

Capitalism and Digital Inequality: Implications for Inclusive Education

Jan-René Schluchter

Faculty of Educational and Social Sciences, Ludwigsburg University of Education

schluchter@ph-ludwigsburg.de

Anselm Böhmer

Faculty of Educational and Social Sciences, Ludwigsburg University of Education

boehmer@ph-ludwigsburg.de

Abstract

In recent decades, the deep interconnection between capitalism, digital media, and digital infrastructures has become increasingly evident. The capitalist utilization of digital media and technology brings profound social and socio-ecological impacts worldwide, including the worsening of social inequalities. Inclusion, understood as a guiding principle of social transformation, aims to address and reduce both social and digital inequalities. This approach demands ongoing reflection on the processes of social transformation in societies shaped by capitalist economies, particularly in educational settings. This article explores the links between capitalism in the digital age and social and digital inequality, with a specific focus on their implications for education.

Keywords: Capitalism, Digital Inequality, Inclusion, Exclusion, Education

Introduction

Over the past three decades, there has been an increasing connection between capitalism and digitalization, or more precisely, between capitalism and the key elements of a culture of digitality¹, within the context of societal transformation processes (cf. overview in Carstensen et al., 2023; Pfeiffer, 2022; Staab, 2019). This is evident in the collection, analysis, and exploitation of user data on social media platforms (Big Data/Big Data Analytics) for both commercial purposes and for the maintenance, development, or dissolution of power structures (cf. Dander, 2023, p. 3; Niesyto, 2021, p. 5; Buckingham, 2022, p. 83). This phenomenon reflects the "spirit of capitalism," primarily focusing on generating surplus value (cf. Böhmer, 2017, p. 11-12). Such an understanding of capitalism raises ethical concerns regarding the self-referential nature of capital accumulation, which classical authors like Max Weber have deemed irrational (cf. Weber, 2016, p. 42-43). In this view, maximizing monetary profit becomes the sole purpose of capitalist actions and labor.

This capitalist appropriation and shaping of digital technologies and infrastructures leads to various social and socio-ecological consequences on a global scale. For instance, precarious to inhumane working conditions emerge in the production and disposal of digital media and technologies, such as the extraction of raw materials and resources for the production of digital technologies (cf. Lange & Santarius, 2020; Heeks, 2022). These conditions also extend to the use of digital technologies, exemplified by delivery service workers (cf. Pfeiffer, 2022, p. 189-190; Bude & Staab, 2016, p. 7-8.). In this context, societal transformation processes also risk creating, perpetuating, or exacerbating social inequalities both within and between societies (cf. Ragnedda, 2018; Bude & Staab, 2016).

Focusing on digitalization processes, this risk is frequently addressed in discourses on digital inequality (cf. Hargittai, 2021; DiMaggio & Hargittai, 2001) and the digital divide (cf. Kovač et al., 2024; Ragnedda & Muschert, 2013; van Dijk, 2020), as well as in discussions on media (education) and social inequality (cf. Niesyto, 2009), media (education) and inclusion (cf. Bosse et al., 2019). In this context, the intertwining of social and digital inequality primarily crystallizes around unequal opportunities for societal belonging and participation (cf. Kronauer, 2010, p. 24; Pietilä et al., 2021; Clayton & Macdonald, 2013). This is associated with unequal opportunities for interaction and agency, manifesting in better or worse living conditions and life chances (cf. Kronauer, 2013, p. 9-24). The analysis, reflection, and addressing of these social and digital inequalities are central to discourses on inclusion as a perspective for the ongoing development of societies (cf. *ibid.*).

Inclusion, understood in this context as a regulative idea of societal transformation, aims to dismantle the barriers to belonging and participation for individuals. It also seeks to address the accompanying social and digital inequalities (cf. *ibid.*, p. 21). This necessity leads to a continuous reflection on society and societal digitalization processes, focusing on the essential elements of digital culture through the lens of the regulative idea of inclusion. Such an understanding of inclusion should be conceived as a comprehensive transformation project of societal structures, cultures, and practices, rather than being reduced to specific social groups or particular sectors of

¹ At this point, it should be noted that the term "Kultur der Digitalität," coined by Stalder (2016), is translated by the author himself as "The Digital Condition" in the English version. However, we would prefer to retain the term "Digitality," as we find it more accurate.

society (cf. *ibid.*, p. 25). In this regard, inclusion is not only a social practice but also a corner stone aligned with the concept of “universal design” (UN CRPD Art. 2) for society as a whole.

Given the complexity of the interconnection between capitalism and digitalization or the fundamental elements of a culture of digitality, this contribution does not aim to provide a comprehensive overview of the relevant positions and lines of discourse (cf. Seignani et al., 2023 for an overview). Instead, this paper seeks to highlight perspectives on the connections between capitalism, digitalization/culture of digitality, and inclusion/inclusive education from the viewpoint of a theory of inequality.

Capitalism, Digital Media Technologies, and Social Exclusions

The German sociologist Martin Kronauer points out that current discourses on inclusion merge two historically distinct strands of discussion: on the one hand, the discourse on unequal living conditions (e.g., for people with disabilities, but also other groups perceived through the lens of difference), and on the other, the dynamics of social division. Both strands focus on analyzing, reflecting on, and addressing the structures and mechanisms of social exclusion. The result is the creation of societal conditions that can affect the equal inclusion of all people in key areas and resources of society, such as employment (especially as the basis for survival in modern societies), citizenship rights (personal, political, social; especially as the foundation of community life), and reciprocal social relationships (especially as a source of solidarity) (cf. Kronauer, 2013, p. 18). It should be noted that such a normative understanding is rarely fully realized in empirical findings. Empirical research reveals greater complexity, necessitating a more differentiated analysis to address this complexity adequately. Nevertheless, this understanding of inclusion highlights that the associated perspective of societal development extends beyond merely focusing on individual social groups' living conditions and circumstances, such as people with disabilities.

Given the intricate interconnection of current societal structures and conditions, and the resulting moments of social exclusion due to belonging to specific social groups, inclusion cannot be seen as a “special problem of [specific] groups, but only as a socio-political task of creating inclusive conditions” (*ibid.*, p. 25; transl. JRS & AB)² This approach considers intersectionality, which examines how social categories such as gender, age, social origin, and cultural background shape identity and contribute to inequality through interrelated processes. These processes simultaneously liquidate a general overview and epistemological power of disposition (regarding a postcolonial approach to culturalization Hall, 1996; Spivak, 1988; from a feminist perspective Haraway, 1988; Harding, 1993). In this context, inclusion involves examining, critically assessing, and challenging social structures and dynamics of exclusion, aimed at transforming societal

² Original quotation (German): “(...) Sonderproblem von (einzelnen) Gruppen, sondern nur als gesellschaftspolitische Aufgabe, inkludierende Verhältnisse zu schaffen (...)” (Kronauer, 2013, p. 25). For the whole text: All translations of quotations from the German-language original by JRS & AB.

conditions. As outlined—"in stark terms: inclusion in socially exclusionary conditions cannot be the goal, but rather the overcoming of such conditions" (ibid., p. 24; transl. JRS & AB)³.

The concept of the "simultaneity of 'inside' and 'outside'" (Kronauer, 2010, p. 44; transl. JRS & AB), illustrates the relationship between inclusion and exclusion in modern societies. In this context, exclusion is understood as marginalization within society:

"Understanding exclusion as a 'special form of the inside' appears even more necessary today, as people in highly developed capitalist societies [...] are socially integrated through welfare state mechanisms and have developed shared standards across social class boundaries regarding what constitutes a cultural minimum for societal participation. [...] The simultaneity of 'inside' and 'outside,' the confrontation with and identification with socially shared expectations, sharpens the experience of social exclusion" (ibid., p. 45; transl. JRS & AB)⁴.

Looking at the previously outlined central dimensions of inclusion—understood as societal belonging and participation, particularly in employment, citizenship rights (personal, political, social), and reciprocal social relationships—a conception of exclusion as marginalization within society can be exemplified as follows (cf. ibid., pp. 45-46):

- Exclusion in employment means being pushed into a marginal position in the labor market or employment, which can lead to loss of employment. Individuals facing exclusion often find it hard to engage in recognized ways of life and activities (beyond employment). This is also accompanied by a loss of social recognition and agency, as well as the capitalist imperative of participating in monetary profit maximization.
- Exclusion in social relationships refers to the loss of support from social networks, which can lead to (partial) social isolation.
- Exclusion from citizenship refers to the denial of rights, such as the exclusion from institutional support, like state welfare services.

These fields of exclusion, characterized by a simultaneous "outside" and "inside," contain many ambivalences. For example, German educational researcher Fischer-Tahir (2021a) examines the ambivalences of inclusion in the labor market, particularly in digitalization, through the professional biographies of people with visual impairments. Her work focuses on the treatment of people with visual impairments as customers of digital assistance systems provided by technology companies ("leading companies of digital capitalism," Fischer-Tahir, 2021b, n.p.; transl. JRS & AB), which, in turn, are a prerequisite for their participation in the labor market. Consequently, for societal belonging and participation, people with visual impairments depend heavily on the digital

³ Original quotation (German): "(...) zugespitzt formuliert: die Inklusion in sozial ausgrenzende Verhältnisse kann nicht das Ziel sein, sondern nur die Überwindung solcher Verhältnisse" (Kronauer, 2013, p. 24).

⁴ Original quotation (German): "Exklusion als 'besondere Form des Innerhalb' zu begreifen, erscheint heute um so notwendiger, als die Menschen in den hoch entwickelten kapitalistischen Gesellschaften (...) sozialstaatlich eingebunden sind und über soziale Klassengrenzen hinweg gemeinsame Maßstäbe dafür ausgebildet haben, was ein kulturelles Existenzminimum für gesellschaftliche Teilhabe beinhaltet. (...) (I)n den Erfahrungen mit sozialer Ausgrenzung macht die Gleichzeitigkeit von ‚Drinnen‘ und ‚Draußen‘, die Konfrontation und Identifikation mit den gesellschaftlich geteilten Erwartungen, die besondere Schärfe aus" (Kronauer, 2010, p. 45). However, 14 years after this quote, it would be worth discussing whether this self-evident fact of the welfare state can still be taken so clearly in view of its increasing questioning.

assistance systems offered, with their (non-)use ultimately being influenced by a person's socio-economic status and leading to dependencies on the state welfare services (and the associated categorizations and status assignments, particularly the status of "disability"). Additionally, Fischer-Tahir problematizes the employment of people with visual impairments in "low-skilled, low-wage sectors" (Fischer-Tahir, 2021b, n.p.; transl. JRS & AB)⁵, such as vocational rehabilitation facilities, which also function as economic enterprises. While this sector is in the public eye mostly intended to promote inclusion in employment, it is marked by unequal labor conditions.

Fischer-Tahir (2021) further demonstrates that for many people current forms of inclusion in the labor market ("neoliberal labor market policies," *ibid.*; transl. JRS & AB)⁶ are situated in a tension between adaptation (to the conditions of a capitalist-oriented labor market), dependency (on assistance systems provided by technology companies/state welfare), and the risk of being excluded from the labor market (e.g., due to a discrepancy between the rising demand for technical skills in the labor market and the individual capabilities of workers).

Similarly, regarding societal inclusion and exclusion, as illustrated in the previous example, the "new spirit of capitalism" (Boltanski & Chiapello, 2018) becomes evident: the idea of inclusion can be understood as a "normative mobilization and moral commitment of its actors," the individuals in capitalist societies. This concept becomes effective as a result of the internalization of criticism regarding social exclusion (Nachtwey & Seidl, 2017, p. 6; also *ibid.*, 2020, p. 5-11; transl. JRS & AB)⁷.

To reformulate the issue in terms of categories: Our perspective on inequality structures in late-modern societies, which we develop along the lines of inclusion and exclusion, encompasses multiple dimensions:

- A normative dimension, which outlines how an egalitarian social order based on human rights can be established in a regulatory manner while critically engaging with ways of socialisations in capitalist societies;
- An analytical dimension, which examines existing conditions in terms of their obstacles and enablers for individual participation and general solidarity;
- A theoretical dimension which conceptualizes inequalities as symptoms of social differentiation, hegemonic resource management and appropriation, and legitimating frameworks for cooperative and social differences and seeks to deconstruct them.

Each of these dimensions derives its specific structure from the actual social conditions, shaped by capitalist demands for individualization, commodification, and capitalization of individuals and their life situations (cf. Böhmer, 2017, p. 13-14).

Thus, concerning the relationship between inclusion and exclusion in modern, capitalist-influenced societies, it remains clear that: "Inclusion based on social rights is (...) always (sic!) vulnerable and fragile under capitalist market conditions. The precarious link between market dependency and

⁵ Original quotation (German): "gering qualifizierter Niedriglohnsektor" (Fischer-Tahir, 2021b, n.p.)

⁶ Original quotation (German): "neoliberale Arbeitsmarktpolitik" (Fischer-Tahir, 2021b, n.p.)

⁷ Original quotation (German): "Die Idee der Inklusion kann so als „normative Mobilisierung und moralische Bindung seiner Akteure“, der Menschen in kapitalistisch geprägten Gesellschaften, verstanden werden, welche als Resultat der Endogenisierung der Kritik an gesellschaftlichen Ausschlüssen wirksam wird" (Nachtwey & Seidl, 2017, p. 6).

social rights essentially represents the ‘Achilles’ heel’ of social inclusion” (Kronauer, 2010, p. 34; transl. JRS & AB)⁸.

Capitalism, Digital Inequality and Inclusion

Digital media and technologies simultaneously enable and limit opportunities for social belonging and participation—mainly in connection with a society’s capitalist structures (cf. Niesyto, 2021, p. 3). Various links can be made here to discourses surrounding digital inequality (cf. Mossberger et al., 2003; Dobransky & Hargittai, 2001) and related discourses on the digital divide (cf. Hargittai & Hsieh, 2013) or digital inclusion (cf. Hartnett, 2022).

Digital inequality encompasses not only differences in access to digital media and technologies (first-level digital divide), but also differences in the ways these digital resources are used (second-level digital divide) (cf. DiMaggio & Hargittai, 2001, p. 8; Verständig et al., 2016, p. 50-51). The concept of the digital divide has been extended by considerations of the zero-level digital divide (Verständig et al., 2016), which highlights the importance of the structural/architectural level of digital media and technologies (e.g., software/apps, but also the internet) in shaping usage and, consequently, associated digital inequalities (cf. *ibid.*, p. 52-53). These three perspectives of the digital divide describe various phenomena of unequal access to and use of digital media and technologies, and connect them with different explanatory approaches (cf. *ibid.*). In this regard, interactions between existing social inequalities and digital inequalities become evident:

“[...] digital inequality can refer both to how existing social inequalities influence the adoption and use of digital technologies as well as how differential uses of the Internet itself may influence social stratification.” (Hargittai & Hsieh, 2013, p. 141)

In societies where media play a crucial role, both perspectives underscore that “unequal access to digital technologies [...] means unequal participation in society” (van Dijk, 2005, p. 15). At this point, it becomes clear that in a society shaped by digitalization, or in a culture of digitality rooted in capitalism, the accumulation of capital for individuals and groups increasingly occurs in the form of digital products and means of production (cf. Bude & Staab, 2016).

To capture the spectrum of digital inequality, the various dimensions of digital inequality proposed by DiMaggio and Hargittai (2001) are instructive:

- “technical means of access” (Inequality in technical apparatus)
- “extent of autonomy in use” (Inequality in autonomy of use)
- “skills in use” (Inequality in skill)
- “social support in use” (Inequality in the availability of social support)
- “purpose of use” (Inequality in variation of use) (cf. *ibid.*)

As digital media and technologies become more pervasive in society and increasingly critical for social belonging and participation, risks arise of reinforcing existing inequalities or creating “new”

⁸ Original quotation (German): “Inklusion auf Grundlage sozialer Rechte bleibt (...) unter kapitalistischen Vorzeichen immer (sic!) gefährdet und fragil. Die prekäre Verbindung von Marktabhängigkeit und sozialen Rechten stellt gewissermaßen die ‚Achillesferse‘ der sozialen Inklusion dar” (Kronauer, 2010, p. 34).

(previously unobserved) inequalities (cf. Schluchter, 2023, regarding inclusion/exclusion of people with disabilities, also cf. Goggin, 2017). The growing significance of digital media and technologies is deeply intertwined with societal power and control structures, making the design of digitalization processes and a culture of digitality a contested field (cf. Kellner & Share, 2019, p. 8). Therefore, how societal change is shaped—alongside digitalization—becomes a focal point for equality/inequality and privilege/disadvantage issues. In this context, addressing the barriers and opportunities within digital media and technologies for different people is crucial, aiming to explore ways to tackle both digital and social inequalities.

Assuming that media and technologies are never neutral but are designed and used according to the interests of different societal actors (cf. *ibid.*, p. 8), inclusion emerges as a (potential) orientation for the (further) development of society, alongside digitalization processes. This includes developing, producing, and using technologies (cf. Schluchter, 2016). As the previous deliberations show, the way societal change is shaped, including digitalization, involves addressing existing digital and social inequalities, so that, in line with the idea of inclusion, social belonging and participation can be made possible for all (cf. *ibid.*). If the societal phenomena associated with digital inequality are not addressed, the ongoing digitalization of society will progressively widen the gaps between those who participate digitally and those who do not. This will limit opportunities for social belonging and participation (cf. Schluchter, 2023; also, Ragnedda et al., 2022).

In this context, inclusion serves as a constant and indispensable point of reflection on society's (further) development, addressing various sectors of society and societal actors. It focuses not only on shaping the fundamental structures of society but also on the actions of individuals in their everyday lives, thus creating possibilities for multiple affiliations in the sense of intersectional inclusion (cf. Böhmer, 2021).

The previous analysis clarifies the relationship between digitalization or a culture of digitality and inclusion. This primarily addresses the challenge of overcoming digital inequalities, which would otherwise widen the gap between those who can participate digitally and those who cannot. Simultaneously, the previously discussed question of normative orientations in shaping digitalization processes or a culture of digitality—sharpened to “profits before lives” or “lives before profits”—is highlighted. Finally, following the developed perspective of inclusion, we must ask whether inclusion in capitalist societies can genuinely be the goal or whether the aim should be to transcend such conditions. Another critical question is whether the inclusion of one group inevitably requires the exclusion of another. For instance, does including people living in the Global North come at the expense of those living in the Global South? This issue is apparent in the use of digital technologies (including accessibility features and assistive technologies), whose raw materials are often extracted under socially and environmentally problematic conditions. In this regard, the interconnectedness of societal change, digitalization, social participation, and intersectional inclusion becomes evident in its global dimensions (cf. Scherr, 2024; Ragnedda & Mutsvairo, 2018).

Digital Inequality, Inclusion, and Education

In German-speaking countries, discourses of inclusion in education show a diversity of understandings and ambiguities. Depending on the underlying interpretation of the term inclusion

(e.g., as a “narrow” or “broad” concept), different implications emerge for the development and implementation of an inclusive education system. In education, UNESCO (2012) understands inclusion as a perspective for reforming the educational system, defining it as a process of examining, reassessing, and dismantling social barriers and mechanisms of exclusion or disadvantage for children, adolescents, and adults. This approach involves developing an educational system for all (cf. UNESCO, 2012, p. 1). In this process, it is essential to:

- recognize the historical roots of social inequalities;
- take into account the multitude of possible dimensions of diversity, considering intersectional effects (in the sense of overlapping axes of social discrimination, cf. Crenshaw 1989) and understand how they relate to forms of social inequality;
- understand the relationships between social inequalities in society and the education system (and vice versa), as well as the potential role of education in reducing social inequalities (cf. UNESCO, 2012, p. 1).

Against this background, inclusion as an orientation for reforms in the education system is not equivalent to a singularly achievable status. Still, it should be understood as an ongoing and indispensable reflection process on the educational system’s developments. This is particularly relevant considering the structural perspective on diversity. Given the correlation between societal conditions and (new) evaluations of the respective dimensions of diversity, functional fields of society, such as the education system, are inevitably challenged. This understanding applies to various dimensions of the education system—cultures, structures, and practices—for example, in forms of pedagogical action (cf. Ainscow, 2020).

Moreover, this understanding of inclusion considers various dimensions of heterogeneity and difference—cohesively integrating them. It addresses their implication for social inequality, social disadvantage, and discrimination, particularly within the education system (cf. Budde et al., 2017, p. 12). Finally, this concept of inclusion emphasizes the interconnectedness of societal areas, such as education, labor, and law. It indicates that reforms in the education system cannot be viewed in isolation from broader societal developments (cf. Kronauer, 2013, p. 24). As a result, the education system faces the challenge of examining, critically reviewing and overcoming barriers and mechanisms of exclusion within education—linked to social inequalities, disadvantages, and exclusionary practices in other areas of society.

Social inequalities, intertwined with digital inequalities, also manifest in educational contexts, and digital inequalities are (re)produced within educational settings (cf. Kutscher & Iske, 2022; Niesyto, 2009; Ferrante et al., 2023). Beyond the already outlined connections between social inequality and digitalization, “vulnerabilities” related to inequalities, disadvantages, and exclusions are evident in education on several levels: (a) “Vulnerable to exclusion by a system, [...] education system” (cf. European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education, 2022, p. 18), (b) “Vulnerability to exclusion based on societal inequalities and discrimination”, (c) “Vulnerability to exclusion based on the learning process”, and (d) “Vulnerability to exclusion based on learning with digital media” (cf. *ibid.*, p. 41; from a pedagogical perspective, Medina et al., 2023).

Additionally, further “vulnerabilities” concerning inequalities, disadvantages, and exclusions crystallize in educational contexts: (a) “Vulnerabilities of access and poor technical infrastructures”, (b) “Vulnerabilities of digitally marginalized groups and communities”, (c)

“Vulnerabilities related to digital knowledge, literacies, and practice”, and (d) “Vulnerabilities related to political will, policy development, and economic priorities” (UNESCO, 2021, p. 97).

This illustrates how education and educational systems are points of intersection where social and digital inequalities converge, leading to a simultaneous “inside” and “outside” for individuals within the education system. In this context, the concept of “vulnerability” refers to the fundamental insecurity and risk of exclusion that individuals face within the education system—reinforcing the argument above regarding inclusion in other societal domains—that inclusion is “at risk and fragile under capitalist-market conditions” (Kronauer, 2010, p. 34; transl. JRS & AB). This risk is particularly relevant when considering the “vulnerabilities of digital knowledge, literacies, and practice” (UNESCO, 2021). These vulnerabilities highlight the risk of a misalignment between an individual’s knowledge, skills, and competencies in dealing with digital media and the expectations and normative requirements of the education system in this field (cf. Schluchter, 2012; concerning people with disabilities, cf. Buchner & Ojo, 2022).

Drawing on the “Paradox of Technology” (Roulstone, 2016), which highlights that digital media and technologies both enable and limit opportunities for social participation and inclusion, Niesyto (2021) provides a relevant conclusion about the relationship between capitalism in the digital age and education (cf. *ibid.*, p. 8-12). In the context of education, it becomes clear that the use of digital media and technologies within educational settings is always situated within the tension between opportunities for inclusion and participation (e.g., participation in the teaching-learning process via digital technologies, through the facilitation of accessibility) and exclusion (e.g., inadequate access to digital technologies, resulting in a lack of accessibility) (cf. Schluchter, 2012). Additionally, there is a concern regarding the instrumentalization of education within capitalist market logic.

From an educational perspective, inclusion can be understood as a developmental task of society as a whole; it is not merely the education system’s responsibility alone (cf. Kronauer, 2010, p. 24). In this way, inclusion is not just the singularization of participation and opportunities for late-modern socialization but also a practice of solidarity-based participation. As mentioned before, inclusion thus becomes a normative, analytical, and theoretical category. It articulates ethical demands for professionals and organizations in education while critically examining the conditions of socialization based on a critical-modern understanding of humanity. This also raises the question of what type of society—capitalist or otherwise—the normative perspective of inclusion refers to.

A practice of inclusion in educational contexts (and beyond) based on this analysis is therefore capable of contributing, within its scope of influence, to transforming societal structures, cultures, and fields.

Conclusion

In contemporary societies, capitalism and digital inequalities are closely intertwined. As digital media and technologies become increasingly central to society, the possibilities and limitations for individuals’ inclusion and participation in society are continuously shaped, solidified, and even expanded in both number and depth. Accordingly, based on the identification, analysis, and reflection of digital inequalities, it is essential to explore ways to address these inequalities and

foster perspectives that can unfold within society. Our previous analyses have also demonstrated the deep entanglement between societal (in particular, capitalist) and digital structures. Thus, anyone seeking inclusion in digital contexts, or in societal frameworks more broadly, is inevitably embedded in these social realities.

For the current realities of capitalism, it becomes evident that inclusion implies integration into the logic of economic value generation and unequal access to resources. Inclusion in the capitalism of the digital age means that individuals and groups find themselves embedded in the economic mindsets and practices of human capital exploitation and profit orientation. Therefore, those who view inclusion as an ethical, analytical, or theoretical concept of social integration need to simultaneously question the foundations and consequences of this inclusion. Inclusion is not merely a path toward intensified participation; it is also a path shaped by the economic valuation and commodification of resources, as well as of people, their emotions, hopes, and skills.

At the end of our analyses, we therefore ask: What kind of inclusion is being pursued, at what cost, and for what purpose? Furthermore, which forms of inclusion can realistically be pursued, considering societal realities as limitations to emancipation and solidarity? The question remains: What kind of inclusion, and how?

Literature

- Ainscow, M. (2020). Promoting inclusion and equity in education. Lessons from international experiences. *Nordic Journal of Studies in Educational Policy*, 6(1), 7-16.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/20020317.2020.1729587>
- Böhmer, A. (2017). *Bildung der Arbeitsgesellschaft. Intersektionelle Anmerkungen zur Vergesellschaftung durch Bildungsformate*. Bielefeld: transcript.
- Böhmer, A. (2021). Precarious Recognition: Knowledge, Power, and Social Placement of Refugees. *Journal of Identity and Migration Studies*, 15(2), 113-132.
- Bosse, I., Schluchter, J.-R. & Zorn, I. (Eds.). (2019). *Handbuch Inklusion und Medienbildung*. Weinheim, Basel: Beltz Juventa.
- Boltanski, L. & Chiapello, È. (2003). *The new spirit of capitalism*. London, New York: Verso.
- Buckingham, D. (2022). Media Education and Citizenship in Neoliberal Times. In B. S. De Abreu (Ed.), *Media Literacy, Equity, and Justice* (pp. 76-84). New York: Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003175599>
- Buchner, T. & Ojo, J. (2022). Making und Fähigkeit. Eine ableismkritische Analyse der Potenziale von Makerspaces in formalen Bildungseinrichtungen. *Medienimpulse*, 60(2), 1-40.
<https://doi.org/10.21243/mi-02-22-11>
- Budde, J., Dlugosch, A. & Sturm, T. (2017). (Re)Konstruktive Inklusionsforschung. Eine Einleitung. In J. Budde, A. Dlugosch & T. Sturm (Eds.), *(Re)Konstruktive Inklusionsforschung. Differenzlinien – Handlungsfelder – Empirische Zugänge* (pp. 11-20). Opladen, Berlin, Toronto: Verlag Barbara Budrich.
- Bude, H. & Staab, P. (2016). Einleitung. Kapitalismus und Ungleichheit. Neue Antworten auf alte Fragen. In H. Bude, Heinz & P. Staab (Eds.), *Kapitalismus und Ungleichheit. Die neuen Verwerfungen* (pp. 7-22). Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag.
- Carstensen, T., Schaupp, S. & Seignani, S. (Eds.). (2023). *Theorien des digitalen Kapitalismus. Arbeit, Ökonomie, Politik und Subjekt*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Clayton, J & Macdonald, S. J. (2013). The Limits of Technology. *Information, Communication & Society*, 16(6), 945-966. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2012.748817>
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1(8), 139-167.
- Dander, V. (2023). "Der" digitale Kapitalismus als Gegenstand von Medienbildung mit Jugendlichen. In G. Bröckling, Guido, R. Fries, Rüdiger & K. Narr (Eds.), *Mit Medienbildung die*

Welt retten?! Medienpädagogik in einer Kultur der Digitalität (pp. 175-186). München: kopaed.

DiMaggio, P. & Hargittai, E. (2001). *From the "Digital Divide" to "Digital Inequality": Studying Internet Use as penetration increases*. Working Paper No 15. Princeton: Princeton University Center for Arts and Cultural Policy Studies.

European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education (2022). *Inclusive Digital Education*. https://www.european-agency.org/sites/default/files/Inclusive_Digital_Education.pdf [Accessed November 21, 2024]

Ferrante, P., Williams, F., Büchner, F., Kiesewetter, S., Chitsauko Muyambi, G., Uleanya, C. & Utterberg Modén, M. (2023): In/equalities in digital education policy. Sociotechnical imaginaries from three world regions. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 49(1), 122-132. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2023.2237870>

Fischer-Tahir, A. (2021a). *Sehbehinderung und Arbeit. Rekonfigurationen im digitalen Kapitalismus*. Bielefeld: transcript.

Fischer-Tahir, A. (2021b). „Schreibt uns nicht ab, aber zwingt uns auch nicht“. Macht und Ohnmacht in der beruflichen Rehabilitation von Menschen mit Sehschädigung. In: *Zeitschrift für Inklusion*, 1. <https://www.inklusion-online.net/index.php/inklusion-online/article/view/582> [Accessed November 21, 2024]

Goggin, G. (2017). Disability and digital inequalities. Rethinking digital divides with disability theory. In M. Ragneddo & G. W. Muschert (Eds.), *Theorizing Digital Divides* (pp. 63-74). London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315455334>

Hall, S. (1996). The west and the rest: Discourse and power. In S. Hall, D. Held, D. Hubert, & K. Thompson (Hrsg.), *Modernity. An introduction to modern societies* (S. 184–224). Blackwell Publishing.

Haraway, D. (1988). Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14(3), 575–599. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3178066>

Harding, S. (1993). Rethinking Standpoint Epistemology: What Is „Strong Objectivity“? In L. Alcoff & E. Potter (Hrsg.), *Feminist Epistemologies* (S. 49–82). Routledge.

Hargittai, E. (Ed.). (2021). *Handbook of Digital Inequality*. Cheltenham: Edgar Elgar Pub.

Hargittai, E. & Hsieh, Y. P. (2013). Digital inequality. In W.H. Dutton (Ed.), *Oxford Handbook of Internet studies* (pp. 129-150). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hark, S. (2021). *Gemeinschaft der Ungewählten. Umriss eines politischen Ethos der Kohabitation. Ein Essay*. Berlin: Suhrkamp.

Hartnett, M. (2022). Digital Equity and Education. In M. A. Peters (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Teacher Education* (pp. 470-480). Singapore: Springer.

- Heeks, R. (2022): Digital Inequality beyond the Digital Divide. Conceptualizing Adverse Digital Incorporation in the Global South. *Information Technology for Development* 28(4), 688-704. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02681102.2022.2068492>
- Kellner, D. & Share, J. (2019). Towards Critical Digital and Media Literacies. In D. Kellner & J. Share (Eds.), *The Critical Media Literacy Guide* (pp. 1-20). Leiden: Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004404533_001
- Knoblauch, C. & Böhmer, A. (2022). Community Education and Diversity in Digital Contexts: Curricular and Empirical Perspectives. In: D. Guralnick, M. E. Auer & A. Poce (Eds.), *Innovative Approaches to Technology-Enhanced Learning for the Workplace and Higher Education* (pp. 593-607). Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-21569-8_55
- Kovač, N., Žmija, K., Roy, J. K., Kusa, R. & Duda, J. (2024). Digital divide and digitalization in Europe: A bibliometric analysis. *Equilibrium. Quarterly Journal of Economics and Economic Policy*, 19(2), 463–520. <https://doi.org/10.24136/eq.2899>
- Kronauer, M. (2013). Soziologische Anmerkungen zu zwei Debatten über Inklusion und Exklusion. In R. Burtscher, E. J. Ditschek, K.-E. Ackermann, M. Kil & Kronauer, M. (Eds.), *Zugänge zu Inklusion, Erwachsenenbildung, Behindertenpädagogik und Soziologie im Dialog* (pp. 17-25). Bielefeld: Bertelsmann.
- Kronauer, M. (2010). Inklusion – Exklusion. Eine historische und begriffliche Annäherung an die soziale Frage der Gegenwart. In M. Kronauer (Ed.), *Inklusion und Weiterbildung. Reflexionen zur gesellschaftlichen Teilhabe in der Gegenwart* (pp. 24-58). Bielefeld: Bertelsmann.
- Kutscher, N. & Iske, S. (2022). Diskussionsfelder der Medienpädagogik: Medien und soziale Ungleichheit. In U. Sander, F. von Gross & K.-U. Hugger (Eds.), *Handbuch Medienpädagogik* (pp. 667-678). Wiesbaden: VS-Verlag. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-25090-4_80-1
- Lange, S. & Santarius, T. (2020). *Smart Green World? Making Digitalization work for Sustainability*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Medina, A. L., Böhmer, A., Starker-Glass, T., Foxx, S. P. & Franceschini, M. (2023). German and American Pre-service Teachers' Knowledge and Dispositions Towards Understanding Vulnerable Populations. International Research and Review. *Journal of Phi Beta Delta Honor Society for International Scholars*. 12(2), 19-37.
- Mossberger, K., Tolbert, C. J. & Stansbury, M. (2003). *Virtual Inequality. Beyond the Digital Divide*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Nachtwey, O. & Seidl, T. (2017). Die Ethik der Solution und der Geist des digitalen Kapitalismus. *IfS Working Papers*, 11(2017). <https://www.ifs.uni-frankfurt.de/publikationsdetails/ifs-oliver-nachtwey-und-timo-seidl-die-ethik-der-solution-und-der-geist-des-digitalen-kapitalismus.html> [Accessed November 21, 2024]

- Nachtwey, O. & Seidl, T. (2020): The solutionist ethic and the spirit of digital capitalism. SocArXiv, 14(March), 1-53. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/sgizq>
- Niesyto, H. (2021): Digital Capitalism and Critical Media Education. *seminar.net – Media, Technology & Lifelong Learning*, 17(2), 1-21. <https://doi.org/10.7577/seminar.4224>
- Niesyto, H. (2009). Digitale Medien, soziale Benachteiligung und soziale Distinktion. *MedienPädagogik. Zeitschrift für Theorie und Praxis der Medienbildung*, 17(2009). <https://www.medienpaed.com/article/view/115/115> [Accessed November 21, 2024]
- Ottersbach, M, Platte, A. & Rosen, L. (Eds.). (2016). *Soziale Ungleichheiten als Herausforderung für inklusive Bildung*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- Pfeiffer, S. (2022): *Digital Capitalism and Distributive Forces*. Bielefeld: transcript.
- Pietilä, I., Meriläinen, N., Varsaluoma, J. & Väänänen, K. (2021). Understanding youths' needs for digital societal participation: towards an inclusive Virtual Council. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 40(5), 483-496. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929X.2021.1912182>
- Ragnedda, M. & Mutsavairo, B. (2018). *Digital Inclusion. An International Comparative Analysis*. Lanham, Boulder, New York, London: Lexington Books.
- Ragnedda, M., Ruiu, M. L. & Addeo, F. (2022). The self-reinforcing effect of digital and social exclusion. The Inequality Loop. In: *Telematics and Informatics* 72(2022), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2022.101852>
- Ragnedda, M. (2018): Conceptualizing digital capital. *Telematics and Informatics*, 35(8), 2366-2375. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2018.10.006>
- Ragnedda, M. & Muschert, G. W. (Eds.). (2013). *The Digital Divide. The internet and social inequality in international perspective*. New York: Routledge.
- Roulstone, A. (2016). *Disability and Technology. An Interdisciplinary and International Approach*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-45042-5>
- Scherr, A. (2024). Grenzen der Inklusion. Inklusions-/Exklusionsrisiken in der funktional differenzierten Weltgesellschaft. In K. Blaha, M.-A. Boger, J. Geldner-Belli, N. Körner, V. Moser & K. Walgenbach (Eds.), *Inklusion und Grenzen. Soziale, politische und pädagogische Verhältnisse* (pp. 29-54). Bielefeld: transcript. <https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839471081>
- Schluchter, J.-R. (2023). Digitale Ungleichheit, Behinderung, Empowerment. (Medien)Pädagogisches Empowerment als Perspektive für Inklusion. In J. Betz & J.-R. Schluchter (Eds.), *Schulische Medienbildung und Digitalisierung im Kontext von Behinderung und Benachteiligung* (pp. 158-183). Weinheim, Basel.
- Schluchter, J.-R. (2016): Medien, Medienbildung, Empowerment. *merz – Medien und Erziehung*, 60(3), 24-30.

Schluchter, J.-R. (2012): Medienbildung als Perspektive für Inklusion. *merz – Medien und Erziehung*, 56(1). 16-21.

Sevignani, S., Schaupp, S. & Carstensen, T. (2023). Einleitung. Basistheorien und zukünftige Herausforderungen für eine Theorie des digitalen Kapitalismus. In T. Carstensen, S. Schaupp & S. Sevignani (Eds.). *Theorien des digitalen Kapitalismus. Arbeit, Ökonomie, Politik und Subjekt* (pp. 9-41). Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Spivak, G. C. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), *Marxism and the interpretation of culture* (pp. 271–313). Macmillan Education.

UNESCO (2012): *Addressing Exclusion in Education. A Guide to Assessing Education Systems towards more inclusive and just societies*.

<https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000217073> [Accessed November 21, 2024]

van Dijk, J. (2020). *The Digital Divide*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

van Dijk, J. (2005). *The deepening divide. Inequality in the information society*. Thousand Oaks: Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452229812>

Verständig, D., Klein, A. & Iske, S. (2016). Zero-Level Digital Divide. Neues Netz und neue Ungleichheiten. *SIEGEN:SOZIAL*, 21(1), 50-55. https://dspace.ub.uni-siegen.de/bitstream/ubsi/1197/1/Verstaendig_Klein_Iske_Zero_Level_Digital_Divide.pdf [Accessed November 21, 2024]

Weber, M. (2016). *Die protestantische Ethik und der »Geist« des Kapitalismus*. Neuausgabe der ersten Fassung von 1904-05 mit einem Verzeichnis der wichtigsten Zusätze und Veränderungen aus der zweiten Fassung von 1920. (K. Lichtblau, & J. Weiß, Hrsg.) Wiesbaden: Springer.