

Dirassat & Abhath
The Arabic Journal of Human
and Social Sciences



مجلة دراسات وأبحاث
المجلة العربية في العلوم الإنسانية
والاجتماعية

EISSN: 2253-0363
ISSN : 1112-9751

**Virtual Education and the Engineering of Social Roles in the University: A
Sociological Approach to the Mechanisms of Techno-Authority**

التعليم الافتراضي وهندسة الأدوار الاجتماعية في الجامعة: مقاربة سوسيولوجية
في آليات السلطة التقنية

Dr. Zougäi Mounia

Lecturer A, University of Adrar, Algeria

زوقاي مونية

د. أستاذة محاضرة "أ"، جامعة ادرار، الجزائر

ayamouna47@gmail.com

تاريخ النشر: 2026/10/15

تاريخ القبول: 2026/09/01

تاريخ الاستلام: 2026/06/22

Abstract

This paper seeks to provide a critical sociological approach to the profound structural modifications that the university environment has undergone as a result of the forced transition toward the virtual education model. Through this conceptual and analytical framework, the study aims to deconstruct the operational mechanisms of "techno-authority" and track its direct repercussions on the nature of pedagogical interactions and the distribution of symbolic power centers within the academic institution.

The paper posits a foundational premise that digital media do not function merely as neutral channels for transmitting knowledge. Rather, they operate as social actors that re-engineer traditional academic roles. The "pedagogical algorithm" contributes to diminishing the professor's symbolic authority and establishing the hegemony of the technical medium. Consequently, this places both teacher and learner within a context of "digital alienation" and leads to the decline of human epistemic sovereignty in the face of the dominance of automation.

The paper further aims to envision an alternative outlook for a "humanistic pedagogical engineering" that embraces digital fluidity while preserving the integrity of critical consciousness and socio-cultural values. It concludes by offering a set of recommendations aimed at "humanizing digitalization" in a manner commensurate with the contemporary challenges of the university and its sustainable transformations.

Keywords: Virtual Education, Role Engineering, Techno-Authority, Pedagogical Algorithm, Academic Actor.

المخلص:

تسعى هذه المداخلة إلى تقديم مقارنة سوسيولوجية نقدية للتعديلات الهيكلية العميقة التي شهدتها المجال الجامعي جراء التحول القسري نحو نموذج التعليم الافتراضي. وتطمح الدراسة، عبر هذا الطرح الفكري والتحليلي، إلى تفكيك الآليات التشغيلية للسلطة التقنية، ورصد تداعياتها المباشرة على طبيعة التفاعلات التربوية وتوزيع مراكز القوة الرمزية داخل المؤسسة الأكاديمية.

تنطلق الورقة من فكرة أساسية مفادها أن الوسائط الرقمية لا تعمل كمجرد قنوات محايدة لنقل المعرفة، بل تتصرف كفواعل اجتماعية تُعيد "هندسة" الأدوار الأكاديمية التقليدية؛ حيث تُسهم "خوارزمية التعليم" في تقليص السلطة الرمزية للأستاذ وتكريس هيمنة الوسيط التقني، مما يضع المعلم والمتعلم في سياق "الاغتراب الرقمي" وتراجع السيادة المعرفية للعنصر البشري أمام سطوة الأتمتة.

وتستهدف المداخلة استشراف رؤية بديلة لـ "هندسة تربوية إنسانية" تتبنى السيولة الرقمية مع الحفاظ على سلامة الوعي النقدي والقيم السوسيو-ثقافية، وتخلص إلى تقديم جملة من التوصيات الهادفة إلى "أنسنة الرقمنة" بما يتناسب مع التحديات المعاصرة للجامعة وتحولاتها المستدامة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: التعليم الافتراضي، هندسة الأدوار، السلطة التقنية، خوارزمية التعليم، الفاعل الجامعي.

1. INTRODUCTION

The contemporary era is undergoing a major historical turning point that transcends mere technological advancement, positioning itself at the very core of an "existential transformation" of societal structures and institutional frameworks. With the emergence of the "Network Society," digitalization has evolved far beyond being just tools associated with human activities. Instead, it has generated an "all-encompassing environment" that has fundamentally altered the parameters of social existence. Within this environment, the university, as a "domain of knowledge production," has not remained isolated from these transformations. It now faces the necessity of transitioning from the model of the "solid university"—defined for decades by the stability of its roles, the hierarchy of its symbolic authority, and the constraints of its operations within the physical sphere—to the "liquid university." This shift, as articulated by Zygmunt Bauman, has led to the dissolution of traditional affiliations. Physical barriers and spatial boundaries are no longer guardians of pedagogical unity; they have been replaced by "digital flows" that disregard temporal or spatial constraints.

The entry of the university into the realm of "virtual education" was not merely a technical response to the imperatives of modernization or the mitigation of pandemic crises. Rather, it marked the beginning of a "silent revolution" in the structure of social roles. In traditional educational models, the pedagogical bond was built upon "physical presence" and the accompanying "academic charisma" that granted the teacher the authority of meaning and symbolic capital, as defined in the theories of Pierre Bourdieu. Within the virtual world, this human centricity has been replaced by what can be termed "technological authority." This authority is not embodied in the person of an official or administrator; rather, it resides in the "algorithm" itself, the platform design, access protocols, and automated evaluation mechanisms. It embodies an "invisible"

authority that exercises a form of soft control. Both teacher and learner are forced to "comply" with the logic of the machine to maintain the continuity of the educational process, raising profound sociological inquiries regarding the future of the "epistemic sovereignty" of the academic actor.

Turning to the specificities of "role engineering," it is evident that the contemporary university is engaged in a forced reconstruction of professional identities. The professor is no longer viewed as the master of the lecture hall, but is instead directed toward the role of a digital facilitator or a knowledge technician. This transformation is accompanied by an impactful conflict between their established scientific identity and the demands of digital speed and fluidity. Conversely, the learner (the student) emerges as an "autonomous digital actor," yet lives in a state of "digital alienation," where knowledge is commodified into information items to be rapidly consumed, and the "human warmth" that formed the essence of educational engagement is noticeably absent. This new engineering does not merely redistribute responsibilities; it also redistributes "power" within the academic field, threatening to transform the university from a bastion of intellectual emancipation into a domain of algorithmic modeling and standardization. This theoretical, analytical study comes to reveal what is left unsaid in the discourse of "uboyant digitalization," and to place its finger on the sociological wounds that virtual education inflicts upon the structure of social roles. We do not view digitalization as an adversary, but as a "sociological object" that requires critical deconstruction to understand the operational mechanisms of techno-authority and to devise an alternative pedagogical engineering that reclaims the human in the age of the machine, while ensuring the sustainability of the university's transformation without sacrificing critical consciousness or academic identity.

Based on this comprehensive examination of the phenomenon, the central inquiry of our study can be formulated as follows:

In what manner does the "techno-authority" inherent in virtual education systems facilitate the re-engineering of social roles within the university? What are the repercussions of this displacement on the epistemic sovereignty of human actors (the professor and the student) in the context of challenges associated with sustainable societal transformation?

First: The Conceptual Approach of the Study

1. The Concept of Virtual Education

Terminologically: Sociological viewpoints have varied in defining the essence of this concept according to the theoretical premises of each pioneer:

Definition of Manuel Castells: He views it as a network structure that eliminates the "space of places" in favor of the "space of flows," whereby education becomes an act that transcends institutional and physical boundaries.

Definition of Pierre Lévy: He focuses on "dematerialization," considering the virtual to be a mode of existence that liberates the pedagogical act from the constraints of geography.

Definition of Zygmunt Bauman: He regards it as a manifestation of "liquidity," wherein education loses its historical stability to transform into a momentary, consumerist flow of information.

The Researcher's Viewpoint: The researcher posits that virtual education constitutes a "re-engineering of academic time and space," imposing a mode of "symbolic" presence that tests the capacity of actors to communicate without physical mediation.

2. The Concept of Technological Authority (Techno-Authority)

Terminologically: This authority manifests as a regulatory force over the pedagogical act through the following conceptualizations:

Definition of Michel Foucault: He analyzes it as a "panoptic" mechanism that exercises

continuous digital surveillance over both professor and student via algorithms.

Definition of Jürgen Habermas: He views it as an "instrumental rationality" aimed at regulating the university lifeworld according to standards of efficiency and technical automation.

Definition of Jacques Ellul: He describes it as "technical autonomy," whereby technology imposes its own logic and compels the professor to comply with its methods.

The Researcher's Viewpoint: The researcher believes that techno-authority is a "silent authority" that gradually displaces human will, transforming the professor from a pedagogical decision-maker into an executor of software protocols.

3. The Concept of Social Roles Engineering

Terminologically: This concept refers to the reshaping of professional identity according to the following viewpoints:

1. Definition of Alain Touraine: He views it as a form of "social programming" that transforms actors into users who comply with a complex network system.

2. Definition of Pierre Bourdieu: He interprets it as a reconfiguration of the academic "habitus," whereby a new technical capital is imposed, altering the balance of power within the field.

3. Definition of Erving Goffman: He regards it as the "management of the digital front," wherein the actor is compelled to perform digital roles pre-defined by platform templates.

The Researcher's Viewpoint: The researcher concludes that role engineering is a "soft process of alienation" aimed at commodifying the academic act and standardizing the professor's performance to align with the benchmarks of "digital quality" rather than "epistemic quality."

Second: The Sociology of Techno-Authority and the Mechanisms of "Algorithmic Control"

The concept of techno-authority manifests within the virtual academic environment not merely as a neutral tool

aimed at facilitating the dissemination of knowledge, but rather as a precise, authoritarian framework that reinterprets the concept of "social control" in the academic sphere. We are transitioning from what is known as the "disciplinary society," characterized by optical surveillance, to a digital "society of control" that operates through the utilization of covert algorithms. Within the virtual educational landscape, the platform emerges as a pivotal entity that exercises an intensive surveillance (panopticism). Every action and behavior of both teachers and learners is rigorously documented, including access duration and the dynamics of real-time interactions. It can be asserted that this mechanism reshapes pedagogical endeavors from a "human interaction" rooted in autonomy and creativity into a "technical procedure" subject to quantitative evaluation. Power in this context is not exercised through overt commands, but through the design of interfaces, which impose pre-defined templates upon the teacher to transmit their expertise, culminating in what could be termed the "automation of academic thought." Consequently, the instructor is compelled to dilute their profound sociological insights to align with the swift and superficial nature of the technological medium.

At the core of this transformation lies the issue of the "diminishing symbolic authority" of the human actor. The teacher, who historically possessed the "charisma" to engage an audience and generate meaning, now confronts the learning algorithm, which has begun to divest them of their epistemic autonomy. Symbolic capital undergoes erosion when the machine assumes the primary and ultimate role for the student in validating information or evaluating performance. This shift engenders a form of "digital alienation." It can be illustrated that the instructor has migrated into the role of a "technician" or a "coordinator" of information flows regulated by prominent technology corporations, rather than remaining a free intellectual guiding the

educational process. A clear illustration of this phenomenon is observable in automated assessment systems (automated grading) and platforms designed to detect academic misconduct. Despite their technical advantages, these systems perpetuate the authority of the machine to render value judgments regarding human endeavors, thereby transforming the student from a curious seeker of knowledge into a mere pursuer of "algorithm satisfaction" to secure digital success.

Furthermore, this techno-authority is not content with merely regulating performance; it moves toward the "standardization of academic consciousness." Under the dominance of technical standards, "critique" disappears and "compliance" takes its place. It can be argued that the professor complies with the protocols of uploading, downloading, and timing, while the student complies with ready-made answer templates. This standardization, as posited by Neil Selwyn, kills the "sociological spirit" which is fundamentally based on questioning and accountability, transforming the university into a "digital factory" that produces a uniform, flattened academic identity. We are facing a real danger characterized by the "humanization of the machine" versus the "mechanization of the human," wherein we grant algorithms the capacity to direct our academic paths, while we lose our capacity for spontaneous human interaction, which used to constitute the core of "pedagogical justice" within the university campus (Selwyn, 2014, p. 92)

In conclusion, it can be emphasized that the danger associated with this shift does not reside in the use of technology itself, but in the acquiescence to its authoritarian logic. The instructor finds themselves in a state of "professional schizophrenia." They simultaneously strive for scientific depth while being constrained by the imperatives of velocity and technical standardization. This authority imposes a form of "soft symbolic violence" upon us. It leads us to believe that digitalization represents the only conceivable form of "modernity," while it functions, in its

essence, to perpetuate relations of dependency on the technological medium. It can be asserted that reclaiming epistemic sovereignty requires a refusal to view platforms as an "inevitable destiny," but rather as an "object of critique," thereby ensuring that the engineering of roles does not culminate in the "deconstruction of deeply rooted academic values."

Third: Re-Engineering Social Roles and Transformations of Academic Identity

The transition from the physical space of the lecture hall, with all its symbolic weight and live bodily interactions, to the expanse of the silent virtual space does not represent a mere change in the "medium" of knowledge transmission. Rather, it constitutes a sociological earthquake that re-engineers statuses and functions within the university system from their very roots. It can be argued in this regard that the professor is no longer that "central actor" who monopolizes the authority of knowledge and speech; instead, we are witnessing today a forced "dissolution" of their academic charisma in favor of new roles dictated by the nature of digital platforms. In this context, Alain Touraine, in his thesis on the "programmed society," posits that technical logic always seeks to transform social actors into mere functional elements within a massive production system, thereby causing them to lose sovereignty over their actions and their self-autonomy (Touraine, 1984, p. 96) .

In light of this vision, it can be illustrated that the experiences of the university professor under the auspices of "techno-authority" epitomize a process of "de-identification." The professor, historically viewed as the master of the lecture hall and the possessor of scientific charisma, has been forced to assume a role resembling a pedagogical executor to comply with the imperatives of the digital platform. It is observed with a sense of consternation that the metric of "professorship" is no longer built upon the depth of proposition or the capacity to pose provocative, critical inquiries. Instead, it is evaluated through the

instructor's compliance regarding uploads and the algorithms governing automated responses. This shift in role engineering effectively vacates the academic status of its symbolic significance. Consequently, the professor views the transition into becoming a mere "cog" within an unyielding technological apparatus. This phenomenon is what we describe in this study as "professional appropriation," which jeopardizes the essence of academic work, transforming it into a sterile technical vocation devoid of creativity and independence. The individual is stripped of pedagogical decision-making authority in favor of the authority of automated programming.

Upon further examination of the architecture underlying this new social engineering, it becomes evident that we are confronting a radical and unsettling shift in the concept of academic time and professional boundaries. In a virtual environment, the university professor is denied the privilege of private time dedicated to reflection and rigorous research; instead, their temporal and personal domains have been appropriated by the mandatory digital presence imposed by platforms and applications. In this context, empirical studies demonstrate that meaningful social interaction can only be cultivated through the rituals of presence and the capacity to manage mutual impressions within a physical spatial environment that facilitates the reading of body language and the interpretation of gestures. From this perspective, it can be asserted that role engineering in virtual education has culminated in what we term the "desertification of academic emotions." The screen has erected a cold, precisely constructed barrier between the teacher and their students, causing the educational process to lose its intrinsic spirit and transforming it into a mere exchange of data stripped of human essence. As researchers, we emphasize that the professor who previously possessed the capacity to alter the life trajectories of their students with a single

word or an encouraging glance inside the lecture hall has now been relegated to the position of a silent icon or a voice emanating from behind a microphone. This absence of physical presence as a communicative factor has generated a deep chasm that has transformed the university into a mere technical server distributing information, rather than forming an educational embrace that fosters personality development and cultivates critical consciousness. Within the context of our research, it is observed that the professor has ceased to be an "educator" and has instead become a "digital content manager." This professional mutation extinguishes pedagogical spontaneity and redefines the student from a seeker of knowledge into a digital consumer in pursuit of pre-packaged information tailored for rapid consumption, devoid of the requirements of analysis or critique.

Furthermore, a profound and complex transformation can be observed in the domain of evaluation and recognition authority. The newly engineered roles have stripped the professor of the intrinsic right to evaluate the student through "interactive observation" and emotional intelligence, thereby relocating them to the realm of "big data" and automated reports overseen by the platform. In this framework, and as the dominance of "mechanical rationality" within contemporary societies accelerates the colonization of the lifeworld through technical and bureaucratic systems—wherein human relations are distilled into calculations of efficiency and quantitative returns—it is remarkably clear to conclude that technical authority has established a "dictatorship of numbers" over both the professor and the university. We believe that academic evaluation has shifted its focus from "what do we teach?" to "how much have we produced digitally?" At present, the professor finds themselves compelled to pursue "performance indicators" monitored by the algorithm, which we consider a symbolic insult to academic thought and the integrity of scientific research itself. As scholars, we assert that this methodology centers on the

phenomenon of the "manufacturing of mediocrity," where the academic is forced to engage in redundant technical formalities, thereby neglecting the opportunity to deepen scientific discourse and cultivate critical methodologies. As researchers in the field of sociology, we posit that this transformation constitutes an integral part of the process of the commodification of knowledge. The university turns into a commercial entity that markets data and is devoid of a humanistic perspective. In this context, role engineering emerges as a mechanism that generates a compliant professor and a submissive student, which poses a significant threat to the autonomy of the university as an emancipatory arena for critique and informed citizenship amid the conditions of digital fluidity.

In light of the foregoing, we cannot overlook the profound transformation that has occurred within the framework of "academic emotion." Interactions inside the traditional academic environment were based on what can be termed "pedagogical alchemy," which encompasses the emotional bonds achieved through physical communication and the dynamics of an engaged audience. In this regard, genuine social interaction is anchored in the rituals of presence and the capacity to manage mutual perceptions among participants within a shared spatial domain.

Drawing upon Goffman's propositions, we assert that role engineering in the virtual context has sterilized this interaction, thereby draining it of its essential human core. The teacher has transitioned from an instructor possessing the charisma of direct influence to a silent icon hidden behind the screen. Within our investigation, we maintain that the absence of the body as a communicative agent has generated a form of "epistemic coldness." The student no longer views the teacher as a vital, living human role model to be emulated, but merely as an "information repository" to be accessed at will and dismissed with the simple click of a button.

We assert that this emotional detachment drains the educational process of

its intrinsic value and ethical dimensions, thereby converting it into a "sterile technical exchange" devoid of the spirit that fosters collective consciousness. Through our observations of the university environment, we note that the digital divide has generated a significant psychological barrier between the teacher and the students, leading the educational process to lose the spontaneity of discourse and the enthusiasm of social dialogue that previously flourished in lecture halls. The instructor, who formerly possessed the capacity to alter the life trajectories of their students with a single word or an encouraging glance, has become, in the contemporary era, merely a voice that students only encounter on their mobile devices. We emphasize that this embodies the pinnacle of "social alienation" within the university, where the producer of knowledge is separated from the human factor.

In another aspect of this transformation, we can observe the emergence of what might be termed the "dictatorship of quantitative benchmarks" at the expense of qualitative expertise, as the new engineering has replaced the "long-standing expertise of the professor" with dry "digital performance indicators." In this context, Jürgen Habermas points out that the tyranny of instrumental rationality inevitably leads to the erosion of the "lifeworld" and its replacement by technical-bureaucratic systems that seek regulation and control (Habermas, 1987)

In alignment with this Habermasian endeavor, we assert that the status of the instructor on virtual platforms is now measured by the speed of their technical response, the frequency of their file uploads, and their engagement with the control dashboard, rather than the depth of their scientific theses or their capacity to critique social phenomena. We maintain that this model is dedicated to the phenomenon of manufacturing academic absurdity. The teacher is forced to prioritize technical procedures and digital metrics dictated by algorithms at the expense of delving deeply into scientific material.

We consider this a direct threat to "epistemic quality," as technical compliance has emerged as the foundational criterion for success, casting a shadow over "scientific creativity." We can assert that this form of social control perpetuates the "programmed" professor, who is inclined to satisfy the digital platform rather than generate independent critical thought. Under this structure, the instructor loses autonomy over their academic time and becomes a merely secondary figure within a vast and unforgiving digital apparatus. Their scientific contributions are stifled and reduced to numerical values and percentages that do not accurately reflect the reality of the intellectual effort exerted.

What can be concluded at the end of this section is the emergence of a phenomenon termed the "algorithmic master"—an academic entity that has begun the process of self-programming and cognitive alignment to meet the requirements of the machine and the expectations of the platform. The professor inadvertently marginalizes complex and problematic issues that demand extensive philosophical discourse, replacing them instead with "digitally transferable" knowledge that can be easily transmitted. This systematic exclusion of complexity can be described as the pinnacle of contemporary appropriation, wherein technology defines the ceiling of permissible thought. As researchers, we emphasize that reclaiming the role of the professor requires a "pedagogical rebellion," signifying the necessity of posing difficult inquiries that the algorithm cannot process, thereby reviving human warmth within a virtual environment that aspires to be detached and strictly regulated.

Fourth: The Stakes of "Humanizing" Digitalization and Reclaiming Epistemic Sovereignty

The analytical paths we have pursued, anchored in the preceding sections, relentlessly compel us to confront the inevitability of investigating the horizons of "human sustainability" amidst the technological encroachment that jeopardizes

the essence of the academic actor. In this context, it can be asserted that the confrontation with techno-authority must not culminate in mere passive rejection, but must instead evolve into a form of "creative resistance" aimed at reclaiming the position of the actor. In this regard, we maintain that liberation from the hegemony of mechanical rationality inevitably passes through the restoration of free and transparent "communicative action," which empowers actors to reconstruct the "lifeworld" independently of the constraints imposed by technical and bureaucratic frameworks.

In light of this proposition, we assert that the endeavor to humanize digitalization entails transforming the educational platform from a mere repository for files into a forum for critical dialogue. For instance, from a pedagogical perspective, the professor should not settle for presenting a lecture on sociological theories as a silent file, but must accompany it with audio or visual commentary that raises contemporary issues linking theory to practice—such as urging students to analyze virtual relationships within Algerian society through the lens of Bauman's concepts. We emphasize that this represents the pinnacle of "humanization," moving the student from the role of a "passive receiver of the future" to that of an "analytical sociologist." It is certain here that the absence of this engagement relegates digital education to a mechanical process devoid of participation, thereby stifling the student's critical capacities and rendering them a mere "data collector" rather than a "creator of ideas." In this context, digital resistance entails deconstructing the model answer template and promoting analytical commentary that transcends automated algorithmic comprehension or evaluation.

This stake extends to encompass the reclamation of "epistemic sovereignty" through the reconstruction of the pedagogical contract. Within this framework, Zygmunt Bauman posits that the greatest challenge in "liquid modernity" is the preservation of durable human bonds in the face of the rapid

dissolution imposed by technology. (Bauman, 2005) .

Based on this perspective, we emphasize that humanizing digitalization requires students to evolve from digital consumers into active collaborators. To illustrate, we provide a practical educational example: implementing flipped virtual classrooms, where students prepare and present the topic digitally and engage in discussion with their peers under the guidance of the teacher. We believe that this model disrupts the traditional role structure (professor as sender/student as receiver) and reconfigures it into a human discussion forum that is technically facilitated. We note that "artificial intelligence" and platforms, regardless of their precision, cannot replace the pedagogical intuition of the professor who discerns a student's understanding of concepts through tonal nuances or digital commentary. Epistemic sovereignty means that the professor retains the role of a value guide; while technology provides "information," the professor imparts meaning and context—which we consider an existential challenge for the social sciences in an era characterized by "big data" devoid of an analytical soul.

This inquiry leads us to assert that resistance to digital role engineering embodies the struggle for academic freedom. As scholars, we maintain that the future of the academic institution hinges upon the faculty's capacity to maintain a critical distance from the digital medium. For instance, in practical application, the instructor refuses to compress student evaluation into multiple-choice questionnaires (MCQs) automatically administered by the platform, advocating instead for analytical essays and field reports that capture the individual student's personality and their capacity to articulate sociological insights. We posit that the commitment to "constructive writing" amidst the era of digital clicking constitutes an essential act of resistance because it protects intellectual discourse from reductive stereotypes and destructive oversimplification. The subsequent challenge

is sovereignty. Specifically, we must not allow automated systems to dictate what should be taught and how evaluation should occur. Instead, the academic human experience, with its inherent complexity and emotional richness, must remain the supreme benchmark for establishing an authentic knowledge society, far removed from the constraints imposed by algorithms that seek to transform the university campus into a "digital marketplace" for credentials and empty data.

Conclusion

This sociological study of the "engineering of social roles under techno-authority" has revealed a series of observations that transcend the simplistic technical boundaries of hybrid or virtual education, delving deep into the profound dimensions of "academic identity" and its current transformations. Drawing upon the analytical frameworks presented, we can assert that the contemporary university is undergoing a challenging phase regarding pedagogical work, wherein the traditional values of "charismatic presence" must contend with the established principles of "digital efficiency." In this context, Pierre Bourdieu posits that the university institution functions as a site for the reproduction of cultural and symbolic capital, and that any shift in the communicative tools within this field entails a recalibration of power dynamics and symbolic authority among the participants.

In light of this Bourdieusian conclusion, we maintain in this study that our central finding is that digitalization transcends mere technical facilitation, emerging instead as an instrument for "disenchanting" the inherent magic of the educational process. The teacher has transitioned from being the pillar of knowledge to a platform employee. For instance, from a pedagogical standpoint, we note the diminishing appreciation associated with the "virtual lecture" compared to the "in-person lecture." The instructor experiences a loss of the authority of oversight, which previously calibrated the rhythm of the

lecture hall and rendered learning a sacred ritual. We emphasize that this decline is not merely technical; rather, it signals a rupture in the university's social contract. Students increasingly tend to consume information as a transient commodity rather than internalizing it as an epistemic asset that transforms their perception of reality. We conclude that the new engineering of roles has generated a form of the "alienated professor" who operates within a framework that fails to recognize the specificities of their discipline (particularly in the social sciences), forced to adhere to rigid technical models that do not accommodate the adaptive capacity of sociological thought.

In response to these specific findings, and to confront the challenges of humanizing digitalization that we have examined, we propose a set of strategic recommendations considered essential for reclaiming epistemic sovereignty:

1) Transitioning from "Technical Digitalization" to "Sociological Digitalization"

We advocate for the reconfiguration of educational platforms (such as Moodle) to better align with the specificities of the social sciences. For instance, interaction must not be confined to file-upload functions; instead, virtual laboratories for social critique should be integrated, enabling students to engage in collective analyses of social phenomena through digital brainstorming methodologies under the direct supervision of the instructor, thereby overcoming the technical impasse.

2) Enhancing the "Value-Oriented Formation" of Professors and Students

This training must not be restricted to merely instructing on platform usage; rather, it must encompass the sociology of digital communication alongside the ethics of virtual presence. It is posited that instructors require new charismatic tools enabling them to exercise their symbolic presence from behind the screen, manifested in the employment of digital storytelling methodologies when delivering lectures, thereby capturing the

attention of students immersed in an era characterized by "distraction."

3) Revising Evaluation and Recognition Systems

It is recommended to avoid the tyranny of numerical metrics that reduce the professor's contributions to the mere quantification of hours, and to adopt instead benchmarks of intellectual quality. For example, within the educational environment, a greater emphasis should be placed on evaluating critical engagement and the generation of authentic knowledge among students, rather than standardized assessments that foster rote memorization and regurgitation, with the ultimate goal of fostering critical consciousness over a programmatic mentality.

4) Safeguarding the "Interstitial Spaces" of Human Interaction

We call for the integration of intensive face-to-face interactions within the hybrid educational model, thereby ensuring that digitalization does not function as a complete replacement but rather as a complementary element. We are convinced that humanizing digitalization necessitates preserving the lecture hall as a site for intellectual discourse that cannot be substituted by any algorithm, regardless of its complexity.

In conclusion, we maintain that the true challenge does not reside in the accelerated digital flow, but in the profound human impact. The university must endure as the final bastion of intellectual freedom, provided that the professor retains the role of the "master of the ship" of knowledge, rather than being a mere passenger on a high-speed technological transit. We call for a "social renaissance" that reinstates human

considerations in an era driven by the machine, positioning digitalization as an instrument for empowerment rather than a tool of appropriation, thereby ensuring that the social sciences continue to serve as a compass guiding our societies toward the horizons of emancipation and consciousness.

References

Books

1. Bauman, Z. (2005), *Liquid Life*, Polity Press, United Kingdom (Cambridge).
2. Bourdieu, P. (1990), *The Logic of Practice*, Stanford University Press, United States (Stanford).
3. Castells, M. (2010), *The Rise of the Network Society*, Wiley-Blackwell, United Kingdom (Oxford).
4. Ellul, J. (1964), *The Technological Society*, Alfred A. Knopf, United States (New York).
5. Foucault, M. (1977), *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, Vintage Books, United States (New York).
6. Goffman, E. (1959), *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, Doubleday, United States (New York).
7. Habermas, J. (1987), *The Theory of Communicative Action: Lifeworld and System*, Beacon Press, United States (Boston).
8. Lévy, P. (1998), *Becoming Virtual: Reality in the Digital Age*, Plenum Press, United States (New York).
9. Selwyn, N. (2014), *The Digital University: Power, Pedagogy, and the Politics of IT*, Routledge, United Kingdom (London).
10. Touraine, A. (1984), *Le Retour de l'acteur*, Fayard, France (Paris).