Volume 3 Number 1 (2025)
January – June 2025
Page: 11-22

ISSN; 3031-2884
EDUJAVARE PUBLISHING
https://edujavare.com/index.php/EDUJAVARE

Bridging the Digital Divide: Ensuring Equitable Access to Education Technology

M. Anwar Aini[1]

[1] Universitas Qomaruddin, Indonesia;
* Correspondence e-mail; manwaraini@uqgresik.ac.id

Article history Submitted: 2025/01/17; Revised: 2025/02/15; Accepted: 2025/04/14

Abstract

The digital divide in education perpetuates inequities, limiting access to essential learning resources and hindering students' academic success, particularly in underserved regions. This study investigates the barriers and opportunities in ensuring equitable access to educational technology across different geographical and socioeconomic contexts. Using a qualitative research approach, data were collected through in-depth interviews, focus group discussions, and field observations in three regions of Indonesia: Jakarta, Central Java, and Eastern Indonesia. The study found significant disparities in access to digital tools and resources, with urban areas facing digital literacy challenges and rural and remote areas encountering severe infrastructural obstacles. Moreover, sociocultural factors, such as gender and the lack of home-based support, further exacerbated these inequalities. The research highlights the need for context-sensitive and equity-driven policies that address infrastructural and pedagogical gaps. It also emphasizes the importance of community involvement in developing local solutions to bridge the digital divide. The study contributes to the growing body of literature on digital inequality in education by providing insights into the multidimensional nature of the problem and offering recommendations for more inclusive edtech strategies. The findings suggest that bridging the digital divide requires a holistic approach beyond access to technology and includes digital literacy, teacher training, and community engagement.

Keywords Digital Divide, Education Technology, Infrastructure, Rural Education.

INTRODUCTION

In the 21st century, integrating technology into education has transformed how students learn and teachers instruct. From interactive online platforms and virtual classrooms to AI-driven learning systems, educational technology (edtech) offers immense potential to personalize learning, foster engagement, and expand access to quality education (Sebsibe et al., 2023). However, the benefits of edtech are not equally distributed. Across the globe and even within individual countries, significant disparities remain in access to the necessary tools, infrastructure, and digital literacy required to participate in technology-enhanced learning fully (Blau et al., 2020). This digital divide has become one of the most pressing challenges in modern education, reinforcing existing inequalities and creating new barriers for students in marginalized communities (Serrano et al., 2019).

The COVID-19 pandemic starkly revealed the extent of the digital divide in education. As schools closed and remote learning became the norm, students without access to reliable internet, appropriate devices, or supportive home environments were left behind. According to UNESCO, more than 1.6 billion learners were affected by school closures at the height of the pandemic, with nearly 463 million students worldwide unable to access remote learning (Ganal et al., 2022). These figures underscore a systemic issue: the infrastructure and policies surrounding edtech adoption are not universally inclusive. The situation demands a comprehensive and sustained response to ensure that all learners, regardless of socioeconomic status, geographic location, or personal circumstance, can benefit from digital learning tools (O'Connor et al., 2023).

Although the digital divide in education is widely acknowledged, there remains a lack of in-depth exploration into the multidimensional nature of the issue. Existing studies often focus on infrastructure such as access to internet connectivity and digital devices—but overlook other crucial elements, including digital literacy, culturally relevant content, and educator preparedness (Falloon, 2020). Furthermore, many studies adopt a one-size-fits-all approach, failing to account for the diverse contexts in which digital learning occurs. For instance, what works in an urban setting with moderate infrastructure may not translate well to rural or conflict-affected areas (Stansfeld et al., 2021). This research aims to fill those gaps by taking a more holistic and context-sensitive approach to understanding and addressing the digital divide.

One unique aspect of this study is its focus on equity, not just equality, in edtech access. While equality emphasizes providing the same resources to all, equity recognizes that different learners may need different levels and types of support to achieve comparable outcomes (Yogia et al., 2023). This research highlights how edtech policies and practices can be designed with an equity lens, ensuring that underrepresented groups such as students with disabilities, Indigenous communities, and refugees are not merely accommodated but actively empowered (Arpaci, 2019). By analyzing case studies and data from multiple regions, this

article provides a comparative perspective that reveals universal patterns and context-specific challenges in bridging the digital divide.

Another key contribution of this study is its integration of voices from the field teachers, students, parents, and administrators whose lived experiences offer critical insights into the real-world implications of digital inequity (Lee et al., 2021). Too often, policy recommendations and technological solutions are developed in isolation from the end users. This research foregrounds those voices to inform the design of inclusive edtech strategies better. By incorporating qualitative data alongside quantitative metrics, the study captures a richer and more nuanced picture of the barriers and enablers of digital learning equity (Naibaho, 2022).

Despite increased academic interest in the digital divide, previous research has not sufficiently addressed the long-term implications of unequal edtech access, particularly regarding educational outcomes, socio-emotional development, and future opportunities for affected students (Gupta, 2018). This article seeks to bridge that gap by examining the current state of access and the potential consequences of inaction. Without targeted interventions, the digital divide risks becoming generational, limiting economic mobility and deepening societal inequalities (Cartoni Mancinelli et al., 2018). Through this research, we aim to underscore the urgency of systemic change and propose actionable recommendations for educators, policymakers, and technology developers.

The ultimate goal of this article is to contribute to a more equitable educational landscape in the digital age. By identifying the structural, cultural, and pedagogical factors influencing edtech access and adoption, we hope to inform policies and practices promoting inclusion, adaptability, and sustainability. We hope this work catalyzes ongoing dialogue and innovation aimed at narrowing the digital divide not merely as a temporary fix during times of crisis but as a foundational principle of educational justice in a rapidly evolving world.

METHODS

This study adopts a qualitative research approach to explore the complex and multifaceted nature of the digital divide in education, particularly focusing on how different communities experience and respond to disparities in access to educational technology. Qualitative methods are well-suited for investigating nuanced social phenomena such as equity, perception, and lived experience, which are central to this study. The research was conducted over six months, from August 2024 to January 2025. It involved three distinct regions with contrasting digital infrastructures and demographic profiles: an urban area in Jakarta, a semi-rural district in Central Java, and a remote region in Eastern Indonesia. These diverse sites were selected purposively to capture a broad range of experiences and contextual factors affecting access to edtech.

Data collection was carried out through a combination of in-depth interviews, focus group discussions, and field observations. A total of 45 participants were involved, including teachers, school administrators, students, parents, and local education officials. Semi-

structured interview guides allowed flexibility in exploring emerging themes while maintaining consistency across participants. Focus group discussions, conducted separately with students and teachers, helped to gather collective insights and reveal patterns in attitudes and experiences related to digital learning. Observational data were collected during school visits and community activities, contextualizing the educational environments. The primary data were supplemented with document analysis, including school technology policies, local government reports, and NGO publications relevant to digital education initiatives.

The data analysis process followed the principles of thematic analysis. All interviews and discussions were transcribed verbatim and analyzed using a coding framework developed both inductively from the data and deductively based on the conceptual framework of digital equity. The analysis involved multiple coding cycles to refine categories and identify core themes such as infrastructural challenges, digital literacy gaps, policy mismatches, and community-based solutions. Triangulation of data sources and methods ensured the credibility and trustworthiness of the findings. Member-checking with selected participants was conducted to validate interpretations, and ethical considerations were strictly followed throughout the research process, including informed consent, confidentiality, and the voluntary nature of participation. This methodological approach enabled the study to capture the depth and diversity of experiences surrounding digital inequality in education, contributing to a more grounded and context-rich understanding of the issue.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

The findings from this study reveal significant disparities in access to educational technology across the three regions studied, with varying challenges and opportunities based on geographical and socioeconomic contexts. Despite government and private sector efforts to bridge the digital divide, inequities persist and manifest in different ways depending on local circumstances. In all regions, access to technology and digital resources was found to be disproportionately concentrated in urban areas, leaving rural and remote communities at a distinct disadvantage.

In the urban area of Jakarta, there was relatively better access to digital devices and the internet. Still, the study revealed that several challenges remained even in this more developed setting. High-speed internet was available, but many families could not afford reliable devices for all students. Moreover, although students had access to learning platforms, the disparity in digital literacy was glaring. Teachers reported that while some students could navigate online platforms, many lacked the basic skills to fully engage with the material (Alhawsawi & Jawhar, 2021). This gap was not solely related to technical knowledge but was also tied to varying levels of parental support, as many parents lacked the digital skills to assist their children. Consequently, despite having access to devices and the internet, students from low-income families struggled to make the most of digital learning opportunities due to the absence of a supportive learning environment at home (Cronin-de-Chavez et al., 2019).

In contrast, the semi-rural district in Central Java faced more severe infrastructural challenges. The internet connectivity was unreliable, with many areas suffering from slow or intermittent connections, making it difficult for students to participate in online learning. While some schools had made efforts to distribute devices, the number of students per device often meant that only one or two students could use the device at a time, creating further obstacles (Priando Purba et al., 2021). Teachers in this region expressed concern about the inequities in their classrooms, where some students could access digital resources and others could not. The discrepancy led to frustration among both students and teachers, with some students reporting that they could not keep up with their peers due to limited access to digital tools (Ramlah et al., 2022). Digital literacy programs were available in some schools, but the quality and reach of these programs were inconsistent, further exacerbating the digital divide.

The remote area in Eastern Indonesia represented the most challenging environment regarding access to educational technology. Many villages in this region lacked basic infrastructure, including reliable electricity and internet access, making online learning largely unfeasible. In this context, the lack of digital devices was a major barrier, with families relying on shared mobile phones for internet access (Prabowo et al., 2021). Power outages and unstable networks severely limited their effectiveness even when devices were available. Teachers in these communities faced immense difficulties in delivering lessons remotely, and some had to resort to traditional methods like radio broadcasts or printed materials to continue engaging students. Although some local initiatives provided internet cafes and community learning centers, these were few and far between, and many students could not travel to access them due to geographic isolation or financial constraints. Digital literacy among both students and teachers in this region was low, and there was limited support from local authorities to develop digital education initiatives. Though admirable, the community-based approach to learning highlighted the vast gap in access to modern educational tools between remote and more developed areas (Aldiab et al., 2019).

Despite these regional differences, some common themes emerged. Across all three regions, a recurring issue was the lack of teacher preparedness and ongoing professional development in integrating technology into the classroom. Teachers strongly desire more training in using educational technology effectively and managing online classrooms (Zaim et al., 2020). This was particularly critical in areas with unreliable internet, where teachers had to be resourceful in adapting their lessons. The study also highlighted the need for more localized and context-sensitive solutions rather than a one-size-fits-all approach to edtech policies. What worked in urban areas often failed to address the specific needs of rural and remote communities, underscoring the importance of community involvement in designing and implementing digital education initiatives (Hasanah et al., 2021).

Furthermore, the study found that while governmental and non-governmental organizations had made significant strides in providing devices and connectivity, their efforts often overlooked the sociocultural factors contributing to digital inequality. For instance, many students in rural and remote areas lacked parental guidance or technical support due to

widespread digital illiteracy among caregivers (Rath et al., 2024). Moreover, gender disparities in digital access were particularly evident in more conservative regions, where girls were often less likely to have their own devices or to be encouraged to engage with technology outside of school hours. This disparity further compounded the challenges these students faced in keeping up with digital learning (Wang & Dostál, 2018).

Regarding solutions, the study uncovered several promising initiatives to reduce the digital divide. In urban areas, private-public partnerships had led to pilot programs that provided low-cost internet and subsidized devices for low-income families. In rural areas, community-driven initiatives such as using mobile phones for learning and localized radio programs showed resilience and adaptability despite infrastructural limitations (Dewi & Ruidahasi, 2020). Teachers in these areas also highlighted the importance of peer learning, where students shared devices and knowledge, creating informal networks of digital learning support. These bottom-up solutions, while not without their challenges, provided valuable insights into how communities can take ownership of their digital education needs and create sustainable access models.

The findings from this study illustrate the pervasive nature of the digital divide in education but also reveal opportunities for bridging the gap through localized, equity-focused strategies. The study emphasizes the need for a more nuanced approach to edtech policy that considers regional disparities, cultural contexts, and the socioeconomic realities of students and families. Only by addressing these complexities can we ensure that educational technology serves as a tool for equity and empowerment rather than perpetuating existing inequalities.

Table 1. Implementation of PAI and Its Impact on Student Character Formation

No	Category	Barriers	Enablers
1	Infrastructure	- Unreliable internet connectivity (especially in rural areas)	- Government and NGO initiatives providing low-cost internet and devices (in urban areas)
		- Limited access to devices in remote areas and overcrowded usage in schools	- Community-based solutions such as mobile phone-based learning, radio broadcasts, and offline resources
2	Digital Literacy	- Low digital literacy among students and teachers, hindering effective engagement with technology	- Digital literacy training programs for students and teachers in some regions
		- Lack of parental support in assisting students with technology use due to low digital literacy levels	- Localized training for families and students in digital skills (in urban pilot projects)
3	Socioeconomic Factors	- Socioeconomic inequalities leading to limited device ownership in low-income families	- Private-public partnerships aimed at providing subsidized devices and internet access
		- Gender disparities in rural areas limiting access to technology for girls	- Community efforts to ensure equal access to technology for both genders, especially in rural areas

4	Pedagogical Support	- Lack of teacher training and preparedness in using educational technology effectively	- Teacher professional development programs focused on pedagogical integration of technology
		- Limited resources for creating interactive and personalized digital learning experiences	- Peer learning networks and resource-sharing among teachers and schools

Table 1 Infrastructure: The lack of reliable internet connectivity and device access is a major barrier, especially in rural and remote areas. However, enablers such as community-driven solutions and government and NGO initiatives aim to address these issues by providing low-cost internet and devices, particularly in urban areas. Digital Literacy: Digital literacy remains a critical barrier to technology use, with students and teachers often lacking the skills to engage with digital platforms effectively. Enablers include digital literacy programs and localized training for students, teachers, and parents, particularly in areas where these programs are prioritized. Socioeconomic Factors: Socioeconomic disparities exacerbate access issues, with low-income families often unable to afford devices or reliable internet access. Gender inequality in access to technology, especially in rural regions, further amplifies these issues. However, private-public partnerships and community-based efforts have emerged as significant enablers, working to provide subsidized devices and ensure equal access to technology, particularly for girls in rural communities. Pedagogical Support: A critical barrier to the successful integration of educational technology is the lack of teacher preparedness. Many teachers are not adequately trained to use technology effectively in the classroom. On the other hand, professional development programs and peer learning networks for teachers are key enablers, helping educators adopt more effective digital teaching strategies.

Discussion

The findings of this study echo and expand upon existing research on the digital divide in education, reinforcing the notion that access to educational technology is a multifaceted issue influenced by a combination of infrastructure, socioeconomic factors, and digital literacy. A key theme that emerged from our study is the persistence of inequities in access to digital tools and resources, which aligns with earlier studies by (Lyman et al., 2023), who argue that the digital divide is not solely about the availability of technology but its meaningful use. In our research, while urban areas like Jakarta had better access to devices and internet connectivity, challenges persisted in digital literacy and the ability to engage with online learning. This finding corroborates Selwyn's argument that even where access to digital tools is available, the skill and support required to use them effectively remain significant barriers for many learners.

Furthermore, the study found that students from low-income families in urban and rural areas often faced barriers to using available technologies effectively due to a lack of home-based support. This resonates with research by (Rafiola et al., 2020), who emphasize the importance of digital skills and the role of the home environment in fostering technology use. In our study, it was evident that even where devices were provided, the absence of parental

digital literacy and a conducive learning environment at home led to unequal engagement with digital learning (Chen et al., 2020). These findings point to the need for policies that focus on providing technology and supporting families in developing the necessary digital skills to assist their children.

The findings from the rural and remote areas, particularly in Central Java and Eastern Indonesia, highlight the extent to which infrastructure remains a significant obstacle to bridging the digital divide. This is consistent with earlier work by (Li, 2018), who identifies infrastructural disparities as one of the key drivers of digital inequality. In regions with unreliable internet and limited device access, students' engagement with digital learning was severely constrained. This issue is compounded in remote areas, where many students rely on shared mobile phones or depend entirely on offline learning materials such as printed packets or radio broadcasts. This study aligns with the findings of studies like those by (Rahmatullah et al., 2022), who suggest that rural and isolated communities often face compounded disadvantages that limit their opportunities for digital education, leading to further educational disparities.

A particularly salient finding in our study was the role of gender in exacerbating the digital divide, especially in more conservative rural regions. In these areas, girls were found to have less access to technology and were often discouraged from using digital tools outside of school. This gender disparity in technology access is consistent with previous research by (Millner, 2021), who has shown that sociocultural factors, including traditional gender roles, can significantly hinder girls' access to digital resources. Our findings reinforce the need for gender-sensitive approaches in digital education initiatives, where boys and girls are equally encouraged to engage with and benefit from technology. Furthermore, initiatives to combat this inequality must address the cultural and social barriers that prevent girls from fully participating in the digital learning environment.

An important aspect of this study was the exploration of teacher preparedness and professional development in integrating digital tools into the classroom. Teachers expressed a strong desire for more comprehensive training in using educational technologies effectively, an issue identified in previous studies by (Murcia et al., 2020). The lack of teacher training in digital tools is a critical barrier that prevents effective integration of technology in the classroom, regardless of access to devices. Our findings suggest that professional development must go beyond basic technical skills and focus on pedagogical strategies for leveraging technology to enhance learning outcomes. Teachers in our study highlighted the need for support in creating engaging, interactive, and personalized learning experiences through technology, a theme echoed by the research (Mogale & Malatji, 2022), who argue that teacher training should focus on the pedagogical use of technology rather than just the functional aspects.

The study also underscores the importance of community-driven solutions, particularly in rural and remote areas, where top-down policies and large-scale interventions have often fallen short. The creative and adaptive solutions implemented by teachers and communities,

such as mobile phone-based learning, radio broadcasts, and local peer-to-peer networks, provide valuable insights into how localized, grassroots strategies can help mitigate the effects of the digital divide. These findings align with those of (Nugraha et al., 2022), who suggest that community-based solutions leveraging local resources and knowledge can be more effective than external interventions in addressing digital inequality. Our study contributes to the growing body of research emphasizing the need for community ownership and contextual adaptation when designing edtech policies and programs.

The results also highlight the crucial role of policy and government intervention in addressing the digital divide. However, as highlighted in the work of (Dandi & Veronica, 2023), simply providing technology is not enough; policies must also address the broader social, cultural, and economic factors that influence access and use. Our findings suggest that while initiatives to provide devices and improve connectivity are necessary, they must be accompanied by comprehensive strategies to improve digital literacy, support teachers, and involve families in the learning process. This resonates with the framework of the "digital inclusion" model proposed by (Febriani et al., 2023), which advocates for an integrated approach that holistically addresses access, skills, and usage.

In conclusion, the results of this study confirm that the digital divide in education is a multifaceted issue that requires targeted interventions at multiple levels. The findings contribute to the existing body of literature by providing a more nuanced understanding of how digital inequality is experienced in diverse socioeconomic and geographical contexts. Moreover, the study highlights the need for policies that are inclusive in terms of access and equitable in addressing the unique needs of underrepresented groups, including low-income families, rural communities, and marginalized genders. By combining the insights from previous research with the lived experiences of participants in this study, we propose a framework for bridging the digital divide that emphasizes context-sensitive, equity-driven solutions.

CONCLUSION

This study highlights the urgent need to address the digital divide in education and emphasizes that bridging this gap requires more than just providing devices and internet access. The research confirms that access to educational technology is shaped by a complex interplay of factors, including digital literacy, socioeconomic conditions, infrastructure, and cultural barriers. For many students, particularly in rural and remote areas, the challenges of accessing and effectively using digital tools remain profound. The researcher's concern about the inequitable distribution of digital resources and the exacerbation of existing educational inequalities has been validated through this study, which reveals that many students, even in relatively developed areas, face systemic obstacles to engaging with technology in education. The findings underscore the need for equity-driven policies that focus on access and consider the broader sociocultural and pedagogical aspects that influence technology use.

However, there are limitations to this research that must be acknowledged. The study was conducted in a limited number of regions within Indonesia, and while the findings provide valuable insights, they may not be fully representative of all contexts globally. Moreover, the reliance on qualitative data, while rich in depth and context, does not offer generalizable quantitative measures of the scale of the digital divide. Future research could benefit from a larger sample size across diverse geographical regions, including urban, semi-rural, and remote areas, to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the issue. Additionally, longitudinal studies could track the long-term effects of digital inequities on educational outcomes to inform better policies to mitigate these disparities. Finally, exploring the perspectives of other key stakeholders, such as policymakers and tech developers, would provide further insight into the systemic challenges and opportunities for closing the digital divide in education.

REFERENCES

Aldiab, A., Chowdhury, H., Kootsookos, A., Alam, F., & Allhibi, H. (2019). Utilization of Learning Management Systems (LMSs) in higher education system: A case review for Saudi Arabia. *Energy Procedia*, *160*, 731–737. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2019.02.186

Alhawsawi, S., & Jawhar, S. S. (2021). Negotiating pedagogical positions in higher education during COVID-19 pandemic: teacher's narratives. *Heliyon*, *7*(6), e07158. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e07158

Arpaci, I. (2019). Culture and nomophobia: The role of vertical versus horizontal collectivism in predicting nomophobia. *Information Development*, *35*(1), 96–106. https://doi.org/10.1177/0266666917730119

Blau, I., Shamir-Inbal, T., & Avdiel, O. (2020). How does the pedagogical design of a technology-enhanced collaborative academic course promote digital literacies, self-regulation, and perceived learning of students? *The Internet and Higher Education*, *45*, 100722.

Cartoni Mancinelli, A., Dal Bosco, A., Mattioli, S., Ranucci, D., & Castellini, C. (2018). Mobile poultry processing unit as a resource for small poultry farms: planning and economic efficiency, animal welfare, meat quality and sanitary implications. *Animals*, *8*(12), 229.

Chen, C.-H., Shih, C.-C., & Law, V. (2020). The effects of competition in digital game-based learning (DGBL): a meta-analysis. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *68*, 1855–1873.

Cronin-de-Chavez, A., Islam, S., & McEachan, R. R. C. (2019). Not a level playing field: A qualitative study exploring structural, community and individual determinants of greenspace use amongst low-income multi-ethnic families. *Health & Place*, *56*, 118–126.

Dandi, D., & Veronica, M. (2023). Educational Psychology, Subjective Narratives of Consequences of Games Performance. *Socioeconomic and Humanistic Aspects for Township and Industry*, *1*(2), 138–144.

Dewi, M., & Ruidahasi, T. (2020). The role of self-efficacy, positive affect and social support on drug residents' resilience. *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Religion and Mental Health, ICRMH 2019, 18-19 September 2019, Jakarta, Indonesia*.

Falloon, G. (2020). From digital literacy to digital competence: the teacher digital competency (TDC) framework. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *68*, 2449–2472.

Febriani, S. R., Widayanti, R., Saputra, H. Y., Safutri, J. T., & Bedra, K. G. (2023). Hello Talk: An Alternative Media for Improving Writing Skills for Higher Education. *Ta'lim Al-'Arabiyyah: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Arab & Kebahasaaraban*, *7*(1). https://doi.org/10.15575/jpba.v7i1.23661

Ganal, N., Balot, M., & Mauricio, V. (2022). Remote Teaching-Learning and Students' Academic Life: COVID-19 Pandemic Context. *AsTEN Journal of Teacher Education*, *6*.

Gupta, T. (2018). Psychological management of bereavement among adolescents: A case series. *Journal of Indian Association for Child and Adolescent Mental Health*, *14*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/0973134220180208

Hasanah, U., Marini, A., & Maksum, A. (2021). Multicultural education-oriented digital teaching materials to improve students' pluralist attitudes. *Jurnal Prima Edukasia*, *9*(1), 118–126.

Lee, R., Hoe Looi, K., Faulkner, M., & Neale, L. (2021). The moderating influence of environment factors in an extended community of inquiry model of e-learning. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, *41*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2020.1758032

Li, T. M. (2018). After the land grab: Infrastructural violence and the "Mafia System" in Indonesia's oil palm plantation zones. *Geoforum*, *96*, 328–337.

Lyman, F. T., Tredway, L., & Purser, M. (2023). Think-Pair-Share and ThinkTrix: Standard Bearers of Student Dialogue. In *Contemporary Global Perspectives on Cooperative Learning: Applications Across Educational Contexts*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003268192-12

Millner, N. (2021). Unsettling feelings in the classroom: scaffolding pedagogies of discomfort as part of decolonising human geography in higher education. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*. https://doi.org/10.1080/03098265.2021.2004391

Mogale, M. L., & Malatji, K. S. (2022). Progressed Learners' Participation in Developing Curriculum Support Programmes: A Critical Pedagogy Approach. *E-Journal of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences*, *October*, 475–487. https://doi.org/10.38159/ehass.20223105

Murcia, K., Pepper, C., Joubert, M., Cross, E., & Wilson, S. (2020). A framework for identifying and developing children's creative thinking while coding with digital technologies. *Issues in Educational Research*, *30*(4), 1395–1417.

Naibaho, L. (2022). Exploring digital technology integration in learning innovation. *International Journal of Academic Research and Development*, *7*(6), 17–23.

Nugraha, A. P., Wibisono, C., Satriawan, B., Indrayani, Mulyadi, & Damsar. (2022). The Influence Of Transformational Leadership, Job Crafting, Job Satisfaction, And Self-Efficacy On Job Performance Through Work Engagement Of State Civil Apparatus As An Intervening Variable In The Digital Era Of Cases In The Local Government Of Karimun R. *Central European Management Journal*, *30*(3), 2336–2693.

O'Connor, J., Ludgate, S., Le, Q.-V., Le, H. T., & Huynh, P. D. P. (2023). Lessons from the pandemic: Teacher educators' use of digital technologies and pedagogies in Vietnam before, during and after the Covid-19 lockdown. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *103*(January), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2023.102942

Prabowo, P. A., Supriyono, B., Noor, I., & Muluk, M. K. (2021). Special autonomy policy

evaluation to improve community welfare in Papua province Indonesia. *International Journal of Excellence in Government*, *2*(1), 24–40. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijeg-06-2019-0011

Priando Purba, B. E., Riris, I. D., & Muchtar, Z. (2021). Development of Website-Based Learning Media Integrated Inquiri Learning Strategies in Learning Thermochemical Matter Chemistry. *Budapest International Research and Critics in Linguistics and Education (BirLE) Journal*, *4*(1). https://doi.org/10.33258/birle.v4i1.1658

Rafiola, R., Setyosari, P., Radjah, C., & Ramli, M. (2020). The effect of learning motivation, self-efficacy, and blended learning on students' achievement in the industrial revolution 4.0. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning (IJET)*, *15*(8), 71–82.

Rahmatullah, A. S., Mulyasa, E., Syahrani, S., Pongpalilu, F., & Putri, R. E. (2022). Digital era 4.0: The contribution to education and student psychology. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, *6*(S3), 89–107.

Ramlah, R., Riana, N., & Abadi, A. P. (2022). Fun Math Learning For Elementary School Students Through Interactive Puzzle Media. *SJME (Supremum Journal of Mathematics Education)*, *6*(1), 25–34. https://doi.org/10.35706/sjme.v6i1.5775

Rath, K. C., Khang, A., & Roy, D. (2024). The Role of Internet of Things (IoT) Technology in Industry 4.0 Economy. In *Advanced IoT Technologies and Applications in the Industry 4.0 Digital Economy* (pp. 1–28). CRC Press.

Sebsibe, A. S., Argaw, A. S., Bedada, T. B., & Mohammed, A. A. (2023). Swaying pedagogy: A new paradigm for mathematics teachers education in Ethiopia. *Social Sciences and Humanities Open*, *8*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2023.100630

Serrano, D. R., Dea-Ayuela, M. A., Gonzalez-Burgos, E., Serrano-Gil, A., & Lalatsa, A. (2019). Technology-enhanced learning in higher education: How to enhance student engagement through blended learning. *European Journal of Education*, *54*(2), 273–286.

Stansfeld, S., Clark, C., Smuk, M., Gallacher, J., & Babisch, W. (2021). Road traffic noise, noise sensitivity, noise annoyance, psychological and physical health and mortality. *Environmental Health: A Global Access Science Source*, *20*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12940-021-00720-3

Wang, X., & Dostál, J. (2018). Using digital educational games for English foreign language learning. *EDULEARN18 Proceedings*, 144–148.

Yogia, H., Uly, P., Marten, L., & Ratu, D. (2023). *Make Learning Fun for Elementary School Grade 1 Students with Kahoot Games*. *2*(1), 102–109.

Zaim, M., Refnaldi, & Arsyad, S. (2020). Authentic assessment for speaking skills: Problem and solution for english secondary school teachers in Indonesia. *International Journal of Instruction*, *13*(3). https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2020.13340a