Human development and social media in digital societies
Desarrollo humano y redes sociales en sociedades digitales

Vicent Gozálvez-Pérez*
Universidad de Valencia, Valencia, Spain
vicent.gozalvez@uv.es
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7952-8347

Gemma Cortijo-Ruiz**
Universidad de Valencia, Valencia, Spain
gemma.cortijo@uv.es
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1729-7114

Abstract

This article proposes a philosophical and pedagogical reflection about the conditions for Human development and citizen empowerment in digital social contexts. Living in the digital age requires theoretical foundations that guide civic education in digital environments and that point towards social and democratic progress. However, the idea of developing an intercultural and democratic ethos in an interconnected and media world is not an easy task to tackle. In this way, this research aims to respond to aspects such as: What are the civic capacities and virtues in a radically diverse media environment? How to promote media citizenship in the face of ethically and politically questionable uses of social media? How to promote a digital culture in line with human development? After a bibliographical and hermeneutical analysis, a training proposal is articulated to empower media citizenship based on the 'capability approach' of Amartya Sen and Martha Nussbaum. In accordance with these assumptions and based on the current need to rebuild a democratic ethos for an interconnected and globalized world, a theoretical model is formulated to cultivate democracy in digital environments, in favor of human development and taking advantage of the potential of social networks as a reticular communicative structure with a global and intercultural scope.

Keywords

Democracy, interculturality, human development, capabilities, civic education, social media.

*   Holds a PhD in Philosophy and Education Sciences. Master in Psychoethics for civic and moral education. He is a senior lecturer in the Department of Theory of Education at the University of Valencia. Specialist in the research and teaching of Philosophy of Education, Education for Citizenship, Intercultural Pedagogy and Media Education. Author of Moral Intelligence (2000, Desclée de Brouwer), and Media Citizenship. An Educational Look (2012, Dykinson).

**   Teacher of Early Childhood Education at the University of Valencia. Master's Degree in Politics, Management and Management of Educational Institutions. Researcher in training in the Department of Theory of Education and PhD in the Education Program of the University of Valencia. Member of the GIPU-EA research group.

Resumen

El presente artículo plantea una reflexión filosófica y pedagógica acerca de las condiciones para el desarrollo humano y el empoderamiento ciudadano en contextos sociales digitales. Vivir en plena era digital requiere de unas bases teóricas que orienten la educación cívica en entornos digitales y que apunten hacia el progreso social y democrático. No obstante, la idea de forjar un *ethos* intercultural y democrático en un mundo interconectado y mediático no es una tarea sencilla. De esta manera el estudio se propone responder a aspectos como: ¿Cuáles son las capacidades y las virtudes cívicas en un entorno mediático radicalmente diverso? ¿Cómo fomentar la ciudadanía mediática frente a usos de las redes sociales ética y políticamente cuestionables? ¿Cómo promover una cultura digital en la línea del desarrollo humano? Tras un análisis bibliográfico y hermenéutico, se articula una propuesta formativa para empoderar a la ciudadanía mediática basada en el 'enfoque de las capacidades' de Amartya Sen y Martha Nussbaum. De acuerdo con estos presupuestos, y partiendo de la actual necesidad de reconstruir un ethos democrático para un mundo interconectado y globalizado, se formula un modelo teórico para cultivar la democracia en entornos digitales, a favor del desarrollo humano y aprovechando el potencial de las redes sociales como estructura comunicativa reticular de alcance global e intercultural.

Palabras clave

Democracia, interculturalidad, desarrollo humano, capacidades, educación cívica, redes sociales.

42

Introduction

This article raises the issue of human development in today's digital societies, i.e., in societies characterized by the emergence of a new form of communication, which occurs through social networks. The objective is twofold: on the one hand (1) it is about analyzing the problem of this type of communication in relation to human-hand development, on the other hand, (2) it is especially interested in analyzing the conditions and channels for a democratic and intercultural ethos linked to the idea of a human development that can flourish in digital societies. The method of analysis is based on a literature review and hermeneutics as a preliminary step for an interpretation and theoretical reflection of the problem. Given the dangers associated with certain uses of social networks, this study addresses the need to offer conceptual tools for a constructive criticism of digital environments. The aim is to promote social and educational empowerment of citizens in a democratic way, and to promote the use of networks favorable to full human development in accordance with Nussbaum capabilities approach (2012) and Sen´s idea of freedom as development (1999). Thus, after analyzing the risks of a simplistic (naive) and even harmful use of digital communication, the conditions for an autonomous, citizen and promoter of human development are established. From there, a set of practical proposals are created for promoting a democratic and intercultural ethos through social networks.

Human development and empowerment through social networks

As pointed out by Unesco (2015), globalization and the communicative exchange between people all over the world set the arena for an ethical globalization and new forms of political organization, since societies are claiming the possibility of actively intervening in public affairs as well as in the interpersonal and private life of democratic values, i.e., from civil liberties, from dignity and from the commitment to solidarity with the near and distant other. Globalization confronts us with new and undoubtedly global challenges, given the extension of interdependent relations among all human groups, regardless of their location and cultural profile (religious, moral, political, productive, etc.).

Perhaps the most glaring example is the challenge of environmental degradation, due to rising air pollution from the greenhouse effect and the resulting climate emergency. This global phenomenon affects the whole planet and demands urgent and strong measures to promote sustainability, both economically, socially and environmentally. According to Attfield (2010), the call for sustainability is not only a question of ecological respect for the environment, but a new - broader - vision that contains ethical and social aspects, as well as the need for a new way of understanding the relations of production, trade and consumption. In this interconnected and interdependent context, it is increasingly inconceivable that there should be a unilateral (especially war-like) solution to national or international conflicts, a solution which is perceived in this time as chronic and unacceptable both politically and ethically.

These are some examples of the need to expand and educatively consolidate a global and intercultural civic awareness, based on sustainable human development, advocated by the United Nations Organization (UNDP, 2021): an environmentally committed awareness, based on a respectful look at the other, capable of welcoming and celebrating cultural diversity, but at the same time capable of recognizing ethical-political differences that can be shared so that cultural diversity can be deployed in good conditions.

Habermas (1999) referred in this sense to the 'common politic culture' that lays the constitutional foundations for a genuine intercultural understanding, in which there is no place for cultural practices that imply domination or humiliation of the other that involve the violation of fundamental rights recognized by the United Nations. The 1948 Declaration of Human Rights sets a horizon for establishing a genuine intercultural

43
Φ

coexistence, in favor of civic education for the proper treatment of diversity from the value of human dignity and dialogue (active listening, readiness to understand and overcoming prejudices harmful to coexistence in a cultural plural context). However, the United Nations has promoted a new way of understanding human development and intercultural relations that go beyond the mere declaration of fundamental rights: it is the 'Capabilities approach (hereinafter CA) whose origin is in the neo-Aristotelian proposal of Amartya Sen´s ethical economy (1999), reinterpreted and later updated by Martha Nussbaum (2012).

Intercultural or global civic awareness involves not only guaranteeing and promoting fundamental rights: full human development implies, in addition, strengthening ways of life that help to empower or train people in their legitimate project of self-realization, i.e., of fulfilled or happy life. It is about, as Sen (2009) points out, recovering Aristotle's teleological legacy, attached to a broad idea of justice.

From the ethical and social approach of capabilities (CA), what would be the role of social networks in human development and in the process of citizen empowerment? What basic skills are considered necessary for developing a democratic ethos in global and media environments? These are the challenges that we want to face, based on the philosophical assumption of basic capacities for human development: (1) the essential framework for a minimally fulfilled life, and (2) the condition for the vital realization can be deployed in all the diversity and plurality of possibilities, in a limit of democratic legitimacy.

As Aguilar (2011) states, new virtual spaces are transforming the traditional ways of being and relating to the world, due to the impact of technology in our worldview. Social networks and the Internet, based on their network structure of virtually global scope, provide a favorable communication framework for intercultural dialogue and for the empowerment of individuals and peoples. According to Nussbaum (2012), they constitute an ideal space for cultivating basic capacities such as affiliation, imagination and senses, practical reason or the management of emotions. The youth use daily the media like Instagram, YouTube, TikTok, Twitch or Twitter to communicate, interact, exchange information, share, etc. According to the 2021 IAB and Elogia Social Networks Study, this use has increased exponentially due to the COVID-19 pandemic, especially Instagram (83%), TikTok (63%) and Twitter (63%), compared to 2018 (Ugalde and González, 2022). In fact, TikTok and Instagram have been the most downloaded social networks in 2019 by young people from 11 to 16 (Conde del Rio, 2021). According to statistical data from the Ditren-

dia Mobile Report in Spain (2018), 49% of young people between 18 and 24 years invest more than 4 hours a day on their mobile, with 74% of that time spent on social networks or instant messaging applications such as WhatsApp or Telegram.

In this globalized and interconnected context, the empowerment and basic training of people and especially of the youngest considered digital natives can find a place in social networks to expand properly as communicative forms that link people after breaking spatial boundaries and linguistic or cultural configuration. But if this process of civic, global, and democratic empowerment finds a place on social networks, it is also necessary to fulfill communicative provisions and requirements that can be unraveled and justified. Not every action or communication in network is favorable to human capacity, nor to the project of desirable human development. This refers to the challenge of educating in a democratic and intercultural ethos from social networks, hence the relevance of this topic. Pedagogically, a renewed, critical, participative and transformative look of the new digital environment is required, recognizing the value of the new media to improve society.

As known, our globalized and inter-communicated societies demand new ethical and educational models for a fully autonomous and responsible citizenship in an intercultural way. Therefore, this research, through a bibliographic and hermeneutic analysis, addresses a series of key questions, whose answers articulate the theoretical basis for forging a democratic ethos in favor of human development.

As for the structure of the document, the following sections analyze the simplistic, naive, impoverishing and civically questionable use of social networks -use to a large extent related to the absence of shared criteria- in which netizens waste their communicative potential in favor of morally conventional forms of speech or actions politically anchored in a closed and exclusionary us. Against these uses, in the next section, we propose forms of network relationship that help to deepen a democratic ethos, in the line of human development and inter-cultural dialogue. These uses are at the service of human capacities and, therefore, empower critical citizens in an interactive and media world. Finally, a theoretical model is proposed in which concrete practices are collected with the aim of promoting democracy in digital and intercultural environments.

Risks of a simple or naive use
of the social networks in the post–modern time

Reviving the formation of a democratic and, therefore, intercultural ethos in digitalized societies requires, as a preliminary step, approaching our social and cultural context—which is mostly postmodern. A reading of post-modernity can help us analyze and value some use of social networks that in general we could call simple or naive, if not perverse.

Following authors such as Lyotard (2006), Vattimo (2003), Bauman (2022) or Lipovetsky (2006), post-modernity is mainly characterized by the death of the great narratives: the death of 'reason', of 'truth', of 'history', of 'progress', etc. Ours is an age of emptiness, of weak and liquid thinking. The great intellectual and ideological references of Modernity die, and from its ashes sprout innumerable stories or speeches whose only legitimacy is their degree of intensity. According to Vosoughi et al. (2018) digital networks have been a place for the proliferation of multiple discourses, including post-truth, given the spread of arguments as incendiary as false.

The networks have been speakers of countervalues (Renés et al., 2021), as conventional as rough, and a means of socializing the stylism and hatred towards people or groups that have been subjected to digital lynching. As Castells (2007) argues, social networks have given shelter to speeches that, from the point of view of social democratic communication, would deserve not to go beyond the strictest scope of privacy or close transmission. Messages of homophobia or hatred of the ones who are different, claims in favor of ethnic purity and cultural homogeneity, pre-constitutional or clearly anti-democratic contents expanded paradoxically by a media praised in its beginnings for favoring horizontal and democratic interaction. The networks, in this naive use, have been a privileged place for non-dialogue, for echo chambers or digital niches (Sunstein, 2001), where the spiral of silence (Noelle-Neumann, 2010) conforms the opinion of the public, legitimizing the most followed and noisy voices.

In this context, the era of post-truth was almost to be expected, surrounded by a certain misunderstood post-modernity, the one that enhances the difference and the passionate irrationality that excludes at the same time any critical reference and any citizen consensus around the common good and the human development. Also in this context, Sartori (2005) and Lelkes (2016) say that the polarization and fragmentation of the public were expected and therefore the space of civic meeting - of civility achieved after centuries of suffering and struggle – hence, weakening democracy (Morgan, 2018) and the values that sustain it. The crisis

46

and the weakening of democracy is one of its main bases (Runciman, 2018; Applebaum, 2020).

Ultimately, we see the arrival of digital societies to create an enabling environment for social fracturing or segmentation according to previous ideology or preferences, if not for the dissemination of speeches that encourage good communication and so degrade public debate (Han, 2022). An environment in which fake news, bots and the new consent have also been promoted (Gozálvez et al., 2019). An environment in which, after the weakening of liberal democracy, new forms of autocratic, ultranationalist, expansionist and invasive authoritarianism seem to be consolidated (Levitsky and Ziblat, 2018; Frantz, 2018).

Thus, «knowledge» society? Or a society of tumult and confusion, at the behest of corporations and power groups, and an increasingly segmented public? Socially and culturally productive interaction, or algorithmically shaped communication? After the assault on the US Capitol in January 2021, the main digital platforms (Twitter, Facebook...) decided to close the account of Trump and other leaders of the radical right, a move that was considered an attack on freedom of expression by those affected (a right that, like any other, is not absolute and that has to fit with other rights such as respect for equal dignity). What has been the dimension of social fracture and polarization? And the manufacture dimension of consent and the risk to democracy, so that technology corporations decide to limit the sacred right of freedom of expression, cornerstone of democratic constitutions?

Indeed, certain political and economic groups use social networks as a propaganda tool when protected by freedom of expression; when users, protected by the same freedom, use networks to publish private and intimate events, thus trying to transcend an anonymous existence; when, finally, both invade a new digital social space with personal matters, shielded in the freedom that assists them, they are reconfiguring the sphere of the public, initially reserved to the common interest, blurring this interest by shattering the diffuse border that separates the public from private (the publizität according to Habermas, 1984). Public opinion, as a key democratic institution that controls power, is no longer presided over by this very useful and necessary fiction called "public reason" (understood as a place of defense of general interests, of public debate and deliberation, of the nuance and complexity of the plural), but by an instrumental reason privatized, or in other words, by a mere aggregation of private interests that only use the social as an instrument for themselves.

47
Φ

Public opinion becomes the opinion of the public or, better, of the infinite public that as digital niches constitute the new world of life, i.e., social networks (Gozálvez et al., 2019). In other words, the public has been privatized with the digital society. Social segmentation or fragmentation was to be expected. The siege of the Capitol is, in short, the siege of increased privacy (a new augmented reality) via technology: private interests, corporate groups, identity associations, closed and pure "people" (in the sense of private and exclusive) took the streets and intended to take the political institutions of democratic representation to impose a new way of democracy. The demos are no longer the plurality that demands respect for minorities, but supposedly genuine and homogeneous people that proclaims legitimacy in order to seize power and impose its interpretation of the real. A new version of that "tyranny of the majorities" that Tocqueville (1835/2018) and Stuart Mill (1859/1994) alerted us to.

However, neither philosophically nor educationally can we fall into a fatalistic view when it comes to taking the pulse of the network-society. This naive version of privacy and freedom of expression, and therefore of democracy, nests — as we have argued — in that new social space provided to us by social networks. But a reduced version of freedom (reduced to the mere social explosion of privacy, used according to the private interests of groups and corporations) is not the only or the most interesting in network communication. González (2021) affirms that post-truth, along with a version of freedom, can lead to fundamentalism and an ethnocentric populism similar to a new wave nationalism, and intercultural dialogue. However, it is no less true that the Web, used in a civic-harm sense, has been an unbeatable platform for the exercise of other broader and more ethically interesting ways of understanding freedom. For example, freedom coupled with civic autonomy and critical thinking, in the face of the immensity of narratives that proliferate on the networks. We will approach this issue in the next section.

Conditions for a democratic and intercultural ethos in networks

How to ensure that social networks become a real forum or public place for relevant information and sensible argumentation in democracy? Under what conditions do social networks contribute to full democracy and sustainable human development? The answer to these questions requires

Sophia 34: 2023.

© Universidad Politécnica Salesiana del Ecuador

Print ISSN:1390-3861 / Electronic ISSN: 1390-8626, pp. 41-63.

focusing on three actors or bodies involved: network owners or companies, citizens and states.

The owners, shareholders or corporations that manage the networks can expect actions in favor of transparency and content verification, also allowing to express information that can be corrected and verified. But these actions cannot depend only on the mood or discretion of the owner or shareholders, i.e., on the business ethics or ethical economy that they wish to assume to a greater or lesser extent. The State, as guarantor of rights and public debate in democracy, must assume its regulatory role, encouraging, together with or above companies, policies for network communication that do not exceed the legislation limits in line with constitutional values. It is not a matter of exercising a censor role, but of being healthy regulator, knowing the complexity of consensual mediation. In the face of the age-old debate about the limits of freedom of expression, the State could not allow networks to be grounds for hate speech, humiliation of people on the basis of sex, ethnicity, religion or creed, defamation on the basis of anonymity, incitement to violence, etc.

But the most important role in the education of a democratic ethos is that of the third actor: media citizenship. This is not a mere aggregate of individuals who publish without measuring the consequences of their speech or images, either own or reproduced. According to Gozálvez (2013), to speak of citizenship is to speak of a condition, not so much of an administrative category. It alludes to the free, autonomous, responsible, participative condition from the civic and social commitment, and of course respectful of the people who interact on the Net. A citizenship status increasingly in line with a cosmopolitan or intercultural citizenship. Therefore, educating for this condition of citizenship in the media involves not only educating based on critical thinking, thinking not restricted to the evaluation and interpretation of what the person receives from digital media, but also includes sensible, lucid and creative action in the production of content. As Nussbaum (2012) states, all this results in the capacity for practical reason applied to the digital world and social networks.

In this sense, Schutijser De Groot (2022) points out that education is a key piece to cultivate the skills and habits of the participants to overcome, as far as possible, the limitations of our knowledge and our personal commitment of the political field. Creating habits for deliberation and critical thinking is fundamental in a globalized and interconnected world, as well as educating in a critical awareness open to the other, to new perspectives and worldviews, because the Net is a propitious scenario for such encounter or dialogue between people of different cultural origin: a

world of possibilities for interacting with the close and the distant other. Thus, networks are communicative structures to empower people and to expand the lived perception of the other generalized (Mead, 1934), cognitive and moral basis for ethically mature thinking (Kohlberg, 1984).

Given the different speeches circulating on the networks, it is about educating in a selection-interpretation-production of content open to plurality, no doubt, but in a constant and unfinished search for the best discourse, the best content and information: the most truthful and solid, the most acceptable with good reasons by those affected. According to Touriñán (2022), there is no quality education without attending to the educational relationship, a creative relationship of culture, which turns information into knowledge, and knowledge into an educational element. A new hermeneutic and creative epistemology is required, in which any interpretation is not worth the fact of having an audience. Critical thinking is nourished by a new critical hermeneutic model, in which knowing intelligently involves giving oneself to the unfinished task of seeking the best discourse, the best narrative of reality -of the reality of the human.

Thinking and critical hermeneutics in the networks imply the desire to overcome common cognitive biases in everyday argumentation (Ennis, 2015; Gozálvez et al., 2022); it involves educating in a non-neutral or falsely aseptic knowledge of reality but committed to human development and the ethical-civic values of an intercultural citizenship. It is necessary to educate in a selective and reasonable nonconformity in the face of the myriad declarations of the digital sphere, and for this it is necessary to resort to traditional means of information (press or radio), for its reliability and its ability to corroborate information that is also disseminated in digital format.

Authors like Knoll et al. (2020) and Kim and Ellison (2021) say that mere online participation on social or political issues does not guarantee real engagement or offline participation in good conditions, so it is necessary to fill this gap educatively. Additionally, as Monasterio (2017) expresses, digital critical thinking requires transparency about the algorithms used by big tech companies to manage social communication, given the impact and relevance for forming public opinion. It is a political and civic demand against the opacity of the power groups, and it is a pedagogical demand for a worthy civic education. It is not enough that users, as citizens, can rectify and edit their online interventions, so that they are more autonomous and truly participatory. More control and citizen-damage knowledge of the criteria of the technological companies is urgently needed to know what they do with our data, what are their destinations and

50
Φ

with what profit they are used and marketed, in order to know which are the patterns that manage the reception of new content, and to which accounts we are forwarded as users, etc. This demand for transparency is truly democratic and does not undermine any information that is sensitive to national security or public interests, quite the opposite.

In short, digital critical thinking is not a state of enlightenment received by inspiration, but is the result of a formative task to educate in the basic capacities of a democratic and intercultural ethos, intellectually restless and normatively demanding with the patterns of human development. We will talk about this in the next section reflecting on the model or approach of capabilities.

Practical proposals for developing democratic and intercultural ethos in digital contexts

51

This theoretical-practical proposal arises from the efforts to find theoretical bases that promote the development of a democratic and intercultural ethos in digital environments in which the media and specifically social networks constitute an element to walk towards human development and the common good. For this reason, and because of its link with the communication, the authors use Amartya Sen´s abilities approach (Nobel Prize in Economics in 1998) and Martha Nussbaum approach, an approach with principles consistent with the notion of "development" promoted by the United Nations Program and that aim at a social progress mainly democratic and fair. Nussbaum (2012), uniting the two great ethical traditions (a teleological ethics, more Aristotelian, and a deontological ethics, Kantian origin), has linked the quality of life with the well-being and freedom. Thus, in the work "Create Capacities. Proposals for human development", Nussbaum (2012) identifies a list of 10 essential capacities for achieving a dignified life: body health, body integrity, senses, imagination and thought, emotions, practical reason, affiliation, other species, play and control over one's environment, both political and material (p. 61), capacities that according to the author should, for a matter of social justice, be protected and promoted as rights.

Based on this theory, capabilities are understood as the set of real opportunities available to a person to choose the life that he or she deserve to live (Sen, 1999, p. 3), "capabilities that are expressed in the combination of different functioning that can be achieved", given that the functioning (Bicocca, 2015, p. 290) refers to "the things that the subject

does or the situation in which he/she finds thanks to resources and the use he/she can make of them".

This theoretical construct reintroduces the value of ethics in current postmodern discourse and promotes intercultural communication, from the ability to understand each other recognizing the value of the different and at the same time the value of all people as ends in themselves (Nussbaum, 2012, p. 50), "invoking the principle of human dignity and a humanly dignified life", regardless of one's cultural heritage. For Conill (2010), this model starts from the concrete life of people in their cultural diversity and the meaning of things in the real situations of their life.

This is how the 'capabilities approach' understands interculturality as a moral category, which makes of ethics and responsibility the starting point (Romero & Ortega, 2019) with the intention of reaching a common axiological framework socially constructed and accepted that allows to combine the two dimensions of human life, the natural (biological) and the cultural. This proposal, as Conill (2010) says, is articulated from a practical perspective, as a platform to solve the conflicts that arise in complex societies. However, in order to face the challenges presented by a plural society such as ours, it is necessary to train and cultivate the capacity of individuals, cosmopolitan citizens, to participate in public debates on interculturality, and precisely social networks offer a right space to achieve this objective.

According to this theory, the key to development lies in freedom, understood as the ability to choose a decent life project. But what is a person able to do in a hyper-communicated media and heterogeneous environment? In this sense, Gozálvez and Contreras (2014) state that freedom in media contexts does not occur, for example, if transparency in public information and free access to the plural press are not ensured beforehand. Hence the relationship between human development, freedom and the use of new information and communication technologies, which are linked to citizen empowerment.

For Sen (2009) "a free press, together with democratic rights, can help prevent famines, even in relatively poor countries, by putting pressure on public authorities" (p. 342) and giving voice to the most neglected and disadvantaged. In addition, transparency of information in the media contributes positively to the development of multiple capacities due to the role they play in society, the formation of values that they promote and the public reasoning they provoke. Therefore, it is important to emphasize the importance of creating the necessary conditions for people to decide from the good use of reason in relation to digital culture.

Sophia 34: 2023.

© Universidad Politécnica Salesiana del Ecuador

Print ISSN:1390-3861 / Electronic ISSN: 1390-8626, pp. 41-63.

In this sense, a redefinition of "capability" associated with virtual contexts and specifically the use of social networks is needed: the ability to use social networks intervene in a reasonable and responsible way, according to the needs of each person and according to the real freedoms and possibilities of choice that consumers can (and should) have (Litschka, 2019). In response to the general proposal presented by Nussbaum (2012), other media experts such as Hesmondhalgh (2016), Couldry (2012) and Garnham (1997), have established the first connections between the new media context and the Capability approach. But for this, the first task they propose is to reflect on different questions: How can the potential value of media and digital culture contribute to human development? And to the formation of a democratic and intercultural ethos? What role do social networks play today? What basic skills in relation to the proper use of social networks should we promote as a society? According to Hesmondhalgh (2016) and Giles (2018), the most valuable contributions of Nussbaum's theory, in relation to the network-society, focus on:

1. Access to a rich set of mediated artistic-aesthetic experiences that can help people understand and improve their emotional, imaginative and cognitive life skills, while enhancing political activism and cultivating the true sense of participatory democracy.
2. Attention to affective dimensions in living environments to contribute to the flourishing of people.
3. The positive assessment of the CA to critically evaluate the media and connect them with questions of equality and social justice.
4. The role of the media as a key element for the formation of intercultural awareness.
5. The importance of proposing a framework of central human capabilities for digital contexts, as support of constitutional guarantees in all nations.
6. The value of human educability as an essential capacity in media societies.
7. The recognition in CA of the conditions for human development compared to other utilitarianism approaches.

The civic education that a society like ours requires aims to cultivate digital skills aimed at achieving a more inclusive, fully democratic and human development-promoting coexistence. In this sense, we formulate the following practical proposals linked to 10 basic capabilities of the CA, proposals aimed at the formation of a democratic and intercultural ethos in a digital environment.

Table 1
Practical proposals for the development of a democratic
and intercultural ethos through social networks

CONOCIMIENTO Y CONEXIÓN	• Have an electronic device to be able to access the Internet, as well as having basic access for connecting to the network, avoiding the digital gap. • Possess a technical training that allows an autonomous use of social networks.
DIVERSITY	• Respect and value other languages, religions and spiritual practices to which we have easy access thanks to digital culture. • Appreciate human diversity in all its forms (human bodies, ways of thinking, functional diversity, gastronomic customs, musical cultures...) that appear in the media. • To be able to act in an inclusive way and to respond to human needs. • Learn from human diversity.
CRITICAL THINKING AND CREATIVITY	• Have the ability to judge, value, analyze, interpret and argue in virtual environments. • To develop a critical ethos to avoid phenomena typical of digital neopopulism (haters, fans...). • Detecting and avoiding the usual biases and fallacies of online speech (confirmation bias, ad hominem, ad populum, availability bias...) (Gozálvez et al., 2022). • Create, share, publish, etc., creative content. • Recognize the quality of arguments in terms of intellectual openness and plurality of ideas. • Understand, analyze and interpret the iconic language. Be able to do self-criticism in virtual environments. Detect possible manipulations by Influencers, fake news, etc.
VIRTUAL IMAGINATION	• Appreciate the role of arts for personal development and for civic education within the digital sphere by cultivating imagination, empathy and judgment and sensitivity capabilities (Guichot, 2015). This ability involves understanding others, being empathetic, and tuning in to others' feelings through screens. • Develop a sensitivity for justice and interculturality (Cortina, 2010). • Enjoy virtual artistic experiences "aesthetic, musical, literary, etc." (Nussbaum, 2002).

54

Φ

EMOTIONAL INTEGRITY AND PRIVACY	• Have good emotional health. Not be subject to anxiety or fear for the possibilities offered by a digitized environment (haters, likes, stories, instant messaging…). • Being able to not depend emotionally on any of (software, applications, etc.) digital device (Hesmondhalgh, 2016). • Respect and feel respected on an emotional level. • Interact on networks respecting the limits of your own privacy and that of others. • Develop an emotional integrity that avoids an addiction to networks, emotional dependence and similar caused by not receiving enough likes, followers, etc.
ETHICS AND VALUES	• Always have respect for yourself and others. • Apply the fundamental values of a democratic civic ethics as a criterion to judge online content. • Be treated with dignity through screens and not be discriminated against or undervalued on the basis of sex, social class, religion and race. • Report situations of cyberbullying, sexting, grooming and similar that directly affect the rights and dignity of people. • Be responsible for not creating or sharing content that denigrates other people.
COMMUNICATIVE RATIONALITY	• Listen actively when you participate in a dialogue and use the conditions of equality, truthfulness and respect among its participants (Habermas, 1989). • Apply the characteristics of the communicative action theory in all the scenarios of new technologies (streaming, social networks, blogs, applications for instant messaging, etc.) to promote a discursive rationality beyond subjectivity (Gozálvez and Contreras, 2014). • Understand what others are saying and engage in media discussions. • Be able to open a space for intersubjectivity in the search for agreements to different perspectives on the same subject. • Have a virtual space where the person has the opportunity to express and participate in different communication events (entertainment, training, etc.).
PARTICIPATION IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS	• Be responsible as a citizen and worry about the problems that affect the community in which you live. • Get involved in solving problems in public affairs. • Fight social inequalities by leveraging digital tools for social transformation. • Participate virtually in the practical sense of democracy. • Receive and broadcast information by different digital means about events occurring in your community.

55
Φ

RELATIONSHIPS AND SOCIAL NETWORKS	• Be able to start a friendship through social networks. • Form groups of friends for virtual leisure and develop mutual trust. • Expand the social circle with the help of digital media. • Have the ability to affiliate with those groups of people with similar interests, for example, by finding political, religious, artistic, civic associations, etc. • Participate in a group with the goal of learning virtually, working with others and solving problems. • Interact with others to form valuable collaborative and participatory learning groups (Boni et al., 2010).
COSMOPOLITISM AND INTERCULTURALITY	• Conceive one's nation as part of a world order (Nussbaum, 2005). • Demonstrate a capacity for openness and sensitivity in a context full of cultures by practicing active inclusion and otherness, recognizing the value of diversity of other views, other languages, other knowledge, etc. • Develop the capacity to engage in global issues that require transnational deliberation. • Recognize people as having multiple cultural identities and belonging to groups that are heterogeneous and dynamic. • Address cultural diversity from an intercultural perspective (Gil, 2018). • Rely on the ethics of 'being in a relationship' as the basis of a society that can be defined as good and fair (Alessandrini, 2017).

56

Source: Own elaboration based on the literature cited in the table

In this framework of ideas, skills are understood as opportunities that should be promoted in today's societies, especially in youth, since they represent the group that spends the most hours on the network either visualizing, sharing or creating content. Precisely, the role of social and educational institutions depends on the development of these capacities from the good use of freedom and rationality because -in the form of practical and axiological references- these capacities represent the possibility of expanding the freedom of people in a digitized society, empowering and enabling them from the social, political and human points of view. Regarding the latter idea, UNESCO, through the Indicators of Media Development Report (2008) and the MIL Alliance: Media and Information Literacy (2018), emphasizes the need to educate those considered digital natives in socio-moral initiatives, stating that this condition does not guarantee the development of media competence at all. Teenagers generally have advanced technical training in digital media; however, the media competence goes beyond and requires a set of basic skills such as the proposals presented in Table 1.

Thus, we can affirm that despite the civic and anti-democratic use of networks, innovative experiences have emerged in the educational field through the use of social networks such as TikTok or Instagram, which contribute to a new pedagogical horizon (Blanco and González, 2021; Escamilla et al., 2021; Montes et al., 2021; Lázaro, 2020). Social networks, with their playful and socializing components, are a more than promising way to educate and innovate in both formal and informal settings. The current challenge is to educate in an appropriate use of social networks, in the line of a civic, reflective and deliberative education, a use that promotes self-reliance, cooperative work and the dynamic construction of knowledge by students, in order to favor basic human skills and the construction of knowledge.

Various administrations are promoting an educational use of networks, such as the contest "TikTokers for equality" (government subdelegation in Almeria, 2020) whose objective is to promote in youth the value of gender equality, as well as the reflective and creative capacity through TikTok.

If we focus on youth, for example, it has been shown that TikTok and Instagram are the most used social networks by teenagers in recent years (Ditrendia digital marketing trends, 2018; Statista, 2019). According to Lázaro (2020), TikTok is a social network with a simple and intuitive interface that allows users to create and share short videos through the smartphone with a duration of between three and sixty seconds. In addition, it allows to insert text, music, record voices, play with the speed, with camera effects, chat, etc. People can also comment, share content, and give likes. From this digital world, interesting initiatives are emerging in secondary classrooms such as the realization of a 'Tikbooktok'. The student, after reading a book, must individually or collaboratively make a summary of it using Tik-Tok.

In order to get students to reflect on the use of social networks before performing this activity, it is useful that the teacher organizes a debate in the classroom with the aim of deepening on the problems derived from the misuse of networks, and on their relationship with citizen empowerment. Authors like Blasco and López (2020) propose another educational initiative that breaks with the naive use and promotes a capacitating use of networks (according to the parameters exposed), consisting in the creation of a thematic account on the social network Instagram on philosophy contents for students to assume the role of 'influencer philosopher'.

For doing this activity, the students will work in a cooperative way, creating an account with the following elements: name and cover pho-

to, a description of the profile and images with their respective captions, including hashtags. The objective of this activity is to create 10 "memes" about different contents of the subject; thus, the students, in addition to having the need to understand the contents of the subject, must be creative and use the imagination to compose a lucid and original content. This situation favors the acquisition of knowledge and its memorization.

In this way, social networks are presented as a useful tool for valuable didactic purposes, related to critical thinking and citizen empowerment (with human development), a digital space in which students feel familiar and motivated.

In conclusion: empowering democratic citizens from social networks

58

Innovative educational proposals such as those mentioned above are placed on a pedagogical horizon for a socially committed use of networks, in accordance with a democratic ethos, with human development and with intercultural dialogue, open to any person or group of people. In this sense, well-exploited technology is outlined to form media citizenship (Gozálvez, 2013), according to a post-conventional ethical conscience (Kohlberg, 1984), in accordance with universal principles of justice and care.

In conclusion, a twenty-first century education needs to be part of these new digital practices in which citizenship is immersed. Numerous initiatives emerge in formal education from this idea: starting from playful interactions on the web and from appropriate pedagogical practices that can activate the socially committed component of young people, inviting participation in public affairs and cultivating new forms of cooperation and collaboration with the near and distant global community.

Following experts on media in relation to human development (Couldry, 2012; Garnham, 1997; Hes-mondhalgh, 2016; Mansell, 2002), it is interesting to emphasize that social networks can contribute positively to citizen empowerment: this is the meaning of the practical proposal offered, in which we have linked ten basic capabilities with functions and concrete actions that expand freedom and contribute to empower media citizenship, moving towards a more cohesive society, beyond the frequent naive use of networks. Ethical and civic keys, in the form of capabilities, contribute to lower civic apathy and strengthen freedoms, autonomy and participation in community affairs, from the good use of media.

References

AGUILAR, Floralba del Rocío
    2011   Reflexiones filosóficas sobre las tecnologías y sus nuevos escenarios. *Sophia, colección de Filosofía de la Educación*, *11*, 123-174. https://doi.org/10.17163/soph.n11.2011.06

ALESSANDRINI, Guiditta
    2017   *El enfoque de las capacidades: ¿Una teoría pedagógica?* Universidad Politécnica Salesiana: Abya-Yala.

APPLEBAUM, Anne
    2020   *Twilight of democracy. The seductive lure of authoritarianism.* Doubleday.

ATTFIELD, Robin
    2010   *Ética ambiental y políticas internacionales.* Ediciones Unesco. https://bit.ly/3BqYSx7

BAUMAN, Zygmunt
    2022   *Modernidad líquida.* Fondo de Cultura Económica.

BICOCCA, Mauricio
    2015   Competencias vs. capacidades. Un análisis filosófico de un paradigma emergente para la educación superior latinoamericana. *Revista Latinoamericana de Filosofía de la Educación*, *2*(4), 281-298. https://bit.ly/3QTYBIR

BLANCO, Alfredo & GONZÁLEZ, Mercedes
    2021   Aprender desde la perspectiva de las ecologías: una experiencia en Secundaria a través del teatro y de Tiktok. *Educatio Siglo XXI*, *39*(2), 169-190. https://doi.org/10.6018/educatio.465551

BLASCO, José Salvador & LÓPEZ, Rubén
    2020   Instagram como herramienta de aprendizaje musical en educación secundaria y bachillerato. *Revista de Comunicación*, (151), 25-45. https://doi.org/10.15178/va.2020.151.25-45

BONI, Alejandra, LOZANO, José Félix & WALKER, Melanie
    2010   La educación superior desde el enfoque de capacidades. Propuesta para el debate. *Revista Electrónica Interuniversitaria de Formación del Profesorado*, *13*(3), 123-131. https://bit.ly/3BlKN42

CASTELLS, Manuel
    2007   *La Galaxia Internet.* Madrid: Plaza & Janés.

CONDE DEL RIO, Manuel Antonio
    2021   Estructura mediática de Tiktok: estudio de caso de la red social de los más jóvenes. *Revista de Ciencias de la Comunicación e Información*, *26*, 59-77. https://doi.org/10.35742/rcci.2021.26.e126

CONILL, Jesús
    2010   Hermenéutica crítica intercultural desde el enfoque de las capacidades. *Investigaciones Fenomenológicas*, *7*, 35-44. https://doi.org/10.5944/rif.7.2010.5528

CORTINA, Adela
    2010   *Justicia cordial.* Madrid: Trotta.

COULDRY, Nick
    2012   *Media, society, world: social theory and digital media practice.* Polity Press.

DITRENDIA, DIGITAL MARKETING TRENDS
    2018   *Informe ditrendia: Mobile en España y en el Mundo.* https://bit.ly/3f3K9kp

59
Φ

ENNIS, Robert
  2015   Critical thinking: a streamlined conception. En M. Davies y R. Barnett (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Critical Thinking in Higher Education* (pp. 31-49). California: Palgrave Handbooks.

ESCAMILLA, Paloma, ALGUACIL, Mario & López, Samuel
  2021   Incorporating TikTok in higher education: Pedagogical perspectives from a corporal expression sport sciences course. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education, 28*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhlste.2021.100302.

FRANTZ, Erica
  2018   *Authoritarianism. What everyone needs to know.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

GIL, Mario Germán
  2018   Educación y ética para una ciudadanía mundial. *Revista Redipe, 7*(2), 43-52. https://bit.ly/3LrekOl.

GONZÁLEZ, Jorge
  2021   El posmodernismo y el realismo en la aporía de la posverdad. *Sophia, colección de Filosofía de la Educación, 31*, 89-111. https://doi.org/10.17163/soph.n31.2021.03

GOZÁLVEZ, Vicent
  2013   *Ciudadanía mediática. Una mirada educativa.* Madrid: Dykinson.

GOZÁLVEZ, Vicent & CONTRERAS, Paloma
  2014   Empoderar a la ciudadanía mediática desde la educomunicación. *Revista Científica de Educomunicación, 42*(21), 129-136. https://doi.org/10.3916/C42-2014-12

GOZÁLVEZ, Vicent, ROMERO, Luis Miguel & LARREA, Camilo
  2019   Twitter and public opinion. A critical view for an educational outlook. *Revista Española de Pedagogía, 77*(274), 403-419. https://doi.org/10.22550/REP77-3-2019-04

GOZÁLVEZ, Vicent, VALERO, Aida & GONZÁLEZ, María Rosario
  2022   Critical thinking on social networks. A theoretical proposal for civic education in digital environments. *Estudios sobre Educación, 42,* 35-54. https://doi.org/10.15581/004.42.002

GARNHAM, Nicholas
  1997   Amartya Sen's 'capabilities' approach to the evaluation of welfare: its application to communication. *Javnost, 4*(4), 25-34. https://doi.org/10.1080/13183222.1997.11008658

GILES, Moss
  2018   Media, capabilities, and justification. *Media, Culture & Society, 40*(1), 94-109. https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443717704998

GUICHOT, Virginia
  2015   El 'enfoque de las capacidades' de Martha Nussbaum y sus consecuencias educativas: hacia una pedagogía socrática y pluralista. *Revista Interuniversitaria, 27*(2), 45-70. https://doi.org/10.14201/teoredu20152724570

HABERMAS, Jürgen
  1984   *Ciencia y técnica como "ideología".* Madrid: Tecnos.
  1989   *Teoría de la Acción Comunicativa: complementos y estudios previos.* Madrid: Cátedra.
  1999   *La inclusión del otro. Estudios de teoría política.* Barcelona: Paidós.

60
Φ

HAN, Byung
    2022   *Infocracy. Digitization and the crisis of democracy.* Wiley.

HESMONDHALGH, David
    2016   Capitalism and the media: moral economy, well-being and capabilities. *Media Culture & Society*, *39*(2), 202-218. https://doi.org/10.1177/016 34437 16643153

IAB-ELOGIA
    2021   *Estudio de Redes Sociales 2021.* https://bit.ly/3Uxx5UH

KIM, Dam Hee & ELLISON, Nicole
    2021   From observation on social media to offline political participation: The social media affordances approach. *New media & society*. https://doi.org/10.1177/ 1461444821998346

KNOLL, Johannes, MATTHES, Jörg & HEISS, Raffael
    2020   The social media political participation model: A goalsystems theory perspective. *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies*, *26*(1), 135-156. https://doi.org/10.1177/1354856517750366

KOHLBERG, Lawrence
    1984   *The Psychology of Moral Development: The Nature and Validity of Moral Stages.* Harpercollins.

LÁZARO, Rebeca
    2020   La red social Tiktok y su integración en el aula de literatura: propuestas didácticas. En E. López y D. Cobos (Eds.), *Claves para la innovación pedagógica ante los nuevos retos: respuestas en la vanguardia de la práctica educativa* (pp. 3587-3597). Octaedro. ISBN 978-84-18348-22-8.

LELKES, Yphtach
    2016   Mass polarization: Manifestations and measurements. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *80*(1), 392-410. https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfw005

LEVITSKY, Steven & ZIBLAT, Daniel
    2018   *How democracies die.* United Kingdom: Crown.

LIPOVETSKY, Gilles
    2006   *La era del vacío.* Barcelona: Anagrama.

LITSCHKA, Michael
    2019   The political economy of media capabilities: the capability approach in media policy. *Journal of Information Policy*, *9*, 79-110. https://bit.ly/3QYHCVI

LYOTARD, Jean François
    2006   *La condición postmoderna.* Buenos Aires: Cátedra.

MANSELL, Robin
    2002   From digital divides to digital entitlements in knowledge societies. *Current sociology, 50*(3), *407-426.* https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392102050003007

MEAD, George
    1934   *Mind self and society.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

MONASTERIO, Anibal
    2017   Algorithmic ethics: ethical implications of a society increasingly governed by algorithms. *Dilemata, 24,* 185-217. https://bit.ly/3UiBwm3

MONTES, Ramón, FERNÁNDEZ, Ana & MASSÓ, Belén
    2021   Disrupción pedagógica en educación secundaria a través del uso analógico de Instagram: #Instamitos, un estudio de caso. *Revista Complutense de Educación, 32*(3), 427-438. https://doi.org/10.5209/rced.70399

61

Φ

MORGAN, Susan

2018   Fake news, disinformation, manipulation and online tactics to undermine democracy. *Journal of Cyber Policy, 3*(1), 39-43. https://doi.org/10.1080/237 38871.2018.1462395

NOELLE, Elisabeth

2010   *La espiral del silencio. Opinión pública: nuestra piel social.* Barcelona: Paidós.

NUSSBAUM, Martha

2002   Education for citizenship in an era global connection. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 21,* 289-303. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1019837105053

2005   *El cultivo de la humanidad.* Barcelona: Paidós.

2010   Sin *fines de lucro. Por qué la democracia necesita de las humanidades.* Buenos Aires: Katz.

2012   *Crear capacidades. Propuestas para el desarrollo humano.* Barcelona: Paidós.

PROGRAMA DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA EL DESARRROLLO

2021   *Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo.* Informe Anual 2021. https://bit.ly/3QNodqM

RENÉS, Paula, HERNÁNDEZ, María José, CALDEIRO, Mari Carmen & ALVITES, Cleofé

2021   Countervalues of the digital ethos perceived by future trainers. *Comunicar,* 69, 57-67. https://doi.org/10.3916/C69-2021-05

ROMERO, Eduardo & ORTEGA, Pedro

2019   *A la intemperie. Conversaciones desde la pedagogía de la alteridad.* Barcelona: Octaedro.

RUNCIMAN, David

2018   *How democracy ends.* Basic books.

SARTORI, Giovanni

2005   *Parties and party systems: A framework for analysis.* Cambridge: ECPR Press.

SCHUTIJSER DE GROOT, Dennis

2022   Afrontar la posverdad desde un fundamento neo-aristotélico de la educación. *Sophia, colección de Filosofía de la Educación, 32,* 225-243. https://doi.org/10.17163/soph.n32.2022.07

SEN, Amartya

1999   *Desarrollo y Libertad.* Buenos Aires: Planeta.

2009   *The idea of Justice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

STATISTA

2019   *Distribution of Instagram users worldwide as of April 2019, by age group.* https://bit.ly/3SewmFP

SUNSTEIN, Cass

2001   *Republic.com.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

TOURIÑÁN, José Manuel

2022   Construyendo educación de calidad desde la pedagogía. *Sophia, colección de Filosofía de la Educación, 32,* 41-92. https://doi.org/10.17163/soph. n32.2022.01

UGALDE, Cecilia y GONZÁLEZ, Catalina

2022   Edutubers, influencers y TikTok en la educación a partir de la COVID-19. En R. Contreras y C. Ugalde (Eds.), *Adolescentes en la era de las redes sociales* (pp. 9-24). https://bit.ly/3UwfvjQ (2022-06-20).

UNESCO
    2015   *Rethinking education. Towards a global common good?* https://bit.ly/3xytID1 (2022-06-05).
    2008   *Indicadores de Desarrollo mediático. Marco para evaluar el desarrollo de los medios de comunicación social.* Conferencia de las Naciones Unidas.
    2018   *MIL Alliance: Media and Information Literacy.* https://bit.ly/3dni3jk
VOSOUGHI, Soroush, ROY, Deb & ARAL, Sinan
    2018   The spread of true and false news online. *Science*, *359*(6380), 1146-1151. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aap9559
VATTIMO, Gianni
    2003   *En torno a la posmodernidad.* Barcelona: Anthropos.

63