Digital Difference

Perspectives on Online Learning

Ray Land and Siân Bayne (Eds.)

Digital Difference

EDUCATIONAL FUTURES
RETHINKING THEORY AND PRACTICE
Volume 50

Series Editors
Michael A. Peters
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA

Editorial Board

Michael Apple, *University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA*
Miriam David, *Institute of Education, London University, UK*
Cushla Kapitzke, *Queensland University of Technology, Australia*
Simon Marginson, *University of Melbourne, Australia*
Mark Olssen, *University of Surrey, UK*
Fazal Rizvi, *University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA*
Linda Tuahwai Smith, *University of Waikato, New Zealand*
Susan Robertson, *University of Bristol, UK*

Scope
This series maps the emergent field of educational futures. It will commission books on the futures of education in relation to the question of globalisation and knowledge economy. It seeks authors who can demonstrate their understanding of discourses of the knowledge and learning economies. It aspires to build a consistent approach to educational futures in terms of traditional methods, including scenario planning and foresight, as well as imaginative narratives, and it will examine examples of futures research in education, pedagogical experiments, new utopian thinking, and educational policy futures with a strong accent on actual policies and examples.

Digital Difference

Perspectives on Online Learning

Edited by

Ray Land
University of Strathclyde, UK

Siân Bayne
University of Edinburgh, UK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A DIFFERENT GENERATION?

RAY LAND AND SIÂN BAYNE

EDITORS' PREFACE

DIGITAL DISQUIETUDE

Discussing the manner in which digital culture within education might differ from its 'analogue' predecessors incurs the risk of resorting to increasingly roadworn metaphors of new frontiers, 'cyber' domains, inter-generational conflicts and, inevitably, the futurist utopias and dystopias characteristic of western media throughout the twentieth century. These imaginings now seem to belong to an earlier era of internet thinking, and we are perhaps freer, over two decades on, to re-evaluate digital difference from new perspectives. 'That can only be a good thing;' suggests Gunther Kress: 'it frees us up to think a bit more slowly, with a bit more deliberateness, about which things move at what pace' (Kress 2007).

We have moved on from over-simplistic analyses of 'difference' based on generational determinisms, with a significant literature now available which reveals a far more complex picture of student attitudes to technology. This is one which resists homogenising claims for the existence of a 'net generation' while emphasising the cultural embedding of technology – and in particular social media – within the lifeworlds of students. It also demonstrates a general scepticism among students relating to the value of online approaches within formal education. (Jones et al., 2010; Jones and Healing, 2010; Kennedy et al., 2008; Salaway et al., 2008; Selwyn, 2008).

Despite these more measured and empirically-based assessments of the operations of digital difference, moral panics remain readily available. Carr's (2010) recent work on internet use, for example, worries that our neurological structures will be irrevocably modified, to our detriment, by dependence on search engines, while others, such as neurobiologist Blakemore (2010) have responded dismissively to such suggestions, countering such proposals by emphasising the plasticity of the brain, and pointing out that the basic genetic make-up of homo sapiens has been essentially unchanged for a quarter of a billion years.

As Carr's recent publication and the ensuing reviews indicate, a sense of disquietude seems ever present when discussing new digital practices. And to some extent perhaps it should, as the transformations incurred through new digital practices can be profound, troublesome in nature and far-reaching. Indeed, it is probably true to acknowledge that more or less everything that we encounter will have some effect on our cognitive processes – how could it not? But what is more interesting, for the purposes of this volume, are the opportunities opening up through these cultural shifts, the changes in ways of thinking and the re-invention of conventional practice that digital work seems to be fostering in the academy. It is these which form the body of the work presented in this volume.

CULTURE, TECHNOLOGY AND (ENVIRONMENTS OF) LEARNING

The chapters in this volume had their first airing at the final gathering of the ICE series of international symposia (Ideas in Cyberspace Education) organised by the Universities of Strathclyde and Edinburgh at Ross Priory on the shores of Loch Lomond in Scotland.[1] In his keynote address Professor Gunther Kress emphasised the inevitable and ubiquitous link between technology and culture, however simple or complex the technology. It could not be otherwise, he argued, as our human, social and cultural resources can only go so far ahead of or away from what they are and where they have come from. Culture is, in that sense, he observed 'an inertial force', as are social factors, in two ways. 'First, cultural resources are involved in the shaping of technologies in the first place; in that sense we cannot jump over our shadows. Second, in their *social* settings, that is, culture in the field of power, cultural resources set the field of potential application (and transformation) for that technology'. He also remarked that it is a commonplace to say that technologies are linked.

> ...while different technologies have their own rationale and dynamics, they are integrated in an environment where everything affects everything else. So for instance, one would not expect the changes in distribution and function of authorship, which digital technologies offer, to be independent of changes in authority, which characterize the much larger level social changes in which the users of digital technologies are embedded. Both must be seen in terms of the effects of changes in power from state to market, from citizen to consumer, which shape the lives of the users of the technologies. (Kress 2010)

The chapters that follow in this collection reflect this complex embrace of culture, power and technology in relation to the learning environment. A variety of significant, often inter-related issues and challenges arise from the topics that they address. These range from social questions of consumption, speed, uncertainty, and risk to individual issues of identity, selfhood and desire, ethical matters involving equity and authority, as well as structural questions of order and ambiguity. From these themes emerges an engaging agenda for future educational research and practice in higher education over the coming decade.

PERSPECTIVES ON ONLINE LEARNING

Digital Selfhood

Cate Thomas in her striking opening chapter on the Haunted University draws attention to the way in which, given a gradual shift from an 'analogue' to a digital university, the uncanny or *unheimliche* nature of the online world is likely to replace the sense of a stable, fixed and knowable world (albeit perhaps misperceived as such), to one that is shifting and ambiguous. She presents the digital university as haunted in the sense that it affords numerous technological means of constructing the self, and in a witty but faintly disturbing analogy with the restless and unpredictable journey of a stolen letter in Edgar Alan Poe's short story *The Purloined Letter* she demonstrates how email messages, as just one indicative digital technology

employed within the university, have the same quality of 'nowhereness' as Poe's notorious missive. The academic subject is haunted by often hastily written texts circulating through the digital university beyond their control and producing a situation where their selfhood becomes 'clearly unfixed, de-stabilised, split, uncertain and constituted by the readings, utterances and gaze of others'. They lose authority and have little control over their self construction, yet like ghosts cannot 'die', as their spectral selves are endlessly reproducible. Like ghosts also they are 'forced to speak and know in contexts not of their choosing.'

Hamish Macleod and **Jen Ross** (Chapter 2) are also concerned with the ambiguity and liminal nature of the online space. They note that in such spaces 'social engagement and hierarchy become less clearly defined' and this in turn renders the teacher's authority online a 'tricky' matter. The same unstructured nature of the digital space that can offer rich opportunities and connections to foster learning and construct new meanings can also prove difficult for the tutor to regulate. In such terrain, they argue, the tutor's role 'is not to regulate, but rather to *participate* and *provoke* in creative and playful ways that open up passages or possibilities in chaotic online spaces'. They explore this notion further through the metaphors of jester, fool and trickster, seeing such potential positionings as a 'frame of mind' or 'approach to being alongside students in challenging, chaotic, digital environments'. Such fool-ish practice offers ways of modelling 'secure not-knowing' and 'enjoyment of ambiguity' as well as helping students cope with complexity and sense-making in environments that are uncertain and relatively disordered. They view this kind of disruptive practice as a form of troubling knowledge that will provoke students to see anew.

Reporting on their experience of being e-learners in a range of digital environments, including immersive virtual worlds, **Maggi Savin-Baden** and **Christine Sinclair** (along with their *Second Life* avatars **Christine Sanders** and **Second Wind**) (Chapter 3) explore the notion that being an e-learning student 'can sometimes feel like being in a silent space'. This seemed to take the form of a 'pedagogical immobility' and sense of 'stuckness'. Drawing on Meyer and Land's (2003) notion of threshold concepts, the authors characterise these experiences of lurking and stuckness as 'liminal states resulting in liminal identities, which for most of the course have resulted in "chronic uncertainty" about ourselves and our relationships to the new environment'. In keeping with threshold theory the state of liminality tended to be characterised by 'a stripping away of old identities, an oscillation between states and personal transformation'. Nonetheless both authors reported progress across thresholds and through liminal states and, interestingly, discovered that their immersive world avatars performed actions in Second Life that have led to their real life counterparts rethinking some of the things they do in their day-to-day practice in universities.

Transformations

Colleen McKenna and **Claire McAvinia** (Chapter 4) explore the opportunities that digital environments offer for new academic writing practices. Observing that whereas many academic digital texts occupy new sites of writing production, and

often depart from conventional essay form, they remain broadly linear in terms of how they organise knowledge. Their interest is drawn to academic hypertext and how student writers in digital contexts are experimenting with hypertextual forms or how new curricula are making use of new digital writing genres. Through detailed examination of student scripts these authors conclude that hypertextual practice challenges conventional academic genres 'by knowingly disrupting linear organisation and privileging the gaps that such an approach affords'. Hypertext, they find, requires new organisational techniques which displace standard argumentation, relying instead 'on screen design, visual motifs and juxtaposition through linking. From a broader educational perspective this new form, the authors suggest, 'might liberate the thinking of student writers as they work outside of established, and probably internalised, essayistic paradigms.'

The chapter by **Ray Land** (Chapter 5) argues that the nature of academic knowledge is inevitably being transformed in the digital university when its modes of production and exchange employ technologies that operate at the speed of light. Though wary of the perils of technological determinism, he draws on Virilio's analysis of the relation between speed and power to differentiate the changing nature and uses of knowledge in digital environments from those familiar to us from print-based culture. Print culture, he contends, 'in the form of the stable, bounded, individual and private text, has tended to operate within, and to reinforce, patterns of authority and identified authorship.' On the other hand digital environments, 'more protean and restless in nature, tend to be more concerned with image, openness, multimodality and collectivity.' Their increased emphasis on collaboration, group self-regulation and self-explanation may lead to changed academic subjectivity, while technologies that operate in 'fast time' present significant challenges to practices based in the deliberative and contemplative 'slow time' of the cloistered academy.

Politics of the Digital

A new model of the digital academy – based on devolution and collaboration as opposed to hierarchy, traditional authority and exclusivity – is envisaged by **Michael Begg** and his colleagues **Rachel Ellaway, David Dewhurst** and **Hamish Macleod** (Chapter 6). These authors however anticipate political tensions between the unfixed and de-stabilised characteristics of digital spaces discussed earlier and the concerns and priorities of accreditation-focused institutions. They identify 'Web 2.0' as, in many ways, 'just the latest challenge to reactionary and authoritative cultures in higher education and, as such, ... an essential part of the academy's lifecycle'. They anticipate that the academy's embrace of the digital will incur substantial challenges, practically and philosophically.

Digital technologies have been a manifestation of globalisation as well as working to accelerate the processes of it. In the chapter 7 **Leah Macfadyen** and **Anne Hewling** evaluate an innovative online programme they offer at the University of British Columbia which encourages international students to make connections between the academic knowledge they acquire in their classes, and their roles and

responsibilities as members of local and global communities. They oblige these digital-age participants to engage personally and professionally with the practical and ethical complexities of global challenges often in uncomfortable and challenging ways. The authors freely acknowledge the programme's overtly political aims and present their students with hard questions concerning whose interests are being advanced over others, and the prospect of changes to social or political structures that already well suit the interests of some established communities. The aim of this programme, *Perspectives on Global Citizenship,* which fully exploits the potential of digital environments in bringing together widely dispersed international participants, is 'to create a forum where students would engage in issues of social and ecological justice through critical thought, moral commitment, and meaningful engagement in their learning and "coming to know" as global citizens'.

As digital environments have become widely accessible over the last two decades, and the social, academic and economic benefits of internet usage have been recognised, debates over equality of access and entitlement have naturally arisen leading to the notion of a 'digital divide' between those able to make use of digital environments and those who are less able to do so. To date the central issue in these discussions has tended to be the question of 'access'. However more recently this notion has been problematised as an over-simplification and in Chapter 8 **Debbie Holley** and **Martin Oliver** seek to develop a better understanding of what 'access' might actually mean to different groups of users. 'The "flexibility" offered by online environments does not solve access issues, they point out, 'but instead adds new spaces (e.g. the home) where these issues must be negotiated'. Their research indicates that even when open access facilities are provided, 'the disadvantaged are not as well placed to take advantage of this as those who already hold social advantage.' Access to digital environments in many ways still seems to replicate the unequal power structures of society.

Karim Remtulla (Chapter 9) analyses the potential of digital pedagogies within the modern globalised workplace and doubts their capacity, given the evidence of current practice, to authentically deliver constructivist pedagogy, 'with all its complexity, openness, interpretivism, and multi-dimensionality'. Instead he reports somewhat depressing tendencies towards homogenisation, normalisation and universalisation in prevailing e-learning approaches with adult workers. The pedagogies and epistemologies he encounters in the workplaces of globalised organisations seem poorly to reflect the needs of 'a socially and demographically diverse, multicultural and multifaceted workforce'. Drawing on Baudrillard's notion of simulation he argues that e-learning, as simulacrum, has led to the disappearance of face-to-face adult education and training in the workplace, with the overriding objective of 'efficiency' reducing all adult education and training in the workplace to questions of distribution and access to information, with solutions sought through investment in more hardware and media. He advocates an urgent need for a socio-cultural critique of e-learning that can offer a radical online pedagogy of difference, rather than pedagogies which occlude social and cultural difference.

A Different Generation?

Axel Bruns (in Chapter 10) explores ways in which digital environments enable students to become active producers of content, often able to do so on an 'ad hoc, on-the-fly basis'. Digital technologies now permit them to 'occupy a hybrid, user-*and*-producer position which can be described usefully as that of a *produser'*. He, too, is eager to help participants develop a more informed, self-reflexive, and critical perspective on their own practices as information seekers, users, and providers and sees this as involving not just the adoption of new digital tools and technologies but a longer-term paradigm shift towards networked organisational and communicational structures. Perhaps most significantly he sees higher education, in its embrace of digital technologies, inevitably facing the same kind of 'casual collapse' as that experienced by other established hierarchies and institutions. Rather than defensively clinging to the status of a centuries-old brand, or dismissing such a transformative cultural shift as a passing fad he advocates a concomitant shift in service role for higher education institutions, focusing more on the quality assurance of both internal *and* external content creation activities.

As an example of produsage **John Cook** and **Norbert Pachler** (Chapter 11) have identified mobile telephony as an area of digital activity in which user-learners are appropriating the technology to construct their own formal as well as informal learning situations. They regard mobile telephony as 'a socially contingent form of cultural transmission and production' in which mobile phone use is not an externally imposed commercial activity operating upon society but rather a phenomenon that is constructed, appropriated and understood by that society. In the examples of learners that they provide their underlying assumption is that mobile phones can be viewed as cultural resources for meaning-making in social contexts. Digital phones as artefacts come with culturally formed ways of usage, they argue, and traditionally learners have internalised set practices through patterns of acculturation. However their case studies provide evidence of learners appropriating the device in practices that are new to them. The authors stress the notion of agency on the part of the learner underpinning such processes of appropriation, in which they claim the technology for their own for purposes of 'identity formation, social interaction, meaning-making and entertainment.'

For some, it is tempting to characterise such appropriation of digital technology by young people for these purposes as the practice of a new generation that is almost naturally technically adept – the so-called 'digital natives'. In their chapter, however, **Siân Bayne** and **Jen Ross** (Chapter 12), seek to dispel such assumptions. They deconstruct the 'native-immigrant' binary opposition embedded within such discourse and challenge the positioning of young learners as subjects that are more comfortably 'at one' with the digital environment in ways that other 'immigrant' learners such as older people or teachers are unable to be. They challenge the primary metaphor of this discourse, pointing out that if the 'inhabitants' of technological spaces are the natives or immigrants, then this constructs the technological environment as the 'nation-state' or the 'landmass', an entity almost impossible to act on, hence minimising the agency and influence of teachers and learners and discouraging dissent. They emphasise the scholarly obligation to critique a shaping

metaphor that is reductive, even racialised and divisive, and which has been glibly marketised.

CONCLUSION

We hope that the chapters that follow in this book capture something of the challenge and engagement that characterised their initial presentation and debate at the ICE3 conference at Loch Lomond. Our thanks are due to the contributors to this volume, and to the generosity of their colleagues and students in contributing their time, thoughts and feelings in discussion and dialogue about digital difference. We would also like to record our gratitude to all the speakers and participants in the ICE series of conferences held in the United Kingdom between 2002 and 2007 with the support at different times of The University of Edinburgh, Queen Margaret University Edinburgh, Coventry University, the Institute of Education University of London, and the University of Strathclyde Glasgow. These symposia will be fondly recalled as some of the most enjoyable and valuable events of our academic careers.

Ray Land and Siân Bayne
Scotland 2010

NOTES

[1] http://www.education.ed.ac.uk/ice3/

REFERENCES

Baudrillard, J. (1988). Simulacra and simulations. In M. Poster (Ed.), *Jean Baudrillard: Selected writings* (pp. 166–184). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Blakemore, C. (2010, August 15). The net is no threat to our minds. In J. Naughton (Ed.), *Is the Internet changing the way we think?* (p. 20). The Observer, New Review.

Carr, N. (2010). *The shallows: How the Internet is changing the way we think, read and remember*. London: Atlantic Books.

Jones, et al. (2010). Net generation or digital natives: Is there a distinct new generation entering university? *Computers & Education, 54*, 722–732.

Jones, & Healing. (2010, May 3–4). Learning nests and local habitations. In L. Dirckinck-Holmfeld, V. Hodgson, C. Jones, D. McConnell, & T. Ryberg (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th international conference on networked learning*. Aalborg.

Kennedy, G., Judd, T. S., Churchward, A., Gray, K., & Krause, K. (2008). First year students' experiences with technology: Are they really digital natives? 'Questioning the net generation: A collaborative project in Australian higher education'. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology, 24*(1), 108–122.

Kress, G. (2007, March 21). Culture, technology and (environments of) learning. Opening address. In *Ideas in Cyberspace Education 3 (ICE3): 'Digital Difference'*. Ross Priory, Loch Lomond, Scotland.

Meyer, J., & Land, R. (2003). Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge: Linkages to ways of thinking and practising within the disciplines. In C. Rust (Ed.), *Improving student learning – Ten years on*. Oxford: OCSLD.

Salaway, G., Caruso, J. B., & Nelson, M. R. (2008). *The ECAR study of undergraduate students and information technology* (Research Study, Vol. 8). Boulder, CO: EDUCAUSE Center for Applied Research. Retrieved September 2, 2010, from http://www.educause.edu/ecar

Selwyn, N. (2008). An investigation of differences in undergraduates' academic use of the Internet. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, *9*(11), 11–22.

Stald, G. (2008). Mobile identity: Youth, identity, and mobile communication media. In D. Buckingham (Ed.), *Youth, identity, and digital media* (pp. 143–164). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Retrieved from http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1162/dmal.9780262524834.143

Virilio, P. (2000). *Information bomb*. London: Sage.

DIGITAL SELFHOOD

CATE THOMAS

1. THE PURLOINED EMAIL

Death, Desire and Academic Subjectivity
in the Haunted University

'I sent a letter to my love, but on the way I dropped it
Someone must have picked it up and put it in their pocket.'
Rhyme from a children's playground game

'...we cannot say of the purloined letter that, like other objects, it must be, or
not be, in a particular place, but unlike them it will be and not be where it is,
wherever it goes.'
Seminar on 'The Purloined Letter', Jacques Lacan

INTRODUCTION

There is something uncanny about the Internet. The strange, the unexpected, the disturbing, the unaccountable, the familiar found in the midst of the alien, the alien that penetrates the home; the shocking, the obscene, the eerily beautiful; the sense that nothing is fixed, stable, certain or ultimately knowable, be that personal identity, the online environment itself, or the others with whom one's online self communes – all these classic elements of the uncanny are (un)familiar territory to any regular Internet user.

THE UNCANNY

Dolar (1991) describes the uncanny as irrupting with 'the rise of scientific rationality' (p. 7) and constantly haunting modernity 'from the inside'(p. 7)[1]; how much more so has the uncanny grown and mutated with the development of our new technologies, so that it invades, haunts and possesses the world of the Internet, the very locus of technoculture. And if, as Poster (2001) points out, the technologies have contributed to the fact that we inhabit a cyberspace situated knowledge economy, then the uncanny is the unwholesome double that haunts that economy - 'from the inside'.

As Royle (2003) discusses in his comprehensive work on the uncanny, Freud's attempt, in his originating 1919 essay *Das Unheimliche* (translated as *The Uncanny*), to make an exhaustive list of all that is uncanny, results in stopping, starting, contradiction and confusion, precisely because it is impossible to list all elements of

the uncanny. Because the realm is by nature inexhaustible and contradictory, any definition can never be complete or completely true. There is always a remainder, the definition has always to be partial. Similarly, any attempt to sum up what cyberspace 'is' necessarily results in failure; being so intimately intertwined with the uncanny, it shares the same characteristics of inexhaustibility and uncertainty.

Freud's notion of Unheimliche always containing its opposite term 'Heimlich' (which translates as the homely or familiar), and the homely and familiar always containing the uncanny, also relates intimately to the experience of navigating the Internet. One may, for example, unexpectedly come across something which is intimately familiar such as an old acquaintance or a childhood haunt when searching the world of the Internet for something completely unrelated; conversely, one may have the opposite experience of 'Googling' oneself (i.e. searching with one's own name as the search term) and finding, not a familiar homepage but the eerie details (or worse still, photograph) of one's unexpected and disturbing double.

Freud describes the uncanny as 'something which ought to have remained hidden but has come to light' (p. 364). One of the characteristics of cyberspace is that nothing can any longer be hidden in the way that traditional print media permits for censorship. The world of the Internet, as those who celebrate its lack of boundaries and democratic access to publication expound, means the end of censorship. An example of this is how any event of significance has an internationally accessible presence in cyberspace within hours, or even minutes. Uncannily, it brings to light that which ought to be – or would otherwise be – hidden.

If the online world is an uncanny space, how does this affect the Institution of the university, as we move from traditional, face to face, ways of working to a mode where online working is central to our activities? The move from an 'analogue'[2] to a digital university must surely be a move from a space which we collectively view (albeit mis-view) as stable, fixed and knowable, to one which is shifting, unstable and ambiguous. This is a domain where radical uncertainty predominates – the shadowy, unexpected, uncertain strangeness of the haunted university.

THE ACADEMIC IN THE HAUNTED SPACE

And where is the academic in this haunted space? We are at an historical point when the online 'crisis in authorship' undermines scholarly authority for academics as researchers, as outlined in more detail later in this paper; similarly, a move to social constructivist influenced, student centred, collaborative pedagogic practice undermines the traditional authority-position of the academic as teacher. Against this background the question of who the online academic now is, and how that former ostensibly unified, authoritative pre-digital self is now being overtaken by a less stable, fixed or definable Subject, is key to our understanding of how the digital university differs from the 'analogue' institution.

The last ten years have seen an increasing move away from face to face to digital teaching and learning practices in universities. There has also been a move, gathering increasing momentum, towards common usage of a variety of digital means for communication in the university workplace. Consequently, with

the use of technologies such as email, intranets, online shared workspaces and document management systems, virtual learning and research environments, video-link lectures, instant messaging, blogs, wikis, discussion tools and conferencing software of various kinds, academic staff in universities are more able to teach, and otherwise communicate, from a range of locations without necessarily seeing their students and colleagues. The academic Subject has always been constituted by the sum of their utterances, whether in oral form in the lecture hall, seminar, tutorial and conference presentation or in written form by inscription in books, articles and scholarly journals. The increasing disembodiment of the Subject means that the electronic self constructed through digital inscription, comes to constitute the day to day changing presence of the Subject, and begins to define them. Although there may still be embodied contact with colleagues and students, this Real Life (RL) contact is re-configured by the self created in the electronic environments, as in the following extrapolation from Zizek's conception of the impact of cyberspace on RL.

Zizek talks about the way in which sex with an RL, flesh and blood partner is impacted on by the experience of virtual[3] sex, where a fantasy about the other substitutes for physical contact (Zizek 1998). He argues that this means that when one is engaged in RL sexual practice there are three people involved, oneself, one's lover and the fantasy one has about one's lover, as the virtual knowledge makes more explicit the fantasy that has always existed covertly. We might argue, if both parties have this 'virtual knowledge' that this could be further extrapolated to include the fantasy one's lover has about oneself. Also, to include a narcissistic perspective, the projected fantasy of the self one has, could be included and the projected fantasy the lover has of themselves – making six entities in total! To apply this thinking to the rather more mundane everyday work situation of our academic Subject, we could say that when Dr X meets with Professor Y she is not just meeting with the Y she experiences in front of her, but with the Y that has been constructed through online virtual representation and her fantasised, (through online exchange, memory and the filling in of gaps between), Y. Similarly she brings her own virtual and projected selves to the room, so that the meeting of two people becomes haunted by their other selves. So the online world rewrites RL.

The area of digital inscription in the online university is vast, as there are a range of technologies which invite and permit a variety of ways of constructing the self. This paper will concentrate on one technology, that of email.

The use of email is such a central part of the daily business of work for academic staff in universities, that the *Times Higher Education* magazine carried an article guiding academics on the best way to use it effectively, so that communication would not be in any way confused or confounded and so that academics could represent themselves clearly (Swain 2006).

THE ELECTRONIC ARCHIVE AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF SELF

This paper will consider the notion that email exchanges constitute part of an end-less circulation of unfixed knowledge, where the impossibility of truth, let alone

clear communication, becomes foregrounded. Within this the academic Subject is constituted in a number of ways: through the permanent, haunting nature of the electronic archive; and through the transformation of distinctions between public and private; and through email chains of signification.

In particular, the metaphor of the way in which the movement of the Purloined Letter in Edgar Alan Poe's short story[4] traces a symbolic circuit will be used, as will Lacan's analysis of this (Lacan 1956). The use of this metaphor will aid us in exploring how the concepts used by Lacan (and subsequent works by others on Lacan's *Seminar on the Purloined Letter*) might usefully help us consider the constitution of the digital Subject in the circulation of email letters, within the context of the uncanny space of online university

In their anatomy or map of Lacan's Seminar on the Purloined Letter, Muller and Richardson (1988) describe the letter as having 'the property of nowhereness', being 'a symbol of absence [which] is and is not, wherever it may be' (p. 79) and remaining even when destroyed. The resonance with email is significant – an electronic mail is and is not and is always elusive whilst being ever replicable and omnipresent. But it is its ability to remain when destroyed which concerns this part of our discussion, in its relationship with, or representation of, the archive.

As soon as an email is sent, it exists in a number of places. It may be in the 'sent items' section of the sender's software; it may exist on the server of the sender's email service; it will exist on the server of the receiver's email service; and it will be in the inbox of the receivers email software, which may mean it has been automatically downloaded to the hard drive(s) on the receiver's computer(s). In addition to this, the email servers will be backed up in some way, so an additional copy of the mail will be held on both the sender and recipients service providers' back-up servers. If either the sent or received email, or both, are downloaded to the sender and/or recipient's hard drives by their email client software, a copy may exist which cannot easily be deleted. (Computer files on hard drives are not actually erased when the user 'deletes' them, but renamed, and then not easily accessible to the ordinary user). So, once sent, it can exist in up to eight (or more) places, seven of which are largely out of the reach or control of the sender. Once the email has been replied to or forwarded, the whole process of copies proliferating begins again. These multiple and distributed copies form an archive, in a literal sense. Additionally. the archive exists in a more metaphorical sense of a kind of total cultural inscription of all utterances.

The electronic self, the self that is constituted by digital inscription, is and is not the Subject. But it cannot die, or, at least not easily. The Subject can die, in the sense of the embodied self expiring, but the digital double lives on. Because digital texts are Subject to archiving in their very creation, in a way that is completely outside the control of their original author, they become immortal. This archiving forces the Subject to live forever, making impossible, or barely possible, the option of death. But the immortal, revenant self, is and is not the Subject; it is the Subject's double, the self constituted entirely by a specific arena of electronic discourse, a self simultaneously outside the control of the Subject, but eerily and intimately the 'spirit' of the Subject: the Subject's digital spectre.