European Journal of Education Science

Vol. 1 No.1 2025

Article **Open Access**

A Critical Examination of Digital Transformation in Higher Education

Nyamsuren Borkhuu [1,*] and Oyun-Erdene Bat-Erdene [1]

[1] Graduate University of Mongolia, Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia
* Correspondence: Nyamsuren Borkhuu, Graduate University of Mongolia, Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia

Received: 19 March 2025
Revised: 26 March 2025
Accepted: 10 April 2025
Published: 13 April 2025

Abstract: The shift of higher education (HE) to a digital realm harnesses technological advancements to reshape teaching methods and institutional functions. However, this transition is met with skepticism due to commercialization, neoliberal constraints, and a shift away from human-centered values. This analysis navigates these conflicts by blending theory and empirical evidence to assess the impact of digital tools on education, instruction, and the socio-political landscape of universities. It scrutinizes the prioritization of market-driven efficiency over equitable education, emphasizing how resources like Learning Management Systems mainly cater to administrative rather than educational needs. Proposing strategies for fair, educationally effective digital approaches, it advocates for a balanced integration that upholds the communal purpose of education. By addressing commercialization and promoting inclusive technology adoption, it aims to align HE with its core ethics, ensuring digital changes enhance rather than compromise its societal mission.

Keywords: digital education transformation; marketization of education; Learning Management Systems; teaching methods; educational equity; public education mission

1. Introduction

The rapid integration of digital advancements in higher education (HE) is driven by technological progress, market demands, and policy initiatives aimed at modernizing educational structures. Innovations like Learning Management Systems (LMS), artificial intelligence (AI)-powered analytics, and online learning platforms are praised for their potential to enhance accessibility, streamline institutional functions, and spur innovation in teaching and learning practices. This evolution aligns with societal shifts that view digital literacy as essential for professional success and civic participation in the modern era. Universities worldwide have embraced these tools as vital for meeting the evolving needs of students and stakeholders in an increasingly digital landscape. However, beneath the veneer of progress lies a complex set of challenges warranting comprehensive critical evaluation.

In order to recalibrate digital strategies, universities need to balance market-driven efficiency with educational integrity. This can be achieved by ensuring that digital tools are selected not only for their practicality but also for their potential to support inclusive and transformative learning. Additionally, fostering faculty development programs focused on effective digital integration and expanding assessment criteria beyond mere quantification would be key steps in realigning digital strategies with the core goals of higher education.

Scholars like Castañeda and Selwyn caution against the “learnification” of education — a reductionist approach that treats learning solely as a quantifiable outcome, often at the expense of broader societal, ethical, and transformative goals [1]. This perspective warns that this approach risks undermining the holistic mission of higher education by prioritizing measurable results over critical thinking and societal contributions. Research supports these concerns. For example, Bond et al. found a significant gap at the University of Oldenburg. While digital tools have transformative potential, faculty and students primarily use them for administrative purposes, such as content distribution and enrollment management [2]. This reduces their potential to foster innovative educational experiences. This disparity highlights a troubling trend: the promise of digital advancements is often overshadowed by practical limitations and institutional agendas.

This article explores the ramifications of digitization in HE through four interconnected lenses: commercialization, neoliberalization, pedagogical deficiencies, and the human aspects of digital education. It argues that the current trend of technological integration often prioritizes efficiency and market-driven logic over fairness, inclusivity, and educational integrity. By merging theoretical critiques with practical insights, this study aims to unpack these complexities and propose a recalibration of digital strategies that realigns with the core principles of higher education as a societal asset.

2. Pedagogical Challenges in Digital Education

2.1. The Concept of "Learnification" in Digital Education

The concept of "learnification" as articulated by Biesta, critiques the reduction of education to measurable skills and outcomes — a phenomenon exacerbated by digital advancements [3]. Castañeda and Selwyn contend that labeling tools like LMS as "learning management systems" conceals their primary function as administrative tools rather than enhancers of pedagogical progress [1]. This utilitarian focus prioritizes technical competencies — such as navigating digital interfaces — over the cultivation of social awareness or ethical judgment. Empirical evidence supports this critique. Bond et al. indicate that at the University of Oldenburg, 80% of faculty used LMS platforms for administrative tasks (e.g., uploading materials, managing enrollments), while collaborative features like wikis and forums were integrated into less than 3% of courses [2]. Similarly, students preferred passive information retrieval through search engines (94%) over active digital interactions. This transactional approach aligns with neoliberal ideologies, which frame education as a market-driven commodity. In this view, students are treated as consumers seeking measurable outcomes, while educators are positioned as service providers focused on efficiency and standardized delivery. Neoliberalism’s emphasis on individual responsibility and competition further reinforces the idea that education should prioritize measurable, economic outcomes over broader social or ethical goals. This framework, while promoting efficiency, tends to undermine the transformative potential of education by reducing it to a transaction-based exchange rather than a process of holistic learning and societal engagement.

The consequences are twofold: firstly, the devaluation of education as a public good, reframed as an individual pursuit; and secondly, the reinforcement of disparities, as autonomous, metric-driven environments, which disproportionately benefit students with existing resources. These dynamics demand a reevaluation of how digital tools are conceptualized and used in HE.

2.2. Pedagogical Deficiencies in Technology Deployment

The incorporation of digital technologies in higher education (HE) often proceeds without alignment with contemporary pedagogical theories. Castañeda and Selwyn argue that many digital tools, including widely used Learning Management Systems (LMS), prioritize administrative functions over pedagogy [1]. While LMS are essential for course management, they can also support education if used innovatively. For example, at the

University of Michigan, LMS integrates collaborative features like discussion boards and peer assessments, fostering a more interactive learning environment. Similarly, Stanford uses LMS in flipped classrooms, combining online content with in-class activities. These cases demonstrate that LMS can serve both administrative and educational roles when properly integrated. This bias stems from traditional classroom models, where education emphasized hierarchical, teacher-centered knowledge dissemination rather than interactive, student-driven methods endorsed by current research. Data from the University of Oldenburg, as highlighted by Bond et al., vividly illustrate this criticism: 80% of faculty primarily used LMS platforms for assimilative tasks like uploading lecture materials or managing assessments, while transformative features — such as collaborative tools, wikis, or discussion forums — were only utilized in 26% of courses [2]. Students mirrored this trend, with only 3% engaging in collaborative digital activities, opting for passive consumption of information through search engines or static resources.

This prevalent assimilative focus results from a combination of institutional priorities and gaps in faculty preparedness. University policies and resource allocation often prioritize operational efficiency — simplifying administrative processes or ensuring compliance — over fostering innovative teaching approaches. Moreover, faculty training programs tend to focus on technical skills, equipping educators to navigate digital interfaces without empowering them to rethink teaching practices in light of technological opportunities. Consequently, a significant pedagogical gap emerges: digital tools, despite their potential to revolutionize education, do not adequately support heutagogy (self-directed learning), critical thinking, or collaborative knowledge construction as advocated by contemporary educational theories. Instead, they reinforce transactional, lecture-based methods that restrict students' opportunities to develop essential skills like problem-solving, digital literacy, or peer interaction.

To bridge this gap, the article proposes three strategic interventions. Firstly, digital tools should align with heutagogical principles by integrating elements such as adaptive feedback systems and reflective journals that support self-directed learning paths. Secondly, emphasis should be placed on interactivity by incorporating collaborative platforms — such as wikis, peer review systems, and virtual labs — that foster discussion and co-creation among learners. Thirdly, faculty development should shift its focus from mere technical proficiency to pedagogical innovation, encouraging educators to utilize simulations, project-based tools, and other active learning technologies. For instance, simulations in medical education, such as virtual patient diagnosis platforms, enable students to engage in complex decision-making and problem-solving tasks [4]. Project-based tools like those used in engineering programs at MIT — where students collaborate on real-world projects through digital platforms — foster creativity and teamwork, promoting a deeper understanding of the subject matter. Additionally, virtual labs used in biology and chemistry courses allow students to conduct experiments in a digital environment, encouraging hands-on learning and critical thinking. Through the implementation of these measures, institutions can transform digital tools from administrative aids into catalysts for meaningful, student-centered education.

3. Individualization and Commercialization in Digital Education

3.1. The Human and Emotional Impact of Digital Rationalism

The predominant focus on efficiency and quantifiable metrics in digital education often sidelines the emotional and relational aspects essential for effective learning. Castañeda and Selwyn critique this hyper-rational paradigm, asserting that it reduces education to a technical process governed by data-driven analysis and automated procedures, thereby undervaluing the human elements crucial for meaningful educational interactions [1]. Within this context, students are frequently reduced to data points — monitored based on completion rates, quiz scores, or engagement statistics — instead of being recognized as individuals with emotional, social, and identity-related needs. This shift

undermines the teacher-student relationships traditionally pivotal in higher education, substituting nuanced personal connections with impersonal, algorithm-driven interactions. The implications of this rationalistic approach extend beyond teaching methodologies, raising significant ethical questions regarding the purpose and principles of education in an era dominated by digital technologies.

Empirical findings from the University of Oldenburg exemplify these tensions. As reported by Bond et al., while 57% of students value lecture recordings for their flexibility and review capabilities, 27% of faculty are reluctant to adopt them, expressing concerns about the impersonal nature and potential impact on the immediacy and personal connection of live classroom interactions [2]. This discrepancy underscores a fundamental conflict between the accessibility facilitated by digital tools and the relational aspects that nurture a sense of community and engagement. Tools like LMS interfaces and automated feedback systems are efficient but lack the capacity to address critical emotional needs. The widespread use of digital tools like Learning Management Systems (LMS) and automated feedback systems, while efficient in administrative tasks, often fall short in addressing the emotional and relational needs of students. These tools are designed primarily to streamline administrative processes — such as grading, course material distribution, and tracking student progress — thereby reducing the face-to-face interactions that foster meaningful teacher-student connections. The focus on efficiency leads to a transactional approach to education, where students are seen more as data points rather than individuals with emotional, social, and identity-related needs. This "administrative" focus diminishes opportunities for emotional support, peer collaboration, and personalized guidance, all of which are crucial for student well-being and engagement in their learning journey. For students reliant on communal support or thriving in collaborative environments, this rationalistic approach can lead to feelings of isolation and detachment.

Ethically, the excessive reliance on such technologies poses a risk of commodifying student experiences, prioritizing institutional metrics like retention or efficiency over holistic development. This detachment is particularly poignant for marginalized learners who may struggle with the resources to navigate individualized, data-centric systems independently. To counteract these patterns, the article suggests a human-centric approach in the design of digital tools, incorporating features like discussion spaces, collaborative annotation platforms, and peer-engagement arenas that uphold and enrich interpersonal connections. Ethical frameworks should accompany these advancements to ensure that gains in efficiency do not compromise empathy or inclusivity. By reframing digital education to prioritize human interactions, institutions can alleviate detachment, reinforce the humanistic essence of learning, and establish environments where technology complements rather than replaces the interpersonal essence of education.

3.2. Individualization in Education and Its Uneven Impact

The introduction of digital technologies in higher education (HE) increasingly portrays learning as a self-directed, entrepreneurial journey, embodying neoliberal principles that favor individual initiative and personal responsibility. Castañeda and Selwyn critique this trend as "hyper-individualization" arguing that it aligns closely with market-driven metrics and personalized digital platforms that emphasize efficiency and flexibility over communal educational values [1]. This shift redefines students as independent "entrepreneurial learners" tasked with navigating their academic paths through tools like adaptive learning systems and on-demand resources, often at the expense of collaborative interaction. At the University of Oldenburg, this inclination is evident through the limited use of collaborative tools such as wikis and forums, present in only 26% of courses, indicating an institutional preference for solitary tasks over collaborative learning [2]. These trends marginalize students who lack the necessary resources — whether in technological access, digital literacy, or cultural background — to excel in these self-reliant environments, exacerbating existing inequities.

Tressie McMillan Cottom's concept of "roaming autodidacts" further highlights this divide, describing a privileged group of learners equipped with the requisite skills and support systems to thrive in hyper-individualized settings. Conversely, less-prepared peers, often from underrepresented or resource-constrained backgrounds, struggle in such environments. This disparity deepens educational inequalities, as the concept of personalized learning overlooks systemic barriers that hinder fair participation. Moreover, hyper-individualization undermines the collective mission of universities as public goods, institutions historically entrusted with nurturing shared knowledge and civic responsibility. Tools like analytics dashboards and lecture recordings, while offering flexibility (appreciated by 57% of Oldenburg students), prioritize privatized, transactional interactions over communal learning environments faculty lament as diminishing classroom discourse [2]. This erosion of collective engagement undermines the social fabric of education, reducing it to a series of isolated, efficiency-focused transactions.

To address these challenges, the article advocates a two-pronged approach. Firstly, institutions should develop inclusive, collaborative platforms — such as peer-review systems and virtual group projects — that encourage diverse participation and counteract the isolating effects of individualization. Secondly, tailored support, including digital literacy instruction and academic assistance, should be extended to less-prepared students to level the educational playing field. By implementing these strategies, universities can reconceptualize education as a shared endeavor, pushing back against neoliberal influences and reaffirming their commitment to fairness and collective scholarly advancement [5].

3.3. Commercialization and the Marketization of Education

The ascent of digital technologies in higher education (HE) redefines learning as a self-directed, entrepreneurial journey, embodying neoliberal ideals that stress individual autonomy and accountability. Critically examined by Castañeda and Selwyn as "hyper-individualization" this trend aligns with market-oriented benchmarks and personalized digital platforms that prioritize efficiency and flexibility over communal educational principles [1]. Students are now portrayed as independent “entrepreneurial learners” navigating academic paths through adaptive learning tools and on-demand resources, often at the expense of collaborative engagement. However, this shift towards market-driven education platforms also amplifies disparities in resource access, as platforms often prioritize paying users or institutions with greater financial means. This marketization, while increasing flexibility and personal choice, can inadvertently widen the gap between privileged students who can afford premium services and underrepresented students who struggle to access essential resources, ultimately affecting their learning motivation and outcomes. Students may increasingly prioritize efficiency and performance, focusing on grades rather than a holistic educational experience. The University of Oldenburg illustrates this trend through its limited use of collaborative tools like wikis and forums, present in only 26% of courses, showcasing a preference for individual tasks over cooperative learning [2]. This approach marginalizes students lacking resources — whether in technological access, digital literacy, or cultural capital — thus exacerbating existing disparities.

Tressie McMillan Cottom's concept of “roaming autodidacts” sheds light on this disparity, highlighting a group of learners who possess the necessary skills, resources, and support systems to thrive in hyper-individualized settings. These students, often from privileged backgrounds, benefit from flexible learning models and personalized digital tools. However, less-prepared students, especially those from underserved or marginalized communities, struggle in such environments due to a lack of technological access, digital literacy, and supportive home environments. This divide deepens educational inequalities and challenges the idea that personalized learning benefits all students equally. Conversely, less-prepared peers, often from underserved backgrounds, struggle in such

environments. This exacerbates educational gaps, as personalized learning overlooks systemic barriers hindering fair participation. Furthermore, this hyper-individualization undermines universities' collective role as public goods, traditionally fostering shared knowledge and civic responsibility. Tools like analytics dashboards and lecture recordings, while offering flexibility (valued by 57% of Oldenburg students), prioritize private, transactional interactions over communal learning experiences, leading faculty to bemoan diminished classroom dialogue [2]. This decline in collective engagement jeopardizes the social fabric of education, reducing it to isolated, efficiency-centric interactions.

To address these challenges, the article recommends a two-part strategy. Firstly, institutions should develop equitable, collaborative platforms — such as peer-review systems and virtual group projects — that promote diverse participation to counterbalance the isolating effects of individualization [6]. Secondly, tailored support, including digital literacy training and academic aid, should be extended to less-prepared students to level the educational playing field. Through these initiatives, universities can refocus education as a shared endeavor, pushing back against neoliberal influences and reaffirming a commitment to fairness and collective intellectual advancement.

4. Case Study: Digital Transformation at the University of Oldenburg

The University of Oldenburg serves as an instructive case study highlighting the complexities and hurdles of digital integration in German higher education (HE). Empirical data from Bond et al. reveals a significant discrepancy between the university's aspirations for digital transformation and its practical implementation in classrooms [2]. Faculty at Oldenburg heavily rely on the Learning Management System (LMS) Stud.IP for administrative tasks, with 80% using it for duties like tracking enrollments and disseminating materials. Conversely, interactive and innovative tools — such as wikis, forums, and collaborative annotation platforms — are noticeably underutilized, appearing in merely 26% of courses. This disparity underscores a fundamental gap between the potential of digital technologies to revolutionize teaching and learning and their current application, predominantly focused on operational efficiency rather than pedagogical advancement.

This discrepancy is further compounded by differing perspectives between students and faculty. According to Bond et al., 57% of students value lecture recordings for their adaptability, enabling self-paced review and accommodating various schedules [2]. In contrast, 27% of faculty express reservations, viewing these recordings as impersonal and expressing concerns about their impact on the dynamics of live classroom interactions. This disparity stems from differing priorities: students value flexibility and the ability to revisit content at their own pace, while faculty worry about the erosion of face-to-face engagement and the potential for a "transactional" learning environment. To address these differing needs, a more balanced approach is required. For example, hybrid models could be adopted, where students have access to pre-recorded materials, but are also required to participate in synchronous online discussions or live Q&A sessions. This would allow students the flexibility they desire while preserving the collaborative, interactive nature of live teaching. This contradiction mirrors broader challenges within digital transformation initiatives: the pursuit of accessibility and convenience at times clashes with the preservation of personal connections and communal educational experiences. Such discord underscores a critical conundrum: balancing technological progression with the human interactions that define educational excellence [7].

Systemic challenges exacerbate these complexities at Oldenburg and mirror national trends in German higher education. The Hochschulforum Digitalisierung identifies decentralized strategies and uneven adoption as common obstacles, noting that digital innovations often struggle to seamlessly align with curricular goals. At Oldenburg, inadequate faculty training compounds this fragmentation, focusing on technical proficiency — proficiency in navigating Stud.IP — rather than fostering pedagogical restructuring

that leverages technology for transformative purposes. To address this, a more comprehensive training model is necessary, one that combines technical skills with pedagogical strategies. For example, the university could implement online workshops and webinars, where faculty are not only trained on using tools like Stud.IP, but also learn how to integrate these tools into interactive and student-centered lesson plans. Such initiatives could include peer teaching sessions, collaborative lesson planning, and feedback loops to ensure that technology is used effectively in support of teaching and learning reforms. This reflects a broader national deficiency in professional development, perpetuating a cycle where digital tools reinforce conventional, assimilation-focused teaching rather than facilitating student-centered, collaborative learning [8].

The Oldenburg case embodies a neoliberal inclination in digital integration, where institutional priorities lean toward efficiency metrics — like streamlined administration and cost-effectiveness — over pedagogical richness and fairness. Addressing this requires a paradigm shift: faculty training should embrace heutagogical principles, empowering educators to design self-directed, interactive learning experiences. Simultaneously, technology usage should underscore human-centered principles, promoting equitable access and transformative outcomes. Without this reorientation, digital tools risk cementing transactional educational models, hindering the potential for meaningful, inclusive learning in German higher education [9,10].

6. Conclusion and Policy Implications

In conclusion, the digital transformation of higher education (HE) presents a blend of challenges and opportunities, amplifying neoliberal trends while also opening avenues for increased accessibility and innovation. This examination has highlighted the commercialization of education through market-driven measures, pedagogical deficiencies hindering transformative learning, and hyper-individualization favoring self-reliant learners, potentially sidelining equity and communal engagement. These trends threaten the core objective of HE by potentially reducing it to mere transactional exchanges rather than fostering intellectual growth and societal enrichment. Nonetheless, the transformative capacity of digital tools in enhancing education remains undeniable, prompting a necessary shift towards equity, inclusivity, and human interaction.

Referencing Michel Foucault's notion that "everything is dangerous, which is not exactly the same as bad", this critique emphasizes that digital technologies are not inherently harmful, but their uncritical adoption poses risks requiring careful engagement. To align these tools with the educational mission of universities, a proactive "hyper-activist" strategy is essential, leveraging their benefits while systematically addressing their drawbacks. This necessitates deliberate policy interventions to redirect the course of digital transformation.

Key recommendations include advocating for the adoption of open-source platforms like Moodle, supported by government or educational institution funding programs. These platforms should be promoted through national and institutional initiatives to ensure accessibility and facilitate pedagogical flexibility. Universities can integrate these platforms by offering pilot programs and training sessions to ensure smooth implementation and alignment with educational goals. To address the concerns of commodification, universities should establish clear ethical guidelines for data analytics and AI that prioritize privacy, fairness, and transparency, ensuring that student data is used responsibly and does not exploit vulnerable populations. Moreover, faculty training should shift from merely technical proficiency to comprehensive pedagogical empowerment. This can be achieved through ongoing online workshops, professional development courses, and collaborative peer learning opportunities. Institutions should establish continuous training programs that focus on integrating digital tools into active learning strategies, rather than just teaching technical skills, thereby enhancing the overall quality of teaching and fostering student-centered learning. By implementing these strategies, universities can navigate

the risks posed by neoliberalism and dehumanization, ensuring technology serves as a tool to enhance learning rather than an end in itself. By embracing these strategies, HE institutions will be better positioned to fulfill their transformative role, not only by enhancing collective intellectual growth but also by fostering inclusive societal progress through responsible digital transformation. Leveraging digital advancements to uphold their public mission rather than detract from it, universities can ensure that technology serves as a means to enhance educational equity and foster meaningful student engagement.

References

1. L. Castañeda and N. Selwyn, "More than tools? Making sense of the ongoing digitizations of higher education," *Int. J. Educ. Technol. High. Educ.*, vol. 15, pp. 1–10, 2018, doi: 10.1186/s41239-018-0109-y.
2. M. Bond, V. I. Marín, C. Dolch, S. Bedenlier, and O. Zawacki-Richter, "Digital transformation in German higher education: Student and teacher perceptions and usage of digital media," *Int. J. Educ. Technol. High. Educ.*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 1–20, 2018, doi: 10.1186/s41239-018-0130-1.
3. G. Biesta, "Good education in an age of measurement: On the need to reconnect with the question of purpose in education," *Educ. Assess. Eval. Account.*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 33–46, 2009, doi: 10.1007/s11092-008-9064-9.
4. I. A. Awada, A. Sorici, M. Drăgoi, A. M. Florea, and A. Scafa-Udriște, "Virtual Patient: A Web-Based Platform for the Training of Medical Students in Patient Consultation During a Lockdown," in *Proc. EDULEARN*, pp. 6491–6497, 2022, doi: 10.21125/edulearn.2022.1533.
5. D. R. Hansen, "Digital technologies, big data and ideological (neoliberal) fantasies: threats to democratic efforts in education?", *Obra Digit.*, vol. 19, pp. 15-28, 2020, doi: 10.25029/od.2020.260.19.
6. D. Wood and M. Friedel, "Peer review of online learning and teaching: Harnessing collective intelligence to address emerging challenges," *Australas. J. Educ. Technol.*, vol. 25, no. 1, 2009, doi: 10.14742/ajet.1181.
7. J. Dron, C. Seidel, and G. Litten, "Transactional distance in a blended learning environment," *ALT-J Res. Learn. Technol.*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 163–174, 2004, doi: 10.1080/0968776042000216219.
8. L. Amhag, "Learner centered experiences with flipped classroom and mobile online webinars in distance higher education program," in *Proc. Mobile Learn. 2015*, pp. 99–104, doi:10.13140/RG.2.1.3449.3284.
9. K. M. Smith and D. I. Jeffery, "Critical pedagogies in the neoliberal university: What happens when they go digital?", *The Can. Geogr./Le Géogr. Can.*, vol. 57, no. 3, pp. 372-380, 2013, doi: 10.1111/cag.12023.
10. H. G. Schuetze, "Digitalization of German Higher Education and the Role of Europe," *J. Comp. Int. High. Educ.*, vol. 16, no. 2, 2024, doi: 10.32674/jcihe.v16ix.6066.