

Digital Education as Learning-Transformation Infrastructure: Inclusivity, Competence, Data Ethics, and Workforce Readiness

Loso Judijanto

IPOSS Jakarta

Corresponding Author: Loso Judijanto losojudijantobumn@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Digital Education; Learning Transformation; Digital Literacy; Teacher Competence; Digital Divide; Artificial Intelligence; Blended Learning; Educational Inclusion; Data Governance; Job Readiness

Received : 3 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

Digital education is no longer enough to be understood as simply moving materials to online platforms; instead, it should be seen as a sociotechnical infrastructure that connects pedagogical design, human competencies, access, data, and educational governance. This article aims to analyze the contribution of digital education to learning quality, inclusivity, digital literacy, and job readiness, as well as to identify the conditions that determine its safe and sustainable implementation in Indonesia. This study uses a qualitative literature review with thematic synthesis of 66 journal articles, mostly published since 2020. The study results show that technology can enhance flexibility, interactivity, personalization, feedback, and access to learning resources, but its impact isn't automatic. These benefits depend on teachers being ready, students' self-regulation skills, how well the learning design fits, institutional support, and how curriculum integrates with 21st-century skills. Gaps in devices, connectivity, learning space, family support, and digital skills mean digital education could potentially reproduce inequality. The use of artificial intelligence and learning analytics also brings risks like algorithmic bias, excessive monitoring, privacy violations, lack of transparency in decisions, and cognitive dependency. This article suggests a layered implementation framework that includes inclusive infrastructure, human capabilities, evidence-based pedagogy, data governance, and ecosystem collaboration. Effective digital education should therefore be evaluated based on the quality of learning and fairness of outcomes, not just the level of technology adoption

INTRODUCTION

Digital transformation has shifted education from a system that mainly relied on physical spaces, schedules, and learning resources to a learning ecosystem that combines face-to-face interactions, online platforms, multimedia content, cloud computing, learning analytics, and artificial intelligence. This shift is not just about changing the delivery medium, because technology also changes the relationships between teachers, students, curriculum, assessments, and institutions. The emergency learning experience during the pandemic showed the fundamental difference between intentionally designed online education and the rapid transfer of classroom activities to digital spaces; the quality of learning is still determined by activity design, teacher presence, social support, and clarity of learning goals [1], [2], [3].

Digital education is becoming important because learning needs are getting more diverse and happening throughout life. Flexibility in time and place can increase participation for students who work, live far from schools, have family responsibilities, or need a different pace of learning. With the right blended design, replacing some class time with online activities doesn't have to lower academic achievement and can even enhance flexibility and learning autonomy. However, this flexibility shifts some of the responsibility for managing time, attention, and learning strategies to the students, so self-regulation skills and instructional support are prerequisites that shouldn't be overlooked.

The urgency of digital education is also related to changes in the way knowledge and communication work. Students not only need to access information, but they also need to be able to assess the credibility of sources, manage their digital identity, collaborate online, produce content, stay safe, and understand the social consequences of using technology. Therefore, digital literacy is not the same as just being able to operate devices. Digital literacy includes knowledge, skills, critical disposition, ethics, and problem-solving abilities within a specific social and cultural context [7], [8], [9].

From a pedagogical perspective, technology offers opportunities to bring in videos, simulations, visualizations, educational games, collaborative spaces, and faster feedback. Meta-analyses show that videos and gamification can support learning when aligned with goals, cognitive load, and meaningful activities; on the other hand, irrelevant interactive features can be distracting. Immersive technology can also boost psychological presence and engagement, but its effect on learning depends on instructional design rather than just the sophistication of the device.

Artificial intelligence expands the possibilities for personalization through adaptive systems, smart tutors, automated assessments, material recommendations, and predictive analytics. This potential is important for heterogeneous classrooms because teachers can get faster insights into students' difficulties, progress, and support needs. However, algorithm-based decisions can bring data bias, lack of transparency, early labeling, and a reduction in teacher and student autonomy. A human-centered AI paradigm, therefore,

positions technology as a partner to strengthen pedagogical decisions, not to replace educators' professional responsibilities [14], [15], [16], [17].

Digital education is directly linked to job readiness because industry transformation increases the need for data literacy, programming, problem-solving, creativity, collaboration, and the ability to relearn. Industry 4.0 not only requires technical skills but also a mix of digital, cognitive, social, and metacognitive competencies. Therefore, digital education should support project-based learning, creating work, solving real-world problems, and cross-disciplinary collaboration, not just consuming digital content [18], [19], [20].

In Indonesia, the pandemic has both revealed and sped up the digitalization of education. Several studies show that teachers and students are able to adapt, but they face limitations like connectivity, devices, online teaching experience, costs, parental support, and curriculum compatibility. Conditions vary greatly between regions and social groups; because of that, policies that assume digital access is the same for everyone risk widening learning gaps [21], [22], [23], [24].

The digital divide occurs on several levels. The first level is about devices and connectivity; the second concerns skills and usage support; the third is about the ability to turn access into educational benefits. Two students who are both connected to the internet don't necessarily get the same results if the quality of their devices, study space, time, guidance, and ability to evaluate information are different. So, the inclusion agenda needs to go beyond just distributing devices and focus on strengthening capabilities and meaningful usage conditions. The expansion of educational platforms also produces a huge amount of data about student identities, behaviors, learning outcomes, communication, and engagement patterns. This data can help with early interventions but also opens up opportunities for surveillance, commercialization, leaks, and use beyond educational purposes. Vague consent, third-party app integration, and data-extractive business models create a need for principles like data minimization, purpose limitation, security by design, algorithm transparency, and objection mechanisms [16], [28], [29].

Sustainability adds another dimension to evaluating digital education. Reducing travel and printed materials can save resources in some contexts, but streaming, data centers, device production, and e-waste also have energy, water, and carbon footprints. So, the claim that digitalization is always greener can't be taken at face value without looking at life cycles, device choices, usage duration, energy sources, and efficient content design [30], [31].

The main issue in digital education discussions is the tendency to assess success based on the number of devices, platform accounts, or usage frequency. These metrics are important operationally, but they don't show whether students understand the material, become more independent, have their data protected, participate equally, or can transfer knowledge to new situations. This article sees digital education as an infrastructure for learning transformation, whose success should be measured through pedagogical quality, fairness of outcomes, system resilience, and human capability development [32], [33], [34].

Based on that gap, this article raises two research questions:

RQ1. How does digital education contribute to the quality of learning, digital literacy, inclusivity, and job readiness?

RQ2. What technical, pedagogical, institutional, and ethical conditions determine that digital education can be implemented inclusively, safely, and sustainably in Indonesia?

This article aims to synthesize the conceptual foundations and empirical evidence on digital education; explain its benefits and risks; analyze its relevance to the Indonesian context; and formulate an implementation framework that integrates infrastructure, human capabilities, pedagogical design, data governance, and ecosystem collaboration. With this focus, the article does not treat digitalization as an end goal, but rather as a means to strengthen meaningful, equitable, adaptive, and responsible learning.

LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Concept and Scope of Digital Education

Digital education is the organization of learning experiences by using digital technology to expand access, interaction, knowledge production, assessment, and learning support. This definition is broader than e-learning because it includes face-to-face classes enhanced with technology, blended learning, fully online learning, microlearning, open resources, simulations, analytics, and AI. Digital education is also different from emergency remote teaching, which is a temporary shift to remote mode due to a crisis without adequate design time [2], [35], [36], [37], [38].

As a sociotechnical system, the outcomes of digital education are shaped through the interaction of devices, platforms, policies, skills, culture, and teaching practices. Technology has affordances or possible actions, but these possibilities only become useful when users have the right goals, skills, support, and rules. For example, video conferencing platforms can support dialogue or just replicate passive lectures; analytics dashboards can help with interventions or push for surveillance. Because of that, technological determinism needs to be replaced with an analysis that looks at the human, organizational, and technological setup together [33], [34], [39].

The concept of flexibility in digital education includes choices of time, place, pace, path, and learning format. Flexibility is most productive when it's paired with clear structure, realistic deadlines, regular communication, and access to support. Without structure, flexibility can become a coordination burden and increase procrastination, especially for students with limited self-regulation skills. That's why effective design combines autonomy with scaffolding, rather than handing over full responsibility for learning to the students [4], [5], [40].

2. Pedagogical Foundations: Activities, Interactions, and Self-Regulation

The educational value of technology shows up when students engage in relevant cognitive and social activities: explaining, comparing, problem-solving, creating artifacts, giving feedback, and reflecting on the process. The presence of a teacher is still important for designing goals, choosing representations, guiding discussions, and providing support. Online learning studies confirm that

interaction and teacher presence are linked to a more directed learning experience than just providing content [1], [41], [42].

Multimedia content can help when words and images complement each other, information is broken into segments, and irrelevant elements are reduced. Educational videos, for example, tend to be effective when they are concise, integrated with questions or exercises, and allow students to control the pace. Meta-analytic evidence shows positive effects of videos on learning outcomes, but just watching passively doesn't guarantee understanding; activities like retrieval, elaboration, and application are still needed [11], [32].

Gamification and games can boost engagement by giving goals, challenges, feedback, and a sense of progress. However, overly flashy points and rankings can shift motivation toward external rewards, spark unhealthy competition, or disadvantage students who are falling behind. The impact of gamification tends to be positive but mixed, so choosing the right mechanisms should take into account learning goals, student characteristics, duration, and the quality of feedback [12], [13].

Virtual reality and simulation technology support experiences that are hard, expensive, or risky to do physically. Immersive presence can boost attention and emotional experiences, but it can also increase cognitive load or make people focus more on the tech sensations. The CAMIL model highlights the interaction between media affordances, motivation, control, and cognitive processes; so, simulations should be followed by orientation, guided tasks, debriefing, and reflection [10], [43].

Self-regulation is an important foundation because the digital environment offers a lot of choices and distractions. Students need to plan their time, monitor their understanding, manage their attention, ask for help, and evaluate their strategies. Evidence during the pandemic shows that the sudden shift to online learning forced students to reorganize their study habits and that digital readiness is linked to socio-emotional experiences. Learning design should provide milestones, reminders, examples of strategies, formative feedback, and opportunities for interaction so that self-regulation isn't assumed to be automatic.

3. Digital Literacy and Educators' Professional Competence

Student digital literacy includes technical, information, communication, creativity, security, and critical thinking skills. Definitions that focus only on devices overlook the ability to evaluate platform relevance, information bias, digital footprints, and power relations that shape user experiences. A digital literacy framework should be contextual and connect technology use with ethical social participation [8], [9].

For educators, digital competence means the ability to integrate technology, pedagogy, content, assessment, inclusion, and ethics. A teacher who's good at using apps doesn't necessarily know how to design online discussions, manage cognitive load, facilitate collaboration, or evaluate the quality of learning outcomes. So, a digital teacher competency framework needs to cover assessing student needs, designing activities, curating resources,

facilitating, analyzing learning evidence, reflecting, and data protection [7], [8], [46], [47].

Teacher readiness is influenced by self-efficacy, experience, technical support, time, leadership, device access, and institutional culture. Cross-country studies show groups of teachers with low, medium, and high readiness profiles; this gap indicates that one-time uniform training isn't enough. Professional development is more effective when it's ongoing, practice-based, provides mentoring, and allows teachers to design and evaluate digital learning within the context of their subjects [46], [48].

In Indonesia, teacher obstacles appear at the individual, school, curriculum, and student levels. The pandemic experience showed teachers' creativity in using available apps, but it also highlighted the need for material support, collaboration with parents, stable connections, and realistic policies. So, digital education readiness should be seen as a collective institutional capability, not just a personal responsibility of teachers [22], [23], [24].

4. Personalization, Learning Analytics, and Artificial Intelligence

Digital personalization can take the form of adjusting the pace, sequence of material, difficulty level, type of feedback, or choice of representation. Learning analytics process activity traces to help students and educators understand progress, risks, and engagement patterns. Studies show the potential of analytics to support study success, but its effectiveness depends on the connection between information, human interpretation, and actionable interventions [49].

The development of AI is shifting the relationship from systems that direct students to systems that support collaboration and, ideally, empower students to take control of their learning goals. Three AI in education paradigms illustrate the shift from learner-as-recipient to learner-as-collaborator and learner-as-leader. This framework is important because personalization shouldn't mean algorithms determine the path in a closed-off way; students need to understand the recommendations, have choices, and be able to reject or adjust their profiles [14], [15], [50], [51], [52].

Generative AI adds functions like dialogue, explanations, ideation, exercises, translation, early feedback, and content creation. These benefits come alongside hallucinations, bias, dependency, copyright violations, disguised authorship, and unequal access. Users need to verify sources, document usage, protect sensitive data, and maintain their own thinking processes and academic responsibility. Education policies should differentiate between use that supports learning and use that replaces assessed intellectual processes [53], [54], [55]. Recent literature emphasizes the need for human oversight, transparency, fairness, accountability, and explainability. Algorithmic explanations in education should be understandable by teachers and students, and relevant to the decisions being made. Besides prediction accuracy, systems should be evaluated based on their impact on different groups, the likelihood of errors, rights to corrections, and the long-term consequences of labeling students [16], [29], [56], [57].

5. Inclusivity and the Digital Divide

The digital divide isn't a simple matter of being connected or not. The quality of the connection, the type of device, whether it's personally owned or shared, data costs, the ability to use it, language, accessibility, social support, and content quality all shape the real opportunities to learn. When education relies on platforms, the digital gap can actually reinforce existing social inequalities [25], [26].

Distance learning during the pandemic showed that students from lower socioeconomic groups are more likely to face limited study space, shared devices, unstable connections, and less academic support. These conditions increase the risk of achievement gaps because the amount of effective study time and the quality of interactions differ. Interventions, therefore, need to include support for devices, connectivity, offline materials, flexible assessments, community learning centers, and mentoring [27], [58], [59].

Inclusion also involves students with disabilities and diverse needs. Content needs to be compatible with screen readers, provide alternative text and captions, use consistent navigation, be accessible on low bandwidth, and offer multiple ways to participate and show understanding. Universal design principles reduce the need for individual adjustments after a system is built and make it easier for all students to use. Within this framework, accessibility is treated as a design requirement, not an extra feature.

Indonesian studies confirm that online learning experiences are heavily influenced by access, family readiness, teacher competence, and regional characteristics. While local solutions like using lightweight apps, printed materials, asynchronous communication, and limited visits help keep learning going, these experiences also show that digital transformation requires a multimodal strategy. Policies that focus only on high-bandwidth platforms can end up excluding the groups that actually need expanded access the most [21], [22], [23].

6. Digital Education and Job Readiness

Job changes not only create the need for skills to use certain apps, but also the ability to understand data, adapt to new systems, work with both humans and machines, and manage lifelong learning. Mapping competencies in Industry 4.0 shows the importance of problem-solving, communication, creativity, teamwork, tech knowledge, and learning ability. A curriculum that locks itself too quickly into one tool risks becoming outdated; a more enduring focus is on basic concepts, knowledge transfer, data literacy, ethics, and adaptability [18], [20].

Soft skills still matter because digital work happens through coordination, negotiation, presentations, leadership, and decision-making in uncertain conditions. Comparisons between student and employer perceptions show that companies often put more weight on soft skills. Digital education can develop these through team projects, peer reviews, online presentations, client simulations, portfolios, and reflection, as long as assessments don't just measure the completion of technical tasks [19].

Open course platforms and microcredentials expand access to reskilling, but the quality, recognition, support, and completion rates vary. The best integration happens when flexible learning is tied to formal curriculum, project experience, mentors, and proof of competence. Educational institutions need to develop ways to recognize prior learning and make sure digital credentials don't just create a certificate market without real skills [4], [33].

7. Data Ethics, Digital Wellbeing, and Sustainability

Educational platforms turn learning activities into data that can be stored, combined, and analyzed. Datafication can boost learning support, but it also expands dataveillance and institutions' dependence on vendors. Risks go up when contracts don't clarify ownership, storage location, retention, third-party transfers, and use of data for product development. Governance should set clear goals, minimize data use, ensure security, allow auditing, give users access, and handle deletion [28].

Digital well-being is related to screen overload, distractions, isolation, video conference fatigue, pressure to always be connected, and blurred learning boundaries. Students' experiences during emergency learning show uneven academic and emotional impacts. Healthy design requires a balanced sync-async rhythm, breaks, reasonable communication expectations, social interaction, and psychological support [44], [60], [61].

Digital sustainability requires using long-lasting devices, repairability, responsible procurement, e-waste management, data-efficient content, and low-carbon data centers. Digital education can cut down on some physical activities, but increased streaming and storage can create a rebound effect. Institutional decisions should consider learning outcomes per unit of resources, not just switching from paper to screens [30], [31].

METHODOLOGY

This article uses a qualitative literature review, not a systematic literature review. This approach was chosen because the aim of the study is to build conceptual understanding, connect findings across themes, and formulate implementation propositions, rather than to calculate combined effects or claim coverage of all publications. The search was conducted in a targeted and iterative manner through academic databases, publisher websites, and DOI searches, focusing on journal articles in Indonesian and English published since 2020 that are relevant to digital education, online and blended learning, digital literacy, teacher competencies, educational AI, the digital divide, data ethics, sustainability, and work readiness. The review practice was guided by principles of transparency of purpose, theoretical relevance, and an explanation of the synthesis process [62].

The source selection considered direct relevance to the research question, journal reputation, clarity of methods or arguments, context diversity, and contribution to the theme. Empirical articles, meta-analyses, reviews, and conceptual writings were used complementarily; popular reports and unverifiable references were not counted as main articles. A total of 66 journal articles were included in the synthesis. This process was purposive and did not

use a PRISMA diagram, registration protocol, or claim an exhaustive search because the study is not an SLR.

The analysis was done through repeated readings, noting down concepts and findings, grouping codes, comparing sources, and developing themes. Initial themes included pedagogical affordances, competence, access, personalization, job readiness, data governance, well-being, and sustainability; these themes were then integrated into a layered implementation framework. Interpretation was done reflectively, considering findings that both support and limit digital optimism, with special attention to evidence from Indonesia. This approach follows the logic of thematic analysis, emphasizing theme coherence, traceability of interpretations, and researcher reflexivity [63], [64].

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Digital Education as a Learning Infrastructure

Synthesis shows that the main contribution of digital education isn't about replacing physical classrooms, but about the ability to connect resources, people, data, and activities beyond physical boundaries. Flexibility, re-access, varied representations, as well as synchronous-asynchronous communication allow learning to be built as a series of experiences, not just a single meeting. However, success depends on orchestration: goals, sequencing, support, interaction, and assessment all need to form a consistent design [1], [4].

The distinction between adoption and transformation is important. Adoption happens when a book is turned into a PDF, a lecture becomes a long video, and class attendance becomes a login. Transformation happens when technology makes activities possible that were previously difficult: cross-location collaboration, simulations, adaptive feedback, repeated revisions, authentic portfolios, and access to global resources. Because of that, progress indicators should ideally assess changes in experience and learning outcomes, not the number of apps being used [32], [33].

Blended learning has emerged as a model that's more resilient against the online versus offline divide. Face-to-face activities can be focused on discussions, hands-on practice, experiments, and intensive support, while digital spaces are used for preparation, accessing materials, exercises, documentation, and feedback. This division of functions reduces the tendency to just replicate the classroom on a screen and helps institutions maintain social connections without losing flexibility [4], [5].

2. Pedagogical Quality and the Changing Role of Teachers

The study results show that teachers remain the main factor in the quality of digital education, but their role is evolving from just delivering content to designing experiences, facilitating interactions, curating resources, giving feedback, and upholding ethics. This shift requires design time that often goes unnoticed in formal workloads. Institutions that only provide a platform without allocating time, technical support, or a community of practice tend to end up with minimal use or teacher burnout [46], [48].

Training should shift from feature tutorials to scenario-based pedagogy. Teachers need to practice answering questions like: which goals are better

achieved synchronously, which activities require collaboration, what evidence shows understanding, how low-bandwidth students can participate, and when analytics data can be used. Training differentiation is also necessary because teacher readiness profiles are not uniform [7], [48].

Evidence from Indonesia shows that teachers' adaptive capacity improves when there is school leadership, communication with parents, sharing practices among teachers, and freedom to choose context-appropriate technology. On the other hand, overly uniform instruction can create administrative burdens and the use of irrelevant apps. Policy approaches need to set standards for outcomes, access, and security while allowing space for local pedagogical adaptation [22], [23], [24].

Digital assessment needs to reduce reliance on supervision and replicable tests. Project-based tasks, case studies, presentations, reflective journals, demonstrations, and portfolios can provide more authentic evidence while lowering incentives for cheating. Generative AI is increasingly reinforcing the need to assess processes: problem formulation, revision notes, sources, reasoning, and the ability to defend outcomes through dialogue [54], [55].

3. Digital Literacy as a Result and Prerequisite

Digital literacy has a dual role: it is both a prerequisite for participating in digital education and an outcome that education should shape. Students who are not yet able to manage files, accounts, communication, resources, and security need explicit support; otherwise, subject learning turns into a test of technical skills that hasn't been taught. Initial orientation, multimodal guides, help desks, and peer support need to be part of the design [9], [40].

Critical literacy should be integrated into disciplinary tasks. Students can be asked to compare sources, check evidence, identify bias, trace data origins, and explain the use of AI. This approach is stronger than separate digital subjects because students learn how credibility, ethics, and representation work in the context of science, social studies, language, or professions [7], [8].

Digital education also needs to build agency. Students aren't just users of platforms, but also individuals who have the right to understand how their data is used, manage their privacy, voice objections, and choose learning strategies. Agency reduces dependency and helps students develop a mindful relationship with technology, which is an important skill as platforms and devices keep changing [14], [28].

4. Inclusivity: from Device Access to Outcome Fairness

The answer to RQ1 shows that digital education can broaden inclusion, but only if access is seen as a set of capabilities. Just providing devices without affordable connectivity, usage support, mobile-friendly content, and asynchronous design still leaves barriers. Equal access also needs to consider shared devices, disability needs, language, learning spaces, and the time students have available [26], [27].

Multimodal strategies are relevant for Indonesia. Online materials need to have low-bandwidth or offline versions; synchronous activities should be recorded or have alternatives; assignments should be doable on mobile devices; and schools can provide community access points. Flexibility doesn't mean

lowering standards, but offering multiple paths to achieve the same outcomes [21], [23].

Participation data needs to be read in context. Absences on the platform can be due to connectivity issues, family responsibilities, disabilities, shared devices, or academic difficulties. Automatic interventions that label students as unmotivated can reinforce bias. Analytics should spark conversation and support, not serve as a basis for punishment without human verification [16], [49].

Justice in outcomes requires disaggregated measurement. Institutions need to see who is accessing, staying, participating, getting feedback, achieving competence, and feeling safe. Improving averages can hide groups that are falling behind. Gap audits should be a routine cycle of design, implementation, evaluation, and improvement [25], [58].

5. Responsible Personalization

AI and analytics can help with personalization by identifying error patterns, recommending exercises, and providing quick feedback. This contribution is especially useful for formative tasks with clear rules. However, personalization shouldn't narrow students' experiences to paths dictated by their past profiles. Education should also allow room for exploration, surprises, interaction with different perspectives, and opportunities that go beyond predictions [14], [15].

A human-in-the-loop model is needed. The system can generate recommendations, but teachers interpret the context, check for fairness, and decide on the next steps; students are given explanations and a chance to respond. For high-risk decisions like placement, graduation, or disciplinary interventions, the final decision shouldn't rely on a model that can't be audited [16], [29].

Generative AI should be positioned as a cognitive tool with usage protocols. Recommended practices include declaring its use, cross-checking, data protection, storing important prompts, evaluating bias, and reflecting on the parts generated and modified by the user. Total bans are hard to enforce and can hinder AI literacy, while using it without rules threatens academic integrity. A middle ground is authentic assessment and explicit teaching about system limitations [53], [54], [55].

An institution's capacity to handle procurement also affects risk. Before using AI systems, institutions need to do an impact assessment, check the available training data, test performance across groups, set data retention policies, ensure portability, and prepare shutdown procedures. Relying on vendors without audit capabilities can lock institutions into costs and data practices that don't align with educational goals [28], [65].

6. Work Readiness and Curriculum Reorientation

Digital education contributes to job readiness when students use technology to create value, not just to master interfaces. Data-based projects, solution design, simulations, remote collaboration, documentation, and presenting to partners provide experiences that resemble real work. These

activities combine technical skills and soft skills and allow students to build a portfolio [18], [19]

The curriculum needs to avoid two extremes: being too general so it doesn't provide practical skills, or being too specific on applications that quickly become outdated. A balanced structure includes computational and data concepts, the use of current tools, domain problem solving, ethics, communication, and self-learning abilities. Collaboration with industry is necessary to update contexts and issues, but educational institutions should maintain public goals and not reduce the curriculum to vendor training [20], [33]. Microcredentials can support upskilling if they have competency standards, valid assessments, transparency in learning load, and recognition pathways. Without that, microcredentials can add confusion and shift verification costs to participants or employers. Portfolios of evidence, projects, and competency demonstrations need to accompany digital certificates [4].

Work readiness also requires AI literacy. Students need to understand when automation helps, how to check results, what shouldn't be delegated, and who is responsible for decisions. Being able to work with AI isn't just about prompt engineering, but also includes problem formulation, evaluating evidence, assessing risks, and communicating decisions [17], [54].

7. Data Governance, Security, and Welfare

The answer to RQ2 puts governance as a core requirement, not just an administrative matter after a platform is chosen. Institutions need to have a data inventory, processing basis, role distribution between controllers and processors, security standards, incident protocols, retention schedules, and mechanisms for fulfilling user rights. Data collection should be limited to clear educational needs [28], [29].

Security needs to implement the defense in depth principle: strong authentication, updates, encryption, role-based access control, backups, monitoring, and user training. Many incidents start from social engineering, weak passwords, or misconfigurations; so, both technology and behavior need to be addressed together. Students and teachers also need a safe way to report issues without fear of punishment.

Digital well-being should be part of schedule and workload design. Long synchronous sessions, constant notifications, and too many platforms increase fatigue and attention fragmentation. Institutions can set up a single service hub, standard response times, meeting-free days, screen-time limits, and activity breaks. Social interactions and emotional support need to be intentionally designed, not just assumed to happen because of connectivity [44], [60], [61].

Academic integrity should be treated as a learning culture. Clear task goals, chances for revisions, oral assessments, contextual design, and teacher-student relationships are more constructive than relying on invasive proctoring. Monitoring systems that record private spaces or analyze faces can create bias, stress, and disproportionate privacy risks [28], [29].

8. Sustainability and System Resilience

Sustainable digital education maximizes learning benefits while controlling resource consumption. Practices that can be applied include video compression, audio options or transcripts, one-time downloads, managed

storage, using devices longer, repairs, and energy-standard procurement. This approach also helps students with low bandwidth [30], [31].

Resilience means a system can still perform its core functions when there's connectivity issues, disasters, cyberattacks, or vendor failures. Institutions need to have offline procedures, backups, content portability, interoperability, and recovery drills. The pandemic experience shows the importance of flexibility, but long-term resilience requires planning before a crisis [2], [37].

Procurement policies need to calculate the total cost of ownership, including licenses, training, integration, support, data migration, security, and decommissioning. Free platforms can get expensive if they create dependency, extract data, or are inaccessible. Public value assessments should come before tech decisions [28], [34].

9. Layered Digital Education Implementation Framework

Based on the synthesis, implementation can be organized through five interdependent layers. The first layer is inclusive infrastructure; the second layer is human capability; the third layer is evidence-based pedagogical design; the fourth layer is data and technology governance; and the fifth layer is ecosystem collaboration and outcome evaluation. Weakness in one layer can limit the benefits of another. Available tools are useless without competence; teacher competence isn't enough without time and support; analytics can't be trusted without governance; and local innovation struggles to survive without funding and institutional policies [7], [48], [65].

Table 1. Layered Digital Education Implementation Framework

Lapis	Key questions	Risks If Ignored	Initial Indicators
Infrastruktur Inklusif	Are devices, connectivity, accessibility, and offline alternatives available?	Exclusion, low participation, yield gap	Device access; connection quality; alternative use; Accessibility
Human Capabilities	Do teachers, students, leaders, and support staff have the competence and time?	Superficial use, fatigue, technical dependence	Competence; support; design time; Self-regulation
Evidence-Based Pedagogy	Is technology aligned with goals, activities, assessments, and interactions?	Digitization of lectures, distractions, weak reach	Engagement; feedback; achievement; transfer; Retention
Governance and Ethics	Are data, AI, security, privacy, and vendors transparently managed?	Bias, leaks, surveillance, <i>vendor lock-in</i>	Data minimization; auditing; incidents; <i>explainability</i> ; User rights

Lapis	Key questions	Risks If Ignored	Initial Indicators
Infrastructure Inclusion	Are devices, connectivity, accessibility, and offline alternatives available?	Exclusion, low participation, yield gap	Device access; connection quality; alternative use; Accessibility
Evidence-Based Pedagogy	Is technology aligned with goals, activities, assessments, and interactions?	Digitization of lectures, distractions, weak reach	Engagement; feedback; achievement; transfer; Retention
Governance and Ethics	Are data, AI, security, privacy, and vendors transparently managed?	Bias, leaks, surveillance, <i>vendor lock-in</i>	Data minimization; auditing; incidents; <i>explainability</i> ; User rights
Ecosystem and Evaluation	Do schools, families, governments, industry, and communities collaborate?	Fragmented and unsustainable programs	Fair results; curriculum relevance; cost sustainability; Resilience

Source: Synthesis by the Author From a *Literature Review*

Table 1 emphasizes that digital education can't be implemented through standalone device projects. Policy steps don't have to be linear, but every decision needs to be checked against five layers. Evaluation should combine usage indicators with learning outcomes, group equity, user experience, security, and cost sustainability. This way, tech innovations can be stopped or improved when they don't deliver equivalent educational value [30], [49].

10. Synthesis of Answers to Research Questions

For RQ1, digital education contributes through four main mechanisms. First, expanding access and flexibility; second, enriching representation, interaction, and feedback; third, supporting personalization and monitoring; Fourth, building digital competencies and job readiness through authentic practices. The positive impact is not automatic and is most powerful when technology is combined with pedagogical design, teacher attendance, self-regulation, and institutional support [1], [11], [18], [49].

For RQ2, the implementation requirements include meaningful access, layered competencies, leadership, design time, technical support, adaptive curriculum, authentic assessments, data governance, security, clarity of AI policies, accessibility, and evaluation of outcome fairness. In the Indonesian context, multimodal strategies and local adaptation are very important due to variations in infrastructure, economy, and family support. Collaboration among the government, institutions, teachers, families, communities, and industry is needed, but public responsibility for fairness and data protection should not be entirely shifted to vendors [22], [23], [28], [66].

The first policy implication is shifting investment focus from procurement to total learning infrastructure. The budget needs to cover connectivity, maintenance, support, professional development, accessibility, security, content production, and evaluation. The second implication is establishing minimum standards for interoperability, privacy, and accessibility. The third is encouraging controlled innovation through pilots, impact assessments, and stopping programs that aren't effective [33], [56].

The implications for institutions are using the principles of pedagogy first, equity by design, privacy by design, and evidence before scale. Technology is chosen after needs and goals are set; vulnerable groups are involved in the design; data is limited from the start; and expansion happens after the results, risks, and costs are evaluated. These four principles provide a steadier direction than just following fast-changing app trends [16], [29], [30].

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Digital education is an infrastructure for learning transformation, not just the use of devices or platforms. Its potential lies in the ability to expand flexibility, connect resources and communities, provide diverse representations, speed up feedback, and support lifelong learning. However, technology only creates value when it's integrated with goals, activities, assessments, teacher presence, and coherent learning support. Therefore, the quality of digital education should be measured by the depth of understanding, transfer, participation, and the development of student agency.

This study concludes that digital literacy and teacher competence are the main levers. Students need to master technical, informational, critical, creative, security, and ethical skills; teachers need the ability to combine content, pedagogy, technology, assessment, and inclusion. Competency development should be continuous, practice-based, differentiated, and supported by time and professional communities. Placing all responsibility on individuals without improving institutional support will lead to shallow use and burnout.

Inclusivity requires a shift from device access to meaningful access and outcome fairness. Devices, connectivity, skills, family support, accessibility, learning spaces, and low-bandwidth design determine who benefits. For Indonesia, a multimodal approach, offline alternatives, community services, and local adaptations need to be a permanent part of the system, not just temporary solutions. Evaluations should look at disaggregated outcomes so that average progress doesn't hide groups that are falling behind.

AI, analytics, and data platforms can boost personalization and interventions, but they come with risks of bias, lack of transparency, surveillance, leaks, dependence, and reduced autonomy. Data governance, human oversight, explainability, impact assessments, security, data minimization, and correction rights should be implemented before using the technology in important decisions. Responsible digital education is also needed to protect users' well-being and control environmental impact through content design, procurement, and sustainable device management.

Future research needs to test a layered implementation framework through longitudinal studies and comparisons between regions in Indonesia. Research priorities include the relationship between access quality and learning outcomes; the effectiveness of teacher competency development models; the impact of generative AI on reasoning and academic integrity; algorithm bias audits in local languages and contexts; experiences of students with disabilities; as well as cost, carbon, and platform resilience analyses. Participatory research involving students, teachers, families, and communities needs to be expanded so that success indicators aren't determined solely by institutions or vendors. With this agenda, digital education can grow into a system that is innovative while also being fair, safe, humane, and sustainable.

FURTHER STUDY

This research still has limitations, so further studies on the topic of Digital Education as Learning-Transformation Infrastructure: Inclusivity, Competence, Data Ethics, and Workforce Readiness are needed to improve this research and add insights for both the writer and the readers.

REFERENCES

- A. Aristovnik, D. Keržič, D. Ravšelj, N. Tomaževič, and L. Umek, "Impacts of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Life of Higher Education Students: A Global Perspective," *Sustainability*, vol. 12, no. 20, p. 8438, Oct. 2020, doi: 10.3390/su12208438.
- A. Haleem, M. Javaid, M. A. Qadri, and R. Suman, "Understanding the role of digital technologies in education: A review," *Sustain. Oper. Comput.*, vol. 3, pp. 275–285, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.susoc.2022.05.004.
- A. K. Feroz, H. Zo, and A. Chiravuri, "Digital Transformation and Environmental Sustainability: A Review and Research Agenda," *Sustainability*, vol. 13, no. 3, p. 1530, Feb. 2021, doi: 10.3390/su13031530.
- A. Lie, S. Mina Tamah, I. Gozali, K. Retno Triwidayati, T. Sari Diah Utami, and F. Jemadi, "Secondary School Language Teachers' Online Learning Engagement during the Covid-19 Pandemic in Indonesia," *J. Inf. Technol. Educ. Res.*, vol. 19, pp. 803–832, 2020, doi: 10.28945/4626.
- A. P. Aguilera-Hermida, "College students' use and acceptance of emergency online learning due to COVID-19," *Int. J. Educ. Res. Open*, vol. 1, p. 100011, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.ijedro.2020.100011.
- 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. B. Lockee, "Online education in the post-COVID era," *Nat. Electron.*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 5–6, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.1038/s41928-020-00534-0.

- B. Williamson and R. Eynon, "Historical threads, missing links, and future directions in AI in education," *Learn. Media Technol.*, vol. 45, no. 3, pp. 223–235, Jul. 2020, doi: 10.1080/17439884.2020.1798995.
- B. Williamson, R. Eynon, and J. Potter, *Pandemic politics, pedagogies and practices: digital technologies and distance education during the coronavirus emergency*. Learning, media and technology, Taylor & Francis, 2020. doi: 10.1080/17439884.2020.1761641.
- C. K. Y. Chan, "A comprehensive AI policy education framework for university teaching and learning," *Int. J. Educ. Technol. High. Educ.*, vol. 20, no. 1, p. 38, Jul. 2023, doi: 10.1186/s41239-023-00408-3.
- C. Müller and T. Mildenerger, "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.
- C. Succi and M. Canovi, "Soft skills to enhance graduate employability: comparing students and employers' perceptions," *Stud. High. Educ.*, vol. 45, no. 9, pp. 1834–1847, Sep. 2020, doi: 10.1080/03075079.2019.1585420.
- D. Byrne, "A worked example of Braun and Clarke's approach to reflexive thematic analysis," *Qual. Quant.*, vol. 56, no. 3, pp. 1391–1412, Jun. 2022, doi: 10.1007/s11135-021-01182-y.
- D. Ifenthaler and J. Y. K. Yau, "Utilising learning analytics for study success: Reflections on current empirical findings," *Res. Pract. Technol. Enhanc. Learn.*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 1–13, 2020.
- E. Beaunoyer, S. Dupéré, and M. J. Guitton, "COVID-19 and digital inequalities: Reciprocal impacts and mitigation strategies," *Comput. Human Behav.*, vol. 111, p. 106424, Oct. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2020.106424.
- E. Kasneci et al., "ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models," *Learn. Individ. Differ.*, vol. 103, no. 9, pp. 1–9, 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274.
- F. Biwer et al., "Changes and Adaptations: How University Students Self-Regulate Their Online Learning During the COVID-19 Pandemic," *Front. Psychol.*, vol. 12, Apr. 2021, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2021.642593.
- F. Ferri, P. Grifoni, and T. Guzzo, "Online Learning and Emergency Remote Teaching: Opportunities and Challenges in Emergency Situations," *Societies*, vol. 10, no. 4, p. 86, Nov. 2020, doi: 10.3390/soc10040086.

- 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.
- G. Falloon, "From digital literacy to digital competence: the teacher digital competency (TDC) framework," *Educ. Technol. Res. Dev.*, vol. 68, no. 5, pp. 2449–2472, Oct. 2020, doi: 10.1007/s11423-020-09767-4.
- 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.
- G. Spöttl and L. Windelband, "The 4th industrial revolution – its impact on vocational skills," *J. Educ. Work*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 29–52, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.1080/13639080.2020.1858230.
- G.-J. Hwang, H. Xie, B. W. Wah, and D. Gašević, "Vision, challenges, roles and research issues of Artificial Intelligence in Education," *Comput. Educ. Artif. Intell.*, vol. 1, p. 100001, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.caeai.2020.100001.
- 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.
- H. Tinmaz, Y.-T. Lee, M. Fanea-Ivanovici, and H. Baber, "A systematic review on digital literacy," *Smart Learn. Environ.*, vol. 9, no. 1, p. 21, Dec. 2022, doi: 10.1186/s40561-022-00204-y.
- I. Molenaar, "Towards hybrid human-AI learning technologies," *Eur. J. Educ.*, vol. 57, no. 4, pp. 632–645, Dec. 2022, doi: 10.1111/ejed.12527.
- J. Borup, C. R. Graham, R. E. West, L. Archambault, and K. J. Spring, "Academic Communities of Engagement: an expansive lens for examining support structures in blended and online learning," *Educ. Technol. Res. Dev.*, vol. 68, no. 2, pp. 807–832, Apr. 2020, doi: 10.1007/s11423-020-09744-x.
- J. König, D. J. Jäger-Biela, and N. Glutsch, "Adapting to online teaching during COVID-19 school closure: teacher education and teacher competence effects among early career teachers in Germany," *Eur. J. Teach. Educ.*, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 608–622, Aug. 2020, doi: 10.1080/02619768.2020.1809650.
- J. Lai and N. O. Widmar, "Revisiting the Digital Divide in the COVID-19 Era," *Appl. Econ. Perspect. Policy*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 458–464, Mar. 2021, doi: 10.1002/aepp.13104.

- J. Portillo, U. Garay, E. Tejada, and N. Bilbao, "Self-Perception of the Digital Competence of Educators during the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Cross-Analysis of Different Educational Stages," *Sustainability*, vol. 12, no. 23, p. 10128, Dec. 2020, doi: 10.3390/su122310128.
- 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. S. Barrot, I. I. Llenares, and L. S. del Rosario, "Students' online learning challenges during the pandemic and how they cope with them: The case of the Philippines," *Educ. Inf. Technol.*, vol. 26, no. 6, pp. 7321-7338, Nov. 2021, doi: 10.1007/s10639-021-10589-x.
- 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. Longo et al., "Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) 2.0: A manifesto of open challenges and interdisciplinary research directions," *Inf. Fusion*, vol. 106, p. 102301, 2024, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2024.102301>.
- L. M. Kipper et al., "Scientific mapping to identify competencies required by industry 4.0," *Technol. Soc.*, vol. 64, p. 101454, Feb. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.techsoc.2020.101454.
- L. Pangrazio and A. L. Godhe, "What is digital literacy? A comparative review of publications across three language contexts," *E-learning Digit.*, 2020, doi: 10.1177/2042753020946291.
- 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. Bond, S. Bedenlier, V. I. Marín, and M. Händel, "Emergency remote teaching in higher education: mapping the first global online semester," *Int. J. Educ. Technol. High. Educ.*, vol. 18, no. 1, p. 50, Dec. 2021, doi: 10.1186/s41239-021-00282-x.
- M. D. H. Rahiem, "The Emergency Remote Learning Experience of University Students in Indonesia amidst the COVID-19 Crisis," *Int. J. Learn. Teach. Educ. Res.*, vol. 19, no. 6, pp. 1-26, Jun. 2020, doi: 10.26803/ijlter.19.6.1.
- M. Farrokhnia, S. K. Banihashem, O. Noroozi, and A. Wals, "A SWOT analysis of ChatGPT: Implications for educational practice and research," *Innov. Educ. Teach. Int.*, vol. 61, no. 3, pp. 460-474, May 2024, doi: 10.1080/14703297.2023.2195846.

- M. Händel, M. Stephan, M. Gläser-Zikuda, B. Kopp, S. Bedenlier, and A. Ziegler, "Digital readiness and its effects on higher education students' socio-emotional perceptions in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic," *J. Res. Technol. Educ.*, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. 267–280, Mar. 2022, doi: 10.1080/15391523.2020.1846147.
- M. Mailizar, A. Almanthari, S. Maulina, and S. Bruce, "Secondary School Mathematics Teachers' Views on E-learning Implementation Barriers during the COVID-19 Pandemic: The Case of Indonesia," *Eurasia J. Math. Sci. Technol. Educ.*, vol. 16, no. 7, p. em1860, May 2020, doi: 10.29333/ejmste/8240.
- M. Noetel et al., "Video Improves Learning in Higher Education: A Systematic Review," *Rev. Educ. Res.*, vol. 91, no. 2, pp. 204–236, Apr. 2021, doi: 10.3102/0034654321990713.
- M. Sailer and L. Homner, "The gamification of learning: A meta-analysis," *Educ. Psychol. Rev.*, 2020.
- N. Iivari, S. Sharma, and L. Ventä-Olkkonen, "Digital transformation of everyday life – How COVID-19 pandemic transformed the basic education of the young generation and why information management research should care?," *Int. J. Inf. Manage.*, vol. 55, p. 102183, Dec. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2020.102183.
- O. B. Adedoyin and E. Soykan, "Covid-19 pandemic and online learning: the challenges and opportunities," *Interact. Learn. Environ.*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 863–875, 2023.
- 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. Baltà-Salvador, N. Olmedo-Torre, M. Peña, and A.-I. Renta-Davids, "Academic and emotional effects of online learning during the COVID-19 pandemic on engineering students," *Educ. Inf. Technol.*, vol. 26, no. 6, pp. 7407–7434, Nov. 2021, doi: 10.1007/s10639-021-10593-1.
- R. E. Baticulon et al., "Barriers to Online Learning in the Time of COVID-19: A National Survey of Medical Students in the Philippines," *Med. Sci. Educ.*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 615–626, Apr. 2021, doi: 10.1007/s40670-021-01231-z.
- R. Gopal, V. Singh, and A. Aggarwal, "Impact of online classes on the satisfaction and performance of students during the pandemic period of COVID 19," *Educ. Inf. Technol.*, vol. 26, no. 6, pp. 6923–6947, Nov. 2021, doi: 10.1007/s10639-021-10523-1.
- R. Marachi and L. Quill, "The case of Canvas: Longitudinal datafication through learning management systems," *Teach. High. Educ.*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 418–434, May 2020, doi: 10.1080/13562517.2020.1739641.

- R. Obringer, B. Rachunok, D. Maia-Silva, M. Arbabzadeh, R. Nateghi, and K. Madani, "The overlooked environmental footprint of increasing Internet use," *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.*, vol. 167, p. 105389, Apr. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.resconrec.2020.105389.
- R. Rasmitadila et al., "The Perceptions of Primary School Teachers of Online Learning during the COVID-19 Pandemic Period: A Case Study in Indonesia," *J. Ethn. Cult. Stud.*, pp. 90–109, Jul. 2020, doi: 10.29333/ejecs/388.
- S. Akgun and C. Greenhow, "Artificial intelligence in education: Addressing ethical challenges in K-12 settings," *AI Ethics*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 431–440, Aug. 2022, doi: 10.1007/s43681-021-00096-7.
- 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. Dhawan, "Online Learning: A Panacea in the Time of COVID-19 Crisis," *J. Educ. Technol. Syst.*, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 5–22, Sep. 2020, doi: 10.1177/0047239520934018.
- S. Goudeau, C. Sanrey, A. Stanczak, A. Manstead, and C. Darnon, "Why lockdown and distance learning during the COVID-19 pandemic are likely to increase the social class achievement gap," *Nat. Hum. Behav.*, vol. 5, no. 10, pp. 1273–1281, Sep. 2021, doi: 10.1038/s41562-021-01212-7.
- S. K. Howard, J. Tondeur, F. Siddiq, and R. Scherer, "Ready, set, go! Profiling teachers' readiness for online teaching in secondary education," *Technol. Pedagog. Educ.*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 141–158, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.1080/1475939X.2020.1839543.
- 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. 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.
- 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.

- 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.
- V. Braun and V. Clarke, "One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis?," *Qual. Res. Psychol.*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 328–352, Jul. 2021, doi: 10.1080/14780887.2020.1769238.
- 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.