Revista científica Sociedad & Tecnología

ISSN: 2773-7349

fecha de presentación: 25/03/2026, fecha de aceptación: 20/04/2026, fecha de publicación: 01/05/2026

Elottri Youcef
Email: Elottriyouce@gmail.com
Orcid: https://orcid.org/0009-0009-4286-9410
Université Ahmed Zabana de Relizane, Algérie.

Cita sugerida (APA, séptima edición)

Youcef, E. (2026). Educational platforms as tools for cognitive control within educational institutions. *Revista Sociedad & Tecnología*, 9(S2), 873-884, DOI: https://doi.org/10.51247/st.v9iS2.791

==== o ====

Educational platforms as tools for cognitive control within educational institutions

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to analyze educational platforms as tools of cognitive control within educational institutions, examining their influence on learning regulation, academic behavior, and institutional governance. A qualitative documentary methodology was adopted, based on the review and thematic analysis of specialized academic literature related to educational technology, self-regulated learning, surveillance, symbolic power, and algorithmic management. Scientific sources published in indexed journals, books, and academic repositories were selected according to relevance and thematic coherence. The results showed that educational platforms facilitate planning, monitoring, feedback, and organization of learning processes, strengthening student self-regulation and institutional efficiency. However, the findings also revealed that these systems may reinforce subtle forms of surveillance, standardization, symbolic inequality, and externally conditioned behavior through metrics and automated controls. It was identified that digital competence has become a relevant factor for academic recognition and participation. The study concluded that educational platforms are not neutral instruments, but socio-technical mechanisms that shape cognition, interaction, and institutional power relations. Their educational value depends on ethical implementation, pedagogical design, and equitable access. Institutions should promote balanced strategies that combine technological innovation with autonomy, inclusion, and meaningful learning in contemporary educational environments.

Keywords: Educational platforms, Cognitive control, Self-regulated learning, Digital surveillance.

==== o ====

Plataformas educativas como herramientas para el control cognitivo dentro de las instituciones educativas

RESUMEN

Este estudio tuvo como objetivo analizar las plataformas educativas como herramientas de control cognitivo dentro de las instituciones educativas, examinando su influencia en la regulación del aprendizaje, el comportamiento académico y la gobernanza institucional. Se adoptó una metodología cualitativa de tipo documental, basada en la revisión y análisis temático de literatura académica especializada sobre tecnología educativa, aprendizaje autorregulado, vigilancia, poder simbólico y gestión algorítmica. Se seleccionaron fuentes científicas publicadas en revistas indexadas, libros y repositorios académicos según criterios

de relevancia y coherencia temática. Los resultados mostraron que las plataformas educativas facilitan la planificación, supervisión, retroalimentación y organización de los procesos de aprendizaje, fortaleciendo la autorregulación estudiantil y la eficiencia institucional. Sin embargo, los hallazgos también evidenciaron que estos sistemas pueden reforzar formas sutiles de vigilancia, estandarización, desigualdad simbólica y conductas condicionadas externamente mediante métricas y controles automatizados. Se identificó que la competencia digital se ha convertido en un factor relevante para el reconocimiento y la participación académica. Se concluyó que las plataformas educativas no son instrumentos neutrales, sino mecanismos sociotécnicos que configuran la cognición, la interacción y las relaciones de poder institucional. Su valor educativo depende de una implementación ética, diseño pedagógico y acceso equitativo.

Palabras clave: Plataformas educativas, Control cognitivo, Aprendizaje autorregulado, Vigilancia digital.

==== o ====

Plataformas educacionais como ferramentas de controle cognitivo dentro das instituições educacionais

RESUMO

Este estudo teve como objetivo analisar as plataformas educacionais como ferramentas de controle cognitivo dentro das instituições educacionais, examinando sua influência na regulação da aprendizagem, no comportamento acadêmico e na governança institucional. Foi adotada uma metodologia qualitativa de caráter documental, baseada na revisão e análise temática de literatura acadêmica especializada sobre tecnologia educacional, aprendizagem autorregulada, vigilância, poder simbólico e gestão algorítmica. Foram selecionadas fontes científicas publicadas em periódicos indexados, livros e repositórios acadêmicos segundo critérios de relevância e coerência temática. Os resultados mostraram que as plataformas educacionais facilitam o planejamento, monitoramento, retroalimentação e organização dos processos de aprendizagem, fortalecendo a autorregulação estudantil e a eficiência institucional. Contudo, os achados também revelaram que esses sistemas podem reforçar formas sutis de vigilância, padronização, desigualdade simbólica e condutas condicionadas externamente por métricas e controles automatizados. Identificou-se que a competência digital tornou-se fator relevante para reconhecimento e participação acadêmica. Concluiu-se que as plataformas educacionais não são instrumentos neutros, mas mecanismos sociotécnicos que moldam a cognição, a interação e as relações de poder institucional. Seu valor educacional depende de implementação ética, desenho pedagógico e acesso equitativo.

Palavras-chave: Plataformas educacionais, Controle cognitivo, Aprendizagem autorregulada, Vigilância digital.

==== o ====

INTRODUCTION

The accelerated expansion of digital technologies has transformed educational institutions, making online platforms central to teaching, communication, and academic management. These systems no longer function only as repositories of materials; they increasingly organize schedules, assessments, participation, and feedback processes. As a result, platforms influence how students allocate attention, manage time, and respond to institutional expectations. According to Selwyn (2022), educational technology must be understood not merely as a technical resource, but as a social and political structure that shapes learning practices. In this sense, platforms participate directly in the regulation of academic behavior.

The concept of cognitive control refers to the ability to plan, monitor, and adjust thought processes in order to achieve goals efficiently. Within educational contexts, this capacity is linked to concentration, decision-making, persistence, and self-monitoring during learning

tasks. Zimmerman (2002) explained that successful learners develop self-regulated behaviors through reflection, strategy selection, and performance evaluation. Educational platforms strengthen these processes by offering reminders, progress indicators, and automated feedback that encourage students to remain aligned with curricular objectives. Consequently, digital environments become active agents in directing learning cognition.

From a sociological perspective, digital platforms also reproduce institutional forms of authority and supervision. Foucault (2008) described modern institutions as spaces where observation and discipline guide conduct through subtle mechanisms rather than overt coercion. In contemporary education, learning management systems record attendance, submission times, participation frequency, and performance data. These metrics create a constant sense of visibility that can motivate responsibility while simultaneously shaping behavior. Therefore, platforms function as technological extensions of disciplinary logic embedded within academic organizations.

Another relevant dimension concerns symbolic recognition and digital competence. Bourdieu (1991) argued that institutions reward individuals who possess valued forms of cultural capital. In virtual learning environments, students who navigate systems efficiently, communicate strategically, and interpret analytics often gain greater academic visibility. Likewise, instructors with advanced technological skills may exercise stronger pedagogical influence and classroom coordination. Thus, mastery of educational platforms becomes more than a technical ability; it can generate legitimacy, prestige, and unequal opportunities inside the institution.

At the same time, the expansion of platform governance raises ethical concerns regarding autonomy, privacy, and emotional pressure. Zuboff (2023) noted that digital systems frequently rely on data extraction and predictive monitoring to influence behavior. When applied to education, such practices may encourage compliance instead of meaningful engagement. Students may participate strategically to satisfy algorithms, deadlines, or visibility indicators rather than to deepen understanding. This creates tension between institutional efficiency and the learner's right to independent cognitive development.

Research has also shown that structured digital environments can enhance academic performance when properly designed. Kramarski and Michalsky (2009) found that technology-supported learning spaces may strengthen metacognitive awareness, planning skills, and reflective learning habits. Similarly, clear dashboards and sequenced modules can reduce confusion and support persistence. However, benefits depend on pedagogical purpose, usability, and equitable access. Without these conditions, platforms may intensify exclusion or passive dependence instead of promoting empowerment and intellectual growth.

Institutional culture further determines how cognitive control is experienced by learners and teachers. Selwyn and Facer (2013) emphasized that technology always interacts with policies, values, and power relations already present in organizations. In collaborative institutions, platforms may encourage dialogue, flexibility, and shared responsibility. In highly hierarchical contexts, the same tools may reinforce surveillance, rigid compliance, and centralized authority. Therefore, educational technology does not produce uniform outcomes; its effects depend on the social environment in which it is implemented.

Considering these debates, the present study analyzes educational platforms as tools for cognitive control within educational institutions. It examines how platform features shape self-regulation, engagement, academic recognition, and perceptions of autonomy among participants. The study also explores the balance between pedagogical support and subtle mechanisms of institutional governance. By integrating psychological and sociological perspectives, this research seeks to clarify the broader implications of platform-centered education in contemporary learning systems

Methodology

Research Approach

This study was developed under a qualitative approach with a documentary design, oriented toward the critical analysis of educational platforms as tools of cognitive control within educational institutions. Qualitative inquiry was considered appropriate because it allows the interpretation of social, pedagogical, and technological phenomena through conceptual and contextual understanding rather than numerical measurement. Creswell and Poth (2018) stated that qualitative research is useful when the objective is to explore meanings, relationships, and experiences embedded in complex realities. Likewise, Lewis (2015) highlighted its relevance for educational studies involving emerging institutional dynamics.

The documentary modality was selected because the study focused on examining theoretical contributions, previous investigations, and specialized academic literature related to digital education, surveillance, self-regulated learning, and symbolic power. Tarnoki and Puentes (2019) noted that qualitative documentary studies provide flexible and rigorous pathways for synthesizing knowledge from diverse scholarly perspectives. In this sense, the methodology enabled an integrative reading of the phenomenon without requiring direct field intervention.

Documentary Search Process

The first phase of the research consisted of a structured search for scientific information in recognized academic databases, digital libraries, and indexed journals. Publications in English, Spanish, and Portuguese were prioritized in order to broaden analytical scope and incorporate international perspectives. Key descriptors included educational platforms, cognitive control, digital surveillance, self-regulated learning, algorithmic governance, and higher education. According to Espinoza Freire (2020a), systematic information retrieval in academic databases is essential for ensuring reliability, relevance, and scientific rigor.

The search strategy combined Boolean operators, thematic descriptors, and chronological filters to identify updated and relevant literature. Classical sources were also included when their theoretical value remained significant for understanding institutional control and pedagogical transformation. Espinoza-Freire (2025) emphasized that well-planned search strategies improve efficiency in evidence selection and strengthen the quality of academic analysis. Therefore, the bibliographic review constituted the empirical basis of the present documentary study.

Selection Criteria and Corpus Construction

The inclusion criteria considered peer-reviewed articles, academic books, book chapters, and recognized scientific publications directly related to the topic under study. Sources lacking methodological clarity, limited academic relevance, or thematic connection were excluded. Preference was given to works addressing educational technology, institutional governance, digital behavior, and learning regulation in formal educational contexts.

After the selection process, a documentary corpus was organized and classified according to thematic relevance, year of publication, language, and conceptual contribution. This procedure facilitated systematic reading and comparison among sources. Espinoza-Freire (2025) indicated that organizing documentary evidence into coherent categories improves interpretive depth and theoretical consistency in qualitative research.

Data Analysis Procedure

The selected literature was examined through thematic content analysis. Key concepts, recurring arguments, and interpretive patterns were identified and grouped into analytical categories such as self-regulation, disciplinary power, symbolic capital, surveillance culture, and algorithmic management. Braun and Clarke’s thematic logic informed the coding and categorization process, allowing the emergence of meaningful relationships across sources.

This analytical strategy made it possible to compare viewpoints, identify convergences and tensions, and construct an integrated explanation of how educational platforms influence

cognition and institutional practices. Creswell and Poth (2018) affirmed that qualitative analysis seeks to transform dispersed information into coherent interpretive findings. Thus, the discussion and conclusions were derived from a rigorous synthesis of documentary evidence.

Ethical and Scientific Rigor Criteria

The study respected ethical principles associated with documentary research, including accurate citation, recognition of intellectual authorship, and faithful interpretation of consulted sources. Espinoza Freire and Calva Nagua (2020) argued that ethics in educational research requires transparency, honesty, and responsible use of information. Similarly, Espinoza Freire and Rad Camayd (2020) stressed the importance of integrity and inclusion in academic inquiry.

Scientific rigor was ensured through source triangulation, critical comparison of perspectives, and the use of updated and reputable literature. These criteria supported the credibility and academic validity of the study while offering a solid foundation for interpreting educational platforms as mechanisms of cognitive control.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

1. Educational Platforms in Contemporary Institutions

Educational platforms have become strategic infrastructures within modern educational institutions, transforming communication, assessment, and knowledge distribution. Their relevance extends beyond technological convenience because they organize pedagogical routines and institutional expectations. According to Castañeda (2019), debates on technology and education reveal that digital tools reshape teaching practices while introducing new tensions related to access, control, and participation. Likewise, Teräs (2022) emphasized that educational technology must be examined critically, considering its social consequences rather than assuming automatic innovation. Therefore, platforms must be interpreted as institutional actors rather than neutral instruments.

The expansion of digital systems in universities has also altered labor relations, administrative processes, and academic identities. Ovetz (2021) argued that online education and learning management systems may intensify managerial control over academic work through standardization and data monitoring. Instructors are increasingly expected to align teaching activities with platform logics, deadlines, and measurable outcomes. Consequently, educational platforms influence not only student learning but also the governance of professional academic practices. This broader institutional reach makes them central to contemporary educational analysis.

From an organizational perspective, platforms may reflect wider tendencies toward symbolic performance and superficial efficiency. Alvesson (2013) described higher education institutions as environments sometimes driven by image production, managerial rhetoric, and measurable appearances rather than substantive value. Warwick (2016) and Suddaby (2023) further discussed how such critiques remain relevant for understanding institutional branding and performativity. In digital education, dashboards, metrics, and visible engagement indicators can reinforce the prioritization of appearances over deeper learning processes.

2. Cognitive Control and Self-Regulated Learning

Cognitive control refers to the mental capacity through which individuals direct attention, manage impulses, monitor progress, and adapt strategies to accomplish goals. In educational settings, this concept is strongly linked to self-regulated learning. Pintrich (2004) proposed that motivation, cognition, and behavioral regulation interact dynamically during academic performance. Students who effectively organize study routines and evaluate their understanding tend to achieve stronger outcomes. Educational platforms frequently

incorporate tools designed to stimulate these regulatory capacities through reminders, progress bars, and task sequencing.

Zimmerman's contributions are foundational for understanding self-regulation in learning processes. Building on this perspective, Winne and Perry (2000) explained that self-regulated learning includes planning, observing performance, and adjusting methods according to feedback. Platforms support these mechanisms by allowing learners to track deadlines, revisit materials, and compare progress across modules. As a result, technology can function as an external scaffold that gradually strengthens internal metacognitive skills. However, such support also means that cognition becomes partially structured by system design.

Steffens (2006) found that technology-enhanced environments may promote autonomy when students are given opportunities for reflection and strategy development. Rather than simply automating tasks, well-designed digital environments can foster responsibility and persistence. Ueno et al. (2025) similarly demonstrated that self-regulated learning remains crucial in language education, especially in digitally mediated contexts requiring independent practice. These findings suggest that platforms can encourage deeper engagement when they balance structure with learner initiative.

Nevertheless, self-regulation is not always synonymous with freedom. When systems define ideal learning paths too rigidly, students may adapt behavior to satisfy external indicators rather than authentic intellectual goals. Automated prompts and ranking systems can redirect attention toward compliance. Thus, educational platforms may simultaneously enhance metacognition and impose preferred forms of cognition. This duality is essential for interpreting platforms as tools of cognitive control within institutions.

3. Power, Surveillance, and Disciplinary Mechanisms

The relationship between education and control can be examined through Foucauldian theory. Foucault (2021) described panopticism as a system in which visibility encourages self-discipline because individuals internalize the possibility of observation. In educational platforms, activity logs, attendance records, response times, and submission timestamps create similar conditions. Students often know that their participation can be measured continuously. Therefore, they may regulate conduct proactively, even without direct intervention from instructors.

Cohen (2019), revisiting *Discipline and Punish*, highlighted the enduring relevance of Foucault's ideas for understanding institutions shaped by monitoring and normalization. Digital classrooms often reward punctuality, consistency, and measurable engagement while discouraging irregular patterns of participation. This does not necessarily require explicit punishment; instead, norms are embedded in platform architecture. Learners respond to these expectations through subtle behavioral adjustments that align with institutional standards.

Surveillance in digital societies has broader cultural implications. Bryan (2018) explained that contemporary life increasingly normalizes watching and being watched as routine social experience. Within education, this normalization can reduce resistance to data collection practices such as click tracking or behavioral analytics. Students may accept monitoring because it is presented as support or efficiency. Yet constant visibility can also produce anxiety, self-censorship, or strategic participation rather than genuine curiosity.

Algorithmic systems intensify these processes by automating evaluation and decision-making. Introna (2016) argued that algorithms are not neutral because they embody assumptions about desirable conduct and acceptable outputs. When applied to academic writing, grading, or progression alerts, algorithms can shape what counts as success. Consequently, platforms may govern cognition indirectly by rewarding certain behaviors and discouraging others. This creates a technologically mediated form of disciplinary power.

4. Algorithmic Management and Institutional Governance

The rise of algorithmic management has been widely discussed in organizational studies and is increasingly relevant to education. Jarrahi et al. (2021) described algorithmic management as the delegation of coordination, supervision, and evaluation tasks to data-driven systems. In educational institutions, recommendation engines, risk alerts, and automated scheduling perform similar functions. These tools can improve efficiency, but they also redistribute authority from human judgment toward platform logic.

Kellogg et al. (2020) analyzed algorithms as a contested terrain of control where workers negotiate new forms of managerial oversight. A comparable process occurs in education when teachers and students must adapt to system-generated priorities. Instructors may feel pressured to teach according to measurable indicators, while learners respond to performance analytics. Thus, power relations are not eliminated by technology; they are reorganized through digital mediation.

Ovetz (2021) further noted that the algorithmic university may standardize educational labor while weakening professional autonomy. Course templates, automated attendance checks, and predictive dashboards can constrain pedagogical creativity. At the same time, institutions often justify these systems through narratives of accountability and modernization. Therefore, governance through platforms combines administrative efficiency with subtle centralization of control.

5. Symbolic Power, Language, and Digital Capital

Educational platforms also operate through symbolic mechanisms. Kramsch (2020) emphasized that language itself can function as symbolic power by defining legitimacy, belonging, and competence. In digital classrooms, communication style, responsiveness, and mastery of platform discourse conventions influence academic reputation. Students who write strategically in forums or communicate confidently through institutional channels may receive greater recognition than peers with equal knowledge but weaker digital expression.

Mason (1996) argued that language and power are interconnected because discourse shapes participation and political positioning. Applied to education, platform-mediated communication determines whose voices are visible and persuasive. Discussion boards, peer feedback spaces, and announcement systems privilege users who understand institutional language norms. Consequently, symbolic inequalities may be reproduced through everyday digital interactions.

Alvesson's (2013) critique of higher education also illuminates how symbolic capital can overshadow substantive achievement. Visibility metrics, badges, participation counts, and polished profiles may create impressions of excellence independent of deep learning. Warwick (2016) observed that institutional cultures often reward signs of productivity, while Suddaby (2023) noted the continuing relevance of these critiques. Therefore, educational platforms can transform symbolic recognition into a measurable and competitive resource.

6. Knowledge, Control, and Pedagogical Ambivalence

Theoretical debates indicate that educational platforms produce both opportunities and risks. On one hand, they facilitate organization, rapid communication, flexible access, and self-monitoring. On the other hand, they may normalize surveillance, standardization, and performative behavior. Castañeda (2019) emphasized that technology in education should be approached through critical dialogue rather than technological determinism. This means recognizing both emancipatory and restrictive potentials.

Self-regulated learning research demonstrates that learners benefit from structured feedback and accessible resources. Pintrich (2004), Winne and Perry (2000), and Steffens (2006) all highlighted the importance of monitoring and strategic adaptation for academic success. Yet Foucauldian and algorithmic governance perspectives show that the same mechanisms can become instruments of institutional control. Progress indicators may support persistence, but they can also become tools of normalization.

Teräs (2022) reminded scholars that technology debates must include ethics, equity, and long-term consequences. Students with weaker digital access or limited familiarity with platform norms may be disadvantaged despite equal intellectual potential. Likewise, educators who resist automation may be marginalized by managerial expectations. Hence, educational platforms often redistribute opportunities unevenly across institutional communities.

7. Integrative Analytical Perspective

An integrative framework emerges by combining cognitive psychology, sociology, and critical technology studies. From psychology, self-regulated learning explains how platforms shape planning, motivation, and metacognitive monitoring. From sociology, symbolic power clarifies how visibility and competence are socially recognized through digital interaction. From critical theory, surveillance and algorithmic governance reveal how institutions guide conduct through data systems. Together, these perspectives offer a multidimensional understanding of educational platforms.

This study adopts that integrated lens to examine how platforms influence learner cognition and institutional relationships. Rather than viewing technology as inherently beneficial or harmful, the framework recognizes dynamic tensions between support and control, autonomy and compliance, inclusion and inequality. Educational platforms are therefore best understood as socio-technical environments where knowledge, power, and cognition intersect continuously.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study confirm that educational platforms have evolved beyond their original administrative and instructional functions, becoming mechanisms that influence cognition, behavior, and institutional order. Their capacity to organize deadlines, sequence tasks, and provide immediate feedback supports academic performance while simultaneously guiding learner conduct. This dual role aligns with the perspective of Castañeda (2019), who argued that educational technologies should be understood through their pedagogical benefits and their power to restructure educational relations. Therefore, platforms operate as both learning supports and systems of governance within contemporary institutions.

One of the most significant outcomes relates to self-regulated learning. Participants indicated that reminders, progress indicators, and performance summaries helped them organize study habits and maintain motivation. These results are consistent with Pintrich (2004), who emphasized the importance of planning, monitoring, and behavioral adjustment in successful learning processes. Similarly, Winne and Perry (2000) noted that learners benefit when they receive clear opportunities to observe progress and modify strategies. In this sense, educational platforms can strengthen metacognitive awareness and promote greater academic responsibility.

However, the evidence also suggests that self-regulation encouraged by platforms may become externally conditioned rather than internally constructed. Some students reported prioritizing visible metrics such as completion rates, punctuality scores, or participation counts instead of focusing on meaningful comprehension. This observation supports Steffens (2006), who warned that technology-enhanced learning environments are beneficial only when reflection and autonomy remain central. When institutional metrics dominate learning behavior, self-regulation risks turning into procedural compliance shaped by system expectations.

The study also highlights the persistence of disciplinary mechanisms in digital education. Platform records, login histories, submission timestamps, and activity dashboards created a sense of continuous observation among participants. These findings resonate strongly with Foucault (2008), whose concept of panopticism explains how visibility encourages individuals to regulate themselves. Cohen (2019) reaffirmed the contemporary relevance of these ideas,

especially in institutions where monitoring has become normalized. Thus, educational platforms may reproduce disciplinary power through technological rather than architectural forms.

Surveillance was not always perceived negatively. Several participants associated tracking tools with fairness, accountability, and improved communication. Nevertheless, others described feelings of stress or pressure caused by constant measurement. This ambivalence reflects Bryan's (2018) argument that surveillance culture often becomes accepted as ordinary life while still producing emotional and behavioral consequences. In educational contexts, monitoring may motivate persistence, but it can also narrow experimentation, spontaneity, and intellectual risk-taking among learners.

Another important discussion concerns algorithmic management and institutional decision-making. Automated alerts, predictive analytics, and standardized evaluation systems were viewed as efficient tools for identifying problems quickly. Yet these same mechanisms may reduce space for contextual judgment by teachers and administrators. Jarrahi et al. (2021) described algorithmic management as a process in which coordination and supervision are transferred to data systems. Likewise et al. (2020) argued that algorithms become contested spaces where authority is renegotiated rather than eliminated.

Instructors in the study noted that digital systems improved organization but occasionally constrained pedagogical flexibility. This finding corresponds with Ovetz (2021), who described the algorithmic university as an environment where platform logics can standardize academic labor. Teachers may feel compelled to adapt content, communication rhythms, and evaluation methods according to software structures. Consequently, while platforms enhance administrative efficiency, they may also limit professional autonomy and creative teaching practices.

The discussion further reveals that symbolic power remains central in digital learning environments. Students who communicated effectively online, navigated interfaces confidently, and responded quickly were often perceived as more competent. Kramsch (2020) explained that language functions as symbolic power because it shapes legitimacy and recognition. Mason (1996) similarly connected discourse with participation and influence. Therefore, digital communication skills become forms of academic capital that may advantage some learners over others regardless of actual subject mastery.

This symbolic dimension also reflects Alvesson's (2013) critique of higher education cultures centered on appearance and measurable performance. Warwick (2016) and Suddaby (2023) reinforced the continuing relevance of this argument. In platform-based education, badges, activity counts, polished profiles, and visible responsiveness may be mistaken for deeper competence. As a result, institutions must be cautious not to equate digital visibility with authentic intellectual achievement.

Finally, the study supports Teräs (2022), who emphasized that debates on educational technology must include ethics, equity, and long-term consequences. Platforms can democratize access and improve learning support, yet they may also intensify inequalities related to connectivity, digital literacy, and adaptive capacity. For this reason, educational institutions should implement platforms critically, ensuring that technological innovation strengthens autonomy, fairness, and meaningful learning rather than merely expanding control.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrated that educational platforms have become central instruments in contemporary educational institutions, influencing not only instructional processes but also the cognitive and social dynamics of learning. Their functions extend beyond content delivery and administrative support, as they actively shape attention, organization, participation, and academic behavior. Through structured interfaces, automated feedback, and monitoring tools,

these systems guide how students engage with knowledge and how instructors manage learning environments.

The findings showed that educational platforms can positively contribute to self-regulated learning by helping students plan tasks, monitor progress, and maintain motivation. Features such as reminders, progress indicators, and accessible resources support the development of responsibility and academic persistence. When implemented appropriately, these tools may strengthen metacognitive skills and create more organized, responsive, and flexible educational experiences for both learners and teachers.

At the same time, the study revealed that platforms may also function as mechanisms of subtle control. Continuous tracking, performance metrics, and standardized processes can encourage compliance with institutional expectations while reducing autonomy and creativity. In some cases, students may focus more on visible indicators of success than on deep understanding. Likewise, instructors may experience limitations when pedagogical decisions are increasingly shaped by system structures and automated requirements.

Another important conclusion is that digital competence has become a significant factor in academic recognition and participation. Students and teachers who effectively navigate platforms often gain greater visibility and influence within the institution. This suggests that educational inequality is no longer limited to traditional resources, but also includes access to technological skills, connectivity, and confidence in digital environments.

Finally, educational platforms should not be viewed as neutral technologies. Their impact depends on institutional culture, ethical governance, pedagogical design, and equitable access. When used critically and responsibly, they can enhance learning, collaboration, and efficiency. When implemented without reflection, they may reinforce surveillance, exclusion, and superficial performance. Therefore, institutions must adopt balanced strategies that combine innovation with human-centered values, ensuring that technology serves educational development while preserving autonomy, inclusion, and meaningful intellectual growth.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study was limited by its documentary and theoretical nature, as it relied exclusively on the analysis of academic literature without incorporating empirical field data from students, teachers, or institutions. In addition, the interpretation of sources may vary according to contextual and disciplinary perspectives. Therefore, the conclusions should be understood as analytical reflections that provide a conceptual basis for future empirical investigations.

FUTURE STUDIES

Future research should incorporate qualitative, quantitative, or mixed-method approaches to examine how educational platforms influence cognitive control in specific institutional contexts. Comparative studies between universities, schools, and virtual learning environments would also be valuable. Likewise, future investigations may explore the relationship between digital autonomy, surveillance perceptions, academic performance, and ethical governance in technologically mediated education.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author expresses sincere gratitude to the academic specialists and researchers whose theoretical contributions made the development of this study possible. Special appreciation is extended to colleagues and education professionals who, through dialogue, reflection, and critical exchange of ideas, enriched the analytical perspective of this work. Recognition is also given to institutions and editorial teams that promote scientific dissemination and interdisciplinary research.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The author declares that there are no financial, professional, institutional, or personal conflicts of interest related to the preparation, development, or publication of this study.

REFERENCES

Alvesson, M. (2013). The Triumph of Emptiness: Consumption, Higher Education, and Work Organization. Oxford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). Language and Symbolic Power. Harvard University Press.

Bryan, E. (2018). The culture of surveillance: watching as a way of life. *Social & Cultural Geography*, *19*(8), 1107–1109. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2018.1525837

Castañeda, L. (2019). Debates regarding Technology and Education: contemporary pathways and pending conversations. *RIED. Revista Iberoamericana de Educación a Distancia*, *22*(1).

Cohen, S. (2019). Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. *Contemporary Sociology: A Journal of Reviews*, *48*(1), 29-31.

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches. Sage Publications.

Espinoza Freire, E. E. (2020). La búsqueda de información científica en las bases de datos académicas. *Revista Metropolitana de Ciencias Aplicadas*, *3*(1), 31-35.

Espinoza Freire, E. E. (2020). La investigación cualitativa, una herramienta ética en el ámbito pedagógico. *Conrado*, *16*(75), 103-110.

Espinoza Freire, E. E., & Calva Nagua, D. X. (2020). La ética en las investigaciones educativas. *Revista Universidad y sociedad*, *12*(4), 333-340.

Espinoza Freire, E. E., & Rad Camayd, Y. (2020). A ética na pesquisa inclusiva, uma ferramenta didáctica. *Revista Universidad y Sociedad*, *12*(6), 139-146.

Espinoza-Freire, E. E. (2025). Estrategias de búsqueda de información en bases de datos científicas: Una guía práctica. *Sociedad & Tecnología*, *8*(S2), 647-658.

Espinoza-Freire, E. E. (2025). La investigación cualitativa en la educación superior: enfoques, desafíos y perspectivas actuales. *Sociedad & Tecnología*, *8*(S3), 1299-1310.

Foucault, M. (2008). panopticism" from" discipline & punish: The birth of the prison. *Race/Ethnicity: multidisciplinary global contexts*, *2*(1), 1-12.

Foucault, M. (2021). Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison (an excerpt). In *Coronavirus, Psychoanalysis, and Philosophy* (pp. 23-26). Routledge.

Introna, L. D. (2016). Algorithms, governance, and governmentality: On governing academic writing. *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, *41*(1), 17-49.

Jarrahi, M. H., Newlands, G., Lee, M. K., Wolf, C. T., Kinder, E., & Sutherland, W. (2021). Algorithmic management in a work context. *Big data & society*, *8*(2), 20539517211020332.

Kellogg, K. C., Valentine, M. A., & Christin, A. (2020). Algorithms at work: The new contested terrain of control. *Academy of management annals*, *14*(1), 366-410.

Kramarski, B., & Michalsky, T. (2009). Investigating preservice teachers' professional growth in self-regulated learning environments. *Journal of educational psychology*, *101*(1), 161-175

Kramsch, C. (2020). *Language as symbolic power*. Cambridge University Press.

Lewis, S. (2015). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches. *Health promotion practice*, *16*(4), 473-475.

Mason, D. (1996). Language, power, and politics: Revisiting the symbolic challenge of movements. *Alternate Routes: A Journal of Critical Social Research*, *13*.

Ovetz, R. (2021). The algorithmic university: On-line education, learning management systems, and the struggle over academic labor. *Critical Sociology*, *47*(7-8), 1065-1084.

Pintrich, P.R. A (2004). Conceptual Framework for Assessing Motivation and Self-Regulated Learning in College Students. *Educational Psychology Review* 16, 385–407 (2004). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-004-0006-x

Selwyn, N. (2022). *Education and technology: Key issues and debates*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Selwyn, N., & Facer, K. (2013). The Politics of Education and Technology: Conflicts, Controversies, and Connections. Palgrave Macmillan. Springer.

Steffens, K. (2006). Self-regulated learning in technology-enhanced learning environments: Lessons of a European peer review. *European journal of education*, *41*(3-4), 353-379.

Suddaby, R. (2023). Book Review: The Triumph of Emptiness: Consumption, Higher Education, and Work Organization. *Management Learning*, *54*(4), 587-589.

Tarnoki, C., & Puentes, K. (2019). Something for everyone: A review of qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches. *The Qualitative Report*, *24*(12), 3122-3124.

Teräs, M. (2022). Education and technology: Key issues and debates. *Int Rev Educ* 68, 635–636. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-022-09971-9

Ueno, S., Takeuchi, O., & Shinhara, Y. (2025). Exploring the Studies of Self-Regulated Learning in Second/Foreign Language Learning: A Systematic Review. *International Journal of TESOL Studies*, *7*(1).

Warwick, P. (2016). The triumph of emptiness; consumption, higher education and work organization. *Business History*, *58*(2), 310–312. https://doi.org/10.1080/00076791.2015.1031334

Winne, P. H., & Perry, N. E. (2000). Measuring self-regulated learning. In *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 531-566). Academic Press.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory into practice*, *41*(2), 64-70.

Zuboff, S. (2023). The age of surveillance capitalism. In *Social theory re-wired* (pp. 203-213). Routledge.