ETHICS OF HIGHER EDUCATION MANAGEMENT IN THE FACE OF DIGITAL DIVIDE FOR SUSTAINABILITY

MIRIAN NDIDI OBIZUE Ph.D.
Institute of Education, Management and Professional Studies (IEMPS).
https://orcid.org/0009-0001-9712-0337
mnobizue@gmail.com
07031976469.

ISONG BLESSING EDET

Department of Educational Management, Faculty of Educational Foundation Studies University of Calabar
Isongblessing97@gmail.com
09027172898

DABO SAIDU BENJAMIN

Department of Educational Management, Faculty of Educational Foundations
Taraba State University, Jalingo
dabobengy@gmail.com
08060667606

Abstract

The ethics of higher education management in the digital age is increasingly shaped by the persistent digital divide, which threatens equity, inclusivity, and sustainability. The digital divide is not merely about access to technology but extends to inequalities in digital literacy, quality of use, and opportunities for empowerment. This paper explores the ethical implications of the digital divide in higher education, particularly in relation to sustainable development. It provides a conceptual overview of the digital divide, discusses its multiple levels, and analyzes its ethical and managerial implications. Furthermore, it examines how the digital divide influences sustainability goals, particularly access to quality education, research capacity, and global competitiveness. Finally, the paper suggests practical strategies for higher education management, including infrastructure expansion, digital literacy promotion, inclusive policy-making, ethical ICT governance, and alignment with sustainability goals. The discussion emphasizes that bridging the digital divide is not only a technological imperative but also a moral

obligation for higher education leaders committed to building a just, inclusive, and sustainable future.

Keywords: Higher education management, ethics, digital divide, sustainability, equity, inclusivity, ICT.

Introduction

The 21st century has witnessed the largest transformations in higher education, prompted largely by the digital revolution and the convergence of information and communications technologies (ICTs). Higher education institutions across the globe today increasingly rely on digital platforms for learning, research, communication, and administrative efficiency. Online learning management systems, virtual classrooms, electronic libraries, and digital research databases are now at the heart of academic life (García-Morales, Garrido-Moreno, & Martín-Rojas, 2021). These developments present potential for enhanced access, greater flexibility, and global knowledge sharing. However, with these opportunities come enormous challenges. Digitalization has also deepened underlying social inequalities by opening the gap between people with access to digital technology and skills and those who lag behind (van Dijk, 2020). This gap popularly referred to as the digital divide is not only a technical issue but also a moral and managerial challenge. It creates systemic barriers that choke equal access to knowledge, undermine academic success, and constrict the transformative potential of higher education toward fostering sustainable development. The COVID-19 pandemic brutally exposed such inequalities. As campuses shut down and online education was the new reality, low-resource environments, particularly developing countries, disproportionately excluded students from digital classrooms due to a lack of reliable internet, devices, or weak digital competencies (Beaunoyer, Dupéré & Guitton, 2020). The "homework gap" grew, illustrating how access to ICT has become the door to educational inclusion. The situation brings out the ethical responsibility of higher education managers to create equitable systems where every student is included, regardless of their socioeconomic status, geographical location, or personal circumstances.

Higher education management ethics does not merely involve compliance with administrative processes; it involves fairness, openness, inclusivity, and respect for human dignity in making decisions (Ess, 2021). When digital resources are disproportionately allocated, moral issues are brought to the fore: Who shall have access to digital platforms? What regulations need to guide how scarce resources get rationed? What safeguards must be institutionalized to ensure privacy, equality, and equity? Addressing these questions becomes urgent for universities to sustain their mandate as institutions of equity and social transformation. Also, closing the digital divide supports world sustainability. The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), SDG

4 (quality education) and SDG 10 (reduced inequalities), underscore the moral obligation of institutions to assure inclusive, equitable, and lifelong learning (UNESCO, 2021). Higher education as a public good and driver of societal progress can never be sustainable if digital divides are not bridged and moral ICT management is not embedded. Therefore, the article critically examines the ethics of governing higher education in the context of the digital divide and its effects on sustainability. It addresses the nature and scope of the digital divide, the ethical and management issues it raises, and provides actionable suggestions for bridging these divides. Lastly, it argues that bridging the digital divide is not so much a matter of technological progress but an ethical obligation that underlies the sustainability of higher education systems.

Conceptual Clarifications

1. Ethics in Higher Education Management

Ethics in higher education institutional management can be understood as that collection of moral principles, professional standards, and values that guide institutional governance, decision-making, and everyday practices. It invites leaders and managers to harmonize institutional goals with justice and fairness to all stakeholders, including students, faculty, staff, and society at large (Ess, 2021). Ethical management involves transparency in financial decision-making, accountability in the use of resources, respect for academic freedom, and fairness in evaluation and promotional procedures. In the technological era, ethical concerns also include questions about access to learning materials online, the digital preparedness of students and employees, and how disadvantaged groups that may not necessarily have the same level of technological access are treated. This is particularly so with universities adopting blended and online forms of learning. Ethical leadership makes certain that technology deployment is not an additional cause of exclusion but a means of empowerment (García-Morales, Garrido-Moreno, & Martín-Rojas, 2021).

2. Comprehending the Digital Divide

The digital divide is now more than an issue of presence or absence of access to digital technologies, but has expanded to encompass complex issues of skills, quality of usage, and social inclusion. Van Dijk (2020), describes it as a multi-dimensional concept that involves material access (hardware, connection), motivational access (interest to use ICTs), skills access (digital literacy), and usage access (the extent and quality of ICT uses). In higher education, these layers manifest in a variety of manners. Students with stable internet and newer devices are able to easily attend virtual classes, download course materials, and even engage in global collaborative research. Students with poor access are not able to meet course requirements, attend virtual classes, or even submit assignments in a timely manner (Robinson et al., 2020). This reinforces

systemic inequalities that extend beyond academic performance into employability and lifelong learning opportunities.

3. Levels of the Digital Divide

Literature identifies three connected but distinct levels of the digital divide that affect educational results:

• **The Access Divide:** This stage highlights physical and infrastructural differences in access to ICT tools such as laptops, broadband internet, and institutional digital platforms. For example, as university students in urban campuses have high-speed campus Wi-Fi, students in rural or under-resourced universities have poor connectivity and outdated infrastructure (Scheerder, van Deursen, & van Dijk, 2017).

• **The Usage Divide:** Beyond infrastructure is the question of digital literacy and ability to utilize ICTs for productive ends. Beaunoyer et al. (2020), observe that students with weak digital competencies are disadvantaged in online learning environments, where they are unable to fully exploit virtual libraries, online assessment, or online collaboration tools.

• **The Quality-of-Use Divide:** Despite access and fundamental digital literacy, disparities exist in the quality of ICT usage. Van Dijk (2020), explains how certain users employ digital technologies for empowerment for instance, conducting research, creating innovations, or networking globally while others utilize them for entertainment only or for limited social interaction. This difference in quality is embodied in variations in academic performance, research output, and career preparation. These dimensions of digital divide are not discrete but intersect with socio-economic status, geographical location, gender, and institutional capacity, creating multi-layered inequalities in higher education.

Ethical Implications of the Digital Divide in Higher Education

1. Equity and Access

Higher education equity is not merely admitting students into universities, but ensuring that they are afforded the same opportunities to thrive. As marginalized sections are deprived of ICTs, they are disenfranchised from vital learning opportunities and deepen inequalities. Alhumaid (2019), insists on equity in digital accessibility as being a fundamental condition for higher education to serve its mandate for enhancing social mobility and reducing inequity. Ethical management therefore entails taking affirmative action, for instance, by data cost subsidies, providing digital devices, and making learning portals accessible to all.

2. Justice and Fairness

The moral principle of educational justice obliges institutions to balance the field in such a manner that each learner, irrespective of his/her socio-economic or geographical context, has the capability to perform well academically. The exclusion from digital resources creates an unequal field where some students are able to engage proactively in virtual discussions, employ high-end learning software, or enjoy online mentorship, yet others are unable to (Livingstone & Helsper, 2007). The digital stratification has negative implications for the fairness of tests and learning in general. Institutional managers are required to implement distributive justice policies by reallocating resources and ensuring that marginalized groups are provided with extra facilitation.

3. Privacy and Data Protection

Higher education's movement to digital environments creates elaborate moral issues surrounding data for students. Universities now gather private information from simple profiles to academic performance indicators and behavioral analytics within learning management systems. Ess (2021), cautions that without adamant ethical standards, the information may be abused for purposes of surveillance, profit-making, or algorithmic bias. Ethical management demands strict adherence to data security laws, informed consent procedures, and clear policies that protect students' digital rights.

4. Academic Integrity

The digital divide also has an indirect impact on academic integrity. Learners who lack resources may turn to plagiarism or illicit digital shortcuts as coping mechanisms. Again, disproportionate use of plagiarism detection software and academic databases further distorts academic fairness (Beaunoyer et al., 2020). Ethical management entails both punishment of misconduct and elimination of the underlying causes by promoting balanced use of academic resources, digital ethics coordinates, and advocacy for responsible use of ICT.

5. inclusivity and Sustainability

Inclusivity is the key to the sustainability of higher education. Tilbury (2016), argues that sustainable universities are those that make social responsibility, inclusivity, and ethical governance central to their practice. As digitalization goes ahead without a concerted effort at bringing on board those who are normally excluded, higher education risks being caught in exclusionary cycles that are incompatible with the UN's Sustainable Development Goals (SDG 4 and SDG 10). Ethical management accordingly requires that ICT strategies be matched by inclusive policies - that women, rural students, and traditionally excluded groups are not excluded in the digital makeover.

The Digital Divide, Higher Education, and Sustainability

The relationship between digital divide and higher education sustainability is rich and varied. Campuses are learning hubs and innovation drivers, social champions and human capital generators. If digital connectivity is unequal, higher education fails to fulfill its equity mandate and sustainable development goals. The digital divide hinders inclusivity, reduces research prowess, hinders economic competitiveness and spawns environmental concerns that need to be addressed on moral grounds (Obizue, 2022).

1. Education Disparity

The digital divide has a direct impact on educational inequities by acting on students' use and exposure to learning chances. The students who are deprived of exposure to devices or lack consistent and reliable Internet connectivity cannot engage in remote classrooms, complete digital assignments, or access computerized educational databases. This creates what researchers termed the "homework gap" the persisting gap between the students who are well-resourced with computers and those who are poorly resourced (Beaunoyer et al., 2020). This gap manifests in measurable academic performance differences, contravening tests of fairness and equity. Moreover, digital disparity is intersectional it disproportionately affects rural students, low-income students, and minorities, widening other structural inequities such as poverty and gender gap (Alhumaid, 2019). Unmitigated, digital disparity will continue to hinder social mobility, contravening higher education's mandate for enhancing SDG 4 on quality education.

2. Research and Knowledge Production

Higher institutions are producers of academic knowledge, yet research capability is heavily influenced by digital connectivity. University scholars in the digitally marginalised regions are likely to experience difficulties in accessing up-to-date literature, participation in international scholarly networks, and international cooperation (Eynon & Geniets, 2016). The unavailability of a reliable ICT infrastructure also affects participation in international conferences, use of digital test laboratories, and utilization of the high-end data analytics tools that characterise high-end research. This exclusion reifies epistemic inequality, with knowledge development becoming centralised within technologically advanced locales at the expense of the voices from the Global South (Robinson et al., 2020). The inequities thus engendered hinder global competitiveness and suppress sustainable innovation. Without balanced contributions from universities in disenfranchised locations to the knowledge economy, sustainable development becomes skewed towards the advantaged nations and thereby reifies global inequities.

3. Economic and Social Sustainability

The digital divide also has severe economic and social implications. Higher education should equip graduates with skills appropriate for the realities of the digital economy. The students, however, who are not exposed to ICTs while at college tend to graduate with low digital competence and hence low employability and competition within the labor market (Patrick, Kim, & Woronov, 2014). This contributes to fueling unemployment and underemployment, particularly in economies that are already characterised by high rates of youth unemployment. From a societal standpoint at large, universities that are unable to infuse sustainable digital practices may end up churning out graduates who cannot innovate, adapt, or lead in digitally fueled economies. This subverts both private career options and public societal gains. Social sustainability therefore demands that higher education managers view digital equity as a condition for generating globally competitive, digitally literate graduates (Nwachukwu, 2025).

4. Environmental Dimensions

Digtalization may be presented as a green alternative to paperwork, digitalization generates additional environmental problems. The development and disposal of digital devices are a leading cause for electronic waste (e-waste), and they present a toxic danger to the ecosystem and human physiology. The exponential growth in digital infrastructures also produces additional energy consumption and widens the carbon footprint for universities (García-Morales, Garrido-Moreno, & Martín-Rojas, 2021). Higher education administration should therefore adopt a balanced approach that is consistent with digital development on the one hand and minimization of environmental destruction on the other. This may be in terms of e-waste recycling policies, environmentally friendly data centers, and investments in green energy for the generation of ICT infrastructure. On that account, the digital divide must be conceived in social and economic as well as environmental sustainability.

Overcoming the Digital Divide: Ethical and Managerial Strategies

Mitigation of higher education digital divide demands a holistic, morally based, and sustainability-focused management strategy. It cannot be addressed by mere tooling and technology delivery without regard to inclusivity, building of capacity, data ethics, and enduring resilience. Higher education leaders must use integrated strategies that balance accessibility, equity, ethics, and sustainability (Obizue & Nwachukwu, 2025).

1. Infrastructure Expansion

The first and most evident response to the digital divide is enhancing ICT infrastructure access. Universities, governments, and private companies need to cooperate in growing broadband penetration, deploying campus Wi-Fi, and making prices for laptop access, tablet PCs, and

cellular smartphones more balanced. UNESCO (2021), insists that fair and balanced digital infrastructure is a necessity for higher education democratization in the 21st century. Fortunately, in addition to hardware devices, infrastructure also refers to investments in digital libraries, environments for e-learning, and research in the cloud to allow all students and staff members to be actively involved in academic activity.

2. Digital Literacy Programs

Only infrastructure cannot eliminate the digital divide, and we must supplement that with investments in human capacity. Digital literacy instruction provides learners and instructors with skills for the effective use of ICTs for teaching, learning, and research. Training programs should extend beyond technical skills to include ethical consciousness, digital citizenships, and critical selection of online resources, according to Beaunoyer et al. (2020). Ongoing professional development for instructors ensures that they are competent in matters of online pedagogy, digital resource creation, and blended learning designs. It also instills sustainable teacher approaches that make effective use of technology.

3. Inclusive Policy Contexts

Higher education management that is ethically sound must have policies that proactively engage with marginalized groups. Priorities for policies should be providing accessible digital outlets for disabled students, subsidized learning for low-income households, and customized support for remote and rural students (Robinson et al., 2020). Gender-sensitive digital policies are also a part of inclusivity since women in most areas encounter extra obstacles in reaching ICTs. By infusing inclusivity at a foundational level for institutions, universities are able to make digital reformation inclusive and aligned with fairness and equity.

4. Ethical ICT Governance

Growing use of ICTs has implications for ethics, privacy, and trust. Organizations should design systems for governance that direct data security, proper use of learning management systems, and transparent information gathering systems. Ess (2021) contends that ethical governance of ICT should be inclusive and that learners, employees, and civil society must be engaged for purposes of ensuring accountability and legitimacy. Special data gathering policies, consent, and digital rights policies ensure academic integrity and make postsecondary institutions trustworthy.

5. Sustainability Alignment

Lastly, digital divide bridging ought to be aligned with the SDGs strategically. Universities ought to increase access while ensuring ICT adoption promotes inclusivity, resilience, and long-term sustainability. Tilbury (2016), describes that higher education institutions ought to adopt a holistic

sustainability agenda that covers environmental stewardship, social equity, and economic viability. This includes integrating green ICT practices, adopting inclusive digital teaching strategies, and incorporating sustainability principles while planning digital transformation strategies.

Case Reflections: Digital Divide in African Higher Education

The African digital divide persists as one of the greatest obstacles to the moral administration of higher learning and a search for sustainability. As ICT has revolutionized world education, Africa lags behind with systematic obstacles that have their roots in infrastructual inadequacies, socio-economic inequities, and policy deficiencies. One of the most vivid representations of this disparity was seen in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, when higher education systems globally transitioned to emergency remote instruction. In Nigeria, varsities were handicapped by inadequate internet penetration, expensive data rates, and unreliable electricity, rendering thousands of students inaccessible to online tutorials or electronic libraries (Patrick, Kim, & Woronov, 2014). Elite universities in central cities were able to implement e-learning software like Moodle, Zoom, or Google Classroom, while those in under-resourced varsities particularly those located in rural or peri-urban areas were edged out. This was doubly detrimental, both damaging equity and raising ethical questions about justice, fairness, and the right to education. Similar situations were witnessed elsewhere on the continent. In South Africa, while main universities adopted high-end online teaching infrastructures, the majority of rural students were excluded from digital inclusion by a lack of devices and connectivity. The government and institutions attempted to compensate with data subsidies and distributing devices, but the interventions were patchy and often tardy (Czerniewicz et al., 2020). In Kenya, while penetration for mobile telephones was relatively high, data bundle affordability and sparse broadband penetration meant that students were unable to maximise on online learning, once more creating the digital disparity gap (Sey & Hafkin, 2019).

These are realities that reveal the African higher education digital divide to be a multifaceted phenomenon. On the accessibility level, the vast majority of the students lack proper physical infrastructure computers, a reliable power supply, and easily accessible Internet. On the use level, digital literacy is a cross-cutting limitation, and some staff and students are poorly trained to make effective use of e-learning resources. On the quality-of-use level, in spite of those who have accessibility, they end up on limited digital activities like visiting social sites rather than academic or research use and therefore minimize the transformative power of ICT (van Dijk, 2020). From a moral perspective, they raise significant questions: How ought universities to allocate scarce digital resources on a fair basis? Have governments and institutional leaders a responsibility to make resources available on a fair basis? How may policies ensure that disproportionate groups, such as rural individuals, women, and individuals with disabilities, are not routinely excluded

from digital systems for learning? Solving these issues demands structural reforms. Firstly, infrastructural investments are urgently needed at country level and at institution level to increase broadband penetration, provide device subsidy, and ensure a stable electricity supply. Secondly, digital literacy programs for both staff and students are essential for making meaningful use of ICT tools. Thirdly, inclusive management approaches should infuse equity into digital transformation agendas such that resource distribution takes vulnerable sections into account. Fourthly, private sector actors, NGOs, and international development agencies could ensure required assistance for sustainable elimination of digital divides. So in the African context, digital higher education would have to be guided simultaneously by technological efficiency and ethical and sustainability considerations. Without a balance between these mutually conflicting imperatives, the danger is that the digital divide would deepen and widen inequalities and threaten the continent's promise for educational and socio-economic transformation.

Conclusion

Education management ethics within the context of the digital divide is no marginal priority it is the core of the inclusivity and sustainability of contemporary academic systems. The present study has verified that the digital divide consists of three levels access level, use level, and quality-of-use level. The three divides cumulatively determine the learning success of students, research output and dissemination ability of scholars, and globally competitive strength of institutions. Ethical problems are presented where these divides isolate marginalized populations, limit educational access, or compromise fairness, justice, and inclusivity. For the African region, these are exacerbated by infrastructurally induced deficiencies, exorbitant connectivity costs, and a lack of policy frameworks. The pandemic went on to show that the digital divide is more than a limitation in a technical sense, and that it's a social justice problem that manifests deeper structural inequities. Higher education for the purpose of promoting sustainability requires that universities and policy makers adopt holistic strategies that go beyond the simple technological fix. Moral management insists that infrastructural investments are matched with digital literacy projects, inclusive policy environments, and transparent ICT governance. Sustainability similarly insists on environmental awareness, such that ICT expansion does not engender unsustainable consumption patterns for energy and e-waste accumulation. Ultimately, closing the digital divide involves more than handing out devices or connectivity it requires making higher education deliver on its mandate as a common good that promotes equity, innovation, and societal transformation. When ICT strategies are conceived in ethical frames and the Sustainable Development Goals, higher education institutions can be at the forefront of constructing equitable, just, and resilient knowledge societies. There is an ethical imperative at hand: universities must not be a spectator against digital exclusion. Higher education management

requires moral leadership if institutions are to empower students on a level playing field, ensure balanced development, and make societies prepared for a digital future.

References

Alhumaid, K. (2019). Four ways technology has negatively changed education. *Journal of Educational and Social Research, 9*(4), 10–20.

Beaunoyer, E., Dupéré, S., & Guitton, M. J. (2020). COVID-19 and digital inequalities: Reciprocal impacts and mitigation strategies. *Computers in Human Behavior, 111,* 106424.

Ess, C. (2021). *Digital media ethics* (3rd ed.). Polity Press.

Eynon, R., & Geniets, A. (2016). The digital skills gap: Evidence and policy implications for education. *Oxford Review of Education, 42*(1), 123–146.

García-Morales, V. J., Garrido-Moreno, A., & Martín-Rojas, R. (2021). The digital transformation of higher education: An international perspective. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 166,* 120636.

Livingstone, S., & Helsper, E. (2007). Gradations in digital inclusion: Children, young people, and the digital divide. *New Media & Society, 9*(4), 671–696.

Nwachukwu C. N (2025). Technology Integration in Educational Administration. Educational Management, Leadership and Supervision: Contemporary Perspective. (Ed). Obizue et al. Deep Science Publishing. https://doi.org/10.70593/978-93-7185-247-0.

Obizue, M.N. (2022). Management by Objective (MBO) for Functional Education and Human Develoment: A penanced for Sustainable National Development: *Nigerian Journal of Educational Administration and Planning* (NJEAP) Vol.17, No 5, 2017.

Obizue, M.N. & Nwachukwu C. N (2025). Lecturers' Perception on Academic Conferences in Nigeria: Benefits and Roles in Research and Professional Development. *Review of African Educational Studies (RAES). 4(1)*

Patrick.A., David .I., & Ugochukwu ,M. (2014). ICTs and Sustainable Development of Higher Education in Nigeria: Rewriting the Ugly Narrative. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, *4*(1), 357.

Robinson, L., Schulz, J., Dunn, H., Casilli, A. A., Tubaro, P., Carvath, R., ... & Dodel, M. (2020). Digital inequalities 2.0: Legacy inequalities in the information age. *First Monday, 25*(7).

Scheerder, A., van Deursen, A., & van Dijk, J. (2017). Determinants of Internet skills, use and outcomes. *Information, Communication & Society, 20*(7), 1004–1023.

Tilbury, D. (2016). Higher education for sustainability: A global overview of commitment and progress. In M. Barth et al. (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of higher education for sustainable development* (pp. 17–30). Routledge.

UNESCO. (2021). *Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education.* UNESCO Publishing.

van Dijk, J. (2020). *The digital divide.* Polity Press.