Hate 2.0

This lesson is part of USE, UNDERSTAND & CREATE: A Digital Literacy Framework for Canadian Schools: http://mediasmarts.ca/teacher-resources/digital-literacy-framework.

Overview

This lesson is designed to be delivered after students have completed at least one of the following lessons: *Thinking About Hate, Scapegoating and Othering* and *Hate or Debate*. In groups, students research an online environment (*such as social networking sites*) and a particular example of that environment (*such as Facebook*) to learn the issues, strategies and tools relating to online hate in that environment.

Learning Outcomes

Students will demonstrate the ability to:

- learn about the ways in which people, and youth in particular, may be exposed to hate
- learn how hate groups use user-generated content and cloaked hate sites to spread their message and appeal to youth
- learn how to respond to hate content in social networking sites and other user-generated content
- learn how to flag or report hate speech online

Preparation and Materials

Arrange for computer and Internet access for the class

Review the *Unpacking Privilege* mini-lesson

Review and prepare to project the slideshow *Deconstructing a Cloaked Hate Site*

Review the teacher backgrounder *Complicated Conversations in the Classroom*

Prepare to distribute the assignment sheet *Creating an Online Hate Response Guide*

- If students have not completed *Thinking About Hate*, prepare to distribute the handout *Dishonest Arguments*
- If students have not completed *Hate or Debate*, prepare to distribute the handout *Ideologies of Hate*

- *Optional:* Prepare to distribute the handout How to Tell What's True Online
- *Optional:* Send home the parent tip sheet Talking to Kids About Hate Online
- *Optional:* Review the MediaSmarts articles on Online Hate and Authenticating Information

Procedure

Begin by asking students if any of them have ever encountered hate material online. (*There's no need to ask students to provide specific details, though they may if they choose to; it's also fine if no-one says they have encountered it.*) Explain that while the best-known examples of hate online are websites maintained by hate groups, hate can be found in different forms all over the Internet. Two-thirds of young Canadians have seen hate content on YouTube, and a third see it often or very often; eight out of ten you Canadians have seen it on Instagram.

Now ask students how they can tell if they whether the content they have seen is hate or not—for instance, if they are doing research for a project on history or a current issue, how can they tell if a source they find is legitimate or if it is pushing an agenda of hate?

After students have discussed this for a few minutes, tell them (if none have raised the issue) that one of the ways hate groups and movements spread their message is through *cloaked hate sites* which pretend to be legitimate sources of information or honest debate on topics such as science, history, current affairs and so on.

Show students **slide 1** of the *Deconstructing a Cloaked Hate Site* slideshow and explain that the quote is from a high school teacher whose students found one of these sites while doing research. If he had not recognized it for what it was, most of them would probably have believed it was a legitimate site, and might have believed some of what it said. Even university students have fallen for them.

Move to **slide 2** and explain that together you will be *deconstructing* an example of a cloaked hate site—that is to say, you will be analyzing it to see how it might fool you and how you can recognize it for what it is.

Move to **slide 3** and tell them this site is called "The Remembrance Project." What are some things that might make it look legitimate? What might make it look like a good source if you were doing research for an essay on immigration?

Discuss for a few minutes and make sure the following points come up:

- It has a professional look and layout, with lots of images and videos
- It has no ads
- The sections listed in the banner across the top show that it has lots of information about immigration

Point out that hate groups and other people who spread bad information know what makes people think a website is reliable, so they try to make their sites look useful and professional. Sometimes a website from a legitimate university, nonprofit or even a government agency will look *less* professional because they don't always have the money to spend to keep it up to date. And of course most legitimate newspapers have ads.

Move to **slide 4** and ask: Does this make it look more or less legitimate? Explain that anyone can buy a dot-org address for their website, but hate groups and other people who spread bad information know that people think it means a site is reliable.

Click to bring up the Board of Directors and contact information. Tell students that the Remembrance Project is open about who they are when it comes to their board of directors and how to contact them. They know that makes them look more legitimate too.

Click to bring up the site's transparency seal and tax information. Tell students that hate groups will try to get as many signs of legitimacy on cloaked websites as they can. The "Seal of Transparency", for example, doesn't say anything about the content on the site: it just means they're open about where their money goes.

Move to **slide 5** and tell or remind them that to verify *any* information online you can follow one or more of four steps: use fact–checking tools, find the original source, verify the source and check other sources. Tell them that while fact-checking tools can be very useful to verify or debunk a particular *claim* on a website, they aren't the best way to find out if a whole website is reliable. It's also useful to find the original source of any facts or statistics you find on a website.

For finding out if the whole website is reliable, though, the two steps that are most useful are *verify the source* and *check other sources*.

Move to **slide 6** and show students how you verify this source by checking its entry on Wikipedia. That shows us that the Remembrance project has been criticized for "demonizing immigrants" and supported a "catch an illegal immigrant" game on a university campus.

Move to **slide 7** and explain that to make sure the Wikipedia article is reliable, we can check its Talk page. That shows us that while it's not a highly-ranked article—mostly because it's very short—there's nothing identified as being wrong with it. There's been a conversation between editors about whether to include the criticisms of the site but in the end they were left in.

Move to **slide 8** and show that we can also check the Revision History page. The fact that there have been only a few revisions in the last years shows that the content of the article is basically settled. Automated Wikipedia "bots" fix prank edits pretty quickly, so we can be sure that editors have looked at everything in the article.

Move to **slide 9** and explain that we can also check other sources by going to Google or another search engine and entering the group's name (in quotes is best) and then add their web address with a minus sign before it. That will keep the website itself from coming up in the search results.

Move to **slide 10** and say that the results here are the same as Wikipedia—the Southern Poverty Law Center has a number of articles arguing that the Remembrance Project is an anti-immigrant hate site.

Ask students: What if you're not sure you can trust what other people are saying about a site? What if there is no Wikipedia entry and no useful search engine results? (A lot of Canadian website won't have either of those.)

Move to **slide 11** and explain that in that case we need to look for the signs of a cloaked hate site: dishonest arguments, ideologies of hate, scapegoating and dog-whistling.

Move to **slide 12.** If students have not completed *Thinking About Hate*, distribute the handout *Dishonest Arguments* and go through it with the class. If they have, ask them to recall the examples from that lesson.

Move to **slide 13** and point out that the site's use of the term "illegal aliens" is an example of a *naming your terms argument*. Because it is not the term used by the U.S. government or non-partisan groups to describe immigrants who entered the U.S. by irregular means ("undocumented immigrant" is generally used instead) it means that anyone trying to verify their facts or statistics — such as by searching for "number of illegal aliens" — will be more likely to find information that's hostile to immigrants.

Move to **slide 14** ask students if they can identify how these statistics are an example of *cherrypicking.* Click to enlarge the graphic.

Make sure the following points come up:

- No source is given for the statistics. For the purposes of the discussion we'll assume they're accurate, but in general if someone doesn't give you a source for statistics you should not believe them. (They may have left the source off on purpose, hoping you'll do a search using the term they used.)

- The purple bars look like they're supposed to represent fractions or percentages, but they're clearly meaningless—the bar for the second item is bigger than the one for the first, though the number in the top item is much higher.

- The different numbers are presented inconsistently to make immigration look like a bigger problem: while the numbers in the first and second item are both in the millions, in the second item every digit is given (instead of "1.1 M") to make it look bigger, both as an absolute number and as a proportion of the total. As well, while the first two items refer to undocumented immigrants in particular, the third item counts everyone who is not a U.S. citizen—mixing apples with oranges. (Undocumented immigrants are thought to be roughly a quarter of the non-citizen U.S. population.)

- All of them leave out important data. For example, there are 328 million people in the US which makes the top item automatically suspicious—could ten percent of the U.S population really be undocumented immigrants? If we look up the total state and federal prison population in the U.S. we find it is roughly one and a half million, meaning that non-citizens make up just five percent of the total. If both statistics given here are correct, that means that non-citizens are half as likely as citizens to be in state or federal prison—exactly the opposite of what this graph is trying to make you believe. (In fact, evidence suggests that both documented and undocumented immigrants are less likely than U.S.-born citizens to commit violent crimes, property crimes and drug violations, with undocumented immigrants being least likely of the three groups: https://www.pnas.org/content/117/51/32340)

Advance to **slide 15** and ask how the Remembrance Project portrays itself as a *persecuted genius*.

Make sure the following points come up:

- "Killings of Americans" are said to be "ignored"
- "Many in the media seem not to care"
- "It's up to us to spread the truth" suggests that some force (maybe the "most politicians" and "many in the media" mentioned above) is trying to suppress the truth.

Advance to **slide 16.** If students have not completed *Hate or Debate*, distribute the handout *Ideologies of Hate* and go through it with the class. If they have, ask them to recall the examples from that lesson.

Advance to **slide 17** and ask students how this graphic *others* undocumented immigrants.

Make sure the following points come up:

The term "alien" instead of "immigrant" is othering because it makes us think of immigrants as inhuman

The list of violent acts allegedly committed (again, without a source) by undocumented immigrants makes them seem uniformly violent and dangerous

In the headlines, each of the victims is described as an individual ("convenience store worker," "70-year-old-man," etc.) and one is even named, while the alleged perpetrators are all simply described as "illegal aliens." This has a powerful othering effect: if they are all alike, and they are dangerous, then they are all dangerous.

Advance to **slide 18** and ask students how the site suggests that undocumented immigrants are in league with *secret enemies*.

- Make sure the following points come up:
- Undocumented immigrants are benefiting from an app created by "an open borders group" (unnamed to make it seem more secretive)
- The group, and therefore the app, have received "U.S. taxpayer dollars" (suggesting that the reader, through their tax dollars, is responsible for the app without even knowing it—an example of "sheep" or "asleep" imagery)
- The group was also funded by "leftwing billionaire George Soros". (Ask students if they are familiar with the terms "left-wing" and "right-wing." Explain that while in Canada immigration is a more non-partisan issue, in the United States people on the left tend to be more in favour of immigration and people on the right tend to be opposed to it. While that doesn't mean that any criticism or debate about immigration is automatically hate speech, it does mean that anti-immigrant hate groups are more likely to use terms and ideas aimed at conservative readers.)

Advance to **slide 19** and explain to students that Mr. Soros is here an example of the "master manipulator" version of the secret enemy, supposedly pushing for open borders, racial disharmony, Black separationists, Black Lives Matter (which is portrayed negatively by association) while being opposed to immigration enforcement, capitalism, "the integrity of the nation's electoral systems" and counterterrorism. By suggesting that illegal immigration is supported by a "master manipulator" the group makes sure that no matter how strictly immigration laws are enforced they will always have an enemy to fight.

If students have completed Thinking About Hate*, they may recognize the use of the term "globalist" as an example of* dog-whistling. *If so, tell them they are correct and you will come back to look at that in more detail in a few minutes.*

Advance to **slide 20**. If students have not completed *Scapegoating and Othering*, explain to them that *scapegoating* means throwing blame for a problem on a single person or group so that the larger group does not have to accept responsibility for it. One of the reasons why people engage in scapegoating is because having someone else to blame can strengthen your group identity.

Ask students: Based on what they've seen so far, how does this site use scapegoating to strengthen group identity?

Advance to **slide 21**, then click the mouse to make the enlarged text appear. Ask students: Why would the site emphasize the fact that these people were killed on "Super Bowl Sunday"?

Point out that this is one of the most significant days in the American calendar (the Super Bowl broadcast has the most expensive ads in all of US television). Focusing on the fact that people were killed on this day (positions the victims as "real Americans" and reinforces the "us versus them" message.

Advance to **slide 22**. Tell students that another reason why people engage in scapegoating is so they can blame someone else for a problem they don't want to face or fix.

Based on what you've seen so far, how does this site use scapegoating to do that?

Advance to **slide 23**, then click the mouse to make the enlarged text appear. Point out to students that just under half of the people memorialized as "stolen lives" were killed in car accidents. While their deaths are undeniably tragic, unless there is evidence that undocumented immigrants are more likely to cause car accidents than other US residents— evidence the site does not provide— it seems likely that the real danger is not immigrants but cars.

Advance to **slide 24**. Tell students that while hate groups and people promoting hate do usually believe some or all of what they say, most of them are out to make money from it as well. Scapegoating can be a financial benefit because they can get people to donate money or buy things that 'defend' their group against the 'enemy'.

Ask students: Based on what they've seen before, is this group benefiting financially from promoting hate?

Advance to **slide 25**. Tell students that while this group is not as focused on making money as some — they don't sell books, t-shirts, hats, or "supplements" and they don't charge large fees for public appearances — they definitely draw your attention to the "donate" button, putting a box around it and a red rectangle behind it so that it stands out compared to the other headers in the banner.

Advance to **slide 26**. If students have not completed *Thinking About Hate*, explain to them that hate groups send out messages at three levels: ones that seem basically reasonable but a bit edgy or controversial to get more sympathizers, ones that are more extreme to turn sympathizers into members of their group or movement, and ones that give their true beliefs to turn members into activists who are willing to do violent or illegal things.

Sometimes messages aimed at a lower level of the pyramid include something that only people at the higher level will recognize. That's called dog-whistling because it's like blowing a whistle than only dogs can hear. That way if someone who's already higher up the pyramid sees something aimed at people lower down it'll feel like they have special knowledge others don't, like they're part of an "inside joke."

Ask students: Have they seen anything so far that might be an example of *dog-whistling*?

Advance to **slide 27**. Remind them that they saw this text before, when discussing the "Hidden enemy" ideology, and then click the mouse to make the enlarged text "radical globalist" appear. Tell them the word "globalist" is a *dog-whistle* for "Jewish" and that recognizing dog-whistling is one of the most reliable ways that we can tell the true nature of a group like this that is trying to seem less hateful than it is, or a cloaked hate site like this one.

Assessment/Evaluation: Creating an online hate response guide

Have the class make a list of online environments in which they might come across online hate. Examples include:

- Social networking sites (e.g. Instagram, Twitter)
- Music and video hosting sites (e.g. iTunes, YouTube)
- User-generated content sites (e.g. DeviantArt, Wattpad)
- Multiplayer online games or gaming platforms (e.g. Fortnite, Overwatch)
- Virtual worlds (e.g. Minecraft, Roblox)
- Online research sources (e.g. Wikipedia)
- Online forums (e.g. Reddit) Photo and video sharing sites and networks (e.g. Snapchat, TikTok)

For each of environment, discuss:

- In what ways might users of this environment be exposed to online hate?
- What form(s) is the hate content on this site likely to take (e.g. text, graphics, music, video, etc.)?

Distribute the handout *Creating an Online Hate Response Guide* and divide students into groups. Have each group choose a specific *example* that they are familiar with of one of the environments listed; make sure that there is no duplication between the groups. (For example, more than one group could choose social networks — one might choose Instagram and one might choose Twitter—but they could not both choose Instagram.)

Each group will be responsible for researching the following:

- What kind(s) of hate content or behaviour are forbidden by the platform's Terms of Service, community guidelines or similar policy?
- What penalties does the platform have for people who break those rules?
- What can users do if they see hateful content or behaviour that is against the Terms of Service? (Students should provide as detailed instructions as possible.)
- Does the site make any suggestions, or link to any other resources, on how to respond to hateful content or behaviour that does not violate the Terms of Service?

Each group will contribute their research to a class webpage, blog, pamphlet or poster (*depending on the time and facilities available*) that explains what kinds of hateful content or behaviour are against the terms of service of the platform they have researched and the best practices for confronting it. The final product may be made available to students (*and, if you choose, to the larger school community*) as a resource to be used when online hate is encountered. (*If the product is a website or blog, it may be bookmarked on class computers; if it is a poster or pamphlet, it may be displayed or made available in the classroom or computer lab*.)

Three Kinds of Dishonest Arguments

A dishonest argument is a way of "lying with the truth." It doesn't include things that are actually lies, but it selects or presents things in a way that gives you a false idea of how strong the argument is.

Dishonest arguments are a sign that someone isn't *really* interested in discussing an issue with you, so it's probably a waste of time debating them. It can also be a sign that they're trying to manipulate you into believing something without being open about their real position.

Here are the three most common kinds of dishonest arguments and three specific examples of each one.

Arguments that are dishonest about the facts: These fool you by giving you a false impression of what the facts are on the issue.

The Cherrypicking Argument

Giving only the facts that support one side of the argument, and leaving out the others.

Example: "This cereal is the perfect breakfast. It has a dozen vitamins and minerals." (And also a day's worth of sugar.)

The Iceberg Argument

Excusing a lack of evidence by that what *has* been recorded suggests there must be much more that has not.

Example: "Five people were charged with running restaurants without a license last year. When you add all the people they *didn't* catch we can see this is a big problem." (Some things are genuinely under-reported. But if you don't have a good reason to believe that's the case, assume the facts that you have are accurate.)

The Naming Your Terms Argument

Using a name or term that requires the other person to accept your point of view or interpretation of the issue. This technique is also used to get people to Google words or phrases that will be more likely to support your side.

Example: "We need to do something about all the wildlife in cities, especially raccoons. These little trash pandas are responsible for knocking over more garbage cans than anything else. If you don't believe me, Google 'trash panda' and 'garbage can.'" (Searches for that term are a lot more likely to get results that are negative about raccoons, and adding "garbage can" means you're more likely to see examples of raccoons causing problems.)

Arguments that are dishonest about the arguer: These fool you by hiding or misrepresenting something about the person making the argument.

The "just asking questions" argument.

Pretending that you're just playing "devil's advocate" when you really support one side of the argument, or hiding a personal reason why you might support one side over another. It can also mean being skeptical about something that doesn't affect you but does affect others: for example, it's easy to question whether how bad racism is if you've never experienced it.

Example: "Before I start my math homework I think we should think about whether I really need math to succeed in life." (You obviously have a motivation to not want to do your homework!)

"The Sock Monkey Bar and Grille is the best restaurant in town." (Did I mention my brother owns it?)

The Moving Target Argument

Making an argument, then if people react badly pretending that you had been making a less extreme one.

Example:

A: "We shouldn't let women be firefighters." B: "What? That's sexist." C: "I don't mean that *no* women should be firefighters, but we should make them show they're strong enough for the job before we hire them." (They'll keep moving the target until they find something you decide isn't worth the trouble of arguing against.)

The Persecuted Genius

Treating that the fact that most experts in the field think you're wrong as evidence that you must be right, because why else would they try to keep you quiet?

Example: "*Canadian Geographic* won't publish my theory that the city of Flin Flon was only put on maps as a secret message to aliens. They must be afraid I'm getting too close!" (Theories that go against the consensus in fields like science and history *have* turned out to be true—for example, at first scientists didn't agree that the dinosaurs were killed by an asteroid, and historians used to believe that only men went on Viking raids—but in both cases nobody tried to 'silence' the people promoting those theories, and the consensus changed when new evidence was presented.)

Arguments that are dishonest about the issue: These try to fool you by giving a misleading picture of the debate around the issue.

The Fake Doubt Argument

Pretending that there is not a *consensus* (a theory that most experts in a field agree is most likely correct) on the topic when there is. Sometimes there really isn't a consensus, but if there is then an argument that goes against it needs a lot of extra evidence to be convincing. If you think someone might be using this argument, ask these questions:

- How many experts are there on each side?
- How many of those experts have relevant credentials? (Doctors, scientists and other experts don't necessarily know more than the average person outside their own topic. Be suspicious when someone is used as an authority on a topic they're not a real expert on.)
- Is there an established consensus? (To find out, look for an article on the topic in an encyclopedia like Wikipedia or Encyclopedia Britannica.)
- Does one side have a motive to make you think there's doubt when there isn't? (Tobacco companies funded research for years on *other* possible causes of lung cancer to make it look like there was still doubt.)
- Where has evidence on either side appeared? (Scientific and academic journals are the best evidence: check their Wikipedia article to make sure they have a good track record. Newspapers will sometimes print "both sides" of a story even if it doesn't really have both sides, so being quoted in a news article isn't good evidence there isn't consensus.

Example: "Whether or not Flin Flon exists is still under debate. Not every map has Flin Flon on it." (All cartographers agree that Flin Flon does exist. It's not on every map because it only has about 6,000 people.)

Ideologies of Hate

There's a big difference between hate speech and making real political points. One way to tell the difference is to look for *ideologies of hate*: these are basic ideas that are found in hate material and not usually found in legitimate discussion. (An *ideology* is a system of ideas or a way of thinking.) Writers who use these ideas are trying to play on your emotions to get you to agree with them.

Othering and Dehumanization

The most important hateful idea is that the world is divided into two groups: "Us" and "Them." Hate content creates an idea of an "Other" who is absolutely and unchangeably different from us. Writers who use this idea will always emphasize things that make the Other seem different and will argue that people are born different, rather than the differences come from our cultures or how we are raised. Sometimes writers will use negative terms for the Other or compare them to animals to portray them this way.

The Other is usually shown as either *inferior* or *threatening* (or both). It's important to hate speech that the writer's group is shown as being both smarter and better than the Other. At the same time, the Other will often be shown as a threat to the writer's group. This is often done by misinterpreting facts, statistics or history to suggest that the Other is trying to hurt the writer's group. Othering and dehumanization can make it seem like violence against a group is acceptable and even necessary for your own group's survival.

The Glorious Past

Another important idea in hate material is that the writer's group has lost its rightful place in the world. Usually, the writer will say that this is the fault of the Other or people within the group who've turned against it.

Victimhood

It's important for hatemongers to feel as though they are the victims and their group is under attack. Since we all sometimes feel like the world is against us, it can be very effective to tell us that our problems are somebody else's fault. Anyone who suffers as part of the struggle (including those who are arrested for hate crimes, or whose websites are shut down for spreading hate speech) are not just victims but *martyrs*, whose suffering is almost holy because it happened as part of the struggle. Also, if members of the writer's group are the real victims, this means that people we have designated as Other are not victims, so we don't need to feel any sympathy for them.

Secret Enemies

One of the clearest signs that an argument is based on hate is showing one or more groups as secretly plotting against the writer's group. Sometimes the group being targeted is shown as being manipulated by another, even more evil group (to explain how they can be both dangerous and inferior.) In some cases the secret enemy may be a group that does not even exist, such as a conspiracy, secret society or even aliens.

Member's of the writer's group who don't share the writer's prejudices are portrayed as being "asleep" or "sheep" while the writer and others like them "have their eyes open." To explain why the crimes of these secret enemies are not reported, hate groups will often say that the targeted groups are in control of the news media.

Us Versus Them

Another sign of an argument coming from hate is the idea that the groups cannot co-exist: conflict is inevitable. An extreme version of this is *accelerationsism*, suggesting that a war will happen soon between the writer's group and the Other and that the writer's group must be prepared to be on top.

Creating an Online Hate Response Guide

For this assignment you will be helping to create a guide on how to respond to hate in different online environments.

First, choose a specific *example* that you know well of one of the environments we listed in class. Confirm with me that nobody else has chosen the same example. (More than one group could choose the same environment, such as social networks — one might choose Instagram and one might choose Twitter—but they could not both choose Instagram.)

Research the following:

- What kind(s) of hate content or behaviour are forbidden by the platform's Terms of Service, community guidelines or similar policy?
- What penalties does the platform have for people who break those rules?
- What can users do if they see hateful content or behaviour that is against the Terms of Service? (Give as detailed instructions as possible.)
- Does the site make any suggestions, or link to any other resources, on how to respond to hateful content or behaviour that does not violate the Terms of Service?

When you have finished your research, we will discuss as a class how you will present what you've found out.

Task Assessment Rubric: Online Hate Response Guide

	Learning Expectations	Achievement
Use Skills and competencies that fall under "use" range from basic technical know-how – using computer programs such as word processors, web browsers, email and other communication tools – to the more sophisticated abilities for accessing and using knowledge resources such as search engines and online databases and emerging technologies such as cloud computing.	*Ethics and Empathy* use digital or traditional media to promote ethical and responsible behaviour *Community Engagement:* use digital or traditional media to be part of a community exhibit leadership as a digital citizen *Making and Remixing:* communicate information and ideas effectively to multiple audiences using a variety of media and formats participate in society through online engagement in democratic actions (e.g. lobbying, petitions, parliament) locate, organize, analyze, evaluate, synthesize and ethically use information from a variety of sources and media	Insufficient (R) Beginning (1) Developing (2) Competent (3) Confident (4)
Understand "Understand" includes recognizing how networked technology affects our behaviour and our perceptions, beliefs and feelings about the world around us. "Understand" also prepares us for a knowledge economy as we develop information management skills for finding, evaluating and effectively using information to communicate, collaborate and solve problems.	*Ethics and Empathy:* show understanding of the concepts of ethical behaviour and online ethics understand the dynamics of online hate material and how it affects all of the people involved *Community Engagement:* understand how meaning is produced through multimedia (text, images, audio, video) and how culture is produced through the Internet and social media in particular show an understanding of the issues through their creative work *Making and Remixing:* select and use applications effectively and productively (e.g. chooses the most appropriate technologies according to the task) understand the potential of digital devices and resources for her/his schoolwork	Insufficient (R) Beginning (1) Developing (2) Competent (3) Confident (4)

	Learning Expectations	*Achievement*
Understand (continued)	understand the different purposes and contexts of digital image editing understand how meaning is produced through multimedia (text, images, audio, video) and how culture is produced through the Internet and social media in particular • show an understanding of the forms and techniques of the medium and genre: • the chosen topic, issue and solution were clear • the product displayed an insight into a topic and opinion	Insufficient (R) Beginning (1) Developing (2) Competent (3) Confident (4)
Create "Create" is the ability to produce content and effectively communicate through a variety of digital media tools. It includes being able to adapt what we produce for various contexts and audiences; to create and communicate using rich media such as images, video and sound; and to effectively and responsibly engage with user-generated content such as blogs and discussion forums, video and photo sharing, social gaming and other forms of social media. The ability to create using digital media ensures that Canadians are active contributors to digital society.	*Ethics and Empathy* create a digital work that effectively promotes positive online behaviour *Community Engagement:* make valuable contributions to the public knowledge domain (e.g. wikis, public forums, reviews) create a practical implementation plan *Making and Remixing:* contribute to project teams to produce original works or solve problems interact, collaborate, co-construct content and publish with peers, experts or others employing a variety of digital environments and media effectively apply the forms and techniques of the medium and genre: • photographs or video were taken with care and relevant to the topic at hand • text was effectively integrated	Insufficient (R) Beginning (1) Developing (2) Competent (3) Confident (4)