Technology, Innovation, and Social Change in Higher Education: An Integrative Review with Implications for Mongolia

Zol. N[1], Munkhbat. O[2], Otgonbayar. Ya[3],

[1]PhD Candidate in Sociology, National University of Mongolia; Lecturer, Department of Social Sciences, Mongolian National University of Education

[2]Professor, National University of Mongolia; Director, Ulaanbaatar Science and Technology Park, National University of Mongolia

[3]Associate Professor, Department of Sociology and Social Work, School of Arts and Sciences, National University of Mongolia

ORCID: 0009-0000-3396-6731[1]

ORCID: 0000-0002-7869-9144[2]

ORCID: 0000-0001-7297-2288[3]

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.101000327

Received: 17 October 2026; Accepted: 22 October 2026; Published: 02 November 2026

ABSTRACT

Digital technologies are reshaping higher education, but the presence of new tools does not establish educational innovation. This integrative review examines the conditions under which technological adoption is translated into changes in university teaching, participation, assessment, and governance, with particular attention to Mongolia. It brings together selected peer-reviewed syntheses, international reports, Mongolian policy documents, and country-specific empirical studies, principally from 2010–2026. A purposive, non-exhaustive synthesis across four domains—teaching and learning; access and equity; artificial intelligence (AI) and assessment; and institutional change—indicates that benefits depend on pedagogical design, staff capability, and organizational support rather than technology alone. Evidence from Mongolian lecturers and students points to variation in readiness, access, and the pedagogical integration of digital learning. Combining diffusion of innovations with neo-institutional theory, the article advances an analytical distinction between adoption, pedagogical enactment, and educational outcomes. This distinction makes it possible to investigate whether formal commitments and individual uptake are translated into meaningful instructional change. A multilevel framework specifies candidate constructs, indicators, and testable associations for future research in social science programs. The synthesis is interpretive: it does not establish causal effects, systematically quantify all available studies, or demonstrate institutional decoupling in Mongolia. Its main contribution is a theoretically grounded, operationalizable agenda for studying when digitalization becomes substantive educational innovation.

Keywords: educational innovation; higher education; digital transformation; diffusion of innovations; neo-institutional theory; Mongolia

INTRODUCTION

Universities do more than absorb technological change: through their teaching, research, and public engagement they also shape its social consequences. Learning management systems, online and blended learning, digital research tools, and generative artificial intelligence (AI) have expanded what universities can do while unsettling assumptions about instructional quality, assessment, access, and academic work. In the

World Economic Forum's Future of Jobs Report 2025, surveyed employers anticipated that 39% of workers' existing skill sets would be transformed or become outdated by 2030 (World Economic Forum, 2025). Such forecasts provide a rationale for reviewing university curricula, but they do not demonstrate that digitalization improves learning. The substantive question is not whether a university uses emerging technology; it is whether its use produces educationally defensible changes.

Mongolia provides a consequential setting for examining this question. Ministry of Education statistics for 2025–2026 report 68 universities and colleges with 161,891 students, including 125,750 bachelor's students (77.7%) (Ministry of Education, 2025). Mongolia ranked 78th among 139 economies in the Global Innovation Index (GII) 2025, with innovation-input and innovation-output ranks of 87th and 69th, respectively (World Intellectual Property Organization [WIPO], 2025). These are national innovation-system indicators—not measures of university teaching quality—and differences from earlier GII editions must be interpreted cautiously because data availability and methodology can change. Taken together, the figures underscore the importance of studying institutional capacities and outcomes rather than using expansion or system-level rankings as proxies for educational innovation.

Kirkwood and Price (2014) distinguish technology-enabled enhancement from the mere replication of existing teaching arrangements, while Selwyn (2016) cautions against technologically deterministic explanations of educational change. This article builds on that distinction and asks: (RQ1) What does the selected international and Mongolian evidence show about the consequences and limitations of technology in higher education? (RQ2) How can diffusion of innovations and neo-institutional theory jointly explain variation between formal adoption and day-to-day enactment? (RQ3) Which observable constructs and relationships should future studies examine in Mongolian social science programs? Our contribution is a conceptually explicit bridge from literature and policy analysis to a falsifiable empirical research agenda, not a claim to have tested a new model.

REVIEW METHOD

This article adopts an integrative literature-review design suited to connecting findings generated by different research traditions and levels of analysis (Snyder, 2019). The aim is analytic integration rather than a statistically pooled intervention effect or a comprehensive census of publications. The evidence base includes (i) peer-reviewed meta-analyses, systematic reviews, and relevant primary studies; (ii) institutional reports and guidance from organizations such as UNESCO, OECD, WIPO, EDUCAUSE, and the Higher Education Policy Institute (HEPI); and (iii) Mongolian legislation, official education statistics, and country-specific research. These source types are not interchangeable: experimental and observational studies support claims about their particular samples and measures; policy texts document commitments; and national indices describe broader systems.

The underlying review drew on ERIC, Scopus, Google Scholar, and publicly accessible institutional repositories and websites, using English and Mongolian combinations of terms relating to higher education, educational technology, online and blended learning, AI, institutional innovation, and Mongolia. Publications from 2010–2026 were emphasized, while earlier foundational theories were retained where required. Sources were prioritized for their direct relevance to university-level educational or organizational change, the clarity of their underlying evidence, and the ability to locate and assess the original publication. International syntheses were used to characterize broad patterns; country-specific studies were used to illuminate local conditions; and policy sources were analyzed as statements of intent, not evidence of achieved impact. Purely promotional material and unsupported opinion were not treated as evidence of learning outcomes.

The material was synthesized through four deductively defined domains: (1) teaching and learning, (2) access and equity, (3) AI and assessment, and (4) research, governance, and institutional change. Within each domain, we distinguish reported findings from plausible explanatory mechanisms and identify limits to transferability. Diffusion and neo-institutional concepts were then applied as sensitizing—not independently validated—frameworks. This is a purposive, narrative-integrative review rather than a systematic review. The original work did not preserve a complete search log, database-specific strings and dates, study-selection counts, a registered protocol, or standardized risk-of-bias scores. These items cannot be retroactively supplied reliably; accordingly, no PRISMA flow, reproducibility claim, or exhaustive-coverage claim is presented. Selective

coverage, publication-language asymmetry, mixed designs, and limited post-pandemic longitudinal evidence from Mongolia constrain inference.

2.1. Evidence selection, synthesis, and inferential boundaries

A practical hierarchy guided interpretation, not a numerical quality score. Meta-analyses and methodologically described comparative studies inform statements about measured educational effects within their study populations; single-country surveys illuminate associations and implementation processes; official statistics describe administrative populations; policy documents establish formal aims; and theoretical works supply explanatory concepts. Evidence from one tier is not promoted to a stronger claim by combining it narratively with another. For example, a national innovation index does not verify a university-level causal mechanism, and a UK survey of AI use is not a proxy for Mongolian student behavior.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION

Technology denotes the tools and infrastructures through which educational work is organized, whereas innovation refers to the introduction and implementation of a new or significantly improved practice or organizational process (OECD & Eurostat, 2018). Rogers (2003) defines innovation in relation to actors' perceptions of novelty and explains diffusion through communication, time, social systems, and attributes of innovations. For present purposes, it is useful to distinguish three empirically different phenomena: acquisition or formal adoption of a technology; pedagogical enactment, meaning changed instructional and assessment practices; and demonstrated educational outcomes. A university can exhibit the first without achieving the second or third (Kirkwood & Price, 2014).

Innovation in higher education operates across pedagogical, technological, organizational, and institutional-model dimensions. Active and inquiry-based learning change instructional interaction; LMS, AI tools, and learning analytics change available technological affordances; curriculum governance and staff-development arrangements change organizational routines; and new collaborations or delivery models may affect institutional boundaries. These distinctions prevent the purchase of a digital platform from being equated with curriculum innovation. Christensen and Eyring (2011) distinguish innovations that strengthen existing arrangements from those that could alter dominant university models, although whether any particular technology proves disruptive is an empirical rather than definitional question. Serdyukov (2017) likewise emphasizes the need to evaluate educational innovation against demonstrated purposes and effects.

The integrated theoretical claim is specific. Diffusion of innovations helps explain why teachers and students adopt practices at different rates: perceived relative advantage, compatibility, complexity, trialability, and observability can facilitate or impede uptake (Rogers, 2003). Neo-institutional theory explains why institutions may adopt similar policies or organizational structures under coercive, mimetic, and normative pressures (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983), including adoption motivated partly by legitimacy. Meyer and Rowan (1977) theorize that formal structures can become decoupled from actual practice. Placed together, these traditions identify an adoption–enactment–outcome sequence in which individual acceptance and institutional conformity may diverge from substantive change. Such divergence is a hypothesis to investigate, not a finding already established about Mongolian universities.

The mechanisms are not reducible to either theory alone. Technology can be welcomed by students but resisted by teachers because its compatibility with assessed learning objectives differs. Conversely, a university may issue a detailed digitalization strategy without supplying sufficient time, training, or incentives to redesign courses. The technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK) framework draws attention to teachers' capacity to integrate technology with disciplinary content and pedagogy (Mishra & Koehler, 2006). Clark (1983) offers a methodological caution about attributing learning to media reinforces the need to measure learning processes, compare plausible alternatives, and account for pedagogical design. This integrated account is especially relevant to social science education, where interpretive discussion, methodological reasoning, and evidence evaluation cannot be inferred from platform-use statistics.

3.1. Theoretical contribution and scope conditions

The proposed contribution is thus a two-level explanation of the same observable discontinuity: widespread adoption can coexist with limited instructional change. The actor-level mechanism involves perceived suitability and feasibility; the organizational mechanism involves legitimacy incentives and implementation capacity. They may reinforce each other, but they may also diverge. The framework is expected to be most informative where policy commitments are visible yet enacted practices can be independently assessed; its relevance to other systems remains to be investigated, not presumed.

EFFECTS OF TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION: FINDINGS OF THE REVIEW

4.1. Effects on Teaching and Learning

Meta-analytic findings suggest a conditional, not automatic, benefit from blended instruction. Means et al. (2013) report advantages for blended conditions relative to face-to-face instruction, but note that treatment conditions often differed in learning time, materials, and instructional resources. Bernard et al. (2014) find a positive overall effect for blended learning in higher education (approximately $g = 0.33$). The practical implication is not that the online medium causes learning gains: blended formats often package changes in communication, activities, feedback, and opportunities for practice. The relevant unit of explanation is the instructional configuration, not technology in isolation.

Research on pedagogical redesign provides a useful comparison. Synthesizing 225 studies in undergraduate STEM education, Freeman et al. (2014) report examination gains of roughly six percentage points under active learning and a higher failure risk under conventional lecturing. This is evidence about active learning, not an estimate of the independent contribution of digital tools. Across 198 studies spanning educational levels and disciplines, Strelan et al. (2020) find a moderate performance advantage for flipped classrooms ($g = 0.50$), with structured active learning an important explanatory feature. These results support testing whether technology makes meaningful activity and feedback possible; they do not justify assuming equivalent effects in Mongolian social science courses.

In the social sciences, tools for surveys, statistical analysis, qualitative coding, collaborative annotation, and simulated inquiry can connect classroom work with authentic research practice. Their value depends on whether assignments require students to formulate questions, justify evidence, interpret uncertainty, and engage competing explanations. An LMS log-in, a digital submission, or AI-assisted draft is a process indicator, not proof of conceptual mastery. Suitable learning outcomes therefore include quality-assessed research designs, argumentation and source evaluation, performance on common rubrics, and sustained engagement—not simply frequency of tool use.

4.2. Access, Flexibility, and Equity

Digital delivery can reduce travel and scheduling barriers, yet availability is distinct from meaningful participation. Reich and Ruipérez-Valiente (2019) document persistent difficulties in participation and completion in large-scale online courses, challenging early claims that massive open online courses would straightforwardly democratize higher education. Where devices, affordable connectivity, language-appropriate materials, accessibility support, and quiet study environments are unequally distributed, online provision may widen effective inequalities even as nominal access expands. The relevant equity question is therefore who benefits, under what constraints, and according to which outcome. UNESCO (2023b) similarly cautions that educational technology should be assessed against equity and quality objectives rather than presumed to deliver them.

The COVID-19 emergency exposed this distinction. A global survey by the International Association of Universities documented extensive disruption and rapid shifts to distance provision (Marinoni et al., 2020). Hodges et al. (2020) distinguish emergency remote teaching from online education designed in advance, cautioning against inferring the effectiveness of the latter from crisis experiences. In an integrative review,

pandemic case studies are important evidence of resilience and implementation stress, but they should not be treated as controlled evaluations of mature digital pedagogy.

Mongolia-specific evidence helps identify mechanisms. Dembereldorj (2021), studying online student engagement during the pandemic, found that participation and performance were salient dimensions of engagement and that internet access was associated with performance. The observational design does not identify a causal effect. In a study of 726 lecturers from Mongolian universities and colleges, Tuul et al. (2023) reported that both organizational factors (including institutional characteristics and LMS availability) and individual factors (including training and disciplinary context) were associated with e-learning course development. Their findings also highlighted faculty-development and learning-design challenges. These studies indicate that differences in infrastructure and professional support should be measured rather than assumed away; neither provides a national estimate of improvements in student learning.

4.3. Artificial Intelligence, Assessment, and Learning Analytics

Prior to the public release of generative AI systems, AI research in higher education was concentrated on applications such as prediction, assessment, adaptive systems, and tutoring. Zawacki-Richter et al. (2019) found limited educator participation in the research they reviewed, underscoring the need to examine instructional practice rather than algorithmic performance alone. Learning analytics can support early feedback and identification of academic difficulty, but the collection and reuse of student-level data create governance obligations concerning privacy, contestability, and the legitimacy of predictive labels (Siemens & Long, 2011).

Generative AI has accelerated the pressure to revisit assessment. Crompton and Burke (2023) and Bond et al. (2024) characterize rapid growth and persistent methodological and ethical challenges in the research base. HEPI's successive surveys of UK undergraduates reported that the proportion using AI for assessed work increased from 53% in 2024 to 88% in 2025 and 94% in 2026; the overall share reporting any AI use reached 95% in 2026 (J. Freeman, 2025; Stephenson & Armstrong, 2026). These figures describe UK survey respondents, not Mongolian students, and changing uses of 'AI' across questionnaires warrant cautious comparison. They nevertheless demonstrate the speed with which assessment contexts can change relative to institutional routines.

UNESCO's 2023 survey found that fewer than one in ten responding schools and universities had formal guidance on generative AI at that time (UNESCO, 2023a), while its guidance advocates a human-centered and capacity-building approach (Miao & Holmes, 2023). Because the UNESCO and HEPI surveys differ in country coverage, population, and timing, they cannot be combined into an estimate of the magnitude of an institutional 'policy gap'. Kasneci et al. (2023) discuss opportunities for support alongside risks of bias, dependency, and unreliable output. Cotton et al. (2024) argue for academic-integrity responses focused on assessment design and transparency rather than uncritical faith in detection. In social science programs, appropriate safeguards include explicit rules on disclosure, staged research assignments, source-tracing exercises, and assessment of oral and written reasoning. The effect of any such intervention requires evaluation.

4.4. Research, Governance, and Institutional Change

Organizational change extends beyond the classroom. Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff (2000) conceptualize university–industry–government relationships through the Triple Helix, while Clark (1998) identifies structural and cultural capacities of entrepreneurial universities. These perspectives are relevant to institutional innovation but do not, by themselves, show that research partnerships or digital management systems improve student learning. Salmi (2009) highlights the importance of talent, resources, and governance for high-performing universities; the transferable implication is that digital initiatives should be analyzed in the context of institutional capability rather than technological acquisition alone.

Cross-institutional synthesis also points to the social organization of change. OECD (2023) discusses the importance of coherent digital education ecosystems, including data governance and interoperability, principally at education-system level. The EDUCAUSE Horizon Report identifies emerging technological

developments and governance issues for higher education (Robert et al., 2025). European higher education research describes how change agents mobilize networks and resources (Hasanefendic et al., 2017), and how leadership, incentives, culture, regulation, and partnership arrangements condition implementation (Lašáková et al., 2017). These are candidate mechanisms for Mongolian research, not findings that can be generalized without further observation.

Table 1. Evidence across four review domains

Domain	Evidence-based synthesis	Boundary / risk	Selected sources
Teaching and learning	Blended and flipped formats show average positive effects when redesigned instruction supports interaction.	Effects are heterogeneous; technology-specific causation is not isolated.	Bernard et al. (2014); Strelan et al. (2020)
Access and equity	Online delivery increases potential geographic and temporal flexibility.	Participation is constrained by connectivity, prior advantage, and supportive study conditions.	Reich & Ruipérez-Valiente (2019); Dembereldorj (2021)
AI and assessment	AI tools can assist feedback, writing processes, and support tasks; student use is widespread in UK surveys.	Misuse, bias, dependency, privacy, and assessment validity; evidence is context-specific.	Kasneci et al. (2023); Stephenson & Armstrong (2026)
Governance	Supportive leadership, capability development, and data systems may enable implementation.	Formal policy or platform deployment is not evidence of altered pedagogy or outcomes.	Hasanefendic et al. (2017); Tuul et al. (2023)

Source: Authors' synthesis of cited research. The entries distinguish source-specific observations from proposed interpretation.

TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION IN THE CONTEXT OF MONGOLIAN HIGHER EDUCATION

Mongolia's policy environment increasingly creates expectations for institutional innovation. The General Law on Education and the revised Law on Higher Education (2023) establish regulatory conditions for educational governance, quality assurance, and the development and use of innovation (State Great Khural, 2023a, 2023b). The Mongolian Education Declaration 2024 identifies digital technologies, e-learning, education data, and ethical AI-supported use of data as priorities (Ministry of Education and Science, 2024). These documents demonstrate official orientation. They do not establish how many departments have redesigned assessment, how consistently lecturers use pedagogically appropriate digital methods, or whether students' demonstrated competencies have changed.

Two sets of verified contextual figures help frame the scale of the issue without conflating levels of analysis. First, the Ministry of Education (2025) reports 68 higher education institutions, of which 18 were public, 47 private, and three community/religious institutions, enrolling 161,891 students in 2025–2026. Second, WIPO (2025) places Mongolia 78th overall in the GII, with input and output ranks of 87th and 69th. Neither the number of institutions nor an aggregate national innovation rank is a direct indicator of pedagogical quality. A defensible evaluation must connect policy commitments to institutional supports, observable classroom enactment, and student outcomes measured with suitable instruments.

The available empirical studies illustrate why these links matter. Dembereldorj (2021) reports an association between students' internet access and an engagement-related performance measure during emergency online learning; this is a student-level observational association. Tuul et al. (2023), drawing on a cross-institutional survey of 726 lecturers, identify both institutional and personal predictors of e-learning course development. Together, the findings support examining access, staff development, LMS provision, and disciplinary variation. They do not establish that Mongolia's reforms were implemented uniformly, that top-down pressure

is the predominant cause of digital adoption, or that technology has improved learning outcomes across the sector. Such claims need program-level comparative data.

The distinction between policy, enactment, and outcome is analytically decisive. National legislation indicates authorized direction; university strategies indicate formal commitments; lecturer surveys can describe capability and reported practice; and appropriately designed student assessments can measure particular learning outcomes. Evidence at one level cannot substitute for evidence at another. A policy claiming commitment to AI literacy, for example, could coexist with wide variation in teachers' assessment practices or unequal access to devices. Conversely, intensive student use of AI might occur without formal institutional endorsement. A sociology of innovation must examine these possible mismatches rather than count strategies or licences as evidence of educational transformation. UNESCO (2020), in its broader Mongolia Education Policy Review, reinforces the importance of institutional capability and equity, although its education-system perspective cannot supply a university-level outcome estimate.

5.1. From policy aspiration to measurable outcomes

An implementation-oriented assessment would trace a specific policy objective through four linked questions: What requirement was stated? What resources and procedures did the university put in place? What changed in course design, assessment, or lecturer practice? What student-level outcomes were measured using comparable evidence? A policy-to-practice matrix could combine dated institutional documents, staff training records, syllabus revisions, assessment rubrics, and student results. Where such records are missing, the correct conclusion is a data gap rather than successful or unsuccessful implementation.

Table 2. Mongolia: policy context and observational evidence (not causal indicators)

Verified indicator / evidence	Finding	Interpretive boundary and source
Institutional landscape (2025–2026)	68 institutions; 18 public, 47 private, 3 community/religious	Describes provision, not innovation quality (Ministry of Education, 2025)
Students enrolled (2025–2026)	161,891 total; 125,750 at bachelor level (77.7%)	Participation statistic, not an outcome measure (Ministry of Education, 2025)
Global Innovation Index (2025)	78th of 139; input rank 87th; output rank 69th	National innovation ecosystem, not university effectiveness (WIPO, 2025)
Student online engagement	Internet access associated with performance-related engagement	Observational university sample, not causality (Dembereldorj, 2021)
Lecturer e-learning implementation	Survey of 726 lecturers; individual and institutional factors linked to course development	Association and reported practices, not student-learning effects (Tuul et al., 2023)
National education policy	2023 higher education legislation; 2024 digital / ethical data priorities	Documented policy commitments, not implementation measures (State Great Khural, 2023b; Ministry of Education and Science, 2024)

Source: Authors' synthesis of cited research. The entries distinguish source-specific observations from proposed interpretation.

DISCUSSION AND THEORETICAL INTERPRETATION

Across the reviewed literature, three evidence claims are relatively well supported within their original domains: (i) blended and active learning can outperform conventional formats under particular designs; (ii) access and capability inequalities constrain the benefits of digital provision; and (iii) student-facing AI practices are changing rapidly, while institutional guidance and educational research must adapt. The claim that formal adoption can become decoupled from pedagogical enactment is instead a theoretically motivated interpretation of these patterns (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). No data assembled in this review directly measure decoupling or causally identify the effects of digital policies on learning in Mongolia. Keeping these

evidentiary statuses separate prevents a plausible sociological explanation from being presented as an empirical result.

Diffusion theory offers an actor-centered account: teachers' willingness to redesign activities may be shaped by perceived relative advantage, compatibility with assessment and disciplinary culture, complexity, trialability, and observable benefits (Rogers, 2003). Neo-institutional theory offers an organization-centered account: legislation and quality assurance can create coercive pressures; emulation of visible peer institutions may encourage mimetic adoption; and professional networks or accreditation may generate normative expectations (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). In combination, the two approaches make divergent trajectories intelligible. Student use may spread quickly while curriculum committees deliberate; institutions may announce strategies that departments lack the resources to enact. These are theoretically plausible scenarios—not classifications of actual Mongolian universities or proof of any specific diffusion mechanism.

The integrated proposition is that perceived innovation attributes and institutional environments are associated with the depth of pedagogical enactment, which in turn is associated with educational outcomes. The relationships are conditional: staff expertise, discipline, access, and institutional capacity may modify them. Adoption and pedagogical enactment must therefore be modeled as distinct variables. When data permit, a multilevel design should account for students nested in courses and courses nested in departments and institutions. Table 3 translates the constructs into candidate indicators and specifies appropriate evidence sources; the framework requires instrument development, validation, and ethical review before empirical use.

The analytical distinction also exposes rival explanations. Higher course-performance scores may reflect differences in student composition, assessment difficulty, teacher experience, or contact time rather than an innovation. Reports of greater AI use may indicate altered disclosure norms or improved survey recognition as well as behavioral change. A correlation between LMS availability and course redesign may reflect institutional wealth or supportive leadership. Future studies should therefore collect relevant covariates, report missing data and measurement properties, and avoid strong causal language unless design and assumptions justify it.

Four directional propositions follow, each requiring empirical testing. H1: stronger perceived relative advantage and compatibility of an educational innovation will be positively associated with teachers' pedagogical enactment, net of relevant professional and contextual factors. H2: institutional support—training, infrastructure, protected development time, and leadership—will be positively associated with enactment, above and beyond formal digital-policy adoption. H3: a larger formal-adoption–enactment discrepancy will be associated with lower alignment between policy promises and observed classroom practice. H4: deeper, pedagogically purposeful enactment will be associated with better assessed learning and engagement when access and baseline achievement are taken into account. H4 is an association hypothesis; demonstration of a causal effect would require stronger longitudinal, quasi-experimental, or experimental designs.

A feasible research sequence in Mongolian social science education would combine policy and syllabus analysis, a validated survey of lecturers and students, qualitative interviews with curriculum leaders, and comparable samples of course assessments. Institutions should be purposively contrasted by ownership, resources, and mission, without assuming that such categories explain differences on their own. Quantitative work could assess scale reliability and measurement structure before estimating associations; qualitative material could investigate mechanisms and exceptions. The goal is to identify combinations of institutional conditions and pedagogical practice that enable substantive change while preserving the interpretive strengths of social science teaching. Because the present review is non-systematic and includes limited Mongolian outcome studies, these propositions should be treated as a transparent research agenda, not as conclusions already verified.

6.1. Limitations of the proposed model

The framework is deliberately parsimonious and cannot capture every dimension of innovation. Organizational resources may both encourage adoption and improve educational outcomes, generating confounding. Institutional expectations are not directly observable from policy text alone; they must be assessed through

interviews, organizational documents, and credible measures. Responses to self-report surveys may also differ from observed classroom practice. Before making comparisons, researchers would need to test scale validity, examine comparability across institutions and disciplines, specify outcomes in advance, and report uncertainty and ethical safeguards for student data.

Table 3. Proposed multilevel constructs and operational indicators (not results)

Construct / level	Illustrative indicators	Evidence / inference
Perceived innovation attributes (teacher)	Relative advantage, compatibility, complexity, trialability, observability; validated ordinal items	Lecturer survey; candidate predictor of enactment
Institutional pressures and support (university)	Policy expectations, leadership, training hours, LMS access, protected development time	Policy records + leadership interviews + audit; separate pressure from support
Formal adoption (institution / course)	Strategy approved, platform available, departmental guidance issued	Dated documents and system records; no assumption about pedagogy
Pedagogical enactment (course)	Redesigned syllabus/assessment, purposeful use, authentic tasks, feedback cycles	Syllabus and rubric coding + observation; proposed mediator
Student opportunity and outcomes	Connectivity, accessibility, engagement, rubric-based performance, course completion	Student survey + comparable assessments; outcomes adjusted for baseline factors

Source: Authors' synthesis of cited research. The entries distinguish source-specific observations from proposed interpretation.

CONCLUSION

This review finds no defensible basis for equating the presence of digital tools with successful educational innovation. Evidence from international syntheses indicates that blended, active, and flipped approaches can benefit learning, but instructional design, opportunities for interaction, and teacher expertise matter. Digital provision can widen opportunity while reproducing inequality where connectivity, competence, and support differ. Rapid uptake of generative AI has made the validity and transparency of assessment a central challenge, particularly for disciplines in which writing and interpretation are core practices.

For Mongolia, policy reform and the expansion of higher education make rigorous evaluation important, yet available indicators speak to different levels of analysis. National statistics describe the scale of provision, policy documents express priorities, and observational studies illuminate specific implementation conditions. None alone shows that classroom practice or student learning has improved. The distinction among formal adoption, enacted pedagogy, and educational outcomes offers a more appropriate basis for institutional monitoring and comparative research.

The article's original contribution is a multilevel explanatory framework linking perceived innovation attributes with institutional legitimacy pressures and implementation conditions. Its central proposition is that formal compliance and individual uptake may be necessary but insufficient for substantive pedagogical change. The proposed indicators and hypotheses make this proposition empirically contestable in Mongolian social science programs. The immediate policy implication is to align technology investment with staff development, equitable access, curriculum redesign, and credible evidence of student learning. Future research should test—not presume—the pathways outlined here.

ETHICS STATEMENT

This article synthesizes previously published research and publicly available policy documents and does not report new research involving human participants.

DATA AVAILABILITY

No original participant-level data were collected or analyzed for this integrative review. Bibliographic and public-source details are provided in the references. A complete historical search log or screening dataset is not available; this limitation is disclosed in Section 2.

REFERENCES

1. Bernard, R. M., Borokhovski, E., Schmid, R. F., Tamim, R. M., & Abrami, P. C. (2014). A meta-analysis of blended learning and technology use in higher education: From the general to the applied. Journal of Computing in Higher Education, 26(1), 87–122. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-013-9077-3
2. Bond, M., Khosravi, H., De Laat, M., Bergdahl, N., Negrea, V., Oxley, E., Pham, P., Chong, S. W., & Siemens, G. (2024). A meta systematic review of artificial intelligence in higher education: A call for increased ethics, collaboration, and rigour. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 21, Article 4. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00436-z
3. Christensen, C. M., & Eyring, H. J. (2011). The innovative university: Changing the DNA of higher education from the inside out. Jossey-Bass.
4. Clark, B. R. (1998). Creating entrepreneurial universities: Organizational pathways of transformation. Pergamon.
5. Clark, R. E. (1983). Reconsidering research on learning from media. Review of Educational Research, 53(4), 445–459. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543053004445
6. Cotton, D. R. E., Cotton, P. A., & Shipway, J. R. (2024). Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 61(2), 228–239. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148
7. Crompton, H., & Burke, D. (2023). Artificial intelligence in higher education: The state of the field. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 20, Article 22. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00392-8
8. Dembereldorj, Z. (2021). Exploring online student engagement during COVID-19 pandemic in Mongolia. International Journal of Higher Education, 10(7), 10–18. https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v10n7p10
9. DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. American Sociological Review, 48(2), 147–160. https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101
10. Etzkowitz, H., & Leydesdorff, L. (2000). The dynamics of innovation: From National Systems and "Mode 2" to a Triple Helix of university–industry–government relations. Research Policy, 29(2), 109–123. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-7333(99)00055-4
11. Freeman, J. (2025). Student generative AI survey 2025 (HEPI Policy Note 61). Higher Education Policy Institute. https://www.hepi.ac.uk/reports/student-generative-ai-survey-2025/
12. Freeman, S., Eddy, S. L., McDonough, M., Smith, M. K., Okoroafor, N., Jordt, H., & Wenderoth, M. P. (2014). Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 111(23), 8410–8415. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1319030111
13. Hasanefendic, S., Birkholz, J. M., Horta, H., & van der Sijde, P. (2017). Individuals in action: Bringing about innovation in higher education. European Journal of Higher Education, 7(2), 101–119. https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2017.1296367
14. Hodges, C., Moore, S., Lockee, B., Trust, T., & Bond, A. (2020, March 27). The difference between emergency remote teaching and online learning. EDUCAUSE Review. https://er.educause.edu/articles/2020/3/the-difference-between-emergency-remote-teaching-and-online-learning
15. Kasneci, E., Seßler, K., Küchemann, S., Bannert, M., Dementieva, D., Fischer, F., Gasser, U., Groh, G., Günnemann, S., Hüllermeier, E., Krusche, S., Kutyniok, G., Michaeli, T., Nerdel, C., Pfeffer, J., Poquet, O., Sailer, M., Schmidt, A., Seidel, T., … Kasneci, G. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. Learning and Individual Differences, 103, Article 102274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274

16. Kirkwood, A., & Price, L. (2014). Technology-enhanced learning and teaching in higher education: What is "enhanced" and how do we know? A critical literature review. Learning, Media and Technology, 39(1), 6–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2013.770404
17. Lašáková, A., Bajzíková, Ľ., & Dedze, I. (2017). Barriers and drivers of innovation in higher education: Case study-based evidence across ten European universities. International Journal of Educational Development, 55, 69–79. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2017.06.002
18. Marinoni, G., van't Land, H., & Jensen, T. (2020). The impact of COVID-19 on higher education around the world: IAU global survey report. International Association of Universities.
19. Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., & Baki, M. (2013). The effectiveness of online and blended learning: A meta-analysis of the empirical literature. Teachers College Record, 115(3), 1–47.
20. Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. American Journal of Sociology, 83(2), 340–363.
21. Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). Guidance for generative AI in education and research. UNESCO.
22. Ministry of Education. (2025). Higher education report for the 2025–2026 academic year [in Mongolian]. https://moe.gov.mn/post/170086
23. Ministry of Education and Science. (2024). Mongolian education declaration 2024 [in Mongolian]. https://moe.gov.mn/post/153338
24. Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. Teachers College Record, 108(6), 1017–1054.
25. OECD. (2023). OECD digital education outlook 2023: Towards an effective digital education ecosystem. OECD Publishing.
26. OECD & Eurostat. (2018). Oslo manual 2018: Guidelines for collecting, reporting and using data on innovation (4th ed.). OECD Publishing.
27. Reich, J., & Ruipérez-Valiente, J. A. (2019). The MOOC pivot. Science, 363(6423), 130–131. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aav7958
28. Robert, J., Muscanell, N., McCormack, M., Pelletier, K., Arnold, K., Arbino, N., Young, K., & Reeves, J. (2025). 2025 EDUCAUSE Horizon Report: Teaching and learning edition. EDUCAUSE. https://library.educause.edu/resources/2025/5/2025-educause-horizon-report-teaching-and-learning-edition
29. Rogers, E. M. (2003). Diffusion of innovations (5th ed.). Free Press.
30. Salmi, J. (2009). The challenge of establishing world-class universities. World Bank.
31. Selwyn, N. (2016). Education and technology: Key issues and debates (2nd ed.). Bloomsbury.
32. Serdyukov, P. (2017). Innovation in education: What works, what doesn't, and what to do about it? Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching & Learning, 10(1), 4–33. https://doi.org/10.1108/JRIT-10-2016-0007
33. Siemens, G., & Long, P. (2011). Penetrating the fog: Analytics in learning and education. EDUCAUSE Review, 46(5), 30–40.
34. Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. Journal of Business Research, 104, 333–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039
35. State Great Khural. (2023a). General law on education [in Mongolian]. Unified Legal Information System. https://legalinfo.mn/mn/detail?lawId=16759958962301
36. State Great Khural. (2023b). Law on higher education [in Mongolian]. Unified Legal Information System. https://legalinfo.mn/mn/detail?lawId=16759959041191
37. Stephenson, R., & Armstrong, C. (2026). Student generative AI survey 2026 (HEPI Report 199). Higher Education Policy Institute. https://www.hepi.ac.uk/reports/student-generative-ai-survey-2026/
38. Strelan, P., Osborn, A., & Palmer, E. (2020). The flipped classroom: A meta-analysis of effects on student performance across disciplines and education levels. Educational Research Review, 30, Article 100314. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100314
39. Tuul, S., Sambuu, U., Banzragch, O., Mend, N., Bayarjargal, M.-I., & Pagjii, O. (2023). Factor analysis on e-learning implementation in Mongolian higher education. iBusiness, 15(1), 38–59. https://doi.org/10.4236/ib.2023.151003
40. UNESCO. (2020). Mongolia education policy review: Towards a lifelong learning system. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000373687

41. UNESCO. (2023a). UNESCO survey: Less than 10% of schools and universities have formal guidance on AI. https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/unesco-survey-less-10-schools-and-universities-have-formal-guidance-ai
42. UNESCO. (2023b). Global education monitoring report 2023: Technology in education—A tool on whose terms? https://www.unesco.org/gem-report/en/publication/technology
43. World Economic Forum. (2025). The future of jobs report 2025. https://www.weforum.org/publications/the-future-of-jobs-report-2025/
44. World Intellectual Property Organization. (2025). Global Innovation Index 2025: Mongolia economy profile. https://www.wipo.int/gii-ranking/en/mongolia
45. Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education – where are the educators? International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 16, Article 39. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0