Cultural and Religious Studies, May 2025, Vol. 13, No. 5, 266-270
doi: 10.17265/2328-2177/2025.05.007

Disruptive Innovation or Institutional Betrayal? A Critical Examination of EdTech in Higher Education

XIAO Shufang
Software Engineering Institute of Guangzhou, Guangzhou, China

This essay critically re-examines pedagogical authority in the age of artificial intelligence (AI) and hybrid learning. As AI technologies disrupt the traditional teacher-centered paradigm and hybrid formats dissolve spatial hierarchies, educational authority becomes increasingly distributed and relational. The essay deconstructs conventional models rooted in institutional hierarchy and physical presence, advocating instead for an ethics-driven, dialogic, and technologically literate approach. Educators must transition from authoritative figures to facilitators of critical inquiry, capable of guiding students through algorithmic structures and promoting inclusive, participatory learning. By embracing relational authority and transparent pedagogical practices, higher education can reclaim its transformative and democratic potential in a post-AI landscape.

Keywords: Pedagogical authority, Artificial intelligence, Hybrid learning, Dialogic pedagogy

Introduction: Reframing Technological Progress in Academia

"Technology is neither good nor bad; nor is it neutral" (Kranzberg, 1986, p. 112).

The rapid integration of educational technologies (EdTech) into higher education has been lauded as a form of disruptive innovation—promising efficiency, accessibility, and personalization. Yet beneath this optimistic rhetoric lies a more complex reality. EdTech not only reshapes how knowledge is delivered but also reconfigures institutional priorities, labor structures, and pedagogical values. In many instances, it operates less as a tool of liberation and more as a mechanism of managerial control and market alignment. This paper critically examines whether EdTech in higher education constitutes genuine innovation or represents a betrayal of the academy's democratic and ethical foundations. Rather than simply assessing EdTech's tools or functionalities, the discussion interrogates its institutional logics, ideological undercurrents, and structural consequences.

The Rhetoric of Disruption: Framing EdTech as Progress

At the heart of EdTech's appeal is the narrative of disruption—a Silicon Valley export that casts technology as a force that sweeps away inefficiencies and entrenched bureaucracies (Christensen, Horn, & Johnson, 2011). In this view, universities are seen as outdated incumbents resistant to change, while startups and private platforms are imagined as nimble innovators solving problems of scale and access. MOOCs (Massive Open Online Courses), artificial intelligence (AI) tutors, learning analytics, and LMS (Learning Management Systems) are heralded as revolutionary tools democratizing education.

XIAO Shufang, Master of Arts, Software Engineering Institute of Guangzhou, Guangzhou, China.

This framing, however, is ideological. It privileges speed, scale, and standardization over depth, deliberation, and dialogue. Innovation becomes conflated with efficiency and user convenience, reducing education to a consumer product rather than a transformative process (Selwyn, 2016). When disruption is commodified, the question shifts from what is pedagogically valuable to what is scalable and profitable.

The notion of the student as a consumer—now a central tenet in EdTech marketing—alters institutional logics. Success is measured in terms of engagement metrics, time-on-task, or retention dashboards, rather than critical insight or ethical development. Consequently, pedagogical authority risks being outsourced to algorithmic proxies and data dashboards, where what is visible becomes what is valuable (Williamson, 2017).

Even more troubling is how disruption rhetoric obscures the asymmetries of access and power. Not all students benefit equally from technological interventions. Digital divides in bandwidth, device quality, and home environment exacerbate educational inequity (Watkins, Noble, & Winant, 2018). Thus, the promise of disruption often masks a deeper betrayal: a technocratic shift that benefits institutions and vendors more than learners themselves.

Furthermore, the metaphors used to describe EdTech—"revolution", "explosion", "breakthrough"—carry with them a temporal violence that devalues slow learning, reflection, and relationality. Such language precludes a more ethical conversation about the purposes of education in democratic life. If innovation is narrowly defined through market metrics and short-term gains, then the university's social mission risks being subordinated to a logic of disruption for its own sake (Cottom, 2017).

The cultural dominance of disruption discourses also affects policy-making. Governments increasingly partner with private EdTech firms to implement data-driven reforms, often without sufficient public debate or pedagogical oversight. In this sense, EdTech becomes a vehicle for state-market collusion, where public education is reframed as a site for technological experimentation rather than civic development (Selwyn & Facer, 2014).

Platformization and the Managerial Turn

A significant feature of EdTech's expansion is the "platformization" of education—the migration of pedagogical and administrative functions onto commercial platforms such as Canvas, Blackboard, Coursera, or Google Classroom. These platforms mediate everything from assignments and grading to communication and behavioral tracking. On the surface, they offer convenience. Beneath that surface, they embed a managerial logic that aligns education with performance surveillance and labor quantification (Couldry & Mejias, 2019).

Faculty autonomy is eroded when syllabi are uploaded into standardized templates, grading is automated, or participation is gamified. As teaching becomes datafied, pedagogical labor is flattened into inputs and outputs. Feedback is quantified, and learning is reduced to a series of clickable behaviors. This shift not only undermines the relational and affective dimensions of education but also enables new forms of institutional surveillance and discipline (Andrejevic, 2020).

Decision-making power drifts from departments and academic senates toward IT divisions, compliance units, and EdTech vendors. This reconfiguration transforms the university into a "data-extractive institution"—an entity more invested in managing student behavior than nurturing student development (Prinsloo & Slade, 2017). What is sold as personalization often operates as preemption: nudging students toward normative behaviors, flagging risk scores, or funneling learners into predictive pathways.

Platformization also imposes epistemological limitations. When curricular content is filtered through learning management systems with rigid taxonomies and assessment protocols, it limits how knowledge can be represented, contested, or co-produced. The platform becomes not only a vessel but a gatekeeper—prioritizing certain types of learning (quantifiable, modular, behaviorist) while excluding others (affective, experimental, relational) (Komljenovic, 2021).

Moreover, the algorithmic infrastructure of platforms is often proprietary and opaque. Faculty and students are rarely aware of how their behaviors are tracked, interpreted, and monetized. This lack of transparency undermines academic freedom and raises serious privacy concerns. Universities, in turn, become complicit in forms of digital enclosure that contradict their own commitments to critical inquiry and public accountability.

Finally, platformization facilitates a broader managerial turn in higher education. Institutional success is increasingly measured through Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), predictive analytics, and real-time dashboards. Teaching is transformed into a logistics problem, and learning into a behavioral pattern to be optimized. This logic devalues uncertainty, failure, and dissent—qualities essential to genuine education—and replaces them with control, prediction, and compliance.

Labor, Precarity, and the Automation of Teaching

EdTech's encroachment into higher education has profound implications for academic labor. While platforms promise to "free up" instructor time through automation, the reality is a growing bifurcation of labor. On one end are a few high-profile content creators or "superstar professors" whose lectures are scaled globally; on the other, an expanding underclass of adjuncts and graduate students tasked with moderating discussions, grading, and providing "human touch" (Cottom, 2017).

Teaching becomes modular, outsourced, and de-skilled. Institutions may adopt pre-packaged content from EdTech firms rather than investing in faculty development or research-informed pedagogy. This not only diminishes academic freedom but also creates precarious labor conditions. Workers are increasingly judged by responsiveness to student messages, platform metrics, and algorithmic flags—creating a "pedagogical panopticon" that disciplines faculty in the name of service (Morris & Stommel, 2018).

Moreover, automation does not eliminate labor—it displaces and reconfigures it. New roles such as instructional designers, data analysts, or learning engineers emerge, often under administrative control and detached from faculty governance. These shifts institutionalize a division between content and context, where teaching is no longer a dialogic process but a logistical one.

The broader cost is a deterioration of pedagogical intimacy. Genuine mentorship, creative improvisation, and critical dialogue are difficult to quantify—and thus marginalized. As labor is atomized and surveilled, the vocation of teaching risks becoming a performance of compliance. The classroom ceases to be a space of risk and wonder, and becomes a dashboard to be optimized.

This labor transformation mirrors broader trends in platform capitalism. Gigification, deskilling, and fragmentation render teaching increasingly precarious. Adjunct faculty bear the brunt of these shifts, facing low pay, limited benefits, and constant evaluation. The promise of EdTech thus rests on the extraction of underpaid labor, even as it celebrates "smart campuses" and "AI tutors".

Unions and faculty associations must reckon with this changing terrain. Traditional demands for salary or tenure must now include algorithmic transparency, labor protections in digital environments, and collective input

into platform governance. Otherwise, the automation of education will continue to hollow out its human core, replacing educators with metrics and relationships with transactions.

Reclaiming Educational Technology for Pedagogical Justice

Despite these concerns, the critique of EdTech is not a call for Luddite resistance. Technology is not inherently oppressive—it becomes so when embedded within extractive, instrumentalist logics. The challenge, then, is to reimagine EdTech through the lens of pedagogical justice: deploying tools not for efficiency, but for equity, reflexivity, and democratic engagement (Selwyn & Facer, 2014).

This requires a shift in design philosophy. Platforms should be co-developed with educators and students, grounded in inclusive pedagogies, and subjected to critical audit. Data practices must be transparent, accountable, and contestable. Rather than nudging students into conformity, EdTech can support exploratory learning, counter-hegemonic voices, and epistemic diversity (Ames, 2019).

Faculty must be empowered not just as users but as co-creators of digital education. Professional development should focus on critical digital pedagogy, algorithmic literacy, and ethical decision-making. Collective bargaining and governance structures should ensure that technology enhances rather than erodes academic freedom (Bayne, Gallagher, & Lamb, 2020).

Critical frameworks such as postdigital theory, feminist technoscience, and critical race digital studies offer tools to rethink the assumptions underlying current EdTech models. These perspectives foreground questions of power, access, and embodiment—insisting that technology be accountable to the communities it claims to serve (Benjamin, 2019).

In practice, this means designing platforms that prioritize accessibility, multilingualism, and cultural relevance. It means embedding care and deliberation into software interfaces. It means refusing datafication as default and recognizing that not all forms of learning can or should be measured. Most of all, it means centering education on relationality, not metrics.

Finally, we must reclaim the language of innovation itself. True innovation in education is not measured by speed or scalability, but by its capacity to cultivate critical consciousness, solidarity, and transformation. If EdTech is to serve higher education's emancipatory promise, it must be radically reoriented—away from market metrics and toward human flourishing.

References

Ames, M. G. (2019). *The charisma machine: The life, death, and legacy of one laptop per child*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Andrejevic, M. (2020). *Automated media*. New York: Routledge.

Bayne, S., Gallagher, M., & Lamb, J. (2020). *Anatomy of an AI university: EdTech and the logic of surveillance capitalism*. Madison: Hybrid Pedagogy.

Benjamin, R. (2019). *Race after technology: Abolitionist tools for the New Jim Code*. Cambridge: Polity.

Christensen, C., Horn, M., & Johnson, C. (2011). *Disrupting class: How disruptive innovation will change the way the world learns.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Cottom, T. M. (2017). *Lower Ed: The troubling rise of for-profit colleges in the new economy*. New York: The New Press.

Couldry, N., & Mejias, U. (2019). *The costs of connection: How data is colonizing human life and appropriating it for capitalism.* Redwood: Stanford University Press.

Komljenovic, J. (2021). The rise of education rentiers: Digital platforms, digital data and the transformation of higher education. *Learning, Media and Technology, 46*(3), 290-301.

Kranzberg, M. (1986). Technology and history: "Kranzberg's laws". *Technology and Culture, 27*(3), 544-560.

Morris, S. M., & Stommel, J. (2018). *An urgency of teachers: The work of critical digital pedagogy*. Madison: Hybrid Pedagogy.

Prinsloo, P., & Slade, S. (2017). An elephant in the learning analytics room: The obligation to act. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 48*(5), 958-969.

Selwyn, N. (2016). *Is technology good for education?* Cambridge: Polity.

Selwyn, N., & Facer, K. (2014). The sociology of education and digital technology: Past, present and future. *Oxford Review of Education, 40*(4), 482-496.

Watkins, S. C., Noble, S. U., & Winant, C. (2018). *Digital equity and why it matters*. New York: Data & Society Institute.

Williamson, B. (2017). *Big data in education: The digital future of learning, policy and practice*. London: Sage.