77). With this in mind, there is a need to examine the technological determinism that plays a role in conceptualizing digital literacies as "globalized" literacy practices around the world. In this article, I attempt to focus on power relations, social issues, and inequality as an under-explored area in the expansion of digital/ "global" literacies. I argue that this conceptualization of digital literacies is problematic because it recycles a neutral, autonomous, and value-free concept of literacy that deemphasizes the questions of power differentials within which individuals around the world operate. I employed the ideological model of literacies by Street (2003) as a theoretical lens. I critically scrutinize the current cyber/digital rhetoric that advocates internet access as a vital infrastructure that "autonomously" can make people better citizens by improving their socioeconomic status and enhancing their cognitive skills, regardless of their sociocultural backgrounds and conditions (Street, 2003).

Emphasizing the critical examination of the cyber narrative is necessary in order to engage with the local and global power relations. As educators and literacy practitioners, the question of power should not be escaped because our job entails, as Morgan & Ramanathan (2005) stated, "cultivating a citizenry that is able to negotiate and critically engage with the numerous texts, modalities, and technologies coming at

learners, and because we now collectively occupy globalized, interconnected spaces that insist on such critical engagement" (p. 152). Also, escaping the question of power might seem as an attempt to accuse "the metaphysics or ontology of power of being fraudulent", meanwhile power has always been rooted deeply in all aspects of our social networks which makes it almost impossible to turn our gaze away from questioning how power is exercised (Foucault, 1982, p. 787). The fact that power has always been part of our socialization practices and social networks does not absolve us from problematizing its structures and how it is exercised and exploited. In other words, as literacy practitioners, we should not be jaded while examining and investigating power's means and relations because nothing about power's exploitations should ever be naturalized or normalized. In that sense, escaping the question of power relations that manifests itself in the cyber narrative will impede us from seguing into some real talk about the ways in which such narratives implicitly disempower people in the so-called developing countries. This narrative has tacit, yet powerful undertones of exclusiveness because digital literacies, in many parts of the world, are not accessible as some empirical ethnographic studies have pointed out (Bartholet, 2013; Harrington, 2010; Haworth, 2011; Kajee & Balfour, 2011; Luke, 2003; McKenna & Hughes, 2013; Papen 2007; Parr, 2013). For instance, Kajee and Balfour (2011) noted that in South Africa an advantaged, elite minority has several access routes to digital literacy in their socio-cultural environments in comparison to a less privileged majority who comes from an under-resourced socio-cultural background. According to Kajee and Balfour (2011), this situation suggests that access to digital technology in South Africa is unevenly distributed. Thus, it is misguided to claim an attainable "global" digital nativeness and overlook the ways in which digitalization in general plays out in larger, complex, social structures of inequality and power relations.

That said, the ultimate goal of this article is to conduct a careful analysis of the cyber narrative that does not feed a "technophobic" rhetoric, which is only obsessed with resisting technological advances and emphasizing their failure and shortcomings (Wang & Chen, 2015). Instead, this analysis aims to socio-culturally situate the cyber narrative to avoid reproducing a neutral, culturally insensitive narrative of digital literacies. To this end, I examine an example of a widely circulated cyber narrative that is implicated in the Facebook-led initiative to spread "connectedness" to the two-thirds of the world who, according to Internet.org (2015), are not "connected" yet. In focusing on the Facebook-led initiative in this article, I am not attempting to promote this initiative as the only option to examine the cyber narrative, but to reveal with great specificity in what ways the current cyber narrative repackages the "autonomous" model of literacies that emphasizes the great divide between "literate" and "illiterate" (Collin & Street, 2014; Street, 2003).

Consequently, by extending Street's (2014) socio-ideological disposition[2] on the

---

[2] Street's disposition is delineated in Collin's and Street's (2014) article.

current techno-centric discourses, this theoretical/position article offers ways of imagining the digital/cyber narrative and its impact on conceptualizing "global" literacies. Towards this end, it is imperative to first focus on the micro level of the cyber narrative and how it recycles the "autonomous" model of literacies. Then, secondly, on the macro level, it is equally important to sketch out the implications of such a narrative for people from economically disadvantaged nations and communities in terms of reinforcing a sense of dis-citizenship, cultural alienation, disempowerment, and inequality.

Exploring the Techno-Utopian Underpinnings of the Cyber Narrative

In the spirit of the arguments outlined, it is essential to consider defining what the current cyber narrative constitutes before discussing the impact of this narrative on conceptualizing digital literacies. The current cyber narrative is a rhetoric that universalizes claims about the power of internet accessibility in which being "connected" can ignite profound transformations in human cognition, disrupt unequal social and power relations, or provoke modes of labor where it alleviates poverty regardless of people's ethnic, racial, religious, socioeconomic, and sociopolitical backgrounds (Bartholet, 2013; Nichols, 2013; Parr, 2013; Street, 2014). According to Street (2014) and Nichols (2013), promoting such utopian characteristics of the Internet is similar to the historical "autonomous" assumptions about literacy that have been refuted by many socioculturalist literacy scholars. One of these scholars is Street who debunked the "autonomous" model of literacy because it "disguises the cultural and ideological assumptions that underpin [literacy], so that it can then be presented as though they are neutral and universal" (2003, p. 77). Therefore, Street highlighted the significance of adapting the ideological model of literacy because it suggests "a more culturally sensitive view of literacy practices as they vary from one context to another [in comparison to] the autonomous approach [that] is simply imposing western conceptions of literacy on other cultures" (2003, p. 77). Street further explained that literacy is "a social practice, not simply a technical and neutral skill" (2003, p. 77). Literacies, in that sense, have to be constructed as contextualized social practices that are shaped by the specific sociocultural factors that impact people in different contexts.

It is essential to denounce any normative universalized claims about any forms of literacies, particularly digital ones because such claims run the risk of dis-embeddedness. Universalizing certain forms of literacy practices, such as the digital ones, goes against conceptualizing literacies as socially situated practices. As Duffy (2007) suggested, any attempt to search for "universal" truth about literacies will fail because "literacy is always marked by the particular, the specific, and the situated" (p. 191). Thus, any attempt to abandon the social and the ideological underpinnings of digital literacies is to restore the "autonomous" model of literacy in the field by

emphasizing a culturally insensitive perspective towards people's literacy practices.

With all of this in mind, the cyber narrative also seems to have a strong tendency in oversimplifying the complexity of people's lives, issues, and problems because it promotes a perspective of "technological solutionism" where people's hardships are being treated as puzzles that can be solved by a click (Morozov, 2012). In his book *The Net Delusion: The Dark Side of Internet Freedom,* Morozov indicated that "internet-centrism" hinders people from engaging in the hard work of mitigating complex social issues by framing these issues in terms of internet access while discarding the sociopolitical and sociocultural nature of these issues. In a similar vein, the internet-centric rhetoric is reflected in some of the current digitalization projects in educational contexts, such as the initiatives of Open Education Resources Movements and Massive Open Online Courses (MOOC) (McKenna & Hughes, 2013). By promoting "equal" digital access for students and teachers in economically disadvantaged nations, these initiatives completely overlook the ways in which "equal" digital access plays out in a cyber-world that has its defined hierarchy of valued scholarships, languages, and literacy practices. In that sense, "equal" here is framed only in terms of getting internet access, regardless of people's social realties. Therefore, in unfolding the debates on literacy digitalization, the following section extends the discussion on the challenges of digital literacy practices in some parts of the world. It also highlights the issues of power differentials in relation to accessibility and affordability of digital literacies worldwide.

Investigating the Fallacy of Digital Nativeness

Even though there are many speculations about the ways in which web-based technologies will transform education around the world, it is significant to explore how sociocultural factors, in particular educational contexts, determine access to these technologies. In Kajee's and Balfour's (2011) study that investigated the techno-utopian rhetoric in different educational contexts in South Africa, the scholars indicated that many of their participants had no computer access at their homes and schools. Kajee and Balfour (2011) also concluded in their study that getting access to digital technologies in South Africa was associated with class and privilege. Therefore, having a minimal access to digital technologies led to disempowerment and marginalization of the majority of the students who came from poor districts around the country. On a similar note, by examining the implementation of digital projects such as Massive Open Online Courses (MOOC) in Rwanda, Bartholet (2013) reported that there are many complex obstacles such as the unequal distribution of resources in school programs, which precludes less privileged students from having digital access. This also echoes Parr's (2013) findings in his study that examined the use of mobile technology in sharing "European" teaching materials and resources in teacher education programs in Sub-

Saharan Africa. Parr (2013) concluded that in order to successfully launch this program, the university needed to widely expand the use of laptops and computer desktops in the Sub-Saharan region, which was financially an impossible solution. This situation forced university teachers to use mobile devices for launching the online sharing program. Similarly, Parr (2013) pointed out that teachers in the nations of Sub-Saharan Africa faced many complexities associated with compatibility issues that prevented the program from successfully showing the teaching materials on cellphones. Teachers also had to deal with the lack of affordable internet access where the only option they had is to get some access via cellphones at high-priced service plans. In the face of these findings, it is necessary to question the ways in which the techno-utopian rhetoric tends to overlook the fact that, in many parts of the world, people lack access to affordable digital technologies. Digital access in that sense is inscribed heavily in other complex power relations, such as state control and distribution of resources.

This being the case, overemphasizing web-based technologies in economically disadvantaged educational contexts, when looked at from a sociocultural perspective, runs the risk of maximizing the gap between in-school and out-of-school literacy practices. When digital literacies are not featured as locally, "legitimized" modes of literacy practices at home in such communities, bridging the non-digital home experiences on the one hand and the "partial" digital experiences at school on the other will be challenging. In other words, championing digital literacy in contexts where the only way for students to get "minimal" digital access is via web-based technologies at their schools might preclude these students from transferring their home-based literacy practices to their formal educational contexts (Street, 2003).

On a similar note, Street's "culturally-sensitive" theoretical stance that taps into the cultural and social complexity of literacy practices parallels the social view of the OECD Skills report on literacy practices. The OECD is an international policy report from the Organization for Economic Co-operation, which provides rich data sources on adults' performance and proficiency in literacy skills and problem solving in "technology-rich environments." In the foreword of this report, OECD Secretary-General Angel Gurría (2013) suggested that "if there is one central message emerging from this new survey, it is that what people know and what they do with what they know has a major impact on their life chances" (OECD, 2013, p. 3). Interestingly, this implication is actually based on data and surveys that were collected from countries labeled as "technology-rich environments" and "hyper-connected societies." Therefore, it is relative to the argument of digital literacies to imagine what the implications are if the data of the OECD report were collected in communities that are not configured as "hyper-connected societies." Imagining the implications might help literacy practitioners to problematize the overemphasis on technological determinism over the sociocultural factors in disadvantaged communities (Collin, 2013; Collin & Street, 2014; Rogers, Hunter & Uddin, 2007).

On a similar note, the OECD report (2013) indicated that "if large proportions of adults have low reading and numeracy skills, introducing and disseminating productivity-improving technologies and work organization practices can be hampered; that, in turn, will stall improvements in living standards (p. 27). Similarly, introducing technologies without foregrounding the sociocultural factors as a political maneuver runs the risk of romanticizing power differentials in literacy socialization processes (Heath & Street, 2008; Sterponi, 2011).

It is therefore crucial to voice concerns about reproducing a cyber-narrative that equates being literate with being "connected." Such narrative has serious implications in terms of conceptualizing literacies in which techno-centrism repackages the autonomous model of literacy as discussed earlier (Street, 2014). Another important implication is disadvantaging people of "the developing countries" by reinforcing power differentials in their communities. In such communities, as the above studies suggested, a less privileged majority is being left behind in that they are not able to compete with more advantaged peers from privileged backgrounds in terms of digital access and acquiring digital literacies. Furthermore, it is equally important to problematize the cyber narrative that advocates digital nativeness as a key to being fully functioning members in society regardless of people's sociocultural and socioeconomic backgrounds (Turculei & Tulbure, 2015). Such rhetoric perpetuates a sense of dis-citizenship in which less-privileged people are deprived from their right to participate fully in their communities. This is because the reframing of their literacy practices in a decontextualized way does not take into consideration "what people know and what they do with what they know has a major impact on their life chances" (OECD, 2013, p. 3; Ramanathan, 2013). Bearing in mind that the concept of citizenship needs to be understood beyond the passport or visa status that individuals hold, instead citizenship should be conceptualized in terms of being able to participate fully in one's society (Ramanathan, 2013). Such conceptualization of citizenship entails turning our gaze to every instance of literacy practices, teaching pedagogies, and institutionalized discourses that disempower, disadvantage, and marginalize people (Ramanathan, 2013).

As educators, we need to be alert to the discourses that insist on reproducing a utopian rhetoric about digital literacies. This means insisting on ideologically imposing literacy practices that are not part of the contexts and social realities of the majority of people in "the developing countries." In that sense, the current cyber narrative goes against figuring out literacies as social practices that are inscribed in people's sociocultural realties. Hence, Street (2014) argued that failing to recognize the ideological and sociocultural questions in conceptualizing digital literacies will lead to the same dilemmas that educators, policy makers, and literacy practitioners faced with configuring literacy as a technology that "automatically revolutionizes individuals and whole societies" (p. 353). Thus, reviewing the current debates about the use of web-

based technologies for acquiring digital literacies in some parts of the world is not only to highlight the mismatches between these technologies and social realities. It is also used to emphasize the ways in which the utopian rhetoric of digital literacies disempowers and marginalize people, who for sociocultural and socioeconomical reasons, cannot have an access to the digital resources that institutions are marketing globally. Because of the unequal and the insufficient access to web-based technologies in many parts of the world, it is ultimately impossible to claim a "global" digital nativeness across the globe.

To sharpen the discussion on cyber narrative and its impact on conceptualizing digital literacies, I attempt to examine how this narrative is manifested in one of the "globally" powerful institutions' initiatives of spreading internet connectivity. The following section aims to shed light on what is wrong with the current cyber rhetoric by analyzing the mission statement of the Facebook-led initiative.

"The More We Connect; The Better It Gets:" Examining the Cyber Rhetoric of the Facebook-Led Initiative

On August 23, 2013, Mark Zuckerberg, founder and CEO of Facebook, announced the launch of Internet.org. The aim of this initiative was to make internet access available to the next five billion people around the world. On the face of it, such an initiative may seem harmless and innocent, yet careful examination of its mission statement reveals suspicious ambiguity.

For example, Internet.org states that the goal of this initiative is "to make internet access available to the two-thirds of the world who are not yet connected, and to bring the same opportunities to everyone that the connected third of the world has today" (Facebook Newsroom, 2013, para. 5). This statement suggests that being "connected" to the Internet *per se* will bring "the same opportunities" that privileged people enjoy in "technology-rich environments." Such a statement shows signs of communicating an egalitarian ideology, with this equation also qualifying as a fallacy of reasoning. It also indicates a superiority of "online" people in comparison to offline ones because "online" here is equated with positive results, such as bringing "opportunities," while being "offline" is represented as an obstacle that precludes "opportunities." In that sense, "offline" people might be regarded as relatively deprived and inferior in comparison to "online" people. In this way, this initiative reduces "opportunities" to "connectivity," which might recycle the autonomous claims about literacy in which introducing literacy to "illiterate" people would bring ubiquitous transformations for their social growth, economic success, and cognitive skills (Street, 2003; Nichols, 2013). In the same way, the Facebook-led initiative seems to suggest that introducing the Internet to those who are not "connected" will bring them pervasive "opportunities" regardless of people's

socioeconomic, sociocultural, and sociopolitical backgrounds.

Similarly, this culturally-insensitive perspective seems to be reflected in one of Mark Zuckerberg's (2015) statements that advocates his initiative in New Delhi, India. Zuckerberg (2015) asked a group of Indian university students to imagine the power of being "connected" where, according to him, "research has shown that for everyone who gets access to the Internet, about one person gets a job created and about one person gets out of poverty." Such normative claims run the risk of oversimplifying issues such as alleviating poverty by framing it in terms of solely getting access to the Internet. In that sense, the Internet.org's initiative takes a reductive oversimplifying view towards the real problems that impede people from initially "connecting." Nichols (2013) made a similar observation when he suggested:

> Not only does this [Facebook-led initiative] take a reductive and condescending view toward the actual obstacles that impede opportunity in less "connected" countries, but it also doesn't consider the possibility that "connectedness" itself might be complexly intertwined in a larger cycle of development. (para. 11)

Moreover, by claiming that digital connectivity will bring equal "opportunities," the Internet.org's initiative seems to overlook that the Internet still has technological problems that are associated with the reproductions of scripts in languages other than English (Block, 2004). Even though there is an increase in the number of the web pages in other languages other than English, those pages are only in the languages of economically advantaged nations such as France, Germany, Japan, Russia, and Spain, while the languages of minorities and economically disadvantaged nations are still not shown (Block, 2004). Interestingly, Mark Zuckerberg (2014) has readily acknowledged the fact that "more than 80% of content on the internet is in just 10 languages, but a lot of countries in Asia and Africa aren't well represented online" (para. 2). With this in mind, one can indicate that this initiative in fact may not accommodate the multilingual needs of the people who are targeted by this initiative in the first place. In that sense, it is misguided to claim that connectivity will guarantee "the same opportunities" for less privileged people who do not live in "technology–rich environments."

In a similar vein, observing the utopian, rosy language that is used to describe how the Internet can spread basic literacies to the billions who are not "connected" raises many questions. In its mission statement, the Facebook-led initiative asks people to "imagine the power of an encyclopedia for a child without textbooks" (Internet.org, 2015, para. 1-2). It is important to be attentive to the underlying assumption of this statement, which claims that getting access to an "online" encyclopedia for children from economically disadvantaged nations might "empower" them regardless of the reasons that deprive them from having textbooks in the first place. Such statements blatantly overlook the fact that in economically disadvantaged communities, according to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (2015), children are

out of school because of poverty, child labor, and armed conflicts.

Furthermore, the Internet.org's initiative also did not articulate on its mission statement the claim "the more we connect, the better it gets" (Internet.org, para. 2). There is a sense of ambiguity on why "the more we connect, the better it gets" and for whom it gets better. Therefore, it is necessary to call such statements into examination, particularly if we consider Mark Zuckerberg's speech in New Delhi, India in October, 2015, which reveals the plan of his initiative of "connecting" people. In his speech, Zuckerberg presented his connectivity plan that begins with free internet basics, which allow people to surf the Internet for only basic information in search engines and set up their own Facebook pages. Then, if people like the Internet, they can become full paying consumers for the full internet service. In that sense, this initiative will "connect" less privileged people in a certain way that will never provide them with the same "opportunities" that some of the privileged people enjoy in economically advantaged countries. According to Foucault (1982), power relations are maintained when social, cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic differences are reinforced and manipulated by complex means of power, which can be the case of this initiative when it suggests "connecting" less privileged people in a way that sustains their differences instead of mitigating them. Therefore, from a Foucauldian perspective, the Facebook-led initiative is exercising one of the most established power means that aims to implicitly reinforce "the systems of differentiations" that have already been established by social, linguistic, and socioeconomic factors (Foucault, 1982, p. 792). By connecting people in a plan that only offers them "partial" access to the Internet is to reinforce their differences and marginalization, and not to provide them with equal "opportunities" to fully participate in digital literacies.

On the other hand, it is equally important to highlight the ways in which Zuckerberg's "social locations" play a role in authorizing his speech for and about others[3]. According to Alcoff (1991), the "speaker's locations are epistemically salient, but certain privileged locations are discursively dangerous" (p. 7). Alcoff (1991) further explained that, in many cases, when a privileged person speaks for, on behalf, or about less privileged people, it results in reinforcing their hardship because it falls into "the crisis of representation," which involves reductively representing people's needs, problems, goals, situations, and unfortunately, who they are (p. 9). Thus, it is critical to not fall in into the assumptions that Zuckerberg's statements are purely his personal views and do not speak to a greater cyber narrative that reinforces people's marginalization and ghettoization.

To sum up this analysis, examining the cyber narrative that is manifested in the Facebook-led initiative help us, as educators, to understand why it is problematic to

---

[3] According to Alcoff (1991), it is difficult to distinguish the act of speaking for others and speaking about others because "when one is speaking for others, one may be describing their situation and thus also about them" (p. 9).

reduce opportunities and empowerment to "connectivity" and digital access. Therefore, it is salient to highlight the ways in which the vision of this initiative relies on a binary that distinguishes between "connected" and "non-connected" societies in a way that mirrors the great divide between "literate" and "illiterate" peoples (Street, 2014; Nichols, 2013). These clear-cut distinctions are often used to emphasize the inferiority and the backwardness of "illiterate" populations in the same way that Internet.org's mission reinforces the inferiority of those who are not "connected" (Nichols, 2013). Furthermore, the rhetoric of this initiative is rife with "technological solutionism" that fails to take up sociocultural and socioeconomic measures of digital practices in economically disadvantaged nations. As Street (2014) emphasized, the problem with the current techno-centric rhetoric, which I have shown to be reflected in this initiative, overlooks the fact that "technologies set off changes only when they are embedded in socio-ideological projects; strip away the latter, and all you have is an amusing gadget or, in the case of literacy, a mental trick" (p. 353). By championing the universality and neutrality in digital literacies acquisition, we, as educators and literacy practitioners, fail to take into account the specific social contexts in which literacy practices are embedded.

Conclusion

The salient layover of this discussion is to emphasize the need of configuring digital literacies from sociocultural and socio-ideological perspectives in order to avoid repackaging "the autonomous model" of literacy that can be subsumed under the belief that literacy *per se* initiates neutral transformations in societies (Street, 2003; 2014). Likewise, the current cyber rhetoric is promoting a narrative where internet access by itself can give free rein to people's cognitive thinking capacity and improve their socioeconomic statuses. This perspective seems to overlook the fact that some people might face social and economic impediments that hinder their success in acquiring certain forms of digital literacy practices. Therefore, digital/internet access alone cannot eradicate social constraints already imposed on people in disadvantaged communities.

Furthermore, in the face of the digital/technological challenges that many people in these countries face, it is problematic to reductively equate being literate with being "online." Such an equation may preclude people from participating fully in their communities where getting digital access is not attainable in their communities. In that sense, it is necessary to excavate nuances about the ways in which such cyber narratives exclude, marginalize, and disempower people from communities that are not configured as "hyper-connected" ones. Thus, this article has emphasized that campaigning for digital literacies in these communities runs the risk of decontextualizing and dis-embedding literacy practices. Finally, as the debate of digitalization evolves

rapidly, debunking the "old" dualistic ideology of literacy-versus-illiteracy requires breaking the hold of dualism in new emerging literacies as well. That is, as literacy practitioners, we must be alert to any rhetoric that reinforces a new online-versus-offline dualistic ideology in digital literacies.

References

Alcoff, L. (1991). The problem of speaking for others. *Cultural Critique*, *20*, 5-32.

Bartholet, J. (2013). MOOCs: Hype and hope. *Scientific American*, *309*(2), 53-61.

Block, D. (2004). Globalization, transnational communication and the Internet. *International Journal on Multicultural Societies*, *6*(1), 13-28.

Collin, R. (2013). Revisiting Jack Goody to rethink determinisms in literacy studies. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *48*(1), 27-38.

Collin, R., & Street, B. (2014). Ideology and interaction: Debating determinisms in Literacy Studies. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *49*(3), 351-359.

Duffy, J. (2007). *Writing from these roots: Literacy in a Hmong-American community*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

Facebook Newsroom. (2013, August 21). Technology leaders launch partnership to make Internet access available to all. Retrieved from http://newsroom.fb.com/news/2013/08/technology-leaders-launch-partnership-to-make-internet-access-available-to-all/

Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. *Critical Inquiry*, *4*, 777-795.

Harrington, A. M. (2010). Problematizing the Hybrid Classroom for ESL/EFL Students. *TESL-EJ*, *14*(3), 1-13.

Haworth, P. (2011). Globalizing literacy: the challenge of ethnolinguistic diversity in New Zealand. *Literacy*, *45*(3), 141-149.

Heath, S. B., & Street, B. V. (2008). *On ethnography: Approaches to language and literacy research*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Interent.org. (2015). Connecting the world. Retrieved from https://info.internet.org/en/

Kajee, L., & Balfour, R. (2011). Students' access to digital literacy at a South African university: Privilege and marginalization. *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies*, *29*(2), 187-196.

Lea, M., & Jones, S. (2011). Digital literacies in higher education: Exploring textual and technological practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, *36*(4), 377-393.

Luke, A. (2003). Literacy and the other: A sociological approach to literacy research and policy in multilingual societies. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *38*(1), 132-141.

McKenna, C., & Hughes, J. (2013). Values, digital texts and open practices—A changing scholarly landscape in higher education. In R. Goodfellow & M. R. Lea

(Eds.), *Literacy in the digital university: Critical perspectives on learning, scholarship, and technology* (pp. 15-26). New York, NY: Routledge.

Morgan, B., & Ramanathan, V. (2005). Critical literacies and language education: Global and local perspectives. *Annual review of applied linguistics*, *25*, 151-169.

Morozov, E. (2012). *The net delusion: The dark side of Internet freedom*. New York, NY: Public Affairs.

Nichols, P. (2013, August 23). Spreading literacy, spreading Internet: Literacy has always been about more than just the ability to read. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2013/08/spreading-literacy-spreading-internet/279007/

OECD. (2013). *OECD skills outlook 2013: First results from the survey of adult skills*. OECD Publishing, Paris. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264204256-en

Thompson, M. (2015, December). Saudi Arabia: The eyes of others [Video file]. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x-iNzj2_IhI

Parr, C. (2013, September 12). Africa's mobile phone e- learning transformation. *Times Higher Education*. Retrieved from https://www.timeshighereducation.com/features/africas-mobile-phone-e-learning-transformation/2007120.article#survey-answer

Papen, U. (2007). *Literacy and globalization: Reading and writing in times of social and cultural change*. New York, NY: Routledge

Ramanathan, V. (Ed.). (2013). *Language policies and (dis)citizenship: Rights, access, pedagogies*. Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Rogers, A., Hunter, J., & Aftab Uddin, M. (2007). Adult learning and literacy learning for livelihoods: some international perspectives. *Development in Practice*, *17*(1), 137-146.

Street, B. (2003). What's "new" in New Literacy Studies? Critical approaches to literacy in theory and practice. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, *5*(2), 77-91.

Sterponi, L. (2011). Literacy socialization. In A. Duranti, E. Ochs, & B. B. Schieffelin (Eds.), *Handbook of language socialization* (pp. 227-246). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Turculei, A. A., & Tulbure, C. T. (2015). Digital literacy challenge in the context of contemporary education. *ELearning & software for education*, (2), 346-353.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2015). A growing number of children and adolescents are out of school as aid fails to meet the mark. New York, NY: UNESCO publishing. Retrieved from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002336/233610e.pdf

Wang, C. C., & Chen, J. J. (2015). Overcoming technophobia in poorly-educated elderly–the HELPS-seniors service-learning program. *International Journal of Automation and Smart Technology*, *5*(3), 173-182.

Wickens, C. M., & Sandlin, J. A. (2007). Literacy for what? Literacy for whom? The politics of literacy education and neocolonialism in UNESCO-and World Bank–sponsored literacy programs. *Adult Education Quarterly*, *57*(4), 275-292.

Zuckerberg, M. (2014, October 9). I'm in Delhi, India for our first Internet.org summit. Over the year we've been working to overcome the major barriers preventing more [Facebook status update]. Retrieved from https://www.facebook.com/zuck/posts/10101687201975511

Zuckerberg, M. (2015, October 28). Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg speech at ITT Delhi | Interaction With Students | Part 1 [Video file]. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=p1JEJ8n9Wzs