

A Shifting Capital of Religious Education in the Digitalization Era

Halim Wiryadinata

Universitas Kristen Indonesia

Email: halimwiryadinata@gmail.com

Abstract

This study shows how the shifting capital of education aligns with the economic spirit in the digitalization era. The ideology of education, which supports the transformation of human resources to a better and fair world, has been shifted to the economic path due to economic and cultural triggers. The economic element shapes educational institutions' alignment in the labor market. The latter is to make the shifting capital of education move faster towards the economic demand due to the entrance of modernization culture in the form of digitalization technology. Furthermore, the development of religious education also gets the impact of digitalization era, but it still humanizes the humanity aspect as the novelty of this research. The sociological method is to be conducted to analyze and evaluate beyond the shifting capital of education. Critical thinking in the sociological method through Weberian rationality and bureaucracy is used to probe some possible answers to see the shifting capital of education. The result of this research is that the shifting capital of education toward economic and educational capitalism still upholds the humanizing humanity to work in the workforce field. The conclusion reaches that the shifting capital of education emphasizes the access of human resources to engage in the market during the digitalization era through the rationality of educational institutions.

Keywords: a shifting capital; capital of education; digitalization era; sociology of religion

Abstrak

Penelitian ini menunjukkan bagaimana pergeseran kapital pendidikan sejalan dengan semangat ekonomi di era digitalisasi. Ideologi pendidikan yang mendukung transformasi sumber daya manusia menuju dunia yang lebih baik dan adil telah bergeser ke jalur ekonomi yang dipicu oleh faktor ekonomi dan budaya. Unsur ekonomi membentuk penyelarasan lembaga pendidikan di pasar tenaga kerja, dan unsur budaya memicu mempercepat pergeseran modal pendidikan menuju tuntutan ekonomi ketika masuknya budaya modernisasi yaitu teknologi digitalisasi. Oleh karena itu, pendidikan agama juga terdampak dari era teknologi, tetapi masih mengutamakan nilai-nilai kemanusiaan sebagai kebaharuan penelitian ini. Metode sosiologis akan dilakukan untuk menganalisis dan mengevaluasi pergeseran kapital pendidikan. Pemikiran kritis dalam metode sosiologis melalui rasionalitas dan birokrasi Weberian digunakan untuk menggali beberapa kemungkinan jawaban untuk melihat pergeseran modal pendidikan. Hasil dari penelitian ini adalah pergeseran modal pendidikan menuju ekonomi dan kapitalisme pendidikan tetap menjunjung tinggi humanisasi manusia untuk bekerja di lapangan kerja. Kesimpulan penelitian ini yaitu pergeseran modal pendidikan menekankan akses sumber daya manusia untuk terlibat dalam pasar selama era digitalisasi melalui rasionalitas lembaga pendidikan.

Kata Kunci: era digitalisasi; kapital pendidikan; pergeseran kapital; sosiologi agama

Article History:

Received: 06 Juli 2023

Accepted: 27 Desember 2023

Published: 31 Desember 2023



Introduction

Education aims to make social change by transforming the community into a more just world. Education places itself as an institution for every individual to prepare themselves to face these social changes (Martono, 2016). The digitalization era puts pressure on education to respond as a means of social change to the reality and conditions of society with technological developments. Social change in the community is distorted in overhauling a just education system so that education is a tool to legitimize the existing social structure. The shift in educational values toward capitalism is a paradigm shift (Kuwar, 2021). This shift was triggered by two major components in people's lives: the economy and culture. The economy has played a major role in shifting the value of education by growing dualism inequality between rich and poor (Huynh et al., 2020). Economics demands education to lead to partiality to meet soft industrialization skills. This shift is supported by a strong modernization culture in technological developments, so society's culture shifts to digitalization as the main concentration of community growth (Kayed et al., 2022). Because of these two major components, a shift in the value of education cannot be avoided, so education becomes a commodity and is consumed by society. This shift makes a capital change in the value of education and human resources in the digitalization era.

The role of the economy provides a large space for education to produce a workforce that is in line with industrial needs. Human resources development through education allows human resources to gain capital from and in work (Kichuk et al., 2021). The economy influences educational institutions to change systems to prepare a ready workforce in the field. It places the economy's role in creating workers' jobs through the education sector (Rowe, 2019). Therefore, the education curriculum is created according to the workforce's needs, employment, and the labor market. Educational institutions teach human resources following a hidden curriculum to benefit parties and owners of capital by developing soft skills. The noble goals and ideals of the value of education experience changes and shifts that provide economic benefits for owners of capital (Novikov, 2021). The meaning of education that creates a just world through educational institutions and curricula by humanizing humans through the educational process does not materialize as it should. Education has changed to the realm of the economy with all efforts and resources to achieve benefits for institutions (Ershova et al., 2019). These shifts shape a more specific division of labor within the labor market and fields. This division of labor determines the level of capital and determines educational institutions to shift to areas that suit the needs of the workforce and the market (Kharchenko et al., 2020). The economy significantly influences workforce paradigm formation through educational institutions and changes the initial meaning of being an economic man.

Cultural elements move educational values more quickly towards economic and human values through the modernization movement. Modernization shapes modern humans to depend on the power of technology to drive changes in educational values (Lysova et al., 2020). The culture of modernization through the industrial revolution kicked out educational ideological values with propaganda that put forward economic values and rationalization. The growth of capitalism is a symbol of cultural modernization in today's society and places the concept of bureaucracy as a unit in educational institutions (Klees, 2019). The development of the material economy marks capitalism and bureaucracy through the opening of knowledge in the form of technology (Klees, 2020). This thinking makes education a tool to reach layers of society with higher levels of education. Therefore, modernization widens the gap between human beings themselves. Modernization creates alienation through the presence of technology so that humans are far from the reality of their lives (Schneider & Makszin, 2014). This culture encourages education to invest capital in

creating information technology for global education. Shifts in educational values cannot be avoided by the growing paradigm shift in modern humans who depend on the power of technology and digitalization (Tight, 2021) (Tight, 2021).

The two triggers above shift the value of education towards the economics of education to meet the needs of the industry and workforce in the field. The shift in educational values has been examined through the growth of education that uses the power of technology during the COVID-19 pandemic as educational technology (Alam et al., 2022; Asilkan & Domnori, 2020; Mbhiza, 2021). The COVID-19 pandemic provides an open space for strengthening technological power and shifting the value of education as educational technology in meeting workforce needs. The concept of economics and financial power places education's value more on capitalist education. Moreover, it prioritizes supply and demand in education (Hutagalung et al., 2022; Kharchenko et al., 2020; Salmon, 2020). Capitalist education provides an opportunity to shift the value of education that is dependent on getting a quality education with the power of cost from an economic perspective (Datzberger, 2022; Lysova et al., 2020; Nurdin, 2021). The research on shifting educational values in the digital era above has yet to answer how this shift in education is in Weber's perspective to analyze whether a shifting capital of educational value still humanizes humans in the digitalization era. Therefore, this study aims to find answers to the shift in educational values that still prioritize humanizing humans in social change. This goal leads to a research question: How is the change in capital from education as social change in the digitalization era? Does the value of educational change still humanize humans as social actors in the field?

Research Method

The sociological approach is the choice to answer the research question above because this approach prioritizes critical thinking and analysis of human problems as social beings and the interactions within them. The sociological approach places social phenomena as social realities to uncover the veil from the shift in educational values towards the economics of education (Okutan, 2020; Thomson, 2020). This approach has full access to journals, articles, books, scientific papers, and newspapers for analysis and criticism. Therefore, critical analysis of reality provides space for Weber's theory of bureaucracy towards education so that the noble values and ideals of education are confined in an iron cage of Weber (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). The sociological approach through Weber's understanding provides a space for this research to be divided into four parts in reaching answers to research questions. First, education is capital for humans to sustain life. This capital builds humans as modern humans who are educated in dealing with social change, especially in the digitalization era. Second, education is a human handle as social capital that is strived to place oneself in a social environment. This social capital determines humans to stand in the capitalist economy and fight for societal justice. Third, educational values are experiencing a shift in the world of digitalization due to the role of technology in shaping modern humans who are educated to fight for and escape from the concept of slavery. Education has metamorphosed into the strength of the establishment of capitalist economic education. Fourth, the shift in educational capital through Weber's understanding of bureaucracy transforms educated modern humans into technologically modern humans. This change creates capitalist educational values with propaganda to humanize humans through social change. Then, this research closes with conclusions.

Result and Discussion

Education and Capital: The Formation of Capital in the Value of Education in the Social Arena

Formal education creates and places knowledge as capital for modern humans (Efimova et al., 2022). Knowledge is a value individuals possess in developing themselves and placing themselves in a community (Hanushek & Woessmann, 2020). Education and knowledge are a complete package for modern humans to be accepted into the workforce. This knowledge becomes an individual transaction to obtain economic value in their work to exchange this value (Yavuz, 2021). This understanding shows that education has nature as an effort to pass on values in living life as a change in fate and civilization. Therefore, education positions itself as capital for modern humans in developing and saving themselves in social change. Education provides specific skills for individuals and promotes them through these skills (Schweisfurth et al., 2018). These skills create selling points following the abilities obtained through certificates. Parson proved that education has a particular value for the individual to enter the community with that particular skill (Parson, 1964). It confirms that education as a particular value creates a transition from knowledge value to economic value in organizations in the form of capital.

Formal education certificates provide space for modern humans as a sign of human existence in the form of capital (Apfeld et al., 2022). Education places the transformative value of human existence on equality in the community as the existence of modern humans. The role of education through educational institutions transmits the values of life and culture to objects of social change to make individuals involved in societal change (Asad et al., 2022). Education has to transform the value of equality towards individuals as agents of change through graduation certificates. This concept forms an understanding that educational institutions are places of legitimacy for modern humans to gain capital in changing society. Therefore, human existence in society is a sign of human existence through its educational capital. Educational capital is a system created in such a way as to produce graduation certificates as capital for individuals in society (McDonnell, 2021). This understanding provides space for educational institutions to prepare curricula to obtain certificates. The curriculum prepares areas of expertise for individuals with different qualifications to place capital in society through formal education certificates (Brooks et al., 2021). Gathering individuals with the same certificate forms a group of modern humans competing for socio-economic value.

Education has a value of social solidarity over the homogeneity of formal certificates in one group as a form of capital. Education creates modern humans with one skill through a curriculum set by educational institutions (Smythe et al., 2021). When elements of similarity gather in a community, social solidarity capital is formed for each individual. The formation of social solidarity creates bargain capital for individuals to join the community of social solidarity with the capital they have (Zambeta, 2014). This concept was built by Durkheim when he explained that collective orders on common norms and values and consensus coordinate individual activities in a social system based on a personal commitment to collective standards and rules (Durkheim, 2014). This commitment influences small communities' movement to complex communities in the arena of symbols and institutions. This move creates cohesion or solidarity as capital in natural sentiment, not alienation. Therefore, social solidarity, interpreted as capital, has equality that relies on the unconditional trust of organic solidarity in the community through the symbol of educational capital. It places Fukuyama emphasizes that symbols and natural sentiment form social capital as the ability to work together for common purposes through formal education certificates (Fukuyama, 1995).

In social solidarity, education creates a working system that moves through its function in social reproduction as capital in society (Cardinal et al., 2020). Education moves with its working system to create privatization and the free market. The formation of privatization owned by the non-profit sector determines education by the free market. The role of the government is only as a regulator. However, the public gives the management of resources full rights (Mesa-Manosalva, 2022). The free-market phenomenon directs education according to market needs and the market's will to reproduce human resources. Therefore, education is a culture driven through the work system by transforming knowledge and expertise as capital for individuals (Abbas & Razak, 2011). The education system's performance places the development of innovation and technology as capital-added value for graduates with formal diploma certificates to enter the workforce. With the inclusion of technological innovation, education becomes a movement system in social reproduction and makes capital values that must be taken to get a place in the social arena. Finally, educational capital within the scope of the artistic work system makes this capital move towards the growth of social reproduction values for the community.

Education in the Vortex of the Digital Innovation Wave

The presence of digital innovation in the world of education makes the education system undergo a process of adjustment (Teräs et al., 2020). This adjustment process forces education to follow the growing stream of digitalization technology so that the education system also experiences a shift. The shift in education caused by a wave of digital innovation affects the goals of the education system, the integration of the education system, and the process of adaptation of the education system (Haleem et al., 2022). The influence of technological innovation has shifted the role of education as a tool to realize modern humans with a just world, making humans who have the power of digital technology survive under pressure. Digital technology innovation has helped make the education process easier and more flexible in dealing with social changes in the era of globalization (See et al., 2022). The growth of digital technology provides space for education as a step forward and recognizes graduates as modern humans through the education process. Therefore, the integration and adaptation of education through the growth of digital technology changes the goals of education that are close to the growth of digital technology. The shift in educational goals leads to collaboration between education and the economy, shaping education toward the struggle for economic values (Nordlöf et al., 2022). This shift created the education system to reposition in bringing human resources in line with the needs of digital technology growth (Frick, 2020). Adjusting educational goals to the growth of digital technology provides opportunities for social change in society.

Digital technology has caused adjustments in educational goals and created social inequality in social change. The role of digital technology in education makes education a factor of production to produce prosperous human resources through technology (Ambarova & Zborovsky, 2021). Digital technology for education is a tool for achieving prosperity and is contested by work users. When not all humans can master digital technology through formal education, they experience a big disadvantage in competing in the job market (Singgih et al., 2022). Education in the digital technology era is exploitation between groups that master digital technology and other groups that do not master digital technology in education. Therefore, the group that controls education in the digital technology era is a minority group that can control some people through the production of formal education (Krahn et al., 2018). These conditions form social inequality in society so that the goals of education experience a shift in meeting the needs of employers. Marxists see that education in the digital technology era as a factor of production to produce social inequality through expertise and skills through digital technology for groups who master

digital technology capabilities. This social inequality makes human resources who do not have formal certificates become factors of production without changing their existence without education (Boossabong, 2018). This understanding makes the purpose of education shift from its original purpose.

The entry of digital technology into education shackles educational activities and human resources because every activity and movement will be adjusted to the technical performance system (Kuzmenko, 2018). Education and human resources require creativity, time, imagination, and effort to achieve a weekly learning plan. Education in the vortex of digital technology growth experiences fetters so that technology must act quickly and understand human resources' lack of creativity and imagination (Lodge et al., 2022). Technology has no tolerance for educational activities and movements and human resources for creativity and imagination. The presence of digital technology places education to interpret educational goals for human resources in the digital technology era. The shackles of education result in workforce reproduction with limitations on space for movement in the digital technology era (Arafat et al., 2022). Dependence on technology places education as a tool to produce labor entanglement according to employment. Therefore, the purpose of education has experienced a shift in the digital technology era by placing the shackles of educational activities and human resources in digital technology work systems.

Digital technology, through the concept of education, widens inequality and social gaps in reduplicating human resources. Human resources that can compete through owned capital occupy a prestigious institution and receive complete facilities (Demaine, 2003). Educational institutions are used as a social selection mechanism to carry out the process of placing human resources to attend education. Bourdieu argues that social selection places education as a tool to widen social inequality because only individuals from the upper classes can enjoy education based on digital technology (Bourdieu, 1971). Digital technology helps education to reduplicate society as an entire selection process or mechanism for certain individuals. Therefore, the role of technology in education forms a reduplication formula for human resources with digital-based competencies as capital in employment (Kurt, 2015). Digital technology creates a different curriculum for the sake of increasing education costs as the reason. This mechanism provides space for education as a means of unequal social reproduction for human resources (Verhoeven et al., 2022).

Bureaucracy and Rationality in the Heart of Max Weber

The shift in the meaning and purpose of education in society by educational institutions places the concept of modern human rationality in managing education management (Koster & de Regt, 2020). Rationality plays an important role in modern humans deciding the direction of educational policy to meet employment needs. Education and employment needs are a unified package to educate human resources according to market needs (Morelock, 2021). The market becomes an arena that determines the meaning and purpose of education to form a curriculum adapted to market needs. Therefore, individual rationalization refers to the value orientation of market needs for labor prepared by educational institutions (King et al., 2018). These understanding forms educational institutions as instruments in building human resources following the times. Technological growth in the digital era helps the concept of individual rationalization to achieve the goals of modern human life (Nnebedum, 2019). The concept of rationality influences the human mindset in achieving life goals through educational design curricula. The rationality of Weber is the human mind utilizing the individual's own interests to achieve life goals (Weber, 2019).

The concept of rationality places education as a system of social selection to get a place in educational institutions. Shifts in the meaning and purpose of education bring

individual rationality to compete with other individuals in the arena of employment (Menezes & de Castro Crusoe, 2022). This shift in the meaning and purpose of education results in social inequality through educational status selection instruments. Level of education, certificate grades, cumulative achievement index, and special skills make individuals experience a selection process to get jobs (Njoki, 2021). Educational institutions also play a big role in selecting human resources to gain capital in the world of education when registering. Therefore, individual rationality places the concept of instrumental rationality in educational institutions as a selection tool in assisting jobs to find workers (Wæraas, 2007). Instrument rationality also places the power of technology in education to achieve the goals of education itself. Technology is instrumental for educational institutions in making final decisions in the current educational process. Alignment with employment makes the institution, meaning, and purpose of education an instrumental rationality of education. This thinking places education in a bureaucratic space.

The development of education in the digital technology era puts forward bureaucratic mechanisms to regulate education governance and human behavior (Lumby, 2019). Bureaucracy is a working system that gives authority to exercise power through established regulations. Max Weber understood bureaucracy as the result of human rationality applied to institutions to facilitate public services. This bureaucratic concept prioritizes technical efficiency in making decisions as human rationalization in institutions and the ideal type for exercising power. Education as a system and institution requires an ideal type in building the educational function itself (Robinson, 2015). This understanding provides space that bureaucracy is based on the division of labor based on one's ability, not age or family factors. Therefore, the concept of bureaucracy in educational institutions provides a gap in social inequality for human resources who cannot occupy positions using academic degrees (Ainur Rofiq, 2019). The placement of human resources based on ability and intelligence, especially in the era of digital technology, encourages technology to achieve the bureaucracy's goals (Ikramatoun et al., 2021). Bureaucracy in the era of digital technology creates a systematic work system to link individual interests and the functions of educational organizations,

Education in the concept of bureaucracy leads to the shackles of the creative abilities of educators and education itself in the concept of the iron cage. The iron cage concept results from bureaucratic rationality wrapped in rationality arguments, but bureaucratic rationality curbs the freedom of educators and education (Skipper, 2018). Education is carried out with a system that has been standardized, and the curriculum has been determined without regard to the concept of educator creativity. This phenomenon indicates the shackles of education in a rigid system (Mangset & Asdal, 2019). The rigidity of the education system is the iron cage for the world of education and educators in the rational concept of bureaucracy. The restraints of education and educators in developing the ability to innovate in teaching and assessment create space for a shift in the purpose and meaning of education (Xie et al., 2022). Therefore, Weber's iron cage concept signifies a shift in the definition and value of education toward fulfilling jobs by creating a workforce that fits market needs. This rational bureaucracy facilitates a shift in the value of education under the pretext of harmony between employment and labor in the concept of education (Jessop, 2018). The shackles of educators and education in an education system are rules made in such a way for the benefit of the employment industry.

A Shifting Capital: Is the educational shifting still humanizing humanity in the Digitalisation era?

The presence of digitalization technology in the heart of education creates a shifting space for the meaning and the aim of education in the modern technological age (Ritzer et al., 2018). The modern technological age provides an opportunity to interact with local culture through education, forming delocalization and localization. The role of culture is to transform all aspects of life through education, so the role of culture and education places the process of delocalizing local culture (Terjesen, 2022). The entry of digital technology places foreign culture into local culture and creates localization in this new culture. Education that prioritizes foreign languages in the education curriculum, the use of international books, and the adoption of foreign education systems make the process of delocalization and localization strong in educational shifts (Serpa & Sá, 2022). Education and digital technology allow modern humans to communicate across countries and globalize students to advance human values. This modernization culture concept provides space for Weber to see rationality actively shifting educational capital to the digital technology era. The role of digital technology through the concept of rationality prioritizes common sense to follow developments and growth in culture. Shifts in the meaning and purpose of education through digital technology create unlimited space in advancing education to transform science and culture (Gann, 2017). Therefore, the presence of digital technology shifts the meaning and purpose of education to place human resources as technological human capital in dealing with social change.

The impact of cultural delocalization and localization in the education system is the integration of economic and educational aspects. The growth of the digitalization of technology is a concrete manifestation of the crystallization of education and the economy. The era of digitalization places the economy as an indicator of the progress of education itself (Carstensen & Emmenegger, 2023). Education now prioritizes customer satisfaction as a user interest in the learning process. Customer satisfaction is an indicator of creating a meeting between scholarly output and employment according to the needs of the labor market (Novikov, 2021). Therefore, the current education system is oriented towards market interests to satisfy educational institution stakeholders. Employment fulfillment through educational graduates creates indicators of growth and prosperity in the national economic sector. The shift in the value of educational capital provides an opportunity to strengthen the quality of the education and training system for human resources to be accepted into employment. This shift opened a space for bureaucratic concepts to guide education toward the market and economic fulfillment in the labor corridor (Aji, 2020). The job market influences and determines the direction, development, meaning, and goals of education in the digital technology era in saving human resources. Education opens space as a process of open competition in the free market to fulfill the market economy by opening new study programs.

The shift in the direction and development of education gave rise to the concept of educational capitalization, which is oriented toward educational liberalization (Buckingham, 2020). Education has a mission to transform society's knowledge, norms, and values into the curriculum and add local content to understand the character of local culture. The presence of digitalization of technology changes local content and local cultural identity, which is uninformed into one global, worldwide culture (Miller & Liu, 2021). The unifying local culture into a global culture involves the liberalization of education so that education creates social value by forming an instant lifestyle. Instant behavior and attitudes allow students to act negatively, such as cheating and plagiarism. This educational liberalization adds to the driving force of the concept of educational capitalization, which is integrated between education and the economy (Kleibert et al., 2021). This liberalization process for Weber is

part of a rational society and a sign of the development of rationality in modern society. Therefore, education's direction and development are biased toward an orientation toward the economy after studying (Mathier, 2023). Education emphasizes teaching according to a packaged curriculum to obtain a certificate of evidence to gain legitimacy for individuals to play their role in the available labor market. The capitalization and liberalization of education that emphasizes the economy provides opportunities for human resources to develop and grow according to their wishes in pursuing a career and the economy (Hay, 2020). Capitalization and liberalization of education through the formation of a curriculum contribute greatly to supporting the success of educational goals in the digital era of technology.

Shifting education in the era of digital technology is a dynamic process and has value in humanizing humans for Weberian. The values, meaning, and goals of education are a dynamic process in dealing with social change and eras to save human resources (Peercy et al., 2022). Education is a process of transforming knowledge, values, and norms of society to support human resources so that they can survive in changing eras. Digital technology in education shifts the direction and development of education itself and places education in a technological context (Roux & Becker, 2016). Markets and jobs demand changes in direction, policies, and development of human resources in order to be able to compete with global forces. Education provides space for the development of human resources to meet the necessities of life and place oneself in Weberian social stratification in society. Education oriented towards economic value is a natural shift in meeting the needs of the field and the labor market. Therefore, education places modern humans with digital technology insights into the absorption of productive human resources in employment (Carter Andrews et al., 2019). The shift in education's meaning, goals, and values still has the value of humanizing humans to equip modern humans to work for life. The shift in the value of education for Weber still places education in the corridors of a bureaucracy based on the ability of human resources in the digital technology era.

Implication

The digitalization era has affected all aspects of life through the shifting capital of education. The economic oriented becomes the capital of education and moves toward academic capitalism. The shifting capital of education is unavoidable due to the digitalization era affecting the labor market. The labor market influences education through its value. The impact of it is to drive human resources towards humanizing humanity through the alignment of the labor market. Therefore, religious education cannot avoid the shifting of capital of education, but it still humanizes the value of humanity through the educational system in the heart of educational capitalism.

Conclusion

The values and goals of education have shifted in the face of digital technology-based education. Education is a dynamic learning process that follows the culture and currents of modernization in the digital technology era. The shifting value of education still humanizes humanity's value in the digitalization era. It is unavoidable to change because education looks for the space of economic capitalism. Therefore, the shift in educational values and goals still emphasizes human resources as the corridor of modern human rationality. Religious education and the economy quicken each other and are dependable on one another.

References

- Abbas, M., & Razak, A. (2011). *Globalization and its Impact on Education and Culture*. 1(1), 59–69. <https://www.mendeley.com/catalogue/db537b83-4923-3d2e-b134-b8b31233858f/>
- Ainur Rofiq. (2019). Birokrasi, Perilaku, dan Budaya Organisasi dalam Pendidikan Islam. *Dirasah : Jurnal Studi Ilmu Dan Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 2(2), 98–116. <https://doi.org/10.29062/DIRASAH.V2I2.63>
- Aji, M. Q. W. (2020). Bureaucratic Reform: A Case Study in Secretariat General of the Ministry of Education and Culture. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Administrasi Publik*, 9(2), 203. <https://doi.org/10.26858/JIAP.V9I2.10799>
- Alam, M., Al-Mamun, M., Pramanik, M. N. H., Jahan, I., Khan, M. R., Dishy, T. T., Akter, S. H., Jothi, Y. M., Shanta, T. A., & Hossain, M. J. (2022). Paradigm shifting of education system during COVID-19 pandemic: A qualitative study on education components. *Heliyon*, 8(12), 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e11927>
- Ambarova, P. A., & Zborovsky, G. E. (2021). Imitations in higher education as a social problem. *Vysshee Obrazovanie v Rossii*, 30(5), 88–106. <https://doi.org/10.31992/0869-3617-2021-30-5-88-106>
- Apfeld, B., Coman, E., Gerring, J., & Jessee, S. (2022). Education and Social Capital. *Journal of Experimental Political Science*, 9(2), 162–188. <https://doi.org/10.1017/XPS.2021.6>
- Arafat, M. Y., Khan, A. M., Ansari, M. S., & Saleem, I. (2022). What drives internationalization of new ventures? Evidence from India. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 11(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/S13731-022-00225-4>
- Asad, A., Hidayati, S., & Fridiyanto, F. (2022). Education and Human Resources: Retaining Future Human Resources' Behaviours to Nature Through Environmental Education. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, 22(2), 128–141. <https://doi.org/10.33423/JHETP.V22I2.5043>
- Asilkan, O., & Domnori, E. (2020). Roadmap of shifting to online education during COVID-19. *New Trends and Issues Proceedings on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 7(3), 192–197. <https://doi.org/10.18844/PROSOC.V7I3.5252>
- Boossabong, P. (2018). Neoliberalizing higher education in the Global South: lessons learned from policy impacts on educational commercialization in Thailand. *Critical Policy Studies*, 12(1), 110–115. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19460171.2017.1403341>
- Bourdieu, P. (1971). System of Education and System of Thought. In M. F. D. Young (Ed.), *Knowledge and Control: New Directions in Sociology of Education*. Callier-Macmillan.
- Brooks, C., McIntyre, J., & Mutton, T. (2021). Teacher education policy making during the pandemic: shifting values underpinning change in England? *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2021.1997984>
- Buckingham, D. (2020). Epilogue: Rethinking digital literacy: Media education in the age of digital capitalism. *Digital Education Review*, 37, 230–239. <https://doi.org/10.1344/DER.2020.37.230-239>
- Cardinal, T., Lambert, L., & Lamouche, S. (2020). Living the Good Life: A Conversation about Well-being, Education, and Culture. *Paideusis*, 22(2), 8–22. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1071455AR>
- Carstensen, M. B., & Emmenegger, P. (2023). Education as social policy: New tensions in maturing knowledge economies. *Social Policy and Administration*, 57(2), 109–121. <https://doi.org/10.1111/SPOL.12888>
- Carter Andrews, D. J., Brown, T., Castillo, B. M., Jackson, D., & Vellanki, V. (2019). Beyond damage-centered teacher education: Humanizing pedagogy for teacher educators and preservice teachers. *Teachers College Record*, 121(6). <https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811912100605>

- Datzberger, S. (2022). Lost in transition? Modernization, formal education and violence in Karamoja. *World Development*, 158, 1–11.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2022.106013>
- Demaine, J. (2003). Social reproduction and education policy. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 13(2), 125–140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09620210300200107>
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organisational Fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147–160.
- Durkheim, E. (2014). *The Division of Labor in Society* (S. Lukes (ed.); 1st ed.). Free Press.
- Efimova, L. A., Efimov, O. E., Firsova, E. A., Firsov, S. S., & Efimova, M. O. (2022). Education as the Basis for Developing Human Capital. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, 22(4), 178–184. <https://doi.org/10.33423/JHETP.V22I4.5177>
- Ershova, I., Belyaeva, O., & Obukhova, A. (2019). Investment in human capital education under the digital economy. *Economic Annals-XXI*, 180(11–12), 69–77.
<https://doi.org/10.21003/EA.V180-08>
- Frick, T. W. (2020). Education Systems and Technology in 1990, 2020, and Beyond. *TechTrends*, 64(5), 693–703. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S11528-020-00527-Y>
- Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust: The Social Virtues and The Creation of Prosperity*. The Free Press.
- Gann, P. (2017). An Explication and Application of Max Weber's Theoretical Construct of Verstehen. *Journal of Social Work Values & Ethics*, 14(2), 30–34.
https://jswve.org/download/fall_2017_vol._14_no._2/30-Max-Webers-Verstehen-2017-14-2.pdf
- Haleem, A., Javaid, M., Qadri, M. A., & Suman, R. (2022). Understanding the role of digital technologies in education: A review. *Sustainable Operations and Computers*, 3, 275–285.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.susoc.2022.05.004>
- Hanushek, E. A., & Woessmann, L. (2020). Education, knowledge capital, and economic growth. *The Economics of Education: A Comprehensive Overview*, 171–182.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-815391-8.00014-8>
- Hay, C. (2020). Does capitalism (still) come in varieties? *Review of International Political Economy*, 27(2), 302–319. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09692290.2019.1633382>
- Hutagalung, S., Wiryadinata, H., Suwanto, ;, Alvyn, A. ;, & Hendriks, C. (2022). Revisiting Religious Education: The Shifting Curve of Short-Run Aggregate Supply of Human Resource in Educational Capitalism. *DUNAMIS: Jurnal Teologi Dan Pendidikan Kristiani*, 7(1), 429–440. <https://doi.org/10.30648/DUN.V7I1.734>
- Huynh, V. D. B., Nguyen, P. T., Nguyen, Q. L. H. T. T., & Vu, N. B. (2020). E-learning evolution and development from the perspectives of technology, education, and economy. *Research in World Economy*, 11(1), 11–19.
<https://doi.org/10.5430/RWE.V11N1P11>
- Ikramatoun, S., Amin, K., Darwin, D., & Halik, H. (2021). Iron Cage Birokrasi Pendidikan: Suatu Analisis Sosiologis. *Jurnal Sosiologi Pendidikan Humanis*, 6(1), undefined-undefined. <https://doi.org/10.17977/UM021V6I1P18-29>
- Jessop, B. (2018). On academic capitalism. *Critical Policy Studies*, 12(1), 104–109.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/19460171.2017.1403342>
- Kayed, H., Al-Madadha, A., & Abualbasal, A. (2022). The Effect of Entrepreneurial Education and Culture on Entrepreneurial Intention. *Organizacija*, 55(1), 18–34.
<https://doi.org/10.2478/ORGA-2022-0002>
- Kharchenko, L., Levchenko, L., Levkulych, V., & Khanas, U. (2020). Education and Human Capital Development: From Stagnation to Recession in the Ukrainian Economy. *Naukovyi Visnyk Natsionalnoho Hirnychoho Universytetu*, 2020(4), 140–145.
<https://doi.org/10.33271/NVNGU/2020-4/140>

- Kichuk, Y., Kunchenko-Kharchenko, V., Hrushchynska, N., Zhukova, Y., & Yarish, O. (2021). Intellectual capital of institutions of higher education in the knowledge economy. *Journal of Optimization in Industrial Engineering*, 14(1), 183–190. <https://doi.org/10.22094/JOIE.2020.677844>
- King, V., Roed, J., & Wilson, L. (2018). It's very different here: practice-based academic staff induction and retention. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 40(5), 470–484. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2018.1496516>
- Klees, S. J. (2019). Capitalism and global education reform. In *An International Handbook of Educational Reform* (pp. 11–26). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119082316.ch1>
- Klees, S. J. (2020). Beyond neoliberalism: Reflections on capitalism and education. *Policy Futures in Education*, 18(1), 9–29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1478210317715814>
- Kleibert, J. M., Bobée, A., Rottlieb, T., & Schulze, M. (2021). Transnational education zones: Towards an urban political economy of 'education cities.' *Urban Studies*, 58(14), 2845–2862. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098020962418>
- Koster, E., & de Regt, H. W. (2020). Science and Values in Undergraduate Education. *Science and Education*, 29(1), 123–143. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S11191-019-00093-7>
- Krahn, H. J., Chow, A., Galambos, N. L., & Johnson, M. D. (2018). Enlightenment or status defence? Education and social problem concerns from adolescence to midlife. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 39(7), 942–960. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425692.2018.1429893>
- Kurt, I. (2015). Education and Social Reproduction in Schools. *European Journal of Social Sciences Education and Research*, 5(1), 223. <https://doi.org/10.26417/EJSER.V5I1.P223-226>
- Kuwar, P. R. (2021). Impact of Education on Economy. *Triyuga Academic Journal*, 46–51. <https://doi.org/10.3126/TAJ.V2I1.45620>
- Kuzmenko, G. N. (2018). Influence of postindustrial society technologies on modern education. *Journal of Social Sciences Research*, 2018(Special Issue 3), 168–172. <https://doi.org/10.32861/JSSR.SPI3.168.172>
- Lodge, J. M., Thompson, K., & Corrin, L. (2022). The concerning persistence of weird ideas about learning and educational technology and their influence on the future directions of higher education. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 38(3). <https://doi.org/10.14742/AJET.8226>
- Lumby, J. (2019). Distributed Leadership and bureaucracy. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 47(1), 5–19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143217711190>
- Lysova, E. A., Bratukhina, E. A., Sozinova, A. A., & Matushkina, Y. N. (2020). DIGITAL MODERNIZATION OF THE REGION'S EDUCATIONAL MARKET AND ITS INFLUENCE ON QUALITY OF EDUCATION. *International Journal for Quality Research*, 14(1), 253–270. <https://doi.org/10.24874/IJQR14.01-16>
- Mangset, M., & Asdal, K. (2019). Bureaucratic power in note-writing: authoritative expertise within the state. *British Journal of Sociology*, 70(2), 569–588. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12356>
- Martono, N. (2016). Sosiologi Perubahan Sosial. In *Perubahan Sosial Budaya* (4th ed.).
- Mathier, M. (2023). Postdigital disconnects: The discursive formation of technology in education. *Postdigital Disconnects: The Discursive Formation of Technology in Education*, 1–234. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003284963>
- Mbhiza, H. W. (2021). Shifting Paradigms: Rethinking Education During and Post-COVID-19 Pandemic. *Research in Social Sciences and Technology*, 6(2), 279–289. <https://doi.org/10.46303/RESSAT.2021.31>
- McDonnell, J. (2021). How do you promote 'British Values' when values education is your profession? Policy enactment of FBV amongst teachers of Religious Education,

- Citizenship Education and Personal, Social and Health Education in England. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 51(3), 377–394.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2020.1844149>
- Menezes, E., & de Castro Crusoé, N. M. (2022). Elements of Max Weber's comprehensive sociology: categorical application for research in education*. *Educacao e Pesquisa*, 48, undefined-undefined. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1678-4634202248239168ENG>
- Mesa-Manosalva, E. G. (2022). Education for the Culture of Peace in the Context of Los Pastos, Colombia. *Revista Electronica Educare*, 26(3), undefined-undefined.
<https://doi.org/10.15359/REE.26-3.3>
- Miller, R., & Liu, K. (2021). After the Virus: Disaster Capitalism, Digital Inequity, and Transformative Education for the Future of Schooling. *Education and Urban Society*.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/00131245211065419>
- Morelock, J. (2021). Age Norms and the Spirit of Capitalism. *Innovation in Aging*, 5(Supplement_1), 601–601. <https://doi.org/10.1093/GERONI/IGAB046.2306>
- Njoki, H. (2021). Influence of Technology Type on Development of Instructional Materials for Distance Education. *Journal of Online and Distance Learning*, 1(1), 60–74.
<https://doi.org/10.47941/jodl.638>
- Nnebedum, C. (2019). The Value of Integrating 21st Century Skills into the Enterprise of Teaching Sociology. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 8(1), 37–44.
<https://doi.org/10.2478/AJIS-2019-0003>
- Nordlöf, C., Norström, P., Höst, G., & Hallström, J. (2022). Towards a three-part heuristic framework for technology education. *International Journal of Technology and Design Education*, 32(3), 1583–1604. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10798-021-09664-8>
- Novikov, V. V. (2021). Digitalization of Economy and Education: Path to Business Leadership and National Security. *Business Ethics and Leadership*, 5(2), 147–155.
[https://doi.org/10.21272/bel.5\(2\).147-155.2021](https://doi.org/10.21272/bel.5(2).147-155.2021)
- Nurdin, A. (2021). Modernization of Islamic Higher Education in Indonesia at A Glance: Barriers and Opportunities. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 8(3), 288–296. <https://doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v8i3.2490>
- Okutan, B. B. (2020). Tricks of Methods in Sociology of Religion: A Schemetical Attempt. *Cumhuriyet İlahiyat Dergisi*, 24(2), 911–931. <https://doi.org/10.18505/cuid.784076>
- Parson, T. (1964). *The Social System* (2nd ed.). Free Press.
- Peercy, M. M., Tigert, J., Fredricks, D., Kidwell, T., Feagin, K., Hall, W., Himmel, J., & DeStefano Lawyer, M. (2022). From humanizing principles to humanizing practices: Exploring core practices as a bridge to enacting humanizing pedagogy with multilingual students. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 113.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TATE.2022.103653>
- Ritzer, G., Jandrić, P., & Hayes, S. (2018). The velvet cage of educational con(pro)sumption. *Open Review of Educational Research*, 5(1), 113–129.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/23265507.2018.1546124>
- Robinson, S. (2015). Decentralisation, managerialism and accountability: professional loss in an Australian education bureaucracy. *Journal of Education Policy*, 30(4), 468–482.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2015.1025241>
- Roux, C., & Becker, A. (2016). Humanising higher education in South Africa through dialogue as praxis. *Educational Research for Social Change*, 5(1), 131–143.
<https://doi.org/10.17159/2221-4070/2016/V5I1A8>
- Rowe, E. (2019). Capitalism without capital: the intangible economy of education reform. *Discourse*, 40(2), 271–279. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2019.1569883>
- Salmon, J. (2020). Financing Higher Education through Equity, Not Debt: The Case for Income Share Agreements. *Journal of School Choice*, 14(3), 371–394.

- <https://doi.org/10.1080/15582159.2020.1769447>
- Schneider, C. Q., & Makszin, K. (2014). Forms of welfare capitalism and education-based participatory inequality. *Socio-Economic Review*, 12(2), 437–462.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/ser/mwu010>
- Schweisfurth, M., Davies, L., Symaco, L. P., & Valiente, O. (2018). Higher education, bridging capital, and developmental leadership in the Philippines: Learning to be a crossover reformer. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 59, 1–8.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2017.09.001>
- See, B. H., Gorard, S., Lu, B., Dong, L., & Siddiqui, N. (2022). Is technology always helpful?: A critical review of the impact on learning outcomes of education technology in supporting formative assessment in schools. *Research Papers in Education*, 37(6), 1064–1096. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2021.1907778>
- Serpa, S., & Sá, M. J. (2022). Trust in Higher Education Management and Organizational Culture. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 12(1), 8–13.
<https://doi.org/10.36941/jesr-2022-0002>
- Singgih, D. S., Suyanto, B., & Ariadi, S. (2022). Higher education capitalism in Indonesia as a social problem: A case study in the digital age. *Jurnal Sosiologi Dialektika*, 17(1), undefined-undefined. <https://doi.org/10.20473/JSD.V17I1.2022.13-24>
- Skipper, R. B. (2018). Education and bureaucracy. *International Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 32(1), 57–76. <https://doi.org/10.5840/IJAP2018828101>
- Smythe, S., Wilbur, A., & Hunter, E. (2021). Inventive pedagogies and social solidarity: The work of community-based adult educators during COVID-19 in British Columbia, Canada. *International Review of Education*, 67(1–2), 9–29.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/S11159-021-09882-1>
- Teräs, M., Suoranta, J., Teräs, H., & Curcher, M. (2020). Post-Covid-19 Education and Education Technology ‘Solutionism’: a Seller’s Market. *Postdigital Science and Education*, 2(3), 863–878. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-020-00164-x>
- Terjesen, S. (2022). Reducing Higher Education Bureaucracy and Reclaiming the Entrepreneurial University. *International Studies in Entrepreneurship*, 53, 111–132.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-94273-1_7
- Thomson, R. A. (2020). Bringing Back the Social into the Sociology of Religion: Critical Approaches. *Contemporary Sociology: A Journal of Reviews*, 49(1), 24–26.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0094306119889962a>
- Tight, M. (2021). Globalization and internationalization as frameworks for higher education research. *Research Papers in Education*, 36(1), 52–74.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2019.1633560>
- Verhoeven, M., Draelants, H., & Ilabaca Turri, T. (2022). The role of elite education in social reproduction in France, Belgium and Chile: Towards an analytical model. *Journal of Sociology*, 58(3), 304–323. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14407833211051759>
- Wæraas, A. (2007). The re-enchantment of social institutions: Max Weber and public relations. *Public Relations Review*, 33(3), 281–286.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2007.05.007>
- Weber, M. (2019). *Economy and Society* (K. Tribe (ed.); 1st ed.). University of Harvard.
- Xie, C., Ruan, M., Lin, P., Wang, Z., Lai, T., Xie, Y., Fu, S., & Lu, H. (2022). Influence of Artificial Intelligence in Education on Adolescents’ Social Adaptability: A Machine Learning Study. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(13). <https://doi.org/10.3390/IJERPH19137890>
- Yavuz, R. I. (2021). Founders’ education, social capital, and their interplay in the intensity of new-venture internationalization. *Journal of Small Business Management*.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00472778.2021.1913596>

Zambeta, E. (2014). Education and Social Solidarity in times of Crisis: the case of voluntary shadow education in Greece. *Education Inquiry*, 5(1).
<https://doi.org/10.3402/EDUI.V5.24058>