Article Review: Ethics of Educational Technology

Sonja Howell

Ethics of Educational Technology

Educational Technology was just beginning to be reviewed for ethics in 2013. It finally was getting the respect it deserved. Many theories and standards began to emerge leading the path for professional ethics, the design of educational technology, curriculum, responsibility, and action taken with rational planning. Moore & Ellsworth, (2013) states that we need to set the future designers up for social and critical thinking skills so that they may create ethical choices across professional platforms as a natural process. This would not be a way to hinder design, but to promote discussions and experience in preparing for ethical outcomes in new technology.

Summary

Moore & Ellsworth, (2013) says that prior to our scientific technology, tools used were simply a benefit as needed devices to perform tasks and altogether good. The studies of ethics were not previously purposeful in this profession who theorizes with evidence-based research. Moore & Ellsworth, (2013) added that it is important to recognize that we focus on the desirable outcome and not the right answer while we achieve goals being subdued in this world of legal framework since the 1790's Copyright act. Ethically, technology for people with disabilities in need of physical accessibility and universal design have been studied since 1950. In 1990, schools began adding technology and access to digital educational materials to the students while trying to make sure the materials students access is worthwhile. This led to the creation of the Family Educational Rights Act (FERPA) to protect student's records and content protection from CIPA and COPPA (Moore & Ellsworth, 2013). Cross-cultural diversity and multicultural moral variable studies are researched and collected through the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) and Defining Issues Test (DIT) studying competence across cultures. Global and societal ethics research and theories have begun to suggest ideas separately (Moore & Ellsworth, 2013). Moore & Ellsworth, (2013) documents that the Science, Technology and Society (STS) by

Barbour, include linear development, technological determinism, and contextual interaction ways of development focusing on each STS purpose individually and how they relate. Whiteback's theory includes morally begins with predicting the person's responses and not simply the best use or best result for design even though a correct solution or result is rare. Historically, technology has been created for a cultures end need. Kaufman and Reeves' theory compiles the planning, design, and the way we think of the technology effecting on how we design technology. If we add each of these theories together, socially, we may be responsible in instructing that understanding the needs and acting upon finding the answers to goals through sophisticated processes as these theories suggest (Moore & Ellsworth, 2013).

Compare

In the Handbook of Research on Educational Communications and Technology, (2014) researchers agree that sophisticated processes should be put in place. When in the question of children technology should use "developmental and social designed and developed from a strong foundation in developmental theory," (pg. 673). "The challenges for effective technology integration in learning, instruction, and performance are quite significant," (pg. 817). Having these processes in place allows researchers to document the results and needs for future planning. Without them, the story is never told and we have to wait for future handbooks to possibly capture the pro's and con's of educational technological implementations. "Make me to understand the way of thy precepts: so shall I talk of thy wondrous works." (King James Bible, 1769/2017, Psalms 119:27)

Contrast

While Moore & Ellsworth, (2013) suggests using sophisticated processes to determine technology designs, Arnaldi, & Bianchi, (2016) suggests using more broad processes allowing a larger range of social issues to be evaluated. Gonzalez, (2015) shares that people's ethical beliefs

hinder research development when it comes to paying or not paying organ donors. These process

of structured procedures Moore & Ellsworth, (2013) suggest may not be specific enough to leave

room for upcoming new technology and would not include new and upcoming debated issues

such as paying or not paying participants. Each new implementation of new technology may

have their own unique set of ethical choices to make. Social issues could continue to create limits

just as the use of assembly lines were debated (Waelbers, (2011).

References

Arnaldi, S., & Bianchi, L. (2016). *Responsibility in science and technology: Elements of a social*

   theory. Springer., DOI 10.1007/978-3-658-11014-7_1

Gonzalez, W. J. (2015). *New perspectives on technology, values, and ethics: Theoretical and*

   practical. Springer., DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-21870-0_1

Handbook of Research on Educational Communications and Technology. (2014).

   https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-3185-5

King James Bible. (2017). King James Bible Online. https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/

   (Original work published 1769)

Moore, S. L., & Ellsworth, J. B. (2013). Ethics of Educational Technology. *Handbook of Research on*

   Educational Communications and Technology, 113–127. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-3185-

   5_10

Waelbers, K. (2011). *Doing good with technologies: Taking responsibility for the social role of*

   emerging technologies. Springer Science & Business Media., DOI 10.1007/978-94-007

   1640-7_1