Journal of Centre for Distance & e-Learning
(JCDeL), Vol. 5, No. 1, 2026
ISSN: 1595-5362
https://cdeljournal.unn.edu.ng

ALGORITHMIC GOVERNANCE AND COMMUNICATION DYNAMICS IN DISTANCE LEARNING: A MEDIA ECOLOGY PERSPECTIVE

Blessing Ogonnaya Onyekuru, Alozie Ogbonna Christian & Peace Nwamaka Ojonta

Department of Mass Communication,,

University of Nigeria, Nsukka.

Abstract

Higher education is increasingly becoming a digitally mediated communication environment in which teaching, learning, and institutional governance depend on digital platforms, algorithmic systems, and data-driven infrastructures due to the expansion of distance learning. Algorithmic governance in these environments extends beyond learning analytics to include automated assessment systems, recommendation algorithms, adaptive learning technologies, and institutional decision-support systems that increasingly shape educational communication and decision-making. This study examines how algorithmic governance reshapes communication dynamics in distance learning, with particular attention to student-teacher interaction, peer communication, feedback processes, and digital participation patterns. Guided by Media Ecology Theory and complemented by Michel Foucault's Knowledge-Power Framework, the study adopts a qualitative conceptual analytical approach based on a systematic review of scholarly literature, institutional reports, and policy documents on algorithmic governance and digital education. The study argues that algorithmic technologies function not merely as educational tools but as communication environments that restructure patterns of interaction, participation, and institutional authority in distance learning systems. The analysis suggests that while algorithmically mediated systems can enhance institutional responsiveness and facilitate early interventions, they may also privilege quantifiable forms of engagement while marginalizing contextual and qualitative dimensions of educational communication. These concerns are particularly significant in underdeveloped societies where infrastructural inequalities shape digital participation. The study contributes to emerging scholarship on algorithmic governance and educational communication by advocating context-sensitive analytics frameworks and more equitable communication practices.

.

Keywords: Algorithmic governance, Communication Dynamics, Distance Learning, Learning Analytics, Higher Education

Introduction

Higher education has undergone significant transformation as digital technologies increasingly reshape teaching, learning, and institutional communication. Although distance learning predates the COVID-19 pandemic, the global health crisis accelerated universities' reliance on digital infrastructures for classroom interaction, academic support, assessment, and administration. Learning management systems, virtual classrooms, and algorithmically driven educational platforms now function not merely as educational tools but as communication environments through which students, lecturers, facilitators, and institutional authorities interact. While this transformation has improved educational flexibility and access, it has also altered how communication is organized, mediated, and governed within higher education systems (Gašević et al., 2022; Zawacki-Richter & Jung, 2022). Increasingly, communication in digital learning

environments is shaped not only through human interaction but also through algorithmic systems that influence educational participation and institutional decision-making.

At the centre of this transformation is the growing use of algorithmic governance in higher education. Algorithmic governance refers to the use of computational systems, artificial intelligence, learning analytics, recommendation systems, adaptive learning technologies, automated assessment tools, and institutional decision-support mechanisms to regulate educational processes and institutional practices (Williamson et al., 2023; Selwyn, 2022). Among these systems, learning analytics has emerged as one of the most visible forms of algorithmic governance, enabling institutions to collect and analyse digital traces such as login frequency, participation records, assessment performance, and engagement patterns to support learner monitoring and institutional responsiveness. However, concerns remain regarding whether these systems genuinely improve educational experiences or merely privilege measurable activity over meaningful engagement (Guzmán-Valenzuela et al., 2021; Viberg et al., 2024).

Beyond their technical functions, algorithmic systems increasingly shape communication dynamics within distance learning environments. Communication dynamics refer to the patterns and processes through which interaction occurs among students, instructors, facilitators, and institutional systems. These include student-teacher interaction, peer communication, collaborative learning, feedback processes, synchronous and asynchronous communication, and broader patterns of digital participation (Martin et al., 2022; Bozkurt et al., 2022). Through automated feedback, predictive alerts, recommendation systems, and intervention mechanisms, algorithms increasingly influence how participation, engagement, and academic risk are interpreted and acted upon. Consequently, important questions arise regarding communication authority, the capacity to define and legitimize educational interaction and communication governance, which concerns the institutional and technological regulation of communication practices in educational environments (Susnjak et al., 2022).

Understanding these developments requires a theoretical perspective that explains how communication technologies shape human interaction and institutional practices. Media Ecology Theory views communication technologies not merely as tools but as environments that influence social interaction, communication patterns, and institutional structures. From this perspective, algorithmic systems actively restructure how communication occurs and how authority is exercised within distance learning environments. Complementing this perspective, Michel Foucault's Knowledge-Power Framework explains how systems of observation, classification, and surveillance function as mechanisms of institutional authority and regulation (Cope et al., 2021; Cerratto Pargman & McGrath, 2021).

These concerns become particularly significant in underdeveloped societies where digital participation is shaped by infrastructural inequalities, including unstable internet connectivity, unreliable electricity supply, and limited access to digital technologies. Although existing scholarship has extensively examined learning analytics, educational surveillance, and digital governance, limited attention has been given to how broader forms of algorithmic governance reshape communication dynamics in distance learning environments from a Media Ecology perspective, particularly within contexts characterized by digital inequality. Against this background, this study examines how algorithmic governance restructures communication dynamics in distance learning environments, arguing that while algorithmically mediated

systems may enhance institutional responsiveness, they also risk marginalizing the contextual, relational, and human dimensions of educational communication.

Statement of the Problem

Despite the growing integration of learning analytics into higher education, there remains a significant gap in understanding how algorithmically mediated systems reshape communication dynamics within remote learning environments. Although learning analytics has been widely adopted to monitor student participation, predict academic risks, and improve institutional responsiveness, scholarly attention has focused predominantly on its technical effectiveness rather than its implications for communication and governance. As distance learning increasingly depends on data-driven systems, educational interactions once shaped through direct engagement between students and instructors are becoming filtered through algorithmic processes that prioritize measurable indicators such as login frequency, assignment submissions, and participation metrics. While these systems may improve efficiency and enable early interventions, they also raise concerns about how communication authority is redistributed and whether meaningful dimensions of learner engagement are reduced to quantifiable data. Williamson et al. (2023) argue that educational analytics often conceal the institutional values and power relations embedded within digital communication structures, thereby shaping which forms of participation are recognized and acted upon. Yet, limited scholarly attention has examined learning analytics as a mechanism of communication governance within digitally mediated educational environments.

This concern becomes more pronounced in underdeveloped and developing societies where digital participation is constrained by infrastructural inequalities such as unstable internet access, erratic electricity supply, and limited access to digital devices. In such contexts, analytics systems may misinterpret infrastructural barriers as learner disengagement, thereby producing unfair communication responses. Heiser et al. (2023) observe that issues of equity and bias in learning analytics can disproportionately disadvantage learners whose educational realities are not adequately represented within data-driven systems, particularly when institutional responses rely heavily on incomplete digital indicators. Yet, limited attention has been given to the ethical and communicative implications of these systems in contexts shaped by digital inequality, necessitating an examination of how learning analytics reshape communication dynamics in distance learning environments.

Objectives of the Study

1. Examine how learning analytics reshape communication dynamics in distance learning environments.
2. Analyse the role of algorithmic governance in redistributing communication authority among educational actors.
3. Examine the implications of algorithmically mediated communication for ethical and equitable education, especially in underdeveloped nations.

Conceptual Review

Algorithmic Governance in Education

Algorithmic governance in education refers to the increasing use of computational systems, artificial intelligence, and data-driven infrastructures to regulate educational decision-making, communication practices, and institutional processes. In contemporary higher education, algorithmic systems embedded in learning management systems, adaptive learning technologies, recommendation algorithms, automated assessment tools, predictive analytics, and institutional decision-support systems increasingly shape how institutions organize teaching, monitor participation, evaluate performance, and respond to learner needs. These systems do not merely support institutional decisions; they influence how educational participation, academic risk, and learning outcomes are defined and interpreted. Williamson, Macgilchrist, and Potter (2023) argue that algorithmic systems embed institutional values and governance logics within automated decision-making processes, thereby shifting educational governance from human discretion toward data-driven rationalities.

The evolution of algorithmic governance reflects a transition from descriptive data systems to predictive and prescriptive infrastructures capable of anticipating institutional action. Selwyn (2022) conceptualizes these systems as socio-technical arrangements that redistribute authority within educational environments rather than simply improving efficiency. Similarly, Dencik et al. (2022) argue that algorithmic governance increasingly operates through technical infrastructures that exercise forms of "soft authority" while remaining difficult to challenge. Consequently, algorithmic governance raises important concerns regarding transparency, accountability, educational equity, and the automation of institutional authority.

Distance Learning and Digital Communication

Distance learning refers to educational arrangements in which teaching and learning occur across geographical and temporal boundaries through digitally mediated communication technologies. Communication in these environments is facilitated through learning management systems, video conferencing platforms, discussion forums, messaging systems, and other digital interfaces. Hodges et al. (2020) observe that distance learning environments create new forms of educational interaction that depend heavily on technological affordances and digital accessibility. Likewise, Martin et al. (2022) argue that digital education increasingly reorganizes communication through platform-mediated interaction and asynchronous participation.

Unlike face-to-face learning, communication in distance education is characterized by reduced non-verbal cues, delayed feedback, and increased reliance on technological mediation. Bozkurt et al. (2022) therefore argue that distance learning should be understood as a distinct communicative environment rather than merely a virtual extension of classroom instruction. These developments suggest that distance learning represents a fundamental transformation of educational communication.

Communication Dynamics in Distance Learning

Communication dynamics in distance learning refer to the patterns and processes through which interaction occurs among students, instructors, facilitators, learning communities, and institutional systems. In digitally mediated environments, communication extends beyond interpersonal interaction to include technologically and algorithmically mediated exchanges.

Jandrić et al. (2022) describe digital education as a communicative ecosystem in which human interaction is increasingly shaped by technological and algorithmic infrastructures.

Communication dynamics encompass student-teacher interaction, peer communication, collaborative learning, feedback processes, synchronous and asynchronous communication, and broader patterns of digital participation. The increasing use of algorithmic systems, automated feedback mechanisms, and predictive intervention tools has significantly altered these interaction patterns. Garrison (2021) argues that meaningful online learning depends on the integration of social, cognitive, and teaching presence, while Susnjak et al. (2022) observe that algorithmic systems increasingly influence how educators interpret participation, engagement, and learner performance. Consequently, communication authority and educational decision-making are becoming increasingly distributed between human actors and algorithmic systems.

Learning Analytics as a Mechanism of Algorithmic Governance

Learning analytics refers to the measurement, collection, analysis, and reporting of learner data for the purpose of understanding and optimizing educational processes. Through the analysis of digital traces such as participation records, assessments, and engagement patterns, learning analytics enables institutions to monitor performance, predict academic risks, and support institutional decision-making. Gašević, Tsai, and Drachsler (2022) identify learning analytics as one of the principal mechanisms through which algorithmic governance operates within higher education.

The functions of learning analytics extend beyond monitoring to include prediction, intervention, and personalization. Viberg et al. (2024) note that learning analytics has evolved into a core institutional infrastructure shaping educational governance and learner support. However, scholars continue to caution that learning analytics often privileges measurable behaviours while overlooking contextual, relational, and qualitative dimensions of educational engagement.

Conceptual Relationship Among the Variables

The concepts examined in this study are closely interconnected. Algorithmic governance constitutes the broader institutional framework through which computational systems regulate educational communication and decision-making. Learning analytics functions as a specific mechanism of algorithmic governance, while communication dynamics represent the interactional processes affected by these systems within distance learning environments. Consequently, this study conceptualizes algorithmic governance as a communicative and institutional process that restructures interaction, participation, and authority in contemporary distance learning systems.

Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored primarily in Media Ecology Theory and complemented by Michel Foucault's Knowledge-Power Framework. Media Ecology Theory, developed by McLuhan (1964) and later expanded by Postman (1970), conceptualizes communication technologies as environments that shape human interaction, perception, and social organization. McLuhan's proposition that "the medium is the message" suggests that communication technologies influence not only what is communicated but also how communication occurs. Within distance learning environments, digital platforms, learning management systems, artificial intelligence

applications, and algorithmic infrastructures function as communicative environments that actively shape interaction patterns, participation, feedback processes, and educational engagement. Jandrić et al. (2022) argue that contemporary digital learning environments operate as communicative ecosystems increasingly structured by technological and algorithmic systems. Media Ecology Theory therefore provides the primary analytical lens for understanding how algorithmic governance restructures communication dynamics in distance learning.

Complementing this perspective, Foucault's Knowledge-Power Framework explains how systems of knowledge production, surveillance, classification, and observation function as mechanisms of institutional authority and social regulation (Foucault, 1969, 1975). In digitally mediated education, algorithmic systems continuously collect, classify, and interpret learner data, thereby influencing communication processes and educational decision-making. Perrotta and Selwyn (2023) and Williamson et al. (2023) argue that algorithmic governance increasingly redistributes educational authority through data-driven monitoring and institutional regulation. Together, Media Ecology Theory and the Knowledge-Power Framework provide an integrated perspective for understanding how algorithmic systems simultaneously reshape communication practices and institutional authority within distance learning environments.

Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative conceptual analytical approach to examine how algorithmic governance reshapes communication dynamics in distance learning. As a theoretical and non-empirical study, it relies on secondary sources rather than primary data to develop conceptual insights. Relevant literature was retrieved from Google Scholar, ResearchGate, and ScienceDirect, with emphasis on peer-reviewed journal articles, books, institutional reports, and policy documents published between 2021 and 2025, alongside seminal works on Media Ecology Theory and Foucault's Knowledge-Power Framework. Materials were selected based on their relevance to algorithmic governance, learning analytics, communication dynamics, and distance learning. The data were analysed using qualitative content analysis through thematic coding to identify recurring patterns related to communication, governance, institutional authority, learner engagement, and digital inequality. The findings are therefore interpretive rather than empirically generalizable.

Analysis and Discussion

Algorithmic Governance and the Restructuring of Communication Dynamics in Distance Learning

The conceptual analysis suggests that algorithmic governance is increasingly transforming communication dynamics in distance learning by embedding computational systems into the organization of teaching, learning, and institutional decision-making. Rather than functioning solely as administrative tools, algorithmic systems including learning analytics, adaptive learning technologies, recommendation algorithms, automated assessment systems, and predictive models, increasingly shape how communication occurs among students, instructors, facilitators, and institutions. Existing scholarship indicates that these technologies influence not only the delivery of educational content but also the interpretation of learner participation, engagement, and academic performance, thereby redefining communication processes within digitally mediated learning environments (Williamson et al., 2023; Selwyn, 2022). Consequently,

communication in distance learning is becoming increasingly structured through algorithmic processes that determine how interaction is recognized, prioritised, and acted upon.

This development supports the argument advanced in the conceptual review that algorithmic governance extends beyond learning analytics to encompass a broader network of computational systems that regulate educational communication. Learning management systems, recommendation engines, automated feedback mechanisms, and adaptive learning platforms increasingly influence communication by determining what information learners receive, when interventions occur, and how institutional responses are coordinated (Gašević et al., 2022; Viberg et al., 2024). Dencik et al. (2022) similarly contend that algorithmic governance operates through technical infrastructures that subtly shape institutional behaviour and communication without necessarily replacing human actors. Rather than eliminating human interaction, these technologies redistribute communicative responsibilities between educators and algorithmic systems, creating hybrid environments where institutional communication is jointly mediated by technological and human actors.

From the perspective of Media Ecology Theory, these developments demonstrate that digital technologies are not neutral channels of communication but environments that reshape educational interaction. McLuhan's proposition that "the medium is the message" suggests that communication technologies transform the conditions under which interaction occurs, while Postman's extension of Media Ecology emphasizes their influence on institutional practices. Consistent with this perspective, Jandrić et al. (2022) argue that contemporary distance learning environments function as communicative ecosystems in which technological infrastructures increasingly determine patterns of participation and interaction. Likewise, Martin et al. (2022) and Bozkurt et al. (2022) observe that communication in online education is shaped by platform design, instructor presence, and technological affordances rather than by interpersonal exchange alone. Viewed collectively, the literature suggests that algorithmic governance has fundamentally reconfigured communication dynamics in distance learning by transforming digital platforms from passive communication channels into active environments that organize educational interaction and institutional communication.

Learning Analytics, Communication Authority, and Educational Governance

The literature reviewed suggests that learning analytics has evolved beyond a pedagogical support tool to become a central mechanism through which algorithmic governance influences communication and decision-making in distance learning. By analysing learners' digital traces including login frequency, participation records, assessment outcomes, and engagement patterns, learning analytics enables institutions to monitor learner progress, identify students requiring support, and facilitate timely interventions (Gašević et al., 2022; Viberg et al., 2024). As discussed in the conceptual review, learning analytics should be understood as one component of broader algorithmic governance rather than its equivalent, functioning alongside recommendation systems, adaptive learning technologies, automated assessment, and institutional decision-support systems. Consequently, communication authority is increasingly shared between educators and algorithmic systems that shape how participation, engagement, and academic risk are interpreted within distance learning environments.

Existing scholarship, however, cautions that this redistribution of communication authority raises important governance concerns. Williamson et al. (2023) argue that algorithmic systems increasingly embed institutional priorities within automated decision-making processes,

while Hartong and Förschler (2023) observe that these systems may centralize decision-making authority by privileging data-driven interpretations of educational activity. Similarly, Perrotta and Selwyn (2023) contend that artificial intelligence and algorithmic infrastructures increasingly influence professional judgment, making educators progressively dependent on computational outputs when interpreting learner behaviour. These observations suggest that communication governance in distance learning is becoming a hybrid process in which institutional decisions are informed by both human expertise and algorithmic recommendations.

This development aligns with Foucault's Knowledge-Power Framework, which explains how systems of observation, classification, and surveillance operate as mechanisms of institutional authority (Foucault, 1969, 1975). In digitally mediated education, learner data are continuously collected, classified, and interpreted through algorithmic systems, influencing institutional communication, intervention strategies, and educational decision-making. Nevertheless, the conceptual analysis does not suggest that algorithms replace educators' professional judgment. Rather, the literature indicates that communication authority is increasingly negotiated between human actors and computational systems, reinforcing the need for transparent governance structures and sustained human oversight to ensure that educational communication remains context-sensitive, ethical, and pedagogically meaningful (Susnjak et al., 2022; Selwyn, 2022).

Ethical, Equity, and Contextual Implications of Algorithmic Governance in Distance Learning

The literature further suggests that while algorithmic governance has the potential to enhance institutional responsiveness, its implementation also raises important ethical, communicative, and equity concerns, particularly within resource-constrained distance learning environments. Algorithmic systems frequently rely on quantifiable indicators of participation, such as login frequency, assessment completion, and online engagement, to inform institutional decisions (Gašević et al., 2022; Viberg et al., 2024). Although these indicators can facilitate early identification of learners requiring academic support, scholars caution that they may inadequately capture the contextual, relational, and socio-economic realities that influence students' participation in digital learning (Selwyn, 2022; Williamson et al., 2023). Consequently, communication risks becoming increasingly defined by measurable digital activity rather than by meaningful educational interaction.

These concerns are particularly significant in developing countries, where digital participation is often shaped by infrastructural limitations, including unstable internet connectivity, unreliable electricity supply, limited access to digital devices, and varying levels of digital literacy. Under such conditions, algorithmic systems may misinterpret irregular participation as learner disengagement rather than as evidence of structural constraints, thereby reinforcing existing educational inequalities (Lozano-Díaz et al., 2023). From a Media Ecology perspective, these technological environments influence not only communication patterns but also learners' opportunities for participation. Similarly, Foucault's Knowledge-Power Framework suggests that algorithmic classifications can unintentionally reinforce institutional authority by legitimizing decisions based primarily on data visibility rather than contextual understanding. The conceptual analysis therefore underscores the importance of designing algorithmic governance systems that complement rather than replace professional judgment. Integrating contextual awareness, transparent governance practices, and qualitative forms of feedback into

algorithmically mediated learning environments is essential for promoting equitable, ethical, and communication-centred distance education, particularly in contexts characterised by persistent digital inequality.

Conclusion and Recommendations

This study examined how algorithmic governance reshapes communication dynamics in distance learning from a Media Ecology perspective, with Foucault's Knowledge-Power Framework providing complementary insights into institutional authority and surveillance. The conceptual analysis suggests that algorithmic governance, encompassing learning analytics, adaptive learning technologies, recommendation systems, automated assessment, and institutional decision-support systems, increasingly mediates communication among students, instructors, facilitators, and educational institutions. While these technologies enhance institutional responsiveness, learner support, and educational decision-making, they also risk privileging quantifiable indicators of participation over the contextual, relational, and qualitative dimensions of educational communication. From a Media Ecology perspective, algorithmic systems have become communication environments that influence how interaction, participation, and authority are organized within contemporary distance learning.

The study therefore recommends that higher education institutions adopt transparent governance frameworks that combine algorithmic systems with informed human oversight in educational decision-making. Institutions should integrate qualitative indicators, such as instructor feedback and contextual learner information, into analytics-supported interventions to complement quantitative data. Educational policymakers should also establish ethical guidelines for the use of algorithmic systems, including regular audits for fairness, transparency, and accountability. Given the infrastructural realities of many developing countries, algorithmic governance frameworks should be adapted to local contexts to avoid misinterpreting structural barriers as learner disengagement. As a conceptual study, these conclusions provide a theoretical foundation for future empirical research examining how algorithmic governance influences communication dynamics across diverse distance learning environments.

References

Bozkurt, A., Xiao, J., Lambert, S. R., Bond, M., & Richardson, J. C. (2022). Speculative futures on post-pandemic distance education: Scenarios, narratives, and implications. *Asian Journal of Distance Education, 17*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6372980

Cerratto Pargman, T., & McGrath, C. (2021). Mapping the ethics of learning analytics in higher education: A systematic literature review of empirical research. *Journal of Learning Analytics, 8*(2), 123–139. https://doi.org/10.18608/jla.2021.7385

Cope, B., Kalantzis, M., & Searsmith, D. (2021). Artificial intelligence for education: Knowledge and its assessment in AI-enabled learning ecologies. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 53*(12), 1229–1245. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2020.1728732

Dencik, L., Hintz, A., Redden, J., & Warne, H. (2022). Datafication and the governance of everyday life. *Information, Communication & Society, 25*(4), 497–513. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2020.1851387

Foucault, M. (1969). *The archaeology of knowledge*. Tavistock Publications.

Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Vintage Books.

Garrison, D. R. (2021). *E-learning in the 21st century: A community of inquiry framework for research and practice* (4th ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003240600

Gašević, D., Tsai, Y.-S., & Drachsler, H. (2022). Learning analytics in higher education: Stakeholders, strategy and scale. *The Internet and Higher Education, 52*, Article 100833. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2021.100833

Guzmán-Valenzuela, C., Gómez-González, C., Rojas-Murphy Tagle, A., & Lorca-Vyhmeister, A. (2021). Learning analytics in higher education: A preponderance of analytics but very little learning? *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 18*(23), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00258-x

Hartong, S., & Förschler, A. (2023). Opening the black box of algorithmic governance in education. *Learning, Media and Technology, 48*(2), 123–138. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2022.2131907

Hodges, C., Moore, S., Lockee, B., Trust, T., & Bond, A. (2020). The difference between emergency remote teaching and online learning. *Educause Review, 27*, 1–12. https://er.educause.edu/articles/2020/3/the-difference-between-emergency-remote-teaching-and-online-learning

Jandrić, P., Knox, J., Besley, T., Ryberg, T., Suoranta, J., & Hayes, S. (2022). Postdigital education and educational futures. *Postdigital Science and Education, 4*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-021-00275-y

Lozano-Díaz, A., Fernández-Prados, J. S., & Bernal-Bravo, C. (2023). Digital inequality and educational participation in higher education contexts: Challenges for inclusive online learning. *Education Sciences, 13*(2), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci13020174

Martin, F., Sun, T., & Westine, C. D. (2022). A systematic review of research on online teaching and learning from 2009 to 2018. *Computers & Education, 159*, Article 104009. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2020.104009

McLuhan, M. (1964). *Understanding media: The extensions of man*. McGraw-Hill.

Perrotta, C., & Selwyn, N. (2023). Deepening the critique of artificial intelligence in education. *Learning, Media and Technology, 48*(1), 17–29. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2022.2167630

Postman, N. (1970). The reformed English curriculum. In A. C. Eurich (Ed.), *High school 1980: The shape of the future in American secondary education* (pp. 160–168). Pitman.

Selwyn, N. (2022). *Digital education in a postdigital age*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003158851

Susnjak, T., Ramaswami, G. S., & Mathrani, A. (2022). Learning analytics and the ethical use of student data in higher education: A review of current issues and challenges. *Education and Information Technologies, 27*, 875–903. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10785-1

Tsai, Y.-S., Gašević, D., & Drachsler, H. (2021). Learning analytics in higher education: Challenges and policies. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 52*(4), 1570–1583. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13170

Viberg, O., Khalil, M., Baars, M., & Gašević, D. (2024). Learning analytics in higher education: Emerging trends and future directions. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence, 6*, Article 100197. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100197

Williamson, B., Macgilchrist, F., & Potter, J. (2023). Re-examining educational datafication and algorithmic governance in education. *Learning, Media and Technology, 48*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2022.2167835

Zawacki-Richter, O., & Jung, I. (Eds.). (2022). *Handbook of open, distance and digital education*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-0351-9