

Platformization of higher education: privatization, standardization, and alienation in teaching processes

*Plataformização da educação superior:
privatização, padronização e alienação nos processos de ensino*

*Plataformización de la educación superior:
privatización, estandarización y alienación en los procesos de enseñanza*

Braian Veloso¹
Universidade Federal de Lavras

Claudinei Zagui Pareschi²
Universidade Federal de São Carlos

Gustavo Maurício³
Universidade Federal de São Carlos

Achilles Alves de Oliveira⁴
Universidade Estadual do Tocantins

Abstract: Contemporaneity is marked, above all, by the expansion and development of digital Information and Communication Technologies (ICT). Far beyond mere tools at the disposal of human action, the most recent technological resources—understood as true social institutions—redefine practices, knowledge, and various relationships. In education, digital ICT bring a range of implications, among which we highlight the use of platforms that begin to mediate the teaching-learning process. In this context, the objective of this article is to discuss the platformization of higher education, problematizing the processes of privatization, standardization, and alienation of teaching. This is a theoretical essay, and therefore adopts a qualitative approach. Drawing on different authors in the fields of education and/or technology, we conclude that platforms present various dualities, creating opportunities while also generating challenges and problems. In this scenario, it is essential to advocate for a reappropriation by teachers of their protagonism in the face of platforms and what, in these pages, we call platformization.

Keywords: Platformization; Higher Education; Digital Technologies.

¹ PhD in Education (UFSCar) and PhD in Sociology (UFSCar). Professor at the Federal University of Lavras (UFLA), Lavras, Minas Gerais (MG), Brazil. E-mail: braian.veloso@ufla.br; Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/2537302046587655>; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9459-5740>.

² PhD candidate in Education (UFSCar) and Master's degree in Education (UNIMEP). Limeira, São Paulo (SP), Brazil. E-mail: claudineizagui@gmail.com; Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/2613006827700163>; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1402-0059>.

³ PhD candidate in Education (UFSCar) and Master's degree in Education (UFSCar). Universidade Federal de São Carlos (UFSCar), São Carlos (SP), Brazil. E-mail: gcmauricio@ufscar.br; Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/1121415260674004>; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7757-0672>.

⁴ PhD candidate in Education (UnB) and Master's degree in Education, Language, and Technologies (UEG). Professor at the Universidade Estadual do Tocantins (Unitins), Palmas, Tocantins (TO), Brazil. E-mail: achilles.ao@unitins.br; Lattes: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/2166879227141655>; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7478-0810>.

Resumo: A contemporaneidade é marcada, sobretudo, pela expansão e desenvolvimento das Tecnologias Digitais de Informação e Comunicação (TDIC). Muito mais do que meras ferramentas à disposição do agir humano, os recursos tecnológicos mais recentes, enquanto verdadeiras instituições sociais, ressignificam práticas, saberes e relações diversas. Na educação, as TDIC trazem uma série de implicações, dentre as quais cabe citar o uso de plataformas que passam a mediar o processo de ensino-aprendizagem. Diante disso, o objetivo deste artigo é discutir a plataformização da educação superior, problematizando os processos de privatização, padronização e alienação do ensino. Trata-se de um ensaio teórico que, por isso mesmo, possui abordagem qualitativa. Baseando-se em diferentes autores da área da educação e/ou tecnologias, concluímos que as plataformas apresentam dualidades diversas, criando possibilidades ao passo que engendram desafios e problemas. Nesse cenário, é fundamental defender uma reapropriação, por parte dos docentes, do protagonismo em face das plataformas e do que, nestas páginas, chamamos de plataformização.

Palavras-chave: Plataformização; Educação Superior; Tecnologias Digitais.

Resumen: La contemporaneidad está marcada, sobre todo, por la expansión y el desarrollo de las Tecnologías Digitales de la Información y la Comunicación (TDIC). Mucho más que simples herramientas al servicio de la acción humana, los recursos tecnológicos más recientes, en tanto verdaderas instituciones sociales, resignifican prácticas, saberes y diversas relaciones. En el ámbito educativo, las TDIC traen consigo una serie de implicaciones, entre las cuales se destaca el uso de plataformas que pasan a mediar el proceso de enseñanza-aprendizaje. En este contexto, el objetivo de este artículo es discutir la plataformización de la educación superior, problematizando los procesos de privatización, estandarización y alienación de la enseñanza. Se trata de un ensayo teórico que, por lo tanto, adopta un enfoque cualitativo. Basándose en distintos autores del campo de la educación y/o de la tecnología, concluimos que las plataformas presentan diversas dualidades, generando posibilidades al mismo tiempo que producen desafíos y problemáticas. En este escenario, es fundamental defender una reapropiación, por parte del profesorado, del protagonismo frente a las plataformas y a lo que, en estas páginas, denominamos plataformización.

Palabras clave: Plataformización; Educación Superior; Tecnologías Digitales.

Received on: August 6, 2025

Accepted on: October 30, 2025

Introduction

Contemporary life is marked by the use of digital Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) that permeate the most diverse activities of everyday life. From simple to complex tasks, they are increasingly mediated and influenced by various technological resources. We often encounter platform-based realities, which are environments filled with devices and software that not only mediate relationships and transactions but also do so in the way that Latour (2012) describes. They therefore modify the configurations of networks of subjects and technologies, shaping the work of teachers themselves.

In education, digital ICT have varied implications. The very notion of knowledge is redefined, as an ideal of totalizable knowledge gives way to the faltering, expansive, and

flexible character of network society (Castells, 1999) or cyberspace (Lévy, 1999). Other modes of production and construction of intelligence are being developed, while intricate training models are complicating formal education. It is true that many possibilities are emerging in the wake of what we might call digital culture. However, we must consider the challenges, as well as the deleterious effects of the uncritical use of digital ICT.

Mediated social relationships, that is, those that take place on platforms, also influence educational processes in the context of changes that impose new formats and perspectives. In an increasing number of educational networks, schools, and universities, we see the use of technological resources that serve as a link between teaching and learning. By unveiling this mediating relationship promoted by digital ICT, we can identify ulterior motives. Ultra-individualized data is collected and used to produce specific reports, both for the control and supervision of teaching work and for the mapping and manipulation of educational activities. This procedure leads to a dialectical process, which we will refer to in this article as the dialectic of individuation.

The overall objective of this text, therefore, is to discuss the platformization of higher education specifically, questioning the processes of privatization, standardization, and alienation of education. To this end, we used a narrative review of the literature (Cervo; Bervian; Silva, 2007; Flick, 2009) to construct a theoretical essay. This means that the review included the subjective interference of the authors, since no systematic criteria were used for the collection and analysis of bibliographic material.

In general terms, we searched databases such as Scientific Electronic Library Online (SciELO), Google Scholar, and the Journal Portal of the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (Capes). We searched for keywords related to the study, such as "platformization in education," "platforms in education," "platformization in higher education," "digital technologies in education," etc. The materials were selected based on a preliminary reading of titles and abstracts. The authors read the texts in their entirety and, based on subjective criteria of convenience and interest—given the narrative focus of the review—selected those that would comprise the discussion in the text. We also used books that have been part of the authors' analyses, reflections, and research.

Now, we seek to unveil some of the obvious and latent challenges in contemporary times in order to problematize ongoing processes with a view to establishing the necessary critiques for confronting today's obstacles. It should be noted that this research is part of the efforts of the Study and Research Group on Innovation in Education, Technologies, and Languages (Horizonte Group-UFSCar).

Digital technologies in higher education: platformization of teaching

Discussions about the inclusion of digital ICT in education date back several decades (Kenski, 2003; Moran; Masetto; Behrens, 2000). Various studies have already highlighted possibilities and limitations, demonstrating that technological resources, if used under critical guidance, can contribute to improving the teaching-learning process (Candau, 2022; Kenski, 2003; Masetto, 2006; Moran, 2007; Oliveira; Silva, 2023). It is therefore necessary to overcome a Manichean perspective and avoid counterproductive dichotomies, because technological resources, while not a panacea for educational problems, are important to the pedagogical act.

This consideration is important because it shows us that the debate on digital ICT in pedagogical practices is not entirely recent. However, the rapid expansion of digital devices, accompanied by regulatory changes such as the guidelines of the National Common Core Curriculum (BNCC), has brought other nuances to the debate. More recently, there have been movements, including by public officials, to accelerate the incorporation of digital ICT, including so-called educational platforms that, among other things, mediate teaching-learning relationships by collecting, storing, and managing data from both teachers and students. We are facing a scenario of platformization, sustained by seductive promises of educational improvements that are so necessary in countries with marked inequality, such as Brazil.

For Silva and Couto (2024, p. 6), the term “platformization” refers to the “convergence of various systems, protocols, networks, etc., bringing together different actors and human and non-human actions, connected by a dynamic constellation of technologies, economic, and sociocultural mechanisms”. According to the authors, digital platforms permeate everyday life, influencing social interactions, reconfiguring institutional structures, and altering professional routines by transforming the conditions and rules that guide these interactions.

In education, the platformization of teaching can be understood as a process whereby educational and pedagogical activities are mediated and organized through digital platforms used by higher education institutions, such as virtual learning environments (VLEs), for content storage, activities, and web conferencing. Among the most common digital platforms are Moodle, a free, open-source, and customizable platform, and commercial platforms from so-called “big tech” companies (offered and managed by private companies), such as Google Classroom, Google Meet, Microsoft Teams, and Zoom.

In addition to the examples mentioned above, other complementary digital tools have been incorporated into everyday academic life, such as YouTube (for video lessons), Padlet, Mentimeter, Kahoot (for interactive activities), Google Drive and OneDrive (for storing and sharing materials), WhatsApp and Telegram (for communicating with students), etc. Also

noteworthy are platforms focused on active learning practices, including gamification, forums, chats, and interactive videos.

The fact is that the variety of digital platforms that permeate higher education allows students to access digital teaching materials asynchronously and synchronously. They can also promote authorship and collaborative work while facilitating content creation and sharing, automating pedagogical tasks, and enabling the monitoring and analysis of student engagement, attendance, and performance, thereby improving teaching.

However, platformization is considered to bring with it a series of challenges and risks, especially for quality public education. One of the main problems is the incentive for privatization of education through the imposition of standardized pedagogical models and technological dependence that compromises institutional and teaching autonomy. In addition, digital technologies can intensify and, consequently, make work more precarious by increasing the workload.

Candau (2022), during the gradual return to face-to-face classes in the post-pandemic period, warned us about the fad of hybrid education, implemented through digital platforms in public schools—and also in higher education institutions. This public-private partnership, in light of technological determinism, often carries ulterior motives related to the transformation of educational processes into commodities—which is symptomatic in a data-driven economy (Sadin, 2023).

Another critical point to mention is the weakening of the dialogical and humanizing dimension of education, which tends to be replaced by interactions mediated by algorithms and performance metrics, automating teaching work, and reducing or excluding pedagogical interaction, which undermines the bond between teachers and students. Sometimes, practices that achieve optimal quantitative efficiency anchor the use of digital platforms. This efficiency is achieved through the algorithmic conduct of processes (Sadin, 2023). Thus, the human and dialogical dimension of education is lost, suppressing spaces for discussion that favor the development of emancipatory critical consciousness in students, as advocated by Freire (1996).

According to Valente (2019), digital platforms function as true monopolies, taking advantage of their large number of users, the immense amount of data collected, and their technological power to expand their presence and influence in different areas of society. They are not neutral tools: they exercise a role of surveillance and control, capturing users' traces—including personal and sensitive data from teachers and students. Algorithms process the collected information, analyzing and influencing our consumption choices, political, cultural, and educational behavior.

In the context of the data-driven economy (Loveluck, 2018; Sadin, 2023), which Zuboff (2021) discusses as surveillance capitalism, it is evident that the use of private platforms benefits capital through the production, management, and control of data in education. This is because new social dynamics, which permeate relationships in digital spaces, can reinforce disciplinary logics through the ultra-personalized management of individuals (Zarifian, 2022). For students, such an arrangement implies the collection and control of sensitive data, such as demographic data, assessment results, and peer interactions, among others. For teachers, platforms can represent a dystopian allegory in the manner of George Orwell's 1984, in which the surveillance of the subject reaches the optimum of capitalist efficiency through the individualized control of information, such as access, permanence, use, results, etc.

Such an arrangement means that educational platforms often collect data and information about users using the same *modus operandi* applied by big tech companies in other contexts, focusing on productivity, performance control, gamified engagement, and teaching through automated modules, called pedagogical tracks. This reduces education to a process of completing online tasks and makes institutions dependent on external services, usually outsourced for the management and storage of educational data. Following the same logic, teachers are also monitored in terms of their connection time, productivity in providing feedback, response rate, and time with students, among other factors.

From this perspective, platformization is a reality that is developing rapidly in Brazil. During the COVID-19 pandemic, education, including public education, underwent an accelerated process of integrating digital platforms into teaching and learning processes when, on an emergency basis, many institutions adopted services offered by large technology companies such as Google and Microsoft. This movement deepened technological dependence and exacerbated existing inequalities, increasing social and digital exclusion, since many students did not have access to quality internet or adequate equipment, dealing with a scarcity of meaningful public policies to overcome the challenges faced (Costa; Ojeda; Lopes, 2025).

In this scenario, without ignoring the importance of ICTs in education, it is worth emphasizing that teachers need to have autonomy to use them. When guided by a privatized perspective, platformization takes away the leading role of teachers and imposes a commercial logic of surveillance and control over work. This leading role requires coherent critical knowledge that integrates political, technological, pedagogical, and content dimensions (Veloso; Pareschi; Oliveira, 2024), without which the promotion of an education project based on emancipation and social transformation is weakened.

Under the guidance of a neoliberal model and capitalist dynamics, platformization is shaping and replacing pedagogical relationships and mediations. Subjected to externally

defined metrics, algorithms, and standards, teachers are constantly monitored and disciplined. With autonomy weakened, educational work is conducted under the aegis of productivity, efficiency, and adaptation to models. Therefore,

[...] Teaching work, when organized through platforms that emphasize innovation, updating, development, and improvements in administrative and educational processes, is ultimately subordinated to a heteronomous configuration. This configuration diverges from its original purpose by embodying instrumental rationality, leading to a conception of education and teaching aimed at adapting individuals to the social system and the market (Duci; Gomes, 2024, p. 14).

This adaptation of individuals to market dictates, standardized in quantitative terms based on data economics, allows us to question one of the main benefits presented in the enthusiastic discourse of those who defend, at all costs, the platformization of education, namely, the personalization of pedagogical processes. In fact, digital ICT can personalize educational practices, producing individualized data and, consequently, activities, materials, and resources adapted to the specific educational reality and needs of each student.

But the ode to personalization, without a critical bias, obscures the dialectic that underlies individuation in contemporary times. The more personalized the process becomes, through adaptive platforms, the more subjects find themselves subsumed into intricate processes of uniformity and standardization. The autonomy touted by advocates of unrestricted use of platforms, which would result from the adaptation provided by the technological device, unfolds, in many scenarios, into alienation. Only a dialectical analysis is capable of grasping this apparent contradiction as real movement and not untruth. We will discuss this below.

Standardization and alienation in teaching processes: the dialectic of individuation

What we are referring to here as the dialectic of individuation is related to ideas developed elsewhere by the first author. To understand the core of the issue, we should revisit some historical precedents. Since the last decades of the 20th century, we have been living in a scenario of flexibilization of productive relations and expansion of digital ICT. The flexible accumulation regime (Harvey, 1994) stems from the crises of the Fordist model of production after the 1970s. Mass production, rigid labor flows, and scientific and disciplinary management of labor, among other characteristics, give way to a model that emphasizes product customization, flexible productive relations, collaborative management, and other attributes that now prevail in capitalism (Larangeira, 1997).

It is in this scenario of transition that digital technologies have found fertile ground in the last decades of the 20th century. According to Loveluck (2018) and Sadin (2023), the

discourses that contributed to the proliferation of the internet and the initial experiences with personal computing were rooted in the countercultural movement of the 1960s, which sought a reversal of prevailing values. In other words, this movement aimed to put the machine back at the service of humans, empowering them to control it and break free from the constraints of modernity (Weber, 2013). The post-bureaucratic discourse of this historical-social period influences, to varying degrees, the very protocols of computer and internet development, generating decentralized models whose promise was freedom of information and social relations (Loveluck, 2018). This change has led to an unexpected overlap between the neoliberal right, libertarian radicalism, and Californian ideology—the latter resulting from experiences with personal computing and digital technologies in California, United States.

This juxtaposition between flexible capitalism, the counterculture movement, and the advent of the internet and personal computers contributes to the production of an ideological discourse based on free market sovereignty and a libertarianism inclined toward the motto that information should be free (Barbrook; Cameron, 1995; Loveluck, 2018). This historical introduction is necessary to ground the analysis of the technological and ideological movements that will sustain a process of overvaluing individuals. In other words, this process of individuation is based on the promise of vertical, post-bureaucratic relationships beyond the state, which supervises, regulates, and restricts human activities— a model that Foucault (1987) analyzed as disciplinary.

Digital ICT, therefore, fit perfectly into the perspective of flexibility. Just look at the personalized content that is now possible thanks to the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) – not just generative AI. The ideology of Silicon Valley, as a worldview propagated by big tech companies, shapes society in the sense of projecting an ever-increasing freedom for the individual. With a mobile device such as a smartphone, users can browse the internet, accessing content at will and supposedly adapting it to their most personal needs and interests. There is an exaggerated personalization of life and relationships, which is expressed, for example, in advertising based on data generated by people to target specific content to each outlined profile.

The same prevailing discourse influences educational practices, which are confronted with the promise of personalized teaching. Generative AI, to cite a more recent context, is a symptomatic example, as students “can benefit from these technologies, including because they complement traditional educational methods, as they have the potential to increase accessibility and provide personalized learning experiences” (Heggler, Szmoski, and Miquelin, 2025, p. 15). This means that individual freedom and content personalization are part of the promises surrounding the expansion of digital ICT and its use in education.

However, a superficial analysis of this process does not allow us to scrutinize the dialectic that permeates contemporary society. Concomitant with the personalization of content and the promise of individuation, there are complex movements of standardization and alienation. Directing the debate toward higher education, the subject of analysis in this essay, it is clear that platformization, while offering a range of possibilities for diversifying and adapting teaching to the specificities of each scenario, also drives massification and standardization.

It is important to note the phenomenon that Santaella (2021) analyzes as datafication, that is, the transformation of social relations and the actions of individuals into quantifiable data, which enables real-time algorithmic monitoring and predictive analysis. In other words, the more we experience platforms and their customizations, the more we are standardized. We become information exploited by various companies and agencies, based on AI (Rodrigues; Rodrigues, 2023), at the heart of the data economy (Sadin, 2023).

Furthermore, the use of resources sold by companies such as Google requires adaptation to the model that the data economy and other big tech companies conceive from a “one-size-fits-all” perspective. When discussing Mundane Technology, Nemer (2021) shows us how, repeatedly, digital ICT created and designed for the characteristics and standards of the Global North need to be appropriated and reinterpreted by the Global South, namely by the oppressed. This need for reinterpretation is a clear indication that proposals designed for other contexts are being imposed on the education of the dominated classes. They are based on standards that neglect the specificities of unequal contexts and are subject to the logic of countries at the center of global capitalism.

The need to reinvent or overcome externally imposed limitations confirms the argument that technologies are not neutral. Feenberg (2013) proposes that technological resources are like social institutions, carrying values and forms of use that shape our life in society. This does not mean that digital ICT are supersensible beings, oblivious to the possibilities of re-signification. In the sociotechnical sphere, it is understood that all technology is a social product and, as such, carries values that are not universal and necessary but contingent (Veloso, 2023).

What is the dialectic of individuation? We refer to the contradiction inherent in flexible capitalism and Silicon Valley ideology. While software and hardware promise individual liberation, they also forge standards and alienation that are sold and imposed vertically. The greater the use of platforms and their possibilities for personalizing teaching, the more intense the production of a mass of data that reduces us to the standard of the algorithm managed and manipulated by technology—we are datafied. The more we use

devices to personalize and diversify our classes, the more we are urged to adapt to software and hardware models created by companies that sell “unique solutions.” These are standards created in global technology centers that often disregard the realities and vicissitudes of marginalized contexts (Nemer, 2021).

Exposing the danger is crucial. The privatization of education condemns us to standards and alienates us. Education is subject to the limitations and protocols of digital ICT. Data is produced that feeds back into this industry of standardized personalization. The dialectic of individuation concerns the contradiction inherent in the process, which, at the same time, individualizes through the flexibilization and intense use of devices while relegating subjects to an amorphous mass of users treated as algorithmic data “stuck” to the standards and decisions of the large technology companies that control the markets.

Protagonism in the socio-technical network: overcoming alienating standardization

Far from seeking a definitive answer to the challenge at hand, we are content to shed some light, through the reflections contained in these pages, on the obstacles that arise from the relationship between education and digital technologies in the context of platformization. When it comes to higher education institutions, the presence of platforms sold by large companies, such as Google tools, creates ambivalent scenarios. On the one hand, we are dealing with a range of possibilities, such as the organization of virtual agendas, cloud file storage, and various generative AI solutions that optimize and automate processes, in addition to rapid exchanges of messages between peers and with students. However, these platforms' presence makes us vulnerable to outside interests, which may conflict with the institutions' and the individuals' interests.

Dependence on digital ICT reaches the point of paralyzing various teaching, research, and extension activities when a given tool malfunctions – or when the license presents a problem, limiting storage space. Furthermore, as mentioned, constant use of these platforms produces a series of data that are processed and manipulated by large companies, such as Google. Capital in the data economy targets this information to deliver hyper-personalized advertising, among other purposes. In higher education, this is a major problem because sensitive data, such as personal information about students and faculty, is controlled by external agents with commercial interests. Furthermore, confidential research data may become public or be used for various purposes without the prior consent of the authors, violating principles of copyright and authorship in research.

What is the best course of action given these divergent paths that offer both opportunities and challenges? There are no simple answers to such a complex problem. But we understand that the critical use of platforms, with the aim of building healthier—or less harmful—practices, requires the assertion of teacher leadership. The lure of standardized personalization, as a dialectic of individuation, requires critical discussion. Spaces for dialogue, located at the heart of institutions that, by excellence, should produce critical and socially referenced knowledge, will serve as fertile ground for this discussion. We are referring to higher education institutions, especially those in the public sphere.

It is worth revisiting Feenberg's critical theory (2013), which conceives technologies as social institutions. Technologies are not neutral because they embody diverse interests that are historically and socially defined. However, they are not beyond society, nor are they autonomous or independent. Every technological resource is intertwined with social relations—which permeate its creation, use, and analysis. As an institution, it is utopian or naive to assume that ignoring technology will be enough to avoid or obtain rid of its harmful effects. On the contrary, it is by conceiving it as a social institution that we, as human beings and agents, must assume our leading role in the socio-technical networks of which we are a part.

What platforms are we using in our practices? Are they really necessary? What are their benefits? What problems do they cause? How can we weigh up the pros and cons to decide whether it is worthwhile adopting such technology? What are we using platforms for? Who do they benefit? What are they for? Who are they for? These are some of the questions that help us clarify possible critical paths. These questions are not coincidentally influenced by Freire's critical pedagogy (1995), which advocates the use of technologies in light of ethical principles that are aligned with human progress.

Platforms, therefore, present numerous opportunities for everyday higher education. They cannot be ignored. However, they create various challenges. The dialectic of individuation allows us to glimpse that contradictions are part of the process. We must neither reject nor surrender to the process of platformization. We argue that the active involvement of teachers will help us identify powerful spaces for dialogue and critical discussion in higher education institutions, which can lead to using digital technology for progress rather than for alienation or precarious work and social relations.

Furthermore, it is imperative to resume and strengthen the defense of policies and practices oriented toward digital sovereignty and the production of digital public goods, especially in the context of Brazil and other countries in the Global South. Higher education, historically conceived as a privileged space for critical and emancipatory

training, cannot submit to uncritical and mass adherence to processes of platformization, commodification, and privatization of educational practices without properly addressing the issues already discussed in this text. It is well known that, while universities focus on the critical analysis of the dynamics of digital colonization that affect basic education (Barbosa; Alves, 2023; Silva, 2022), paradoxically, space is being opened up for the dominance of big tech and edtech companies to establish themselves insidiously—though not always silently—within public higher education institutions. This is a contradiction that demands epistemological and political vigilance, lest we compromise the very social function of public universities as spaces of resistance, autonomous knowledge production, and defense of the public interest in the digital ecosystem.

In the quest for digital sovereignty and the production of public goods, it is also urgent to invest in the development of and collaboration on open-source platforms—such as Moodle or Jitsi Meet—combined with the promotion of the production and use of Open Educational Resources (OER). This approach allows for the strengthening of internal teams and the promotion of collaborative actions between universities and research institutes, as well as the customization and development of new features that meet the specific needs of the academic community, allowing for greater control, data security, and alignment with institutional pedagogical projects. For Mallmann (2023, p. 564), “promoting technological-pedagogical fluency with free software and education movements, practices, and Open Educational Resources (OER) is one of the most accurate recommendations.”

Final considerations

The platformization of higher education, far from representing merely a technological innovation or an advance in the modernization of pedagogical processes, is part of a broader context of reconfiguring the relationships between teaching, work, and capital. What we are seeing is the emergence of a business logic that transforms education into a product, individuals into data, and educational processes into performance metrics. The promise of personalization, so celebrated by hegemonic discourses, conceals a silent, algorithmic standardization that homogenizes practices, dilutes teaching autonomy, and weakens the dialogical and critical nature of the educational act. The dialectic of individuation, as discussed here, thus reveals itself as a constitutive contradiction: the more technological devices promise to adapt to the individual, the more they subsume them to normative, market-driven, and disciplinary structures.

Thus, it is vital to examine platformization processes in terms of their political, economic, and epistemic goals, as well as their functions. Education, as a historically situated social practice, cannot be reduced to the logic of efficiency and algorithmic control. On the contrary, it requires spaces for creation, autonomy, and critical reflection. To claim the leading role of teachers in the socio-technical network is, therefore, to resist the capture of capital and reaffirm the centrality of human formation in its fullness. As educators, researchers, and historical subjects, we are left with the ethical and political challenge of pushing the limits of technology, reappropriating it under the aegis of an emancipatory education project that does not submit to market imperatives but is guided by social justice, equity, and human dignity.

Referências

- BARBOSA, R. P.; ALVES, N. A Reforma do Ensino Médio e a Plataformização da Educação: expansão da privatização e padronização dos processos pedagógicos. *e-Curriculum*, São Paulo, v. 21, e61619, 2023. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.23925/1809-3876.2023v21e61619>.
- BARBROOK, R.; CAMERON, A. The californian ideology. *Mute*, Londres, v. 1, n. 3, p. 44-73, 1 set. 1995. Disponível em: <https://www.metamute.org/editorial/articles/californian-ideology>. Acesso em: 15 jul. 2025.
- CANDAU, V. M. F. Didática hoje: entre o “normal”, o híbrido e a reinvenção. *Perspectiva*, [S. l.], v. 40, n. 3, p. 1-14, 2022. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5007/2175-795X.2022.e85552>.
- CASTELLS, M. *A sociedade em rede: a era da informação: economia, sociedade e cultura*. Volume I. Trad. R. V. Majer e J. Simões. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 1999.
- CERVO, Amado Luiz; BERVIAN, Pedro Alcino; SILVA, Roberto da. *Metodologia científica*. 6. ed. São Paulo: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2007.
- COSTA, C. R.; OJEDA, C. M.; LOPES, R. P. Plataformização na Educação Superior Pública e seus efeitos no Brasil. In: *Colloquium Humanarum*, v. 22, n. 1, p. 1-18, e245047, 2025. Disponível em: <https://journal.unoeste.br/index.php/ch/article/view/5047>. Acesso em: 1 nov. 2025.
- DUCI, J. R.; GOMES, L. R. Inovação Pedagógica e Plataformização da Docência: apontamentos críticos. *Linhas Críticas*, v. 30, p. e52577-e52577, 2024. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26512/lc30202452577>.
- FEENBERG, A. O que é a filosofia da técnica? In: NEDER, R. (Org.). *A teoria crítica de Andrew Feenberg: racionalização democrática, poder e tecnologia*. Brasília: Observatório do Movimento pela Tecnologia Social na América Latina/CDS/UnB/CAPES, 2013. p. 51-65.
- FLICK, Uwe. *Introdução à pesquisa qualitativa*. Porto Alegre: Artmed, 2009.
- FOUCAULT, M. *Vigiar e punir: história da violência nas prisões*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1987.
- FREIRE, P. *À sombra desta mangueira*. São Paulo: Olho d'Água, 1995.

FREIRE, P. *Pedagogia da autonomia: saberes necessários à prática educativa*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 1996.

HARVEY, D. *Condição pós-moderna*. São Paulo: Loyola, 1994.

HEGGLER, J. M.; SZMOSKI, R. M.; MIQUELIN, A. F. As dualidades entre o uso da inteligência artificial na educação e os riscos de vieses algorítmicos. *Educação & Sociedade*, Campinas, v. 46, e289323, 2025. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/ES.289323>.

KENSKI, V. M. *Educação e tecnologias: o novo ritmo da informação*. 1. ed. Campinas, SP: Papirus, 2003.

LARANGEIRA, S. Fordismo e pós-fordismo. In: CATTANI, A. D. (Org.). *Trabalho e tecnologia: dicionário crítico*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1997. p. 89-94.

LATOUR, B. *Reagregando o social: uma introdução à teoria do Ator-Rede*. Salvador: Edufba, 2012.

LÉVY, P. *Cibercultura*. Trad. C. I. da Costa. São Paulo: Editora 34, 1999.

LOVELUCK, B. *Redes, liberdade e controle: uma genealogia política da internet*. Petrópolis: Editora Vozes, 2018.

MALLMANN, E. M.. A Vulgarização da Inovação nas Políticas Públicas e a Hegemonia Proprietária na Plataformização da Educação Pública. *Paradigma*, Maracay, v. 44, n. 5, p. 542-568, 2023. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37618/PARADIGMA.1011-2251.2023.p542-568.id1516>.

MASETTO, M. T. Mediação pedagógica e o uso da tecnologia. *Novas tecnologias e mediação pedagógica*. Campinas: Papirus, 2006.

MORAN, J. M.; MASETTO, M. T.; BEHRENS, M. A. *Novas tecnologias e mediação pedagógica*. Campinas, SP: Papirus, 2000.

MORAN, J. M. *A Educação que Desejamos: novos desafios e como chegar lá*. 2007.

NEMER, D. *Tecnologia do oprimido: desigualdade e o mundano digital nas favelas do Brasil*. Vitória: Milfontes, 2021.

OLIVEIRA, A. A.; SILVA, Y. F. O. Mediação pedagógica na aprendizagem invertida: uma revisão sistemática de um contexto pré-pandemia de Covid-19. *Práxis Educacional*, Vitória da Conquista, v. 19, n. 50, p. e11883, 2023. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22481/praxisedu.v19i50.11883>.

RODRIGUES, O. S.; RODRIGUES, K. S. A inteligência artificial na educação: os desafios do ChatGPT. *Texto Livre*, v. 16, p. e45997, 2023. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/1983-3652.2023.45997>.

SADIN, E. *La silicolonización del mundo: la irresistible expansión del liberalismo digital*. Trad. M. Martínez. Buenos Aires: Caja Negra Editora, 2023.

SANTAELLA, L. *Humanos hiper-híbridos: linguagens e cultura na segunda era da internet*. São Paulo: Paulus, 2021.

SILVA, P.; COUTO, E. S. Plataformização da Aprendizagem e o Protagonismo de Humanos e Não Humanos nas Práticas Pedagógicas. *Educação em Revista*, v. 40, p. e39146, 2024. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1590/0102-469839146>.

SILVA, P. A. P. *EdTech e a plataformização da educação*. 2022. 114 f. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Faculdade de Educação, Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, 2022. Disponível em: <http://www.bdt.d.uerj.br/handle/1/19281>. Acesso em: 1 ago. 2025.

VALENTE, J. C. L. *Tecnologia, informação e poder: das plataformas online aos monopólios digitais*. 2019. Tese (Doutorado em Sociologia) – Universidade de Brasília, Brasília, 2019.

VELOSO, B.; PARESCHI, C. Z.; OLIVEIRA, A. A. Reapropriação do protagonismo docente na cultura digital: matriz teórica para uma didática crítica. *Revista Multitexto*, v. 12, p. 120-129, 2024. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47247/2316.4484/12.1.11>.

VELOSO, B. Educação e tecnologias como comprometimento: proposições para pensar o estudo da técnica em âmbito educacional. *Sisyphus: Journal of Education*, Lisboa, v. 11, n. 3, p. 89-108, out. 2023. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25749/sis.29403>.

WEBER, M. *A ética protestante e o espírito do capitalismo*. São Paulo: Martin Claret, 2013.

ZARIFIAN, P. Engajamento subjetivo, disciplina e controle. *Novos Estudos Cebrap*, v. 64, São Paulo, 2002, p. 23-31. Disponível em: <https://cristianorodriguesdotcom.files.wordpress.com/2013/06/zarifian.pdf>. Acesso em: 04 ago. 2025.

ZUBOFF, S. *A Era do Capitalismo de Vigilância*. Trad. G. Schlesinger. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Intrínseca, 2021.