"Digital Dilemmas : Analysing the Ethical Challenges in Digital Societies (IT Driven Societies)"

[1] Kiran Naidu

[1] Pondicherry Central University, India
Corresponding Author Email: [1] kiran.naidu2@gmail.com

Abstract— IT creates new human action options, causing ethical dilemmas and a policy vacuum. Computer ethics evaluates novel options and fills policy gaps. Conceptual entropy is crucial to this paper. Standard ethics fails to handle "IT" ethical challenges. Because IT is still new and new applications are being developed, it discusses how new technology bring ethical difficulties.

This paper advocates "sociotechnical ethics." Sociotechnical ethics supplements and avoids the usual account, but it does not simplify IT ethics. The sociotechnical perspective emphasises the interconnectedness of social and technology factors and warns us against thinking we can separate them. This should make our judgements more credible and well- informed, but it will require more complex investigation.

We showed that IT applications are sociotechnical systems—combinations of software, hardware, and social practices that impact human behaviour, both individually and collectively. Viewing these systems as sociotechnical systems allows for deeper investigations and more ethical IT solutions. This integrates sociotechnical computer ethics with ethical frameworks. This is how we examine IT-enabled society ethics.

The Internet and WWW have enabled cross-border electronic communities. Configuring internet communities affects our lives as more people communicate online. Governments, corporations, and technologists decide most of these decisions. Economic, educational, and social activities are changing rapidly.

To determine rights and wrongs in these new IT-enabled societies, we used ethical analysis to investigate IT communication characteristics: We examined the intricate interplay between IT, democracy, and free expression. This analysis stressed that decisions, not "nature," drive Internet and IT system evolution. Ethical analysis will make these issues more evident and help societies make better decisions.

Keywords: Decision , Ethics, Human Behaviour ,Information Technology (IT) , Sociotechnical System .

I. INTRODUCTION

Common Misconceptions of Technology :

Technological determinism :

Even though technological determinism has been defined and described in different ways, it is based on two main ideas: 1) technology develops independently of society, and 2) when a technology is adopted and used in a society, it determines what that society is like. We can say that technology isn't separate from society because the nature and direction of technological development are affected by a wide range of social factors, such as government decisions to fund certain types of research, social events like a war or terrorist attack that make people want to make certain kinds of devices, market forces that drive development in some areas and stop it in others, and the legal environment. Technology grows through a back-and-forth process that involves what is technically possible and how society responds to those possibilities by pursuing some possibilities, rejecting others, or not even noticing others. So, technological determinism is not wrong if it says that technology is a powerful force that shapes society. However,

it is wrong to say that technology "determines" society. Technology and society both change each other. Society shapes and is shaped by technology, and technology shapes and is shaped by society.

Is technology a material thing?

We talk about technologies as things or artefacts. This is at best wrong and gives a wrong idea of what technology is. To be honest, artefacts are parts of technology, but they don't have any meaning, significance, or even use unless they are part of social activities and practises. There are several ways to look at this. First, technologies don't just appear out of thin air. They are made by people and, as we've already said, are shaped by social forces. To make a computer, people and things have to be organised into factories, materials have to be mined, assembly lines and distribution systems have to be set up, computer languages have to be created, people with different skills have to be educated and trained, and more. In other words, tech is a product of society.

To understand the relationship between ethics and IT, it is important to realise that technology is not just a collection of objects, but rather objects that are part of social practises and have social meaning. Ethics has usually been thought of as being almost entirely about how people act and what they do.

Most ethicists haven't paid much attention to technology in the past, perhaps because they thought it was just a bunch of ready-made objects. Material things were thought to be just products of nature, so they were seen as neutral, and there didn't seem to be any reason to think about their ethics. This is exactly what can go wrong when you think of technologies as things. It hides the fact that people and artefacts are connected, that artefacts have an effect on people, and that people shape artefacts. If ethicists don't see the role that technology plays in morality, they don't see a powerful force that shapes the moral questions that people face. If engineers, inventors, and computer experts don't see the social practises that make up the technological systems they make, they can't see what their work means and what it means for others.

We shouldn't think of technology as things. Instead, we should always think of it as sociotechnical systems.

Is technology value neutral ?

We shouldn't believe that technology doesn't have any values. Instead, we should think that technology has values because it can't exist or work without certain kinds of social arrangements. When a certain technology is used, a certain social order is also used. Take nuclear power and windmills as an example. Both produce electricity, but Nuclear power requires a complicated, hierarchical system for making decisions. Nuclear power is made and distributed through social arrangements where decisions are coordinated and someone is in charge. At different points in the organisation, different kinds of experts decide what to do. Windmills, on the other hand, have a single person in charge. each person who owns a windmill can decide how to run it and what to do with the power it makes. In the same way, getting around by train needs a centralised system of organisation, while getting around by bike doesn't.

Why ethics and technology?

Technology is something that people do. It changes the way we live and act, the moral questions we face and the courses of action (options) we have, and it affects the decisions we make, both as individuals and as a group. The more we know about how technology affects and is affected by morality, the more likely it is that our choices and decisions will be better.

Why information technology and ethics ?

Not every piece of tech is the same. Different technologies have different effects on how people live and what they do. The field of computer ethics is all about how IT plays a role in making the moral world. Studies of technology and ethics in general help with IT ethics, and IT ethics helps with studies of technology and ethics in general. So they both help each other.

Why not just call IT ethics ethics?

The sociotechnical systems perspective shows that all social activities and practises are at least partially shaped by technology. This means that, whether ethicists have known it or not, technology has always played a role in moral practises and moral thought, even if they haven't been aware of it. Moral philosophy is about what people do and how they live together, and technology has always been a part of both. In this way, IT ethics is a part of ethics. However, in IT ethics, we focus on the role of IT as one of many factors that affect moral actions, decisions, and outcomes. So, it makes the most sense to say that IT ethics is a part of ethics.

II. ETHICS AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Ethics

Ethics in this context means a way of looking at human situations and interactions through a set of normative concepts and theories. Ethics is a normative way to look at the ways, choices, and actions of people.

We live in a world where we have to act and make choices. When we think about how to act and what to choose, we often think about moral ideas (right and wrong, loyalty, duty, justice, responsibility), ethical principles (do no harm, tell the truth, keep your promises), and ideas about what makes a full and meaningful life (concern for others, community, friendship). Here, we use analytical methods to show the ethical aspects of situations and the ethical consequences of choosing one path or policy over another. In this way, we can think of computer ethics as a type of applied ethics. Even though we use theoretical ethics, our main focus is on figuring out what is right and wrong in real-life situations where IT is involved. The goal of theoretical ethics is to explain what morality is and to figure out where moral claims, usually universal moral claims, come from. Here, our more modest goal is to provide analysis that helps people decide what to do and how to do it. The framework, ideas, and theories we've talked about here are meant to help us think through real-world situations and imagine what a better world would be like.

Let's look at some moral theories in moral philosophy that have stood the test of time. They give people frameworks and words to use in the dialectical process, but they are also subject to the dialectical method. None of these theories is meant to give you a formula for making ethical decisions. Instead, they give you ways of thinking and tools for figuring out what's right and wrong.

Dialectic method:

Dialectic method: But just giving facts and describing things is not enough. Normative analysis usually involves finding a principle or value, thinking about what it means, and making a case for a position. In practical ethics, this means making a link between the principle or value and a specific situation and thinking about the arguments for different actions or decisions in that situation.

Once a value or principle has been found, ethical analysis continues with what is often called a dialectic process. Consistency and coherence are important tools for analysis

that should not be overlooked. Normative claims are turned into arguments with the help of the dialectic method. A claim and a set of reasons that support the claim make up an argument. Once an argument is made, it can be checked for its coherence, plausibility, and consistency, as well as its fit with common experience and relevant empirical information.

consider For instance, when people are asked to explain why they think a certain action or policy is wrong, they have trouble putting their thoughts into words. The first step in the dialectic process is to move from beliefs and gut feelings that haven't been thought through to claims that are based on a value or principle that most people will agree with.

If you can't explain why you think something is right or wrong, you can't talk about it. More importantly, if a person can't explain why he or she believes or thinks something is right or wrong, it seems like there's nothing good about them. If I don't know why you think the way you do, I have no "reason" to think in the manner you do.

In the dialectic method, you must not only explain why you believe what you do, but you must also be consistent from one argument or topic to the next.

The dialectic method doesn't always make it clear what should be done or what went wrong, but it almost always helps people understand each other better. So, from the start, it's important to keep in mind that understanding can grow and progress can be made even if you haven't reached a final answer. We learn which arguments are stronger and why through the dialectic. We learn more about the ideas that give our moral beliefs their strength. We come to have deeper and more consistent beliefs and to see how moral ideas are connected and depend on each other. Dialectic and analysis show us what's at stake, help us understand the values and interests of the different people involved, and often help us find other ways to act or make decisions. Some answers to an ethical problem may be out of the question because they are completely wrong. We might find a number of possible courses of action, each with its own pros and cons. Even if we can't figure out "the" right thing to do or "the" morally required thing to do, we can still say that we have to do something. The dialectic process helps sort out what kinds of actions are completely wrong and what kinds of actions have different pros and cons.

Utilitarianism :

Utilitarianism is an ethical theory that says the only thing that makes behaviour right or wrong is how it affects other people. Because of this, it is also called a type of "consequentialism." Utilitarianism says that what matters about a person's actions is how they turn out, not what they are trying to do.

In another version of utilitarianism, the most important thing is that the results make people happy. Simply put, things are good when they make people happy and bad when they make people unhappy. The word "utility" is where the word "utilitarianism" comes from. According to

utilitarianism, actions, rules, or policies are good if they help bring about good results. This is called their utility.

Instrumental and intrinsic values :

Utilitarians start by looking at values and asking what is so important and valuable to people that it could be used as the basis for a theory of ethics. They say that we can tell the difference between things that people value because they lead to something else and things that they value because they are valuable in and of themselves. The first group is called "instrumental values" and the second group is called "intrinsic values." Money is a great example of something that is good because it helps other things. It is not valuable in and of itself. Instead, it is valuable as a way to get other things. On the other hand, intrinsic goods are valuable because they are valuable, not because they can be used to get something else. People sometimes say that knowledge is valuable in and of itself. So is art because it has beauty.

Utilitarians want to know what is so important that it could set a right and wrong theory. It has to be something that is valuable in and of itself, because something that is useful is only good if it leads to something else that is good. If you want "a" because it will help you get "b," then "b" is what's really valuable and "a" is just a means to an end.

Utilitarianism vs egoism:

Egoism is not the same thing as utilitarianism. Egoism is a theory that says people should act in ways that make the most good things happen for themselves. What makes me happy or gets me what I want is good. Utilitarianism doesn't say that you should try to make yourself happy as much as possible. Rather, what is at stake is happiness in its entirety. So, when you think about your options, you have to think about how they will make everyone happy. This includes how it affects you, but your happiness is just as important as everyone else's. It may turn out to be right for you to do something that will make you less happy, but will make a big difference in the happiness of everyone else.

Case illustration:

Take the case of dialysis machines. Only a small number of hospitals could afford to buy these expensive machines. Soon, hospitals realised that the number of patients who needed treatment on the machines was much higher than the number of machines they could afford or had on hand. Who could use the machines had to be decided, and these were often life-or-death choices. As a result, some hospitals set up internal review boards made up of members of the medical staff and the community. These boards were supposed to decide who could use the dialysis machines. The medical condition of each patient was taken into account, and the decisions were also based on the patient's age, job, number of dependents, the social usefulness of the job, whether or not the person had a criminal record, and so on. It looked like the review committees were using what are called utilitarian criteria. Kidney dialysis machines were a limited resource,

and they wanted to get the most good out of using the machines. So, access would be given to the people who were most likely to benefit and give back to society in the future. People had a higher chance of getting access to the machines if they were doctors (who could save other people's lives), had children, were young, and so on. People who were so sick that they were likely to die even with treatment, people who were older, people who had done bad things, people who didn't have anyone who depended on them, and so on, didn't get access to the machines as quickly or at all.

Here in this case you can't judge how valuable you are as a person by how valuable you are to the community. People were being judged by the review boards based on how valuable they were to society, which seemed dangerous. It was said that everyone has value on their own.

Deontological Theory

For deontologists, what makes an action right or wrong is the principle that it is based on. If a thing is done out of a sense of duty and the idea behind it can be applied to everyone, then it is right. For instance, if I tell the truth because I know I have to respect the other person, I am acting out of duty, which is the right thing to do. If I tell the truth because I'm afraid of getting caught or because I think I'll get something good for it, that's not a moral thing to do.

The main thing we want to talk about is Immanuel Kant's categorical imperative, which has three maxims

Maxim 1: Act only according to that maxim whereby you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law.

This means that a principle should be applied to a subject if it applies to all rational beings and is universally applicable.

In short, it talks about how everyone is equal.

Maxim 2 : Act in such a way that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, never merely as a means to an end, but always at the same time as an end.

This means that we should never treat humans as merely a means to an end but always as en ends in themselves in short it states about humanity

Maxim 3: Thus the third practical principle follows [from the first two] as the ultimate condition of their harmony with practical reason: the idea of the will of every rational being as a universally legislating will.

Meaning that one should accept that principle for himself before applying it to others, so that it doesn't limit the subject's actions. In short, it talks about self-regulation.

Case illustration:

Let's say a professor does research on how university students feel about sex and act sexually. She talks to hundreds students about their thoughts and actions, among other things. She knows that the students won't tell her anything unless she promises to keep it private. Before the interviews, she tells each student that only she will be able to see the raw interview data and that any results that can be

published will be given in a statistical form. So, there is no way to link the information in the study to specific students.

But let's say it's time to code the interview data, and she realises that it will be much easier to have graduate student assistants do this than to do it herself. She isn't sure if she should give the raw data to the graduate students to work with. Should she let the graduate students do the coding and processing? The research will give people who work with high school students important information, and it may help the professor's career grow. Still, she has given the student-subjects a clear promise of privacy, and if she breaks that promise, it could hurt her credibility as a social researcher and social science research in general. If she breaks her promise and information about her interviewees gets out, her interviewees and many other people may be less likely to trust her and other social scientists in the future. Also, getting the research done quickly might not have many benefits.

On a deontological analysis, the important question is not whether keeping the data private will have good or bad effects, but whether the professor only sees her students as a way to learn new things and advance her own career. Does she see the students as ends in and of themselves? Obviously, if she broke her promise to the students that she would keep their secrets secret, she would not be treating them as means. Each student made his or her own decision about whether or not to take part in the study based on the professor's promise of privacy. If she broke her promise when it was convenient for her, she would only care about herself. So, out of respect for the people involved, the sociologist must make sure that the data is kept secret. She can either handle the raw data herself or set up procedures to make sure that graduate students don't tell anyone what they see. In fact, they should be told that it will be very bad if they give out private information.

III. IT ENABLED SOCIETIES

People often use the term "information society" to talk about places where IT is a key part of the infrastructure that makes up economic, political, and cultural life. Even though IT doesn't "make" information societies, it is used to set up their activities, institutions, and social arrangements. IT affects these societies and is affected by them.

We also try to figure out what IT's role is in these societies, especially how it affects moral questions and social values. Here, we look at information societies from a number of different points of view, each one building on the last. We start with the idea that technology can be thought of as the tools that people use to do things. Second, we look at the different parts of IT that come into play when it helps people do things and shapes societies. Next, we look at areas of life that have been made possible by IT, have been changed by IT, or are in the process of being changed to fit IT. Lastly, we talk about democracy and democratic values in societies that are set up with IT.

Technology as instrumentation of human action :

When people's actions are the focus of ethics, the best way to think about technology is as "the tools of people's actions." This makes it easy to see how ethics and technology are related. In IT-configured societies, many (maybe even most) of the things that people and organisations do are made possible by IT. This makes the actions more effective and changes what people and organisations think they can do and what they actually do.

Technology adds to and improves the way our bodies work. When we move our bodies with tools in a world full of technological systems, the effects are different and often stronger than when we move without tools. When I turn on a light switch, the whole room lights up. When I press buttons on a phone and make sounds, my voice can reach someone thousands of miles away.

Technology affects what people can do and what they actually do. Of course, not all instruments are the same. Different technologies help people do things in very different ways. Automobiles help people get around, industrial machinery helps make things, eyeglasses help people see better, and thermostats keep buildings at the right temperature.

This isn't the whole story, though, because technology doesn't just give people more options; it also lets them do things that weren't possible or even imaginable before. Before gene theory and mass media, things like "genetically modifying food" and "watching TV" were not only impossible, but also hard to understand. It's the same for actions that use IT. IT expands what people can do and makes possible things that would have been impossible before IT. Before the Internet, things like "sending spam," "searching the Web," and "blogging" made no sense and were impossible.

Thinking of IT as a tool that people use to do things has two important benefits for ethical analysis. First, it keeps people as the ones who do things, and second, it lets us focus on how the tools people use affect the way they do things. In other words, this way of thinking about technology puts people at the centre of technological outcomes—people are the actors—while also acknowledging that the way people use technology has a big impact on what they can do and what they actually do. Human activity is always made possible by technology, and technology may be a part of what makes human activity possible.

Characteristics of IT-configured actions

Most of the ethical problems that arise in IT-based societies seem to centre on three things: (1) a global (2) conditions for a unique identity. 3) reproducible. Our focus here is on what they mean for ethical issues and how they add to ethical problems. We will start by looking at IT-based communication, especially communication over the Internet, and comparing it to face-to-face, telephone, TV, and radio communication.

Global Communication:

We can only talk to a small number of people when we don't use technology. Whether we whisper or yell, we can only talk to people who are close by. Our reach is limited by how our throats and ears are built and by how sound travels.

Using the Internet to talk has a global reach. Certainly, the Internet doesn't let us talk to everyone and everywhere in the world. Instead, it only lets us talk to people who live in places with electricity, computers, and other devices that can receive phone or satellite signals. The Internet's global reach is tied to how easy it is to use, how quickly it works, and how cheap it is. Getting something in a newspaper or magazine is a complicated and uncertain process. So, the importance of the Internet's global reach depends on how easy, fast, and cheap it is to use.

Conditions for a Distinct Identity:

Even though it's tempting to say that anonymity is what makes Internet communication unique, this isn't quite true. For one thing, our Internet communications are monitored by service providers and can be tracked by others who have a legal right to see the information or the technology to do so. Because we don't see each other directly when we talk on the Internet, we might be tempted to think of it as an anonymous way to talk.

There are two things that make it stand out: 1) Mediation—Internet communication is mediated by a large sociotechnical system. 2) The variety of identity conditions that are available.

The first part of mediation means, among other things, that identity can be changed on purpose or by accident, like when a computer makes an image of a person that looks like someone else. People have used their senses to figure out who other people are for a very long time. Because of this, the trustworthiness or reliability of our identity in electronic communication may always be a problem, if only because technology is easier to manipulate than a physical presence.

The second thing that makes identity conditions in Internet communication unique is that they can change. IT instrumentation makes it possible to use a variety of formats, and these formats, in turn, make it easier or harder to prove who you are. In virtual games, we talk to each other through our avatars. In chat rooms or social networking sites, we can use pseudonyms to stay somewhat anonymous, or we can give accurate, detailed information that is easy to link to other parts of our identities.

Reproducibility :

The third important thing about Internet communication is that it can be repeated. Electronic information is easy to copy, and the quality or value of the copy is usually not affected. Also, since the original is not changed when electronic information is copied, there may be no proof that it was copied. This trait has huge effects on property rights and crime. When things are stolen, they are gone and the owner

can't get to them anymore. When electronic information is copied, whether it's a record, a programme, or a piece of proprietary software, the original is still there, the owner still has access, and there may be no sign that a copy was made.

Because it lets you do so, reproducibility is an important part of Internet communication. When you speak to someone face-to-face and they don't record it, they hear the words and then they are gone. With Internet communication, this is not the case. The words have lasted. They last because they are stored in machines and stay there until they are deleted. In fact, deleting words sent over the Internet isn't always easy. You can delete a message from your outbox, but the person who got it can keep it and send it to others, who can then copy it and send it to others, and so on. Your service provider may also keep records of what you say.

We will take a quick look at three areas of life where IT plays a big role to see how these three traits affect ethical and value questions in IT-based societies. Our goal here is to show the ethical problems and changes that come up when IT is used to do things.

Avatars, Virtuality, and Role-Playing Games

Being able to take part in virtual environments is one of the most interesting things about living in an IT-based world. One such place is a role-playing game. In these games, players talk to each other in real time by using avatars, which are characters that players make using the game software. Avatars are software creations that show up as pictures and words. Players can use a keyboard to control their avatars and make them move and talk in ways that are specific to each game. Avatars talk to each other in worlds that are very different from the real world.

Even though access can be limited, many online games can be played by many people all over the world. Players talk to other players, who could be anywhere in the world, through their avatars. But of the three things we've talked about so far, the identity conditions of interaction in virtual games are the most interesting. This is because they are what make "virtuality" possible. In virtual worlds, people interact with other people through their avatars. No one who plays the game can find out who the other players are in real life, and they don't get information that can be connected to other information about the person. In this way, players are anonymous, and their avatar is also their name, so they are pseudonymous. Avatars can live for a long time and have relationships with other avatars that don't end. Players may not want their avatars to be "representatives" of them; that is, what players do outside of the game and what they have their avatars do are seen as two different things. With avatars, players can try out different identities and see what it's like to be a certain kind of being. Still, avatars are reflections of the people who control them.

There are a few moral issues that need to be dealt with when it comes to virtual environments. These have to do with how people act and what drives them, and the gaming

industry is also worried about them.

Among them are: "Desensitization". Virtual criminality

Desensitisation:

Concerns have been raised about a possible link between virtual reality and losing the ability to feel emotions. This refers to violent virtual reality games or military training exercises where soldiers kill in simulated combat situations.

Desensitisation means that a person is no longer affected by extreme acts of behaviour, like violence, and as a result, they don't feel empathy or compassion. In some situations, they go out of their way to find these kinds of situations so they can feel powerful and get a rush of adrenaline. This is something that has been noticed with gamers, especially those who play first-person shooters or role-playing games that are very immersive.

"Cyber-addiction" is another problem that has to do with this. Some people get hooked on virtual reality games and start to have trouble telling the difference between real life and the games. They are spending more and more time in the virtual world, which is hurting their lives in the real world.

Virtual criminality

It's hard to imagine, but what would happen if someone did something bad in a virtual world? A situation that could happen is if several people are immersed in a virtual world, but one of them gets hurt or traumatised because of what someone else did in the same situation. The question is whether or not someone can get hurt or have trouble with their mind because of something violent that happened in a virtual world. And if this does happen, does the person who did it get the same punishment as someone who does this in the real world?

One thing that could be argued is whether or not a person using virtual reality can feel pain, distress, or other feelings related to a crime. This is still a problem.

The problems with virtual reality listed above are small compared to the many benefits of virtual reality as a whole, but it is very important that these problems are dealt with.

Friendships and social networking :

In IT-based societies, friendships are made possible, at least in part, by social networking sites, chat rooms, instant messaging, e-mail, cell phones, text messaging, and other IT tools. These technologies change who your friends are, how often you talk to them, when you talk to them, what you know about them and how much you know, and what you say and do with them. Friendship in the modern world is a sociotechnical system in this way.

Some people might find it strange that a book about ethics talks about friendship, but friendship has been a part of moral philosophy since the time of the ancient Greeks. Philosophers today still use Aristotle's analysis of friendship as a starting point for thinking about what friendship is and why it's so important. Aristotle wrote about friendship in a way that may seem too idealistic, but the main ideas are still true today.

Aristotle thought that people who were really friends cared for each other in a special way. Friends are people you care about just for themselves. You care about them and want them to be happy not because you can get something out of being friends with them or because their happiness will somehow help you. Aristotle also thought that friendship was at its best when it was based on a mutual respect for the other person's mind and character. You choose friends whose qualities and character you admire, and the better those qualities are, the better your friendship will be.

Internet environment distorts important parts of a person's character (that is, it distorts what people say about themselves) and weakens the interactions through which people develop a relational self through their interactions with their friends. Their argument is based on the fact that people have a lot more control over how much and what kind of information about themselves they share offline than they do online. Their argument is related to Aristotle's idea that friendships are better when they are based on the qualities of a friend. If you can't find out much about your friends on the Internet, you can't really be friends with them.

Think about and compare the views of a person who is 35 or older with those of a person who is 20 or older and grew up with social media. Both of these points of view are very different because older people made friends before social media, so they think that social media friendships are bad, while younger people who grew up with social media think that it can help us make stronger friendships.

So, let's make up a situation where social media is everywhere and everyone uses it, even older and younger people. On this common ground, we should think about what would happen if we could no longer use social media.

If we didn't have social media, we would be able to keep in touch with fewer people. When deciding who we can be friends with, especially close friends, geography would become a more important factor.

We would see less of our friends and hear less about what's going on in their lives. Going to see people, calling them, or writing them a letter or email would take more work, and it would be much harder to share news with a lot of friends at once.

Many important parts of friendship, like sharing news, photos, and other things, that don't need to be done in person because of social media, would have to be.

Sitting alone on a train or at home alone in the evening would become more lonely and isolating because it would be harder to talk to friends from a distance.

It would force people to make friends in a much more outgoing way than social media does. People would spend more time talking to each other in person. Not everyone likes this kind of communication the same way.

It would make people less free because they wouldn't be able to choose whether or not to use social media.

If social media went away, it would be harder for some people to stay in touch with their friends, especially those who need it the most. These people include:

- People who live in rural areas or in places that are far from their friends.
- People who are sick, hurt, or in the hospital.
- People who find it hard to talk to new people one-on-one because they are shy, autistic, etc.
- People who don't have a car or who can't depend on public transportation.
- People who can't afford or don't like doing the things that usually go along with "offline" friendships, like going to the pub, having dinner parties, or travelling to see friends.

Keeping a journal of your life, which sites like Facebook and Tumblr make possible as a social, cooperative activity that can be shared with an online community, would become a solo activity.

But the point of this article isn't to give a fair assessment of what it would be like to lose social media. Instead, it's to show that people whose friendships grew up with social media could be expected to worry about losing it just as much as people whose friendships grew up without social media worry about how much it affects our lives. This should tell us that our worries about how social media will hurt our relationships are probably based on the way things are now.

Status quo bias is when you like how things are. With this in mind, it shouldn't come as a surprise that people who learned about friendship before social media was everywhere are more likely to focus on the bad effects of social media on friendship and downplay the good ones.

Education and plagiarism detection :

IT has changed a lot of different parts of education. Think about how online applications work, how teachers and students talk, how records are kept, and how online courses work. At the deepest level, the spread of IT in education has changed people's ideas about the goals, values, and standards of education. In other words, the way education is set up around IT has changed people's ideas about what it means to be educated. This change has come about not only because IT is used, but also because IT is seen as the infrastructure of the future. So, educational institutions have set goals that help students get ready for a life, a job, and being a good citizen in a world full of IT.

Because information can be copied and is easy to find on the Internet, it is much easier to copy and paste text (either parts of an assignment or the whole thing) and pass it off as your own. Plagiarism gets a little more complicated when you cut and paste, change the text a little, and then say it's your own. Here, one of the many great things about IT and the Internet is in conflict with the values of a part of life. On one hand, it's a good thing that

It's easy to keep and use information because it's easy to find and you can cut and paste it. On the other hand, educational institutions want students to learn knowledge and

show that they know it by making their own knowledge. They also want students to learn how to think and write and show that they can do so by making their own thoughts and writing or speaking about them.

Right now, it seems like what is possible and easy and what is expected in education are colliding. Goals and plans for education are being questioned and rethought on a deep level that isn't always clear. Maybe education needs to change to fit a world where copying and pasting is the norm. Maybe the way people write is changing. Maybe we should change what and how we teach. On the other hand, it seems like schools need to test students and decide if and when they have reached certain levels of mastery. If "cutting and pasting" makes it harder for them to do this, institutions need ways to find and stop illegal "cutting and pasting."

Part of how well students learn depends on how much they trust their teachers. Students have to trust that their teachers will teach them what they need to know, and teachers have to trust that students will tell them when they understand something and when they don't. Student–teacher relationships are similar to doctor–patient relationships in that teachers can't figure out what students don't know and how best to teach them unless students are honest on homework, research papers, and tests. In other words, students won't get the education they need if they try to hide how little they know and how well they can do things.

The problem with devices that check for plagiarism is that they tend to make people doubt each other. When a teacher puts all of a group of students' papers through a plagiarism detector, he or she is assuming that each student might have copied something from another source. Even if the teacher only sends a few papers to be checked for plagiarism, the teacher runs the risk of making some students seem suspicious. If schools become places where people don't trust each other, students won't be able to grow up or learn on their own, which is very important for their futures. This is not a reason to not use plagiarism detectors, but rather to be careful about how you use things. Systems that look for plagiarism are Sociotechnical systems are made up of social practises, and people should pay attention to the social practises that make up these systems. Especially, people should pay attention to how students and teachers are "built."

Democracy and the internet :

How does democracy work?

The main idea behind democracy is that political power should be in the hands of the people of a country, not just one person (like a monarch or dictator) or a small group of people (an oligarchy or aristocracy). In democracies, the people have the most power, and the government is responsible to them. This thought has

It has been said and interpreted in many different ways and has been reinterpreted and changed over time.

Democracy is a moral idea because it has a moral justification at its core. Democratic theory is based on the

idea that each person is the boss of himself or herself, and that to be seen as the boss, they must have some say in the government that rules them. For democracy to work, its citizens have to be able to do things. Also, people are the best people to represent their own interests. So, democracy is good for people and makes for a better state at the same time. It helps people develop their skills, and the state benefits from the ideas and knowledge of its citizens.

In modern, large nation-states, democracy means that people have the right to elect representatives to the government, and the government is responsible to the people. The size of nation-states has been a constant and difficult problem for the idea of democracy because it has made it harder for each citizen to have an impact on their government.

Changes in technology have always led to changes in how democratic institutions have been set up. Think about how systems of communication have changed the content and speed of political decision making, not just in elections but in a wide range of domestic and international policy issues as well. For example, new ways of getting around and talking to each other have changed the way democracies work many times in the past.

Several people who write about social issues see the Internet as the latest technology that will change the way democratic institutions and practises work. The use of the Internet for political campaigns, which now includes websites, blogs, e-mail, YouTube, and more, is one of the best ways to see this. But the Internet has also changed a lot of things about government that have nothing to do with campaigns. Think about how many government agencies have put public records online and made it possible for people to do things like file taxes and pay traffic tickets online.

To get a handle on this very complicated set of issues, we can focus on the Internet and look at some of the arguments that are often implied, if not directly made, in favour of a link between democracy and the Internet.

Many of the claims made in favour of the Internet's democratic nature seem to link many-to-many communication with democracy: The Internet: (1) lets people make and share their own information; (2) gives people access to forums that are run differently than mass media; (3) gives people access to many more sources of information; and (4) makes it easier for people to join groups that don't depend on where they live.

IT, which includes all the technological objects and processes used to share and spread information, has an effect on both responsibility and democracy. Especially the most recent change, which is that everyone can now use the Internet and the World Wide Web, will have a big impact on how we talk to each other. IT changes the way power, money, rights, or responsibilities are given out. At the same time, there is more and more written about how IT and the Internet have changed government. From an ethical point of view, I'll

say a few words about the chances and risks that this change brings.

Most of the chances that IT gives for responsibility and democracy come from the fact that people can now communicate on a bigger and more widespread scale. People with similar ideas can be found all over the world, and they can share information about politically sensitive issues in almost no time. This information can be written down and shared with almost anyone who wants it. IT can also be said to make society more democratic because it gives everyone the same access and has great potential for education. Another point is that the economic side of IT seems to fit well with what some authors say is a good relationship between democracy and the market economy. Lastly, IT makes it easier to keep track of things because it records and gives more detailed information than traditional communication channels. Responsibility and the democratic process depend on this accountability.

On the other hand, IT also puts democracy's moral foundations at risk. There are two kinds of reasons for this: those that happen by accident because of how IT is used, and those that are necessary because of how IT works. Computers and IT can change the way power is shared in ways that aren't always good. Democracies are also run by people who have control over the information. This problem has to do with access and the fact that people who have always been poor are now also information poor and are becoming more and more isolated. Another danger is that commercial interests are taking over the Internet more and more, which could lead to them taking over democracy as well. Lastly, there are all the ethical problems that are usually talked about in computer and information ethics, such as privacy, intellectual property, surveillance, data quality, etc., which can all threaten the legitimacy of democracy.

All of these problems can be fixed, but there are some other problems that I call "necessary threats" that seem to be deeply linked to IT. Here we find the computer's philosophy. It can only show objects as 0s and 1s, so it has to leave out most of the important information. This is especially bad for people, who can lose their importance in computer-mediated communication. This can lead to the loss of the other and, in turn, the loss of the need for ethics.

This theoretical overview of the ethical effects of IT on democracy comes to the conclusion that politics can respond to both opportunities and problems. Politicians can change the odds and keep problems from happening by accident. But political action can't solve the problems that need to be solved. Here, we need new ideas and ways of thinking, as well as a high level of awareness of the dangers. Based on this theoretical foundation, future research should look at how relevant the threats and opportunities are in the real world. From there, it could grow into a framework that politicians could use to deal with computers and basic policy questions like how to pay for information infrastructure.

IV. CONCLUSION

The Internet and the World Wide Web have made it easier for people to join electronic communities that are not limited by where they live. As more and more people talk to each other over the Internet, the choices people make when setting up online communities affect how our lives work. Some of these decisions are made by people, but a lot of them are made by governments, businesses, and tech experts. At the same time, things are changing quickly in the economy, in education, and in social life.

In order to figure out what is right and wrong in these new IT-enabled communities, we have used ethical analysis to look at three unique aspects of IT communication: the global, many-to-many scope, the unique identity conditions, and the ability to reproduce. We also talked about the many different ways that IT and democracy and IT and freedom of speech are connected. In all of these analyses, we focused on how the Internet and other IT systems are made by choices, not by "nature." We think that careful ethical analysis will make these decisions clearer and help societies make better choices.

REFERENCES

[1] Cocking, Dean, and Steve Matthews. 2001. "Unreal Friends." Ethics and Information Technology 2(4):223–231.

[2] Hughes, Thomas P. 1994. "Technological Momentum." Does Technology Drive History?: The Dilemma of Technological Determinism. Edited by Merritt Roe Smith, pp. 101–113.

[3] Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Stallman, Richard. 1995. "Why Software Should Be Free." Computer Ethics and Social Values. Edited by Deborah G. Johnson and Helen Nissenbaum, pp. 190–99. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

[4] Whitbeck, Caroline. 1998. Ethics in Engineering Practice and Research. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

[5] Cockburn C and Omrod S (1993) Gender and Technology in the Making.London sage Johnson D G (1985) Computer Ethics. Upper saddle river, NJ: prentice hall,2001

[6] Jonas H (1984) The Imperative of Responsibility. Chicago: University of Chicago Press Maner W (1996) Unique ethical problems in information technology Science and Engineering Ethics 2 (2): 137-54 Moor J (1985) What is computer ethics? Metaphilosophy, 16 (4): 266-75