

# Speculative Capture: Literacy after Platformization

**T. Philip Nichols**

**Alexandra Thrall**

*Baylor University, Waco, Texas, USA*

**Julian Quiros**

*University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA*

**Ezekiel Dixon-Román**

*Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York, USA*

## ABSTRACT

This conceptual article examines the role of *speculation* in driving responses to generative AI platforms in literacy education and the implications for research, pedagogy, and practice. Our focus on “speculation” encompasses two meanings of the term - each of which has inspired lively lines of inquiry in literacy studies and transdisciplinary research on artificial intelligence, respectively. In the first sense, literacy scholars have recognized literacy education as a speculative project - one characterized by the cultivation of particular reading and writing practices in order to prefigure different imagined social futures. In the second sense, scholars of media and computational cultural studies have theorized a different kind of speculative logic that underwrites the design and functioning of AI platforms - one characterized by extrapolative prediction and algorithmic reasoning. Investigating the evolving relationship between these modes of speculation, we argue that the former has allowed literacy education to be uniquely susceptible to the influence of the latter; and likewise, that the latter exerts its influence in ways that remake the former in its image. We theorize this relation as a process of *speculative capture*, and we highlight its stakes for equitable literacy education. We then conclude by providing provocations for researchers and teachers that may be of use in preempting the collapse of these speculative formations into one another; and perhaps, in mobilizing a conception of the speculative that works productively toward alternative ethico-political ends.

The public release of ChatGPT, OpenAI’s large language model (LLM) chatbot, in late 2022 precipitated a flurry of reactions in popular media, many of which immediately implicated literacy education. Contemporaneous headlines like “Did a Fourth Grader Write This? Or the New Chatbot?” in *The New York Times* (Cain Miller et al., 2022), and “The End of High School English” in *The Atlantic* (Herman, 2022) signal the extent to which developments in artificial intelligence (AI) technology and the future of literacy education were immediately, intimately entwined in the American public’s imagination. It is not surprising, then, that literacy educators responded with equally imaginative intensity. Across essays, op-eds, and social media posts, some encouraged the AI platform’s inclusion in classrooms—either as an assistive resource for research and writing (Cohen, 2023) or an object of critical analysis (Prothero, 2023). Others, by contrast, called for instructors to “AI-proof” assignments—abandoning essay forms easily reproduced by AI in favor of other genres or communicative modes—to avert students’ use of the software (Klein, 2023).

While these reactions from literacy educators to ChatGPT may appear diverse, we contend that they are actually driven by a common

presupposition: namely, that literacy pedagogy ought to respond or adapt to changes in our sociotechnical landscape—be it through the integration, critique, or obstruction of new communicative tools. This presupposition is emblematic, we suggest, of a *speculative* current that runs through literacy education, where “literacy” is understood less by fixed, affirmative qualities than by its relation to an imagined future, and the skills that are presumed necessary for navigating or contesting it. In this essay, we begin by elaborating on how the speculative project of literacy education has been characterized by adaptability—continually broadening the definition of literacy to accommodate new media technologies. We then offer insights from the field of “platform studies” (Burgess, 2021; Nichols & Garcia, 2022; Plantin et al., 2018) to demonstrate how emergent platform technologies, such as generative AI, differ from previous technologies to which literacy education has responded in that they are underwritten by their own, distinctive mode of speculation—one characterized not by adaptation, but by extrapolative prediction and algorithmic preemption (Dixon-Román & Parisi, 2020; Hong, 2020). Examining the interplay of these speculative modes, we argue, helps make visible the ways that literacy education’s future-orientation leaves it susceptible to cooptation by, and enrollment in, the parallel speculative project that animates AI technologies—thus remaking the former in the image of the latter. We theorize this relation as a process of *speculative capture*, and we highlight its implications for equitable literacy education, as well as avenues for inquiry that will be required to loosen their entanglement toward alternative ethico-political ends.

## The Speculative Project of Literacy Education

Scholars of literacy studies have long documented the fluid meanings associated with “literacy.” The term signals, on one hand, discrete skills for encoding or decoding text; and, on the other, variegated social practices for making meaning in situated domains (Lankshear, 1998). Researchers have also highlighted the ideologies embedded in pedagogical agendas aimed at cultivating these skills or practices in others (Street, 1984). The acquisition of literacy has, at different times, and in different places, been presumed to confer normative attributes (e.g., morality, civility, intelligence, empathy), economic benefits (e.g., upward mobility, social efficiency), or political dispositions (e.g., critical consciousness, empowerment) on the people that embrace it (Collins & Blot, 2003; Graff, 1979). It follows, then, that the cultural value of literacy has historically been derived not just from its immediate features or uses, but also from their attachment to imagined futures—that is, the formation of particular kinds of people or societies. This is another way of saying that literacy

education is, and has always been, an inherently *speculative* project.

One consequence of literacy education’s future-orientation is that its focal object, “literacy,” becomes a moving target. The threshold for categorization as “literate” or “illiterate” in a given setting evolves in relation to that context’s anxieties, desires, and anticipated needs. In the United States, for instance, there has been a dramatic rise in functional literacy rates since the early 20th century; yet shifting social circumstances—from new communication technologies to globalized working conditions—have recurrently escalated expectations for reading and writing, leaving educators and policymakers perennially apprehensive about an impending literacy crisis (Myers, 1996; Tierney & Pearson, 2021). Where once literacy education was bounded to alphabetic texts, developments in mass media technologies (e.g., film, television, personal computers, the internet, social networks) have incrementally extended its purview to include a successive march of new competencies: visual literacy (Debes, 1969), multimedia literacy (Postman, 1970), information literacy (Zurkowski, 1974), computer literacy (Anderson, 1983), media literacy (Aufderheide, 1993), digital literacy (Gilster, 1997), news literacy (Hobbs, 2010), algorithmic literacy (Bakke, 2020), and AI literacy (Ng et al., 2021)—not to mention the “critical” variations of each, which attend to their relevant issues of power and justice (Luke, 2014). The expansion of “literacy” to include such competencies further illustrates literacy education’s speculative character. Each addition is justified by its relation to future conditionality: the presumptive capacities young people will need to navigate the forms of life and work that, we imagine, are just over the horizon.

There is much to commend about the research and teaching this adaptive view of literacy has inspired. Scholars’ willingness to theorize “literacy” in response to an evolving media landscape offers a necessary counterweight to those who would position it as something rarified—existing apart, and under threat, from technological developments. For instance, rather than demonizing computer-mediated reading as an inferior or corrupted approximation of print-based literacy, research on “digital literacies” has spotlighted how people engage with each differently—often in ways that resist simple classification as good or bad (Mills, 2010; Nichols & Stornaiuolo, 2019). Moreover, this expansive understanding of literacy has also prompted generative conversations about how educators might meaningfully integrate new technologies—and students’ out-of-school experiences with them—into classrooms (Garcia, 2014; Lankshear & Knobel, 2008). Indeed, we see traces of such perspectives in the aforementioned responses of educators to ChatGPT, which worked to leverage the platform as a supportive resource for writing. Crucially, this view of literacy has also channeled attention to the potentials of literacy education not just to

adapt to a circumscribed vision of the future, but to intervene in social conditions so as to bring about alternative ones—for instance, through re-storying (Thomas & Stor-naiuolo, 2016), speculative design (Wargo, 2021), and speculative civic literacies (Mirra & Garcia, 2020). Such avenues for research, teaching, and social action are further upshots of literacy education's future-orientation.

And yet, for all its promise, the speculative character of literacy education also presents serious, if subtle, challenges for practitioners. Literacy's adaptability to changing social and technological circumstances doesn't just broaden the term's meaning, but redraws its boundaries. Expanding the scope of the literacy curriculum to include, say, "news literacy" or "AI literacy" may posit new ways of being literate, but in doing so, it also constructs its obverse: new ways of being illiterate. The speculative project of literacy education, then, is simultaneously self-undermining and self-reinforcing. By destabilizing what counts as literacy in response to changing sociotechnical conditions, it recurrently produces "illiterate" subjects who must be reconciled to the skills, competencies, or practices associated with the term's shifting norms (Nichols et al., 2024, cf. Bartlett, 2007; Pangrazio & Sefton-Green, 2024; Street, 2012). This cycle continually renews the cultural weight of literacy by centering it, discursively, as an ever-desirable, yet ever-recalcitrant educational outcome—one defined less by its inherent, affirmative qualities than by its relation to a receding horizon of technological developments, workforce demands, and political crises. While this indeterminacy allows literacy education to remain relevant, even urgent, in changing times, we suggest it also leaves literacy education vulnerable to co-optation by other speculative projects that are invested in defining the contours of this horizon—projects whose interests, values, and priorities may differ from those of literacy educators, students, or the publics that schools are meant to serve. As we will demonstrate, this vulnerability is particularly salient in the context of AI technologies—the latest development to which "literacy" is being compelled to adapt.

## AI Platforms: Ecologies of the Speculative

While AI may not appear categorically distinct from the succession of previous technologies that literacy has expanded to include, a growing transdisciplinary literature in "platform studies" (Burgess, 2021; Nichols & Garcia, 2022; Plantin et al., 2018) suggests it has notable differences. Central among these is the fact that AI does not arrive in literacy classrooms as a standalone text (like a film) or tool (like a video camera), but as a *platform*—a digital app, service, or infrastructure that facilitates multi-valent exchanges (Gillespie, 2010). Media theorist José van

Dijk (2013) argues that platforms are distinguished from other technologies by their unique organizational logic. A platform—be it an AI chatbot, social media network, or automated essay scoring service—is not a singular, stable object, but a confluence of three interrelated dimensions of activity: the social, the technical, and the political-economic.

The social dimension refers to the uses and outcomes of platform processes (e.g., what and how people produce and consume using platforms, and the differential impacts that result). The technical dimension refers to the architectures that shape how platforms function and interoperate with one another (e.g., code, data, algorithms, interfaces, hardware). And the political-economic dimension refers to the commercial, labor, and regulatory interests that are bound up with the design, implementation, and diffusion of platforms (e.g., business models, legal governance, natural resource extraction). Significantly, because platforms are always comprised of, yet irreducible to, each of these dimensions, scholars suggest they are best understood not as independent "tools," but as complex "ecologies" (Garcia & Nichols, 2021; Nichols & LeBlanc, 2021; van Dijk, 2021)—an outgrowth of the relational interplay of their component parts.

Understanding platforms from this ecological perspective helps crystallize a tendency in literacy education to engage AI platforms primarily in the register of their social dimension—that is, in ways that concern the affordances, limitations, and impacts of their tool-like *usage* in literacy teaching and practice. For instance, returning to where we began this essay, with literacy educators' responses to ChatGPT, we can see how the divergent reactions in articles and op-eds were largely predicated on a shared interest in AI's social implications, rather than their technical or political-economic operations. Those advocating for AI platforms to be incorporated into instruction did so on grounds that this might support students in becoming effective users of such tools in writing for social purposes (Cohen, 2023). Likewise, parallel calls for teachers to "AI proof" their assignments assumed that teachers must resign to the ways that large language models (LLMs) may obviate conventional writing, such that instruction ought to shift toward alternate social forms, like multimodal assignments (Klein, 2023). Even critical orientations that approached AI as an object of analysis tended to investigate its non-neutrality as a tool, principally through attention to its uneven social impacts (Prothero, 2023).

Significantly, across these social concerns, the speculative current of literacy education is pronounced: each of the above perspectives accommodates AI by redrawing the boundaries of "literacy" to include new technical skills, communicative capacities, or critical dispositions—all in anticipation of an imagined future that AI sets in motion. In many ways, this follows a formula that has served

literacy education well in responding to previous technological developments. But as we, following van Dijck, suggest, platforms are different from other technologies that literacy education has accommodated: they are not stand-alone texts or tools, but dynamic ecologies. Consequently, by isolating the social dimension of AI platforms as an anchor for speculative adaptation, the prevailing approaches to engaging AI in literacy education can overlook the interplay of this dimension with its technical and political-economic counterparts. In doing so, they elide the competing speculative logics these other dimensions introduce into the literacy activities they intermediate.

## Scales of Speculation: The Technical and the Political-Economic

It is understandable why the technical and political-economic dimensions of AI platforms might go unexamined in literacy education. Where the social dimension includes observable practices and their impacts—things literacy researchers are accustomed to studying—the technical and political-economic facets of AI platforms are largely obscured from view. The technical dimension, for one, is layered beneath user interfaces, intellectual property protections, and an air of mathematical inscrutability. Nevertheless, the visible products of AI platforms (e.g., automatically generated text or images, adaptive feedback) and their social uses, are inextricably enmeshed with these opaque technical processes. Significantly, for our purposes, scholars of platform studies theorize these processes as a form of speculation quite different from literacy education's future-orientation. While AI technologies may appear as something proactive and adaptive, their outputs are circumscribed by prespecified modes of data capture and classification that are required for them to generate—or, more precisely, extrapolate—images, text, code, comments, or judgments (Hong, 2023).

Put another way, AI technologies—whether animated by LLMs (like ChatGPT) or narrower forms of natural language processing (like automated assessment services)—speculate from a past-orientation. They model probabilistic futures based on historical data points rather than anticipating a rupture from the present. It is also worth noting that AI platforms' means of processing this historical data are not naturally occurring; they are cultivated by networks of human decision-making, labor, and finance—all of which congeal within the technical structures of platforms and their delimitations of data capture (Dixon-Román, 2016). Accordingly, while AI platforms are often marketed in terms of their capacity to “personalize,” their technical dimensions can only function by modulating

users' activities toward pre-determined futures based on past data processes (Dixon-Román, 2023). This is a speculative logic characterized not by indeterminacy, as in literacy education, but by algorithmic preemption. The future that AI platforms “generate” is always a reinscription of what already exists in the present.

Additionally, AI platforms' political-economic dimension is also driven by a speculative logic distinct from that of literacy education. Inasmuch as the data processes within an AI platform are useful for extrapolating predictions that can be recursively reincorporated into its technical dimension to approximate “adaptability,” they are also useful outside of the platform, as sources of value in speculative finance (Williamson, 2021). This is because platforms are what economists call “multi-sided markets” (Sanchez-Cartas & León, 2021): they do not just process data to deliver services to their users (i.e., the consumer-facing side); their owners can also aggregate this data to derive insights for future product enhancements (i.e., the development-facing side) or to secure advantages over their competitors (i.e., the business-facing side). The imbrication of these “sides” means that the speculative logics that underwrite AI platforms' social and technical dimensions can't be easily disentangled from the speculative growth targets of AI companies, or the speculative investments of venture capital firms that are betting on such companies to usher in new economic and labor relations (Kojljenovic, 2021; Williamson, 2023). Importantly, as Keeling (2019) argues, this logic operates in the interest of racial capitalism, maximizing capital accumulation through the expropriative-appropriative shaping of bodies, affects, and activities. Further, as Morozov (2023) argues, the proliferation of AI is increasingly linked not just to financial futures, but to geopolitical ones. It isn't a coincidence, for instance, that former Google CEO Eric Schmidt, who runs a venture capital fund to seed AI startups, has also chaired Pentagon and National Security commissions on AI and co-authored a book with Henry Kissinger about the need for the U.S. global leadership in AI development and regulation.

Such vantage points bring into relief the vast and multiple scales at which AI platforms' competing speculative projects operate. While it would be comforting if AI platforms could be understood as simple tools for literacy teaching and practice, their ecological relations intricately enroll and massively distribute even their most quotidian social uses across time and space, rendering them into raw material for extrapolative predictions, venture finance, and global politics. There is need, then, for literacy education to engage AI platforms ecologically, attending not just to their social uses for, and impacts on, reading and writing, but also the ways these observable phenomena are entangled with technical and political-economic processes whose speculative logics and aspirations may run counter

to those that have historically driven literacy teaching and learning in schools.

## Speculative Capture

Stepping back, we can begin to see how the convergence of these speculative projects—from literacy education, on one hand, and from AI platforms' technical and political-economic dimensions, on the other—creates contradictions as they are enmeshed in everyday transactions of literacy teaching and practice. Where the future-orientation of literacy education drives its practitioners to adapt the concept of “literacy” to accommodate shifts in the sociotechnical landscape, the particular shifts inaugurated by AI platforms are characterized by a different set of speculative logics—ones that are primed by and channeled toward circumscribed, probabilistic ends. Consequently, the indeterminacy that marks literacy education's speculative project makes it vulnerable both to cooptation by those of AI platforms and to being remade by the preemptive reasoning that animates them. We theorize this vulnerability as a process of *speculative capture*.

Our use of this term signals two interrelated meanings. The first pertains to the mode of power through which AI platforms advance their own speculative projects as they are folded into literacy education—namely, by rendering literacy instruction and practice as being amenable to “capture” as data. Accordingly, they depend on the categorization and sorting of individuals (i.e., teachers, students), and their labor (i.e., reading, writing) and intensities (i.e., expressed tone and affections in writing) into masses, databanks, and markets—or, what Deleuze (1992) calls “dividuals” (cf. Robinson, 2021). In a classroom, for instance, the use of an AI platform to generate feedback on student writing may appear, at the level of its observable social dimension, to offer real-time interpretations and suggestions. However, generating this “personalized” feedback requires, at the level of the platform's technical dimension, a pre-existing dataset where a sample of writers and writing have been broken down and taxonomized to derive comparative judgments when a new student composition is input. In other words, as much as this process is trafficked under the banner of “personalization,” algorithms actually “genericize” their inputs through the potentiation of present renderings of past dividual data (Puar, 2023). Here, “potentiation” refers to the determined and constrained potential outputs, and the “present renderings of past data” are the reading of inputs by the algorithm. Moreover, as we have demonstrated in previous work, model creation—an activity hidden away in the technical dimension of AI platforms—also inaugurates racialized, social, and cultural recursivity that reflects and refracts already existing phenomena into the future (Dixon-Román et al., 2020). In this way, AI's speculative

capture of dividual characteristics, processes, and intensities of students, texts, and classrooms has significant implications for equitable literacy education.

With others, we would argue that this “capture” functions as a distinct mode of power that Deleuze (1992) calls *control* (cf. Holloway & Lewis, 2022; Nichols & Dixon-Román, 2024). Where disciplinary power, in Foucault's (1995) terms, operates through perceived ongoing surveillance in enclosures (i.e. systems, institutions, and norms that shape behaviors at a distance, and through visibility), control initiates power through intimate, adaptive, generative, and continuous governance via iterative data capture and modulated use, often without perceived or known visibility. With the use of an AI platform for adaptive writing assessment, for instance, the real-time feedback produced by the platform, predicated on past and generalized discourses of literacy, primes and determines how students and teachers experience the classroom. A student's inability to produce a text that “passes” the algorithm's criteria for high-quality or effective writing may divert more, or less, material and relational resources toward them and their work. Moreover, the platform's capture of certain dividual data—say, the amount of time spent reading or writing—may be used as a proxy for other phenomena (e.g., focus, disengagement) which can nudge one's attention or even trigger more traditional disciplinary modes of punishment, like detention.

While control mechanisms are often constituted deep in the technical dimension of AI platforms, they produce both subtle and overt forms of surveillance which frequently represent a new version of the old, as it pertains to racialization and formations of difference. Through the very presence of, in our example, an AI platform for adaptive writing assessment, the aim of equitable literacy education is undermined, as its animating model exponentiates the always-already process of perceptually categorizing (Wynter, 2015) students along a circumscribed literate/illiterate axis. This not only diminishes students' individuality (Ferreira da Silva, 2022), but it also has disproportionate impacts on racialized students predisposed to being read as “illiterate” because it is this very predisposition shaping the dividual data that is training the platform's algorithm. Importantly, impacts like these are not unique to assessment platforms in literacy education, but also of “generative” ones. Computational sociolinguists have demonstrated that sets of synthetic texts, produced by platforms like ChatGPT, are more homogenous in their structural and stylistic features than their human-produced analogs and that these features are closely correlated with racialized and classed norms for written expression (Alvero et al., 2023). From this view, we can understand speculative capture as the process by which the past—including histories of racialization and social stratification—are reinforced in the present and recursively recast into the future through a ruse of objectivity

underwritten by dividual data and its attendant mechanisms of control (Dixon-Román, 2023). This is not to say that agency is nonexistent with regard to such mechanisms; only that it always exists *in relation* to them: any usage of an AI platform for textual production or assessment cannot be disentangled from the governing logics of the platform itself, which overdetermine the conditions of its use and, by extension, the agency of its users.

Importantly, our use of the term “speculative capture” simultaneously points to a second meaning—not just AI platforms’ *reinforcing of the past*, via extrapolative prediction, but also its *preemption of possible futures*, via the subsumption of alternate speculative projects. As we have suggested, the adaptability of literacy leaves it vulnerable to cooptation: to construct literacy pedagogy in relation to AI platforms—either by incorporating them into classrooms or altering the curriculum to subvert their usage—necessarily concedes the indeterminacy of literacy education’s speculative project to those driving platforms’ technical and political-economic dimensions. That is to say, inasmuch as we have argued that AI’s speculative logic captures dividual data to control the activities and vectors of *individuals*, it also does so for *literacy* itself. Whether integrating ChatGPT or an assessment platform into literacy classrooms, each is algorithmically directed to “see” certain features of writing, as predetermined by its language model or training dataset. While AI platforms may seem robustly “generative,” in other words, this quality is constituted through extrapolation, not adaptation. AI programs and platforms are almost always designed, programmed, and self-governed to not account for the indeterminacies of emergent potentials of reading or writing—the very potentials that have historically driven literacy education’s speculative current. In the same way, those who would, instead, choose to excise writing assignments altogether in an effort to “AI proof” the curriculum, likewise, preemptively surrender the potential of writing—as an expressive form and material practice—to the specter of an anticipatory future that renders it obsolete. In such examples, the same adaptability that enables “literacy” to accommodate, or evolve in relation to, new technologies also allows, in the case of AI platforms, for its capture by other speculative logics that may be antithetical to the larger aims or values of literacy educators, students, or communities.

## Literacy after Platformization

The process of speculative capture we have examined leaves literacy education with an intractable question: what is to be done? While our analysis of the competing speculative currents running through literacy education and AI platforms does not offer a simple answer to this question, we would contend that it does reframe our approach—shifting focus from the social uses and impacts

of AI in literacy education to the ecological relations that underwrite, delimit, and extend these activities. Such a view helps to recognize that the hurried attempts of literacy educators to develop, in the aftermath of ChatGPT’s public release, curricular and pedagogical stances toward such technologies were not just reasonable responses to the immediacy with which AI appeared poised to redefine literacy practices, but they were also emblematic of the larger speculative project to which literacy education has aspired. However, as we have suggested, the tendency for this project to anchor its speculative extensions of “literacy” to the social dimension of AI platforms—as it has for previous sociotechnical developments—has made it easier to overlook the technical and political-economic relations that are also imbricated in platforms, as well as the conflicting speculative projects they introduce into the literacy practices they intermediate. In making these dynamics visible, we can see that attention to speculative capture spotlights the contradictions that surface when “literacy” is defined in relation to platform technologies, generally—including those that have evaded scrutiny in prior studies of digital literacy—and AI platforms, in particular.

One response to this speculative capture, then, is to interrogate the assumptions that undergird literacy education’s speculative orientation. As we have suggested, inasmuch as this current has invited educators to respond to sociotechnical developments by expanding the purview of “literacy” to include new skills, practices, and dispositions, in doing so, this politics of inclusion has also recurrently reproduced a literate/illiterate binary, and an associated imperative for literacy education to close the gap between the two. Already, we can see this inclination in calls for “AI literacy” (and the teaching of associated skills, like “prompt writing”) as well as in efforts to eschew writing activities that AI platforms can approximate. While these tendencies retain literacy education’s drive for indeterminacy in the *form* “literacy” takes, by redrawing the boundaries of literacy to integrate (or circumvent) AI platforms, they simultaneously preempt the indeterminacy of its *practice* by defining literacy in relation to the platform’s observable social uses without regard for the competing speculative projects its technical and political-economic dimensions impose. Consequently, one tactic for literacy education to confront speculative capture might be to shift the locus of indeterminacy it strives for: emphasizing a pluralistic, non-hierarchical view of reading and writing *practice*, but being cautious about ceding influence to whatever sociotechnical development claims to necessitate a new *form* of “literacy.” Indeed, we would argue that such a view is actually closer to what the field’s foundational theorizations of “literacies,” in the plural, intended by the term (cf. Street, 1984)—that is, to unsettle the hierarchies inherent in the literate/illiterate binary, not to reproduce this binary across an ever-expanding terrain of communicative forms.

More broadly, we would suggest that such a shift from the literate/illiterate binary to a pluralism of practice, both in literacy and its intermediation through sociotechnical systems, necessitates a parallel shift in ethico-political intention. By ethico-political intention, we refer to the inseparability between, on the one hand, an ethics of relationality that takes as its starting point that difference emerges from entanglement and, on the other hand, a politics that seeks to transgress and traverse boundaries toward the pursuit of a radical affirmation of and responsiveness to the multiplicity of existence, especially from the indeterminacies of the dispossessed, the subjugated, those of precarity, and nonbeing. That is, how might “the speculative” in literacy and sociotechnical systems do different work if attention were given to the history and actualization of the colonial formation of the ‘human’ in technology and science? How might a focus on the modernist terms of linearity, separability, and determinacy, pillars that became significant in the racial logics of social science, begin to elucidate the sociotechnical process of hierarchizing and differentiating groups? And, in what ways might modes and methods of transgressing and traversing boundaries toward the potentiality for technodiversity open up new possibilities for literacy’s interest in the speculative with sociotechnical systems? Ethico-political intention—in the purpose, design, implementation, and use of sociotechnical systems—is needed if literacy education is to reconcile the indeterminacy of its speculative project with that of platform technologies, and AI, in particular. Through attention to speculative capture and intention in ethico-political praxis, the entwined ecologies of AI platforms and literacy education have greater potential to more broadly enable an alternative worlding, welcome to indeterminacies and ontologies otherwise.

## Conflict of Interest

No conflicts of interest to disclose.

## Data Availability Statement

Not applicable.

## REFERENCES

- Alvero, A. J., Regla-Vargas, A., & Antonio, A. (2023). *ChatGPT is people: Comparing synthetic and human-made personal statements* [Conference presentation]. Society for the Social Studies of Science 2023 Annual Meeting. Honolulu, HI, USA.
- Anderson, C. A. (1983). Computer literacy: Changes for teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 34(5), 6–9.
- Aufderheide, P. (1993). *Media literacy: A report of the national leadership conference on media literacy*. Aspen Institute.
- Bakke, A. (2020). Everyday googling: Results of an observational study and applications for teaching algorithmic literacy. *Computers and Composition*, 57, 102577. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2020.102577>
- Bartlett, L. (2007). Literacy’s verb: Exploring what literacy is and what literacy does. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 28(6), 737–753.
- Burgess, J. (2021). Platform studies. In S. Cunningham & D. Craig (Eds.), *Creator culture: An introduction to global social media entertainment* (pp. 21–38). NYU Press.
- Cain Miller, C., Playford, A., Buchanan, L., & Krolik, A. (2022). Did a fourth grader write this? Or the new chatbot? *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2022/12/26/upshot/chatgpt-child-essays.html>
- Cohen, Z. (2023). Leveraging ChatGPT: Practical ideas for educators. *ASCD*. <https://www.ascd.org/blogs/leveraging-chatgpt-practical-ideas-for-educators>
- Collins, J., & Blot, R. (2003). *Literacy and literacies: Texts, power, and identity*. Cambridge University Press.
- Debes, J. (1969). The loom of visual literacy: An overview. *Audiovisual Instruction*, 14(8), 25–27.
- Deleuze, G. (1992). Postscript on the societies of control, 59, 3–7.
- Dixon-Román, E. (2016). Algo-ritmo: More-than-human performative acts and racializing assemblages of algorithmic architectures. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 16(5), 482–490.
- Dixon-Román, E. (2023). Algorithmic governance and racializing affect. In G. Seigworth & C. Pedwell (Eds.), *Affect theory reading 2: Worldings, tensions, futures* (pp. 384–403). Duke University Press.
- Dixon-Román, E., Nichols, T. P., & Nyame-Mensah, A. (2020). The racializing forces of/in AI educational technologies. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 45(3), 236–250.
- Dixon-Román, E., & Parisi, L. (2020). Data capitalism and the counter futures of ethics in artificial intelligence. *Communication and the Public*, 5(3–4), 116–121.
- Ferreira da Silva, D. (2022). *Unpayable Debt*. Sternberg Press.
- Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline & Punish* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Vintage Books.
- Garcia, A. (Ed.). (2014). *Teaching in the connected learning classroom*. Digital Media & Learning Research Hub.
- Garcia, A., & Nichols, T. P. (2021). Digital platforms aren’t mere tools – they’re complex ecologies. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 102(6), 14–19.
- Gillespie, T. (2010). The politics of ‘platforms’. *New Media & Society*, 12(3), 347–364.
- Gilster, P. (1997). *Digital literacy*. Wiley & Sons.
- Graff, H. (1979). *The literacy myth: Social studies in the nineteenth century city*. Academic Press.
- Herman, D. (2022). The end of high-school English. *The Atlantic*. <https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2022/12/openai-chatgpt-writing-high-school-english-essay/672412/>
- Hobbs, R. (2010). News literacy: What works and what doesn’t. In *Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication conference*, Denver, CO.
- Holloway, J., & Lewis, S. (2022). Governing teachers through datafication: Physical-virtual hybridity and language interoperability in teacher accountability. *Big Data & Society*, 9(2), 205395172211375.
- Hong, S. (2023). Prediction as extraction of discretion. *Big Data & Society*, 10, 1–11.
- Hong, S.-H. (2020). *Technologies of speculation: The limits of knowledge in a data-driven society*. New York University Press.
- Keeling, K. (2019). *Queer times, Black futures*. Duke University Press.
- Klein, A. (2023). Outsmart ChatGPT: 8 tips for creating assignments it can’t do. *Education Week*. <https://www.edweek.org/technology/outsmart-chatgpt-8-tips-for-creating-assignments-it-cant-do/2023/02>
- Komljenovic, J. (2021). The rise of education renters: Digital platforms, digital data and rents. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 46(3), 320–332.
- Lankshear, C. (1998). Meanings of literacy in contemporary educational reform proposals. *Educational Theory*, 48(3), 351–372.

- Lankshear, C., & Knobel, M. (Eds.). (2008). *Digital literacies: Concepts, policies and practices* (Vol. 30). Peter Lang.
- Luke, A. (2014). Defining critical literacy. In J. Z. Pandya & J. Àvila (Eds.), *Moving critical literacies forward: A new look at praxis across contexts* (pp. 19–31). Routledge.
- Mills, K. A. (2010). A review of the ‘digital turn’ in the new literacy studies. *Review of Educational Research*, 80(2), 246–271. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654310364401>
- Mirra, N., & Garcia, A. (2020). ‘I hesitate but I do have hope’: Youth speculative civic literacies for troubled times. *Harvard Educational Review*, 90(2), 295–321.
- Morozov, E. (2023). AI: The key battleground for cold war 2.0? *Le Monde Diplomatique*. <https://mondediplo.com/2023/05/02china>
- Myers, M. (1996). *Changing our minds: Negotiating English and literacy*. National Council of Teachers of English.
- Ng, D., Leung, J., Chu, S., & Qiao, M. S. (2021). Conceptualizing AI literacy: An exploratory review. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 2, 100041. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2021.100041>
- Nichols, T. P., & Dixon-Román, E. (2024). Platform governance and education policy: Power and politics in emerging edtech ecologies. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*. <https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737231202469>
- Nichols, T. P., & Garcia, A. (2022). Platform studies in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 62(2), 209–230.
- Nichols, T. P., & LeBlanc, R. J. (2021). Media education and the limits of “literacy”: Ecological orientations to performative platforms. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 51(4), 389–412.
- Nichols, T. P., LeBlanc, R. J., & Garcia, A. (2024). After digital literacies: Media pedagogy for platform ecologies. In B. Williamson, J. Komljenovic, & K. Gulson (Eds.), *2024 World Yearbook of Education: Digitalization of education in the era of algorithms, automation, and artificial intelligence* (pp. 212–226). Routledge.
- Nichols, T. P., & Stornaiuolo, A. (2019). Assembling ‘digital literacies’: Contingent pasts and possible futures. *Media and Communication*, 7(2), 14–24.
- Pangrazio, L., & Sefton-Green, J. (2024). Digital literacies as a ‘soft power’ of educational governance. In B. Williamson (Ed.), *World yearbook of education 2024: Digitalisation of education in the era of algorithms, automation, and artificial intelligence* (pp. 196–211). Routledge.
- Plantin, J.-C., Lagoze, C., Edwards, P. N., & Sandvig, C. (2018). Infrastructure studies meet platform studies in the age of Google and Facebook. *New Media & Society*, 20(1), 293–310.
- Postman, N. (1970). The politics of reading. *Harvard Educational Review*, 40(2), 244–252.
- Prothero, A. (2023). ChatGPT and AI are raising the stakes for media literacy. *Education Week*. <https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/chatgpt-and-ai-are-raising-the-stakes-for-media-literacy/2023/04>
- Puar, J. K. (2023). Dividual economies, of data, of flesh. In G. J. Seigworth & C. Pedwell (Eds.), *The affect theory reader 2: Worldings, tensions, futures* (pp. 406–422). Duke University Press.
- Robinson, B. (2021). The ClassDojo app: Training in the art of dividuation. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 34(7), 598–612.
- Sanchez-Cartas, J. M., & León, G. (2021). Multisided platforms and markets: A survey of the theoretical literature. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 35(2), 452–487.
- Street, B. (2012). Contexts for literacy work: New literacy studies, multimodality, and the ‘local and the global.’ In L. Tett, M. Hamilton, & J. Crowther (Eds.), *More powerful literacies* (pp. 15–30). NIACE.
- Street, B. V. (1984). *Literacy in theory and practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Thomas, E. E., & Stornaiuolo, A. (2016). Restorying the self: Bending toward textual justice. *Harvard Educational Review*, 86(3), 313–338.
- Tierney, R., & Pearson, D. (2021). *A history of literacy education: Waves of research and practice*. Teachers College Press.
- van Dijck, J. (2013). *The culture of connectivity: A critical history of social media*. Oxford University Press.
- van Dijck, J. (2021). Seeing the forest for the trees: Visualizing platformization and its governance. *New Media & Society*, 23(9), 2801–2819.
- Wargo, J. M. (2021). “Sound” civics, heard histories: A critical case of young children mobilizing digital media to write (right) injustice. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 49(3), 360–389.
- Williamson, B. (2021). Meta-edtech. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 46(1), 1–5.
- Williamson, B. (2023). The social life of AI in education. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 34, 97–104.
- Wynter, S. (2015). The ceremony found: Towards the autopoietic turn/overturn, its autonomy of human agency and extraterritoriality of (self-)cognition. In J. R. Ambrose & S. Broeck (Eds.), *Black knowledges/black struggles: Essays in critical epistemology* (pp. 184–245). Liverpool University Press.
- Zurkowski, P. G. (1974). *The information service environment relationships and priorities*. National Commission on Libraries and Information Services.

Submitted October 8, 2023

Final revision received February 3, 2024

Accepted March 18, 2024

**T. PHILIP NICHOLS** is an Associate Professor of English Education in the Department of Curriculum & Instruction at Baylor University in Waco, Texas, USA; Email: [phil\\_nichols@baylor.edu](mailto:phil_nichols@baylor.edu).

**ALEXANDRA THRALL** is a Ph.D. student in the Department of Curriculum & Instruction at Baylor University in Waco, Texas, USA; Email: [allie\\_thrall1@baylor.edu](mailto:allie_thrall1@baylor.edu).

**JULIAN QUIROS** is a Ph.D. Candidate at the School of Social Policy and Practice at the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA; Email: [quirosj@upenn.edu](mailto:quirosj@upenn.edu).

**EZEKIEL DIXON-ROMÁN** is a Professor of Critical Race, Media, & Educational Studies at the Teachers College, Columbia University in New York, New York, USA. He is also the Director of the Edmund W. Gordon Institute for Urban and Minority Education and the Institute in Critical Quantitative, Computational, & Mixed Methodologies and the Critical Computation Bureau; Email: [ed2115@tc.columbia.edu](mailto:ed2115@tc.columbia.edu).