

Selecting and Implementing Effective Instructional Strategies: A Review of Pedagogical Alignment, Learner Characteristics, and Digital Learning Ecosystems

Loso Judijanto

IPOSS Jakarta

Corresponding Author: Loso Judijanto losojudijantobumn@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Learning Strategies; Strategy Selection; Learning Effectiveness; Pedagogical Alignment; Learner Characteristics; Teacher Competence; Formative Assessment; Active Learning; Digital Learning; Artificial Intelligence

Received : 2 May

Revised : 20 June

Accepted: 20 July

©2026 Judijanto: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the

[Creative Commons Atribusi 4.0 Internasional](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



ABSTRACT

Choosing a learning strategy is often treated as a technical method choice, even though the appropriateness of the choice and the effectiveness of its implementation are determined by a complex interaction between goals, the nature of the material, learner characteristics, teacher competence, assessment, resources, and the social and digital environment. This article aims to identify the factors that determine the appropriateness of choosing a learning strategy and to explain the factors that influence the effectiveness of its implementation. This study uses a qualitative literature review that is integrative and interpretative of reputable journal articles mainly published since 2020. The literature is analyzed thematically by distinguishing factors at the stage of diagnosing and selecting strategies from factors at the stage of design, implementation, monitoring, and adaptation. The study results show that there isn't a single strategy that works best for all goals and contexts. Choosing the right one mainly depends on how well learning outcomes, cognitive demands, material structure, prior knowledge, motivation, self-regulation, student diversity, classroom conditions, assessments, and the pedagogical function of technology align

INTRODUCTION

Learning strategies are the main link between the planned curriculum and the actual learning experiences that students go through. Learning objectives, curriculum content, methods, activities, media, interactions, assessments, and feedback only lead to meaningful learning if they are combined into coherent pedagogical decisions. That's why learning strategies can't just be boiled down to choosing between lectures, discussions, projects, or using technology. Strategies are action plans that guide how students access knowledge, process information, interact, practice, get support, show evidence of learning, and improve their understanding. Studies on active learning, scaffolding, student engagement, and self-regulation show that the quality of the connection between activity design and the learning process matters more than the strategy label used [1], [2], [3].

The urgency of discussing learning strategies is increasing as the educational environment changes rapidly. Learning now happens through a mix of classrooms, digital platforms, videos, simulations, online forums, learning analytics, virtual reality, and generative artificial intelligence. These changes give teachers more options, but at the same time increase the risk of choosing technology or methods based on popularity, institutional pressure, or visual appeal, rather than learning needs. Research on blended learning and online learning confirms that technology is beneficial when integrated with goals, interaction, support, and assessment; otherwise, technology can add cognitive load, widen access gaps, and weaken focus if used without clear pedagogical design [4], [5], [6], [7], [8].

Another issue lies in the tendency to seek strategies that are considered universally the most effective. Meta-analyses on flipped classrooms, gamification, active learning, virtual reality, and project-based learning generally show positive average effects, but they also find large variability between studies. These variations in results show that effectiveness is not just tied to the name of a strategy, but comes from the fit between the strategy, goals, learners, context, quality of implementation, and forms of assessment. A flipped classroom can boost interaction if the pre-class materials are concise and classroom activities require application; however, the same strategy can fail when learners don't have the time, access, or self-regulation to prepare themselves [9], [10], [11], [12], [13], [14], [15], [16], [17].

In practice, two issues often get mixed up. The first issue is choosing the right strategy, which means whether the strategy selected fits the learning outcomes, the material structure, the characteristics of the students, the assessment, and the resources. The second issue is implementation effectiveness, which is whether a conceptually appropriate strategy is actually carried out with adequate quality. A suitable strategy can have weak impact if the instructions are unclear, scaffolding is insufficient, activities don't require relevant cognitive processes, collaboration is unstructured, or feedback can't be used. On the other hand, a reflective teacher can adapt a simple strategy to be very effective in a specific context [18], [19], [20].

It's important to analytically separate selection and implementation because the ways to improve them are different. Mistakes in selection require re-evaluating the objectives, materials, students, and context. Weaknesses in implementation call for fixing activity design, classroom management, motivational support, formative assessment, feedback, or teacher competence. Without this distinction, learning evaluations can easily lead to oversimplified conclusions, like saying a model is "ineffective," even though the main issue might be student readiness, misaligned assessments, low fidelity, or lack of institutional support [21], [22], [23].

The conceptual gap also becomes clear when the literature discusses strategy components separately. Some studies focus on engagement, others on motivation, self-regulation, feedback, digital competence, or artificial intelligence. In reality, everyday pedagogical decisions require teachers to integrate all of these dimensions. Teachers need to decide not just which strategies to use, but also when direct instruction is needed, how much autonomy to give, how groups are formed, how cognitive load is managed, what learning evidence is collected, and when strategies should be changed. Therefore, a synthesis that connects evidence from various research areas into a decision-making framework that can be used across grade levels and subjects is needed [12], [24], [25], [26].

Based on this issue, this article raises two research questions. First, what factors determine the accuracy of choosing a learning strategy in the context of diverse goals, materials, students, and resources? Second, what factors influence the effectiveness of implementing a learning strategy, and how do design, teachers, students, assessment, interaction, technology, and context relate to each other? These two questions aim to provide an explanation that not only describes the variety of strategies but also outlines the conditions that make a strategy feasible to choose and successful to implement.

The purpose of this article is: (1) to clarify the conceptual boundaries between approaches, models, strategies, methods, and techniques; (2) to synthesize the factors that determine the appropriateness of strategy selection; (3) to explain the mechanisms and conditions that affect implementation effectiveness; and (4) to formulate a decision framework that helps educators choose, design, monitor, and adapt strategies responsibly. The main contribution of the article lies in integrating pedagogical alignment, learner characteristics, teacher competence, assessment, and the digital ecosystem into a single decision-making flow.

Practically, this synthesis is relevant for teachers, lecturers, curriculum developers, school leaders, and providers of professional development. Smarter strategic decisions can reduce the ceremonial use of methods, prevent wasting technology, strengthen inclusion, and increase students' opportunities to engage cognitively, emotionally, and socially. Academically, this article positions the effectiveness of strategies as the result of the interaction between design and context, rather than as a fixed characteristic of a learning model.

LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Concept and Limitations of Learning Strategies

A learning strategy can be defined as a systematic plan to organize goals, content, activities, interactions, learning resources, assessments, and support so that students achieve certain learning outcomes. This definition places strategy at a broader decision-making level than methods. Methods describe specific ways of implementation, while strategies organize the relationships between components from the beginning to the end of learning. One strategy can use several methods, and one method can be placed in different strategies depending on the goals and context.

The terms approach, model, strategy, method, and technique need to be distinguished so that the analysis doesn't get blurry. An approach is a philosophical or theoretical orientation about how learning happens; a model is a relatively structured design pattern with stages; a strategy is a plan of decisions to achieve results; a method is the way of implementation; whereas a technique is a micro action used at a certain moment. Problem-based learning, for example, can be positioned as a model that is operationalized through strategies like collaboration, discussion, source exploration, scaffolding, presentation, and authentic assessment. Think-pair-share is a technique that can be used in various strategies, not a full strategy that stands alone [28], [29].

These differences have evaluative consequences. The effectiveness of a technique can't be concluded without understanding the strategy behind it, and the effectiveness of a model can't be judged based on just one activity. Research on flipped learning shows that flipping the order of materials and classes doesn't automatically lead to active learning; success depends on the quality of pre-class materials, accountability for preparation, integration between online and face-to-face activities, and using class time for higher-order cognitive tasks [13], [15], [30], [31]. Thus, learning strategies should be understood as a decision-making architecture. This architecture connects questions about what needs to be learned, what mental processes should occur, what experiences should be provided, what support is needed, and what evidence shows success. This perspective spares teachers from the false dichotomy between teacher-centered and student-centered learning. Direct instruction, exploration, collaboration, practice, and reflection can be productively combined if each function is clear and aligned with the learning stage.

Table 1. Distinction of Concepts in Learning Design

Concept	Main focus	Example
Pendekatan	Philosophical or theoretical orientation about learning	Constructivistic, cognitive, humanistic, socio-cultural
Models	Design patterns that have relatively distinctive stages or syntax	<i>Problem-based learning, project-based learning, inquiry learning</i>
Strategy	An integrated plan that connects objectives, activities, interactions, media, and assessments	Collaborative strategies to solve authentic cases
Method	How to implement certain parts of the strategy	Interactive talks, discussions, demonstrations, simulations
Technique	Micro-actions used at specific moments	<i>Think-pair-share, exit ticket, peer feedback</i>

Source: author's synthesis based on literature

2. Theoretical Foundation

The constructivist approach emphasizes that learners build understanding by connecting new information with prior knowledge. As a result, strategies need to surface initial ideas, provide challenging experiences or problems, and give opportunities to explain and revise understanding. However, constructing knowledge doesn't mean learners have to figure everything out on their own. Research on scaffolding shows that planned support – like examples, guiding questions, modeling, hints, or task structures – helps learners navigate complexity and gradually take over responsibility for their learning [18], [32].

The socio-cultural foundation places language, interaction, and participation as the medium for knowledge building. Effective collaborative learning requires cognitive, social, and organizational interaction. Learners aren't just placed in groups; they need shared goals, individual responsibility, dialogue norms, role distribution, and opportunities to negotiate meaning. Studies on computer-supported collaborative learning show that the quality of group interaction and organization needs to be designed from the start and monitored during implementation [29], [33].

The cognitive basis highlights the limits of working memory and the importance of knowledge structure. Strategies that are too complex, overloaded with features, or offer too many choices can overwhelm learners, especially when their prior knowledge is low. Managing cognitive load is done through segmentation, scaffolding, worked examples, reducing irrelevant information, gradual practice, and integrating representations. In digital learning, interface design and how media is presented also affect cognitive load; immersive technology isn't always better if the visual elements and interactions don't support the main learning process [24], [34], [35].

The metacognitive and self-regulated learning foundation emphasizes students' ability to plan, monitor, and evaluate their own learning. Strategies that demand a high level of independence – like flipped, blended, project-based, and online learning – work better when students have clear goals, time management skills, help-seeking strategies, and reflective habits. Since self-regulation can't be assumed to develop automatically, these strategies should include agendas, milestones, checklists, monitoring, self-assessment, and opportunities to revise plans [3], [12], [13], [15], [36].

The motivational basis explains that engagement lasts when learners feel autonomy, competence, and connectedness. Supporting autonomy doesn't mean leaving learners without structure, but rather giving meaningful reasons, relevant choices, opportunities to voice their opinions, and support when facing difficulties. Meta-analyses and studies on self-determination theory show that autonomous motivation is linked to perseverance, engagement, and better learning quality compared to motivation that's purely driven by pressure or external rewards [25], [37], [38], [39].

A humanistic and inclusive approach calls for strategies that recognize the diversity of abilities, languages, cultures, socio-economic conditions, special needs, and access to technology. Inclusion isn't about lowering standards; it's about offering multiple pathways to access materials, participate, and show understanding. Active learning can help close achievement gaps if designed with enough support, but it can also widen inequalities if different participation norms, access, and learners' needs are ignored [40], [41].

3. Evidence on the Variety of Strategies and Effectiveness Mechanisms

Empirical evidence shows that active strategies generally provide benefits when learners actually engage in cognitive processes like explaining, comparing, generating questions, solving problems, or testing ideas. The term active learning shouldn't be understood as just physical activity. Activities might look busy but not be relevant to the goals, while a brief explanation can be very effective if it helps learners build an initial framework. So, the main indicator is how well the cognitive processes triggered match the intended learning outcomes [1], [2].

Problem-based learning, project-based learning, and inquiry learning are strong in developing application, problem-solving, collaboration, and transfer skills. However, these benefits show up when the problems are of good quality, learners have a basic knowledge, the process includes scaffolding, and assessments evaluate both the product and reasoning. Projects that only produce a product without guiding questions or reflection can turn into mechanical task-splitting. Similarly, unguided inquiry can increase confusion for beginner learners [18], [28].

Flipped and blended learning offer flexibility and chances to use face-to-face time for higher-level activities. Meta-analyses show an average positive effect, but the results are better when pre-class learning is structured, brief, and directly linked to in-class activities. The main obstacles include workload, self-regulation readiness, connection quality, and unclear integration between online and offline components [5], [6], [9], [10], [13], [15].

Gamification, virtual reality, and artificial intelligence can boost motivation, visualization, adaptive practice, and access to feedback. However, game elements don't always improve understanding; rewards and leaderboards can shift focus from mastery to competition. Virtual reality can support immersive experiences, but costs, cybersickness, and cognitive load need to be considered. Generative AI can expand idea support and early feedback, but it comes with risks like hallucinations, bias, privacy issues, dependency, and breaches of academic integrity [8], [14], [42], [43], [44], [45].

Formative assessment and feedback are cross-strategy mechanisms. Effective feedback doesn't stop at giving comments; it requires clear criteria, opportunities to interpret information, and time to take corrective action. The concept of feedback literacy positions students as active users of feedback, while teacher feedback literacy requires teachers to design processes that can be understood and acted upon. Any strategy will lose its effectiveness if assessment only measures rote memorization while activities are aimed at analysis, collaboration, or creativity [26], [46], [47], [48].

4. Conceptual Framework of Selection and Effectiveness

The theoretical synthesis shows that the accuracy of choosing a strategy works at the diagnosis and alignment stages, while effectiveness works at the design quality and implementation stages. Diagnosis answers who the learners are, what needs to be achieved, what the material's characteristics are, and what constraints exist. Alignment answers whether activities and assessments develop the intended capabilities. Implementation answers whether instruction, support, interaction, time, and resources are carried out consistently. Monitoring and adaptation answers whether learning evidence is used to improve the strategy as the process unfolds.

The framework also emphasizes the interactions between variables. Prior knowledge affects the need for scaffolding; self-regulation affects the success of blended learning; class size affects the structure of collaboration; digital access affects the feasibility of technology; and the form of assessment affects students' learning strategies. Therefore, effectiveness cannot be accurately predicted from a single factor. Educators need to consider a combination of factors and trade-offs, including time efficiency, depth of learning, equality of participation, and sustainability of workload.

Literature also reminds us that fidelity and adaptation don't have to be at odds. The core components of a strategy need to be maintained, but the way it's carried out should fit the context. Take flipped learning, for example – it requires preparation before class and using class time for active processing; the form of materials, duration, and media can be adapted. Project-based learning needs guiding problems or questions, stages, products, and reflection; the project's scope can be adjusted based on time and resources. Effective adaptation keeps the core mechanism while changing surface elements.

Based on that, this article uses an analytical distinction between “selection factors” and “effectiveness factors” as a study framework. Selection factors act as *ex ante* criteria before a strategy is set. Effectiveness factors work as conditions for the process and outcomes that need to be monitored during and after

implementation. This distinction forms the basis for organizing the results and discussion.

METHODOLOGY

This article uses an integrative and interpretative qualitative literature review, not a systematic literature review. This approach was chosen because the goal of the study isn't to calculate aggregate effects or claim coverage of all publications, but rather to connect concepts and findings from several research areas—learning strategies, motivation, self-regulation, assessment, educational technology, inclusion, and teacher professional development—to build a coherent conceptual explanation. An integrative literature review allows the author to compare definitions, mechanisms, conditions, and tensions between perspectives and then produce a synthesis that has theoretical and practical value [49], [50].

The search was done iteratively through academic search engines, DOI searches, journal publisher websites, and citation chaining. Keywords included instructional strategy, teaching strategy, active learning, student engagement, self-regulated learning, scaffolding, cognitive load, formative assessment, feedback literacy, blended learning, flipped classroom, project-based learning, collaborative learning, gamification, virtual reality, artificial intelligence in education, inclusive pedagogy, and teacher professional development. Peer-reviewed journal articles since 2020 were prioritized, especially meta-analyses, systematic reviews, conceptual reviews, and empirical studies that describe implementation conditions. Sources were selected purposively based on direct relevance, journal reputation, clarity of methods, and contribution to the two research questions.

The analysis was carried out through comparative reading and thematic coding. The findings were grouped into: (1) factors that determine the appropriateness of strategy selection; (2) factors that affect implementation effectiveness; (3) mechanisms that explain why strategies succeed or fail; and (4) implications for decision-making. Differences in results between studies were interpreted by considering the level of education, discipline, characteristics of learners, assessment design, learning mode, and resources. Because this review did not use an SLR protocol, the results are not meant to be an exhaustive inventory or a formal risk of bias assessment, but rather a transparent conceptual synthesis that can be further developed.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1 The Role of Teachers as Designers, Facilitators, Assessors, and Reflectors

The synthesis results show that teachers act as decision designers, not just method implementers. Teachers need to translate the curriculum into learning experiences by identifying outcomes, evidence, activities, supports, and the necessary sequence. This role requires knowledge of content, pedagogy, learners, assessment, and technology. Using popular models without diagnosis can lead to misaligned learning; on the other hand, simple designs can be effective if the targeted mental processes, scaffolding, and assessments are clear [2], [27].

Teachers also act as facilitators and providers of structure. Facilitation isn't about reducing the teacher's role but about shifting from dominating the delivery to organizing the learning environment. In inquiry, projects, and collaboration, teachers set the problems, provide resources, model reasoning, ask questions, monitor interactions, and give support when needed. As students' abilities improve, support is gradually reduced, so control over learning slowly shifts. The role of the assessor is integral. Teachers collect initial evidence to diagnose knowledge and readiness, process evidence to improve learning, and final evidence to assess achievement. Formative assessment helps teachers decide whether to reteach, accelerate, give extra examples, reorganize groups, or change media. The quality of strategies improves when change decisions are based on evidence, not just general impressions [48], [51].

In the end, teachers are reflectors and adapters. No design can anticipate all student responses. Teachers need to observe participation patterns, misconceptions, workload, quality of work, and use of feedback. Effective professional development provides practice, coaching, collaboration, and opportunities to test changes in real contexts, not just one-way seminars [20], [21].

2. Factors That Determine the Accuracy of Choosing a Learning Strategy

The first factor is learning outcomes and the level of cognitive demand. Strategies should be chosen based on the abilities you want to develop, not based on what activities are currently popular. Mastery of basic facts and procedures may require explicit explanations, worked examples, retrieval practice, and step-by-step exercises. Analysis, evaluation, creativity, and problem-solving require cases, inquiry, debates, projects, or simulations. Collaboration skills require interdependence and accountability, not just group tasks. Aligning goals, activities, and assessments is the first criterion because strategies that are fun but don't trigger the targeted cognitive processes won't produce relevant evidence of learning [1], [24].

The second factor is the nature of the material and the structure of knowledge. Factual material requires organizing and recalling information; conceptual material needs examples, non-examples, analogies, and connections between concepts; procedural material needs demonstrations, practice, and feedback; conditional material requires a variety of cases so that learners understand when a concept is used. Hierarchical material demands mastery of prerequisites, while open-ended material can use exploration and projects. Strategy accuracy improves when teachers map out the content structure and common misconceptions before deciding on activities.

The third factor is learners' prior knowledge and readiness. Beginner learners tend to need more structure, while more experienced learners can benefit from open-ended problems and autonomy. Prior knowledge affects how information is processed and the amount of cognitive load that can be handled. For that reason, pre-assessments, diagnostic questions, concept maps, or initial tasks are needed to avoid strategies that are either too easy or too complex [18], [34].

The fourth factor is motivation, interest, belief in competence, and self-regulation. Independent or online strategies require the ability to manage time, set goals, and seek help. If readiness is low, teachers need to add milestones, reminders, weekly structures, learning contracts, and monitoring. Choices and authentic contexts can increase relevance, but autonomy needs to be accompanied by clarity. Structured autonomy support is more effective than unlimited choices, which can actually increase confusion [3], [25], [37].

The fifth factor is diversity and the need for inclusion. Strategies should take into account language variation, abilities, disabilities, cultural experiences, economic conditions, and the sense of safety for participation. Public discussion can benefit some learners but put pressure on others; group work can reinforce dominance if roles and norms aren't managed. Choices in material format, flexible timing, captions, alt text, varied ways to respond, and tiered support improve access without lowering academic demands [40], [41].

The sixth factor is the size of the class, time, space, and resources. Complex project strategies might not be realistic for short meetings without support outside the classroom. Discussions can be done in large classes using micro structures like think-pair-share, polling, or peer instruction. Laboratory limitations can be addressed with simulations, but the validity of the experience and access to equipment should be checked. Choosing a responsible strategy considers preparation costs, teacher workload, student workload, and the sustainability of implementation, not just technical feasibility.

The seventh factor is the teacher's competence, confidence, and experience. Strategies that demand high facilitation require the ability to handle open-ended questions, misconceptions, group dynamics, and performance assessments. Adaptive technology or AI requires data literacy and ethics. Teachers who aren't ready can start with small prototypes, adapt examples, and work with colleagues. Evidence from the shift to online learning shows that pedagogical and digital competence, not just device availability, affects teachers' ability to change their practices [22], [23].

The eighth factor is assessment alignment. Students adjust their learning strategies based on what is being assessed. If the goal emphasizes problem-solving, but the test only measures recall, students will prioritize memorization. Choosing strategies should consider what evidence can be gathered validly and fairly. Projects need rubrics, standard examples, checkpoints, and a mix of process and product assessments. Collaboration requires mechanisms to differentiate individual and group contributions. Feedback should be designed as part of the revision cycle, not just comments after the learning opportunity has ended [47], [52], [53].

The ninth factor is the pedagogical function and technology risks. Technology is chosen because of its affordances: visualization, simulation, collaboration, access, adaptation, or feedback. A feature-rich platform isn't always suitable if it complicates navigation or collects too much data. Generative AI can be used for brainstorming, alternative examples, dialogue, or initial feedback, but it needs verification, transparency of use, data protection, and task design that requires authentic reasoning. Technology choices should be guided by the question 'what learning problem does this solve?' rather than 'what tools are available?' [8], [42], [54], [55].

The tenth factor is the institutional and learning culture context. Schedule policies, class size, curriculum load, technical support, assessment culture, and parent or student expectations shape the feasibility of strategies. Innovations that aren't supported by time allocation, recognition of workload, and professional development tend to rely on individuals and are hard to sustain. Also, a culture very focused on the right answers can make learners reject open-ended problems. Strategies need to be introduced by explaining the reasons, training participation skills, and gradually building norms.

Those ten factors show that choosing a strategy is a multi-criteria diagnosis process. Not all criteria carry the same weight in every situation. For urgent procedural goals, efficiency and clarity might matter more; for transfer goals, authenticity and context variation become key. Educators need to document the selection assumptions so that later evaluations can distinguish whether issues come from a misdiagnosis or weak implementation.

Table 2. Diagnosis Matrix for Choosing Learning Strategies

Factor	Diagnostic Questions	Decision Implications
Learning outcomes	What abilities must be demonstrated?	Choose activities that trigger cognitive processes and performance accordingly.
Material	Is the material factual, conceptual, procedural, or complex?	Adjust the level of explicitness, examples, exercises, exploration, and authenticity.
Prior knowledge	What are the prerequisites and misconceptions of learners?	Determine diagnosis, scaffolding, and staging needs.
Motivation and self-regulation	How prepared are learners to manage choices and time?	Add structure, milestones, monitoring, and autonomy support.
Diversity and inclusion	Who is potentially at risk of access or participation barriers?	Provide multimodality, flexibility, and safe participation norms.
Context and resources	What time, class sizes, devices, and support are available?	Choose a realistic and sustainable scale and complexity strategy.

Factor	Diagnostic Questions	Decision Implications
Teacher competence	What facilitation, assessment, and digital capabilities are available?	Use prototypes, peer collaboration, or professional development.
Assessments	What evidence is valid and fair for that purpose?	Align criteria, rubrics, processes, products, and revision opportunities.
Technology	<i>What affordance</i> is required and what are the risks?	Use the tool only when solving the study problem better.
Institutions and culture	What policies and norms support or limit?	Plan for communication, support, and stages of change.

Source: Author's Synthesis Based on Literature.

3. Factors That Influence the Effectiveness of Learning Strategies

The first factor of effectiveness is the quality of activity design. Activities need to trigger relevant cognitive processes and produce artifacts or observable responses. Discussion questions that only ask for general opinions aren't enough to build analysis; projects without quality limits don't guarantee creativity; repeated quizzes without feedback don't automatically lead to understanding. Effective design sets goals, instructions, criteria, stages, and the relationships between activities explicitly [1], [2].

The second factor is clarity of instructions and managing cognitive load. Learners need to understand what to do, why they're doing it, what results are expected, and what resources are available. Task complexity should be distinguished from instruction complexity. Tasks can be intellectually challenging, but still have clear guidance, examples, and work formats. Segmenting, worked examples, cueing, and reducing decorative elements help learners focus their mental resources on the substance [24], [34].

The third factor is adaptive scaffolding. Too little support causes confusion, while too much support reduces autonomy and transfer. Effective scaffolding is contingent on needs, guides thinking strategies, and is gradually reduced. In online learning, scaffolding can be in the form of templates, prompts, rubrics, examples, dashboards, or automated feedback. However, digital support needs to be integrated with teacher monitoring because the system can't always capture the reasons behind students' difficulties [18], [32]. Faktor keempat adalah **keterlibatan kognitif, emosional, dan perilaku**.

Attendance or participation is not enough proof that students are learning. Cognitive engagement is seen in the use of strategies, elaboration, monitoring, and perseverance. Emotional engagement relates to interest, a sense of security, and meaning. Behavioral engagement is related to attendance and task completion. Effective strategies combine achievable challenges, relevance, chances of success, and social support so that all three dimensions reinforce each other [27], [56].

The fifth factor is motivation and support for autonomy. Using rewards, points, and competitions can boost short-term participation, but doesn't always strengthen mastery. Gamification works better when game elements give feedback on progress, provide meaningful challenges, and support choices, instead of just external control. Strategies also need to avoid competition that embarrasses students or widens gaps [14], [37], [44], [45].

The sixth factor is the structure of interaction and collaboration. Effective groups need shared goals, flexible role distribution, individual accountability, communication norms, decision-making mechanisms, and time to evaluate the process. In online learning, social presence and teaching presence help reduce isolation. Teachers need to observe the quality of exchanges, not just the number of messages, because frequent interaction doesn't necessarily lead to idea integration [29], [33].

The seventh factor is formative assessment and the quality of feedback. Feedback is most useful when it addresses students' position relative to goals, improvement steps, and next action opportunities. Comments that are too general, late, or excessive are hard to use. Students also need feedback literacy: the ability to understand standards, manage emotions, evaluate work quality, and turn information into action. Peer assessment and self-assessment can expand learning opportunities if the criteria are modeled and the quality of evaluation is monitored [26], [46], [48].

The eighth factor is self-regulation and co-regulation. Strategies that provide flexibility in time and place shift some of the regulation responsibilities from the teacher to the students. Without support, this flexibility can turn into procrastination and fragmented attention. Schedules, checkpoints, weekly goals, progress dashboards, quick conferences, and study groups can serve as co-regulation before students are able to manage themselves independently [3], [12]. The ninth factor is teacher presence and competence. Student-centered learning doesn't eliminate the need for teacher presence. Teachers monitor, clarify, challenge, connect contributions, and make adaptive decisions. In online or AI-based learning, teacher presence is also important for building relationships, interpreting data, and handling ethical aspects that algorithms can't address. Ongoing professional development boosts teachers' ability to maintain the core components of strategies while adjusting them to the context [21], [57].

The tenth factor is the reliability, accessibility, and ethics of technology. Connection issues, shared devices, complicated interfaces, and low technical support can reduce participation. Immersive technology requires consideration for health and comfort. AI requires policies on privacy, attribution, verification, and acceptable use. Effectiveness can't be judged just by average results if some learners don't have equal access [5], [43], [58].

The eleventh factor is flexible fidelity. Implementation needs to keep the core mechanisms of the strategy, but the way it's carried out can be adapted. Problems arise when innovations only adopt surface elements—for example, pre-class videos without in-depth activities, group work without interdependence, or projects without investigation. Evaluations should check which components are actually being carried out and how adaptations are made. This helps avoid

the conclusion that a particular strategy fails when, in fact, the core mechanisms aren't in place [30], [31].

The twelfth factor is monitoring and continuous improvement. Effectiveness needs to be assessed through triangulating learning outcomes, process quality, engagement, participation equity, and workload. Quiz data, artifacts, observations, platform logs, student feedback, and teacher reflections can all be used together. Learning analytics are useful if interpreted pedagogically and not used as a replacement for dialogue. The design-implementation-evidence-reflection-revision cycle helps strategies grow as professional practice, not as a fixed package [4], [59].

Overall, effectiveness is the result of a configuration. Clarity without motivation can lead to minimal compliance; motivation without structure can lead to shallow activity; technology without access can widen gaps; and assessment without a chance for revision limits formative function. Therefore, factors of effectiveness need to be understood as a system that can either reinforce or weaken each other.

Table 3. Effectiveness Factors, Indicators, and Implementation Risks

Effectiveness Factors	Observable Indicators	Risks If Weak
Activity plan	Activities generate processes and relevant evidence	Being busy without studying deeply
Clarity and cognitive load	Instructions, examples, and sequences are easy to understand	Confusion and divided attention
Scaffolding	Support as needed and gradually reduced	Dependence or frustration
Motivation and engagement	Challenges, relevance, capability, and participation	Minimal compliance or desperation
Collaboration	Interdependence, accountability, and substantive dialogue	Dominance, free-riding, and conflict
Assessment and feedback	Clear criteria, information is used for revisions	Comments not followed up
Self-regulation	Goals, monitoring, time management, seeking help	Delay and losing direction
The teacher's presence	Monitoring, clarification, challenges, and support	Undetected isolation and misconceptions
Technology and access	Stable, easy to access, ethical, and relevant	Gaps, disruptions, and data risks
Evidence-based adaptation	Changes are made from process data and results	Frozen or changing strategies without reason

Source: author's synthesis based on literature.

4. Suitability and Success Conditions of Various Strategies

Expository strategies and explicit instruction are useful when learners need an initial framework, new concepts, safety procedures, or time efficiency. Their effectiveness improves through segmentation, examples, diagnostic questions, retrieval, and practice. The downside shows up when learners just listen without processing. That's why exposition should be combined with short activities that check understanding and encourage elaboration.

Active learning strategies are suitable for goals that require application, explanation, comparison, and evaluation. Their strength isn't in the number of activities, but in the thinking process they spark. This strategy needs participation norms, clear instructions, and support for learners who lack confidence. Evidence shows that active learning can improve outcomes and narrow gaps when implemented inclusively [1], [40].

Problem-based, project-based, and inquiry learning are suitable for integrative and transfer goals. Their effectiveness depends on the authenticity of the problem, prerequisite knowledge, time, and the teacher's ability to facilitate. Effectiveness requires guiding questions, steps, resources, milestones, rubrics, and reflection. Small, structured projects are often more realistic than large projects that overwhelm students and teachers [28].

Collaborative and cooperative learning strategies are suitable when learning outcomes involve negotiation, communication, and solving problems together. Their effectiveness requires designing interdependence and accountability. Group formation should consider size, composition, roles, as well as mechanisms for handling conflicts and free-riding. In online environments, communication channels and social support need to be designed explicitly [29], [33].

Flipped and blended learning work well when the basic material can be studied flexibly and synchronous time is used for applications. Success requires pre-class materials that are easy to access, concise, and come with accountability. Synchronous activities need to provide added value that you can't just get by watching a video. Meta-analyses show that it's the design, not just flipping the order, that makes the difference in outcomes [9], [10], [60].

Gamification and immersive environments are suitable when the goal requires repeated practice, visualization, simulation, or experiences that are hard to provide directly. Game elements need to support competence and progress, while VR should take into account device limitations and cognitive load. The novelty effect can temporarily boost enthusiasm, so evaluation needs to distinguish between fun and understanding [14], [44], [61], [62].

AI-based strategies are suitable for limited personalization, practice dialogues, example generation, and early feedback. However, AI shouldn't be the sole authority. Tasks need to be designed to require source verification, process reflection, contextual reasoning, and accountability. AI literacy includes the ability to understand limitations, bias, privacy, and ethical implications. Teachers' roles shift toward curation, validation, and designing experiences that maintain human agency [55], [63], [64], [65].

5. The “ALIGNED” Framework for Making Pedagogical Decisions

Based on the synthesis, this article offers the SELARAS framework as a decision-making tool. This framework isn’t a validated instrument, but rather a conceptual mnemonic that organizes key questions before, during, and after implementation. “SELARAS” consists of “Goals”, “Content and learning evidence”, “Learner”, “Access and context”, “Activity design”, “Assessment and feedback”, and “Supervision and adaptation”.

“Goals” mean outlining learning outcomes specifically and determining the cognitive, social, affective, or psychomotor level aimed for. Teachers need to distinguish whether students should remember, explain, apply, analyze, create, collaborate, or reflect. Vague goals lead to activities and assessments that are unfocused.

“Evidence” covers two things: structure and proof. Structure means understanding the nature of the material, prerequisites, misconceptions, and complexities. Proof means identifying artifacts or performances that show achievement. By starting with proof, teachers can avoid activities that are fun but don’t give information about learning.

“Learner” means diagnosing prior knowledge, motivation, self-regulation, language, access needs, experience, and social dynamics. Diagnosis doesn’t have to be a formal test; it can be done through initial questions, work samples, short surveys, or analysis of previous tasks. This information determines the level of structure, choices, and scaffolding.

“Access and context” include time, class size, space, technology, costs, policies, technical support, and learning culture. Strategies that require high-end devices aren’t suitable if access isn’t equal. Context also involves the workload of teachers and students, since innovations that aren’t sustainable tend to stop after the initial phase.

“A ‘plan’ means organizing a sequence of activities, instructions, interactions, scaffolding, and use of media. Each activity should have a clear function and transition. Teachers need to anticipate points of difficulty and prepare alternatives. At this stage, the principles of cognitive load, autonomy support, and collaborative structure are translated into concrete actions.”

“Assessment and feedback” ensure that learning evidence is collected during the process and used. Success criteria need to be communicated, learners are given the chance to evaluate examples, and feedback is followed by revisions. Assessment also provides data for adaptive decisions, not just final grades.

“‘Supervision and adaptation’ means keeping an eye on fidelity, participation, outcomes, access, and workload. Teachers stick to the core methods but tweak things like duration, groups, media, support, or level of challenge. Reflecting after implementation documents what works, for whom, under what conditions, and why. In this way, SELARAS connects choice and effectiveness in a single decision-making cycle.”

Table 4. The “ALIGNED” Framework

Elements	Decision Focus	Key Questions
"S - Target"	Results and level of demand	What should students be able to do?
"E - Evidensi"	Structure of the material and proof of learning	What are the prerequisites, misconceptions, and evidence of its success?
"L - Learner"	Characteristics of students	Who are the learners and what support is needed?
"A - Access"	Resources and context	Is the strategy accessible and sustainable?
"R - Design"	Activities, interactions, scaffolding, media	What learning process will be triggered and what is the order?
"A - Asesmen"	Criteria, feedback, revision	How is evidence collected and used for improvement?
"S - Supervision"	Monitoring, <i>fidelity</i> , adaptasi	What works, for whom, and what needs to be changed?

Source: author's synthesis based on literature.

6. Implementation Challenges and Research Directions

The first challenge is innovation pressure. Institutions often push the use of certain platforms, AI, or models without giving time for redesign, training, and evaluation. As a result, innovation ends up being just an extra layer on top of old practices. Policies should allow space for controlled experiments, technical support, and acknowledge workload, so changes actually affect learning design, not just the tools [66], [67].

The second challenge is the digital gap and accessibility. Access doesn't just mean owning a device, but also having a connection, a learning space, digital literacy, family support, and the ability to use access features. Digital strategies need to provide low-bandwidth alternatives, downloadable materials, flexible timing, and help channels. Equality should be an indicator of effectiveness, not just an extra consideration.

The third challenge is teachers' workload and capacity. Project design, authentic assessments, and feedback take time. Without team collaboration, resource banks, shared rubrics, and institutional support, teachers can get exhausted. Professional development needs to be problem-focused, done repeatedly, and connected to classroom data [20], [21].

The fourth challenge is academic integrity and AI. A total ban is hard to enforce and could ignore pedagogical potential, while unlimited use risks weakening the thinking process. Assessment design needs to evaluate the process, ask for sources and verification, use local context, incorporate oral dialogue, and request reflection on AI contributions. Institutions also need clear policies on privacy, attribution, and responsibility [42], [58], [69].

The fifth challenge is the limitation of cross-context evidence. The average effects from meta-analyses can't always be directly applied to a specific class. Future research needs to report more details on implementation components, student characteristics, workload, equity, and technological conditions. Design studies, mixed methods, and implementation research can explain mechanisms, not just score differences[70].

The next development direction is personalization that still keeps the learning community intact. AI and learning analytics can help spot patterns and provide support, but decisions still need to be explainable and correctable by humans. Personalization shouldn't isolate learners or lock them into predicted abilities. Future strategies should combine individual adaptation, collaboration, critical literacy, and data ethics [54], [71].

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study emphasizes that learning strategies are the architecture of pedagogical decisions, not just a method name. The right choice mainly depends on how well it aligns with learning outcomes, cognitive demands, material structure, prior knowledge, motivation, self-regulation, student diversity, assessment, teacher competence, resources, and institutional context. No strategy is universally the best; a strategy works well when its mechanism matches the learning needs and real conditions.

Implementation effectiveness is a different but related issue. The right strategy can fail if activities are shallow, instructions are unclear, scaffolding is not adaptive, cognitive load is too high, collaboration is unstructured, or feedback can't be acted upon. On the other hand, effectiveness improves when teachers combine clarity, challenge, autonomy support, monitoring, formative assessment, and evidence-based reflection.

The role of teachers remains central amidst the growth of digital learning and AI. Technology expands options for visualization, simulation, personalization, and feedback, but it doesn't replace diagnosis, ethical judgment, relationships, and adaptive decision-making. Pedagogical quality should be the basis for choosing tools, while accessibility, privacy, and equity are part of the criteria for success.

The SELARAS framework sums up the practical flow from Goals, Evidence, Learner, Access, Design, Assessment, to Supervision-adaptation. This framework helps separate selection issues from implementation issues while connecting them in a single cycle. Using the framework should come with documenting assumptions and evidence so teachers can explain what works, for whom, under what conditions, and why.

The next research should test and refine this framework across different levels, disciplines, regions, and learning modes. Studies should not just compare strategy labels but also look at the quality of implementation, variations in student responses, fairness of benefits, workload, and sustainability. Longitudinal studies and participatory design research with teachers and students will help generate principles that are both more contextual and transferable.

FURTHER STUDY

This study has limitations; therefore, further research is needed on the topic of "Selecting and Implementing Effective Instructional Strategies: A Review of Pedagogical Alignment, Learner Characteristics, and Digital Learning Ecosystems" to refine the current study and broaden the insights of both the author and the reader.

REFERENCES

- A. M. Lui and H. L. Andrade, "The Next Black Box of Formative Assessment: A Model of the Internal Mechanisms of Feedback Processing," *Front. Educ.*, vol. 7, Feb. 2022, doi: 10.3389/educ.2022.751548.
- A. Maroungkas, C. Troussas, A. Krouska, and C. Sgouropoulou, "How personalized and effective is immersive virtual reality in education? A systematic literature review for the last decade," *Multimed. Tools Appl.*, vol. 83, no. 6, pp. 18185–18233, Jul. 2023, doi: 10.1007/s11042-023-15986-7.
- A. Skulmowski and K. M. Xu, "Understanding Cognitive Load in Digital and Online Learning: a New Perspective on Extraneous Cognitive Load," *Educ. Psychol. Rev.*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 171–196, Mar. 2022, doi: 10.1007/s10648-021-09624-7.
- A. Tlili et al., "What if the devil is my guardian angel: ChatGPT as a case study of using chatbots in education," *Smart Learn. Environ.*, vol. 10, no. 1, p. 15, Feb. 2023, doi: 10.1186/s40561-023-00237-x.
- B. Birgili, F. N. Seggie, and E. Oğuz, "The trends and outcomes of flipped learning research between 2012 and 2018: A descriptive content analysis," *J. Comput. Educ.*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 365–394, Sep. 2021, doi: 10.1007/s40692-021-00183-y.
- B. Wisniewski, K. Zierer, and J. Hattie, "The Power of Feedback Revisited: A Meta-Analysis of Educational Feedback Research," *Front. Psychol.*, vol. 10, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2019.03087.
- C. A. Bredow, P. V. Roehling, A. J. Knorp, and A. M. Sweet, "To Flip or Not to Flip? A Meta-Analysis of the Efficacy of Flipped Learning in Higher Education," *Rev. Educ. Res.*, vol. 91, no. 6, pp. 878–918, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.3102/00346543211019122.
- C. K. Lo, "What Is the Impact of ChatGPT on Education? A Rapid Review of the Literature," *Educ. Sci.*, vol. 13, no. 4, p. 410, Apr. 2023, doi: 10.3390/educsci13040410.
- C. Müller and T. Mildenerberger, "Facilitating flexible learning by replacing classroom time with an online learning environment: A systematic review of blended learning in higher education," *Educ. Res. Rev.*, vol. 34, p. 100394, Nov. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.edurev.2021.100394.
- C. Rapanta, L. Botturi, P. Goodyear, L. Guàrdia, and M. Koole, "Online University Teaching During and After the Covid-19 Crisis: Refocusing Teacher Presence and Learning Activity," *Postdigital Sci. Educ.*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 923–945, Oct. 2020, doi: 10.1007/s42438-020-00155-y.

- D. C. D. van Alten, C. Phielix, J. Janssen, and L. Kester, "Self-regulated learning support in flipped learning videos enhances learning outcomes," *Comput. Educ.*, vol. 158, p. 104000, Dec. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2020.104000.
- D. Carless and N. Winstone, "Teacher feedback literacy and its interplay with student feedback literacy," *Teach. High. Educ.*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 150–163, Jan. 2023, doi: 10.1080/13562517.2020.1782372.
- D. García-Pérez, J. Fraile, and E. Panadero, "Learning strategies and self-regulation in context: how higher education students approach different courses, assessments, and challenges," *Eur. J. Psychol. Educ.*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 533–550, Jun. 2021, doi: 10.1007/s10212-020-00488-z.
- D. Hamilton, J. McKechnie, E. Edgerton, and C. Wilson, "Immersive virtual reality as a pedagogical tool in education: a systematic literature review of quantitative learning outcomes and experimental design," *J. Comput. Educ.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 1–32, Mar. 2021, doi: 10.1007/s40692-020-00169-2.
- D. Lombardi et al., "The Curious Construct of Active Learning," *Psychol. Sci. Public Interes.*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 8–43, Apr. 2021, doi: 10.1177/1529100620973974.
- D. R. Sadler, "Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems," *Instr. Sci.*, vol. 48, no. 4, pp. 345–371, 2020.
- D. Turnbull, R. Chugh, and J. Luck, "Systematic-narrative hybrid literature review: A strategy for integrating a concise methodology into a manuscript," *Soc. Sci. Humanit. Open*, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 100381, 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.ssaho.2022.100381.
- E. J. Theobald et al., "Active learning narrows achievement gaps for underrepresented students in undergraduate science, technology, engineering, and math," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, vol. 117, no. 12, pp. 6476–6483, Mar. 2020, doi: 10.1073/pnas.1916903117.
- E. Kasneci et al., "ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education," *Learn. Individ. Differ.*, vol. 103, p. 102274, Apr. 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274.
- E. Panadero, A. Jonsson, L. Pinedo, and B. Fernández-Castilla, "Effects of Rubrics on Academic Performance, Self-Regulated Learning, and self-Efficacy: a Meta-analytic Review," *Educ. Psychol. Rev.*, vol. 35, no. 4, p. 113, Dec. 2023, doi: 10.1007/s10648-023-09823-4.
- F. M. Van der Kleij and A. A. Lipnevich, "Student perceptions of assessment feedback: a critical scoping review and call for research," *Educ. Assessment, Eval. Account.*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 345–373, May 2021, doi: 10.1007/s11092-020-09331-x.
- F. Martin, T. Sun, and C. D. Westine, "A systematic review of research on online teaching and learning from 2009 to 2018," *Comput. Educ.*, vol. 159, p. 104009, Dec. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2020.104009.
- F. Ouyang and P. Jiao, "Artificial intelligence in education: The three paradigms," *Comput. Educ. Artif. Intell.*, vol. 2, p. 100020, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.caeai.2021.100020.

- F. Paas and J. J. G. van Merriënboer, "Cognitive-Load Theory: Methods to Manage Working Memory Load in the Learning of Complex Tasks," *Curr. Dir. Psychol. Sci.*, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 394–398, Aug. 2020, doi: 10.1177/0963721420922183.
- G. Heilporn, S. Lakhal, and M. Bélisle, "An examination of teachers' strategies to foster student engagement in blended learning in higher education," *Int. J. Educ. Technol. High. Educ.*, vol. 18, no. 1, p. 25, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.1186/s41239-021-00260-3.
- G. Makransky and G. B. Petersen, "The Cognitive Affective Model of Immersive Learning (CAMIL): a Theoretical Research-Based Model of Learning in Immersive Virtual Reality," *Educ. Psychol. Rev.*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 937–958, Sep. 2021, doi: 10.1007/s10648-020-09586-2.
- H. Al-Samarraie, A. Shamsuddin, and A. I. Alzahrani, "A flipped classroom model in higher education: a review of the evidence across disciplines," *Educ. Technol. Res. Dev.*, vol. 68, no. 3, pp. 1017–1051, Jun. 2020, doi: 10.1007/s11423-019-09718-8.
- H. Chai, T. Hu, and L. Wu, "Computer-based assessment of collaborative problem solving skills: A systematic review of empirical research," *Educ. Res. Rev.*, vol. 43, p. 100591, May 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.edurev.2023.100591.
- H. Crompton and D. Burke, "Artificial intelligence in higher education: the state of the field," *Int. J. Educ. Technol. High. Educ.*, vol. 20, no. 1, p. 22, Apr. 2023, doi: 10.1186/s41239-023-00392-8.
- J. Broadbent, E. Panadero, and D. Boud, "Implementing summative assessment with a formative flavour: a case study in a large class," *Assess. Eval. High. Educ.*, vol. 43, no. 2, pp. 307–322, Feb. 2018, doi: 10.1080/02602938.2017.1343455.
- J. König, D. J. Jäger-Biela, and N. Glutsch, "Adapting to online teaching during COVID-19 school closure: Teacher education and teacher competence effects," *Eur. J. Teach. Educ.*, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 608–622, 2020.
- J. L. Howard, J. Bureau, F. Guay, J. X. Y. Chong, and R. M. Ryan, "Student Motivation and Associated Outcomes: A Meta-Analysis From Self-Determination Theory," *Perspect. Psychol. Sci.*, vol. 16, no. 6, pp. 1300–1323, Nov. 2021, doi: 10.1177/1745691620966789.
- J. M. Campillo-Ferrer and P. Miralles-Martínez, "Effectiveness of the flipped classroom model on students' self-reported motivation and learning during the COVID-19 pandemic," *Humanit. Soc. Sci. Commun.*, vol. 8, no. 1, p. 176, Jul. 2021, doi: 10.1057/s41599-021-00860-4.
- J. Radianti, T. A. Majchrzak, J. Fromm, and I. Wohlgenannt, "A Systematic Review of Immersive Virtual Reality Applications for Higher Education," *Comput. Educ.*, vol. 147, p. 103778, 2020.
- J. Reeve and S. H. Cheon, "Autonomy-supportive teaching: Its malleability, benefits, and potential to improve educational practice," *Educ. Psychol.*, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 54–77, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.1080/00461520.2020.1862657.

- J. S. Bureau, J. L. Howard, J. X. Y. Chong, and F. Guay, "Pathways to Student Motivation: A Meta-Analysis of Antecedents of Autonomous and Controlled Motivations," *Rev. Educ. Res.*, vol. 92, no. 1, pp. 46–72, Feb. 2022, doi: 10.3102/00346543211042426.
- J. Valverde-Berrocoso, M. del C. Garrido-Arroyo, C. Burgos-Videla, and M. B. Morales-Cevallos, "Trends in Educational Research about e-Learning: A Systematic Literature Review (2009–2018)," *Sustainability*, vol. 12, no. 12, p. 5153, Jun. 2020, doi: 10.3390/su12125153.
- K. A. Nguyen et al., "Instructor strategies to aid implementation of active learning: a systematic literature review," *Int. J. STEM Educ.*, vol. 8, no. 1, p. 9, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.1186/s40594-021-00270-7.
- K. D. Elsbach and D. van Knippenberg, "Creating High-Impact Literature Reviews: An Argument for 'Integrative Reviews,'" *J. Manag. Stud.*, vol. 57, no. 6, pp. 1277–1289, Sep. 2020, doi: 10.1111/joms.12581.
- L. Anthonysamy, A. C. Koo, and S. H. Hew, "Self-regulated learning strategies in higher education: Fostering digital literacy for sustainable lifelong learning," *Educ. Inf. Technol.*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 2393–2414, Jul. 2020, doi: 10.1007/s10639-020-10201-8.
- L. Chen, P. Chen, and Z. Lin, "Artificial Intelligence in Education: A Review," *IEEE Access*, vol. 8, pp. 75264–75278, 2020, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2988510.
- L. Han, J. Xu, and C. Liu, "Multimodal Learning for Heterogeneous Data Integration," *ACM Comput. Surv.*, vol. 54, no. 9, pp. 1–26, 2021.
- L. Kohnke, B. L. Moorhouse, and D. Zou, "ChatGPT for Language Teaching and Learning," *RELC J.*, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. 537–550, Aug. 2023, doi: 10.1177/00336882231162868.
- L. Zheng, K. K. Bhagat, Y. Zhen, and X. Zhang, "The Effectiveness of the Flipped Classroom on Students' Learning Achievement and Learning Motivation: A Meta-Analysis," *Educ. Technol. Soc.*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 1–15, 2020, [Online]. Available: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26915403>
- M. A. Al Mamun, G. Lawrie, and T. Wright, "Instructional design of scaffolded online learning modules for self-directed and inquiry-based learning environments," *Comput. Educ.*, vol. 144, p. 103695, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103695.
- M. Ainscow, "Promoting inclusion and equity in education: lessons from international experiences," *Nord. J. Stud. Educ. Policy*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 7–16, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.1080/20020317.2020.1729587.
- M. Bond, K. Buntins, S. Bedenlier, O. Zawacki-Richter, and M. Kerres, "Mapping research in student engagement and educational technology in higher education: a systematic evidence map," *Int. J. Educ. Technol. High. Educ.*, vol. 17, no. 1, p. 2, Dec. 2020, doi: 10.1186/s41239-019-0176-8.
- M. Kapur, J. Hattie, I. Grossman, and T. Sinha, "Fail, flip, fix, and feed – Rethinking flipped learning: A review of meta-analyses and a subsequent meta-analysis," *Front. Educ.*, vol. 7, Sep. 2022, doi: 10.3389/educ.2022.956416.

- M. Sailer and L. Homner, "The gamification of learning: A meta-analysis," *Educ. Psychol. Rev.*, 2020.
- M. Zuo, S. Kong, Y. Ma, Y. Hu, and M. Xiao, "The Effects of Using Scaffolding in Online Learning: A Meta-Analysis," *Educ. Sci.*, vol. 13, no. 7, p. 705, Jul. 2023, doi: 10.3390/educsci13070705.
- N. Hernández-Sellés, P.-C. Muñoz-Carril, and M. González-Sanmamed, "Interaction in computer supported collaborative learning: an analysis of the implementation phase," *Int. J. Educ. Technol. High. Educ.*, vol. 17, no. 1, p. 23, Dec. 2020, doi: 10.1186/s41239-020-00202-5.
- P. Strelan, A. Osborn, and E. Palmer, "The flipped classroom: A meta-analysis of effects on student performance across disciplines and education levels," *Educ. Res. Rev.*, vol. 30, p. 100314, Jun. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100314.
- R. A. Rasheed, A. Kamsin, and N. A. Abdullah, "Challenges in the online component of blended learning: A systematic review," *Comput. Educ.*, vol. 144, p. 103701, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2019.103701.
- R. M. Ryan and E. L. Deci, "Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future directions," *Contemp. Educ. Psychol.*, vol. 61, p. 101860, 2020.
- R. Scherer, F. Siddiq, S. K. Howard, and J. Tondeur, "Gender divides in teachers' readiness for online teaching and learning in higher education: Do women and men consider themselves equally prepared?," *Comput. Educ.*, vol. 199, p. 104774, 2023, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2023.104774>.
- R. Yusri, A. M. Yusof, and A. Sharina, "A systematic literature review of project-based learning: research trends, methods, elements, and frameworks," *Int. J. Eval. Res. Educ.*, vol. 13, no. 5, p. 3345, Oct. 2024, doi: 10.11591/ijere.v13i5.27875.
- S. Bai, K. F. Hew, and B. Huang, "Does gamification improve student learning outcome? Evidence from a meta-analysis and synthesis of qualitative data in educational contexts," *Educ. Res. Rev.*, vol. 30, p. 100322, Jun. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.edurev.2020.100322.
- S. Grassini, "Shaping the Future of Education: Exploring the Potential and Consequences of AI and ChatGPT in Educational Settings," *Educ. Sci.*, vol. 13, no. 7, p. 692, Jul. 2023, doi: 10.3390/educsci13070692.
- S. Kraus et al., "Literature reviews as independent studies: guidelines for academic practice," *Rev. Manag. Sci.*, vol. 16, no. 8, pp. 2577–2595, Nov. 2022, doi: 10.1007/s11846-022-00588-8.
- S. Mystakidis, "Metaverse," *Encyclopedia*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 486–497, Feb. 2022, doi: 10.3390/encyclopedia2010031.
- S. Pokhrel and R. Chhetri, "A Literature Review on Impact of COVID-19 Pandemic on Teaching and Learning," *High. Educ. Futur.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 133–141, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.1177/2347631120983481.
- S. Sims and H. Fletcher-Wood, "Identifying the characteristics of effective teacher professional development: a critical review," *Sch. Eff. Sch. Improv.*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 47–63, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.1080/09243453.2020.1772841.

- S. Sims et al., "Effective Teacher Professional Development: New Theory and a Meta-Analytic Test," *Rev. Educ. Res.*, vol. 95, no. 2, pp. 213–254, Apr. 2025, doi: 10.3102/00346543231217480.
- S. W. Chong, "Reconsidering student feedback literacy from an ecological perspective," *Assess. Eval. High. Educ.*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 92–104, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.1080/02602938.2020.1730765.
- T. K. F. Chiu, Q. Xia, X. Zhou, C. S. Chai, and M. Cheng, "Systematic literature review on opportunities, challenges, and future research recommendations of artificial intelligence in education," *Comput. Educ. Artif. Intell.*, vol. 4, p. 100118, 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100118.
- X. Chen, D. Zou, H. Xie, and G. Cheng, "Twenty Years of Personalized Language Learning: Topic Modeling and Knowledge Mapping," *Educ. Technol. Soc.*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 205–222, 2021, [Online]. Available: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26977868>
- X. Huang, D. Zou, G. Cheng, and H. Xie, "A Systematic Review of AR and VR Enhanced Language Learning," *Sustainability*, vol. 13, no. 9, p. 4639, Apr. 2021, doi: 10.3390/su13094639.
- X. Zhai et al., "A Review of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Education from 2010 to 2020," *Complexity*, vol. 2021, 2021, doi: 10.1155/2021/8812542.
- Z. Y. Wong and G. A. D. Liem, "Student Engagement: Current State of the Construct, Conceptual Refinement, and Future Research Directions," *Educ. Psychol. Rev.*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 107–138, Mar. 2022, doi: 10.1007/s10648-021-09628-3.
- Z. Yan, Z. Li, E. Panadero, M. Yang, L. Yang, and H. Lao, "A systematic review on factors influencing teachers' intentions and implementations regarding formative assessment," *Assess. Educ. Princ. Policy Pract.*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 228–260, May 2021, doi: 10.1080/0969594X.2021.1884042.
- Z. Zainuddin, M. Shujahat, H. Haruna, and S. K. W. Chu, "The Role of Gamification in Enhancing Motivation and Engagement in Higher Education Digital Learning," *Interact. Learn. Environ.*, vol. 28, no. 8, pp. 1043–1058, 2020.