

CHAPTER EIGHT

EdTech and Digital Equity: Strategies for Advancing Accessible, Affordable, and Sustainable Global Learning

AGARWAL Raveesh, Ankit Agarwal & GAURAV Kapoor

<https://doi.org/10.54908/iljs.cisp2026.10.01.008>

Abstract

This study investigated the role of educational technology (EdTech) in advancing digital equity by ensuring accessible, affordable, resilient, and sustainable global learning opportunities. Drawing on secondary data from a range of published sources, the research identified critical barriers to equitable EdTech adoption, particularly in rural and underserved regions. The study identified key challenges mitigating the were critical barriers to equitable EdTech adoption included inadequate internet connectivity, unreliable electricity, high costs, and limited digital literacy. These factors disproportionately affected learners from marginalised communities, hindering their access to quality education. The findings underscored the urgent need for collaborative efforts among stakeholders to develop and implement inclusive, AI-driven EdTech solutions that are both cost-effective and contextually relevant. Promoting digital equity requires not only technological innovation but also policy support, infrastructure development, and capacity building. This study advocates for a strategic, multi-stakeholder approach to harness EdTech's full potential in delivering equitable and sustainable education, especially for Generation Alpha and Generation Beta learners across diverse global contexts

Keywords: Digital Equity, EdTech, Education, Global Learning, Sustainable

Introduction

The convergence of education and technology, commonly framed as EdTech, has accelerated unprecedented transformations in the global learning landscape. While digital tools promise democratised access to quality education, a pressing dilemma continues to persist—digital equity. This refers not only to equitable access to technology, but also the capacity to meaningfully use it. In theory, the global shift toward online and hybrid

education should signify progress. In practice, it risks deepening existing educational disparities, especially in socio-economically marginalized communities.

The urgency of this issue became particularly apparent during the COVID-19 pandemic, which acted as a catalyst for digital learning adoption but simultaneously exposed stark infrastructural, economic, and pedagogical divides. As Hodges et al. (2020) emphasised, the global move to emergency remote teaching was not a testament to EdTech's readiness, but rather a reactive necessity. Indeed, the digital learning gap was laid bare, particularly in the Global South, where millions of students were left behind due to lack of internet, devices, and digital competence.

Recent scholarly inquiries have offered valuable insights into this inequality. Bulman and Fairlie (2021), analyzing educational access during the pandemic, argued that even in high-income nations, low-income students disproportionately suffered learning losses due to digital disadvantages. In contrast, countries with robust EdTech infrastructures, such as Finland or South Korea, maintained some degree of continuity (Kim & Rose, 2020). Yet, this disparity underscores a more fundamental question—are we mistaking digital availability for digital accessibility? To unpack this, one must confront the hidden architecture of digital learning: not just hardware or bandwidth, but pedagogy, local context, affordability, and sustainability. Selwyn (2021) cautioned against the techno-solutionist narrative that assumes technology inherently solves educational problems. Rather, he insisted that EdTech needs to be grounded in social realities and educational justice. Without such grounding, the promise of EdTech as a global equaliser remains an illusion.

Furthermore, the intersection of EdTech and policy frameworks remains under-explored. Warschauer and Matuchniak (2010) called attention to “second-level digital divides,” focusing not on access but on how students engage with technology. Their work suggested that even when devices are available, inequities in teacher preparedness, content design, and institutional support can perpetuate inequality. In a similar vein, van Dijk (2020) argued that digital access without accompanying social support mechanisms does little to challenge educational stratification.

This study critically examined how EdTech can effectively function as a catalyst for promoting digital equity by ensuring universal access,

affordability, resilience, and sustainability in global education systems. It aimed to explore the extent to which educational technologies can transcend infrastructural limitations and foster inclusive learning environments across diverse socio-economic and geographic contexts. The investigation also delved into the broader sociotechnical ecosystems—including policies, pedagogical practices, and digital literacy frameworks—that shape the equitable implementation of EdTech solutions. Furthermore, the study interrogated potential strategic pathways, such as AI-driven interventions and stakeholder collaborations across public, private, and community sectors, that can support scalable and context-sensitive EdTech deployment without sacrificing quality or equity. Ultimately, this research aspired to identify actionable strategies for advancing cost-effective and resilient educational models that serve both current and future generations globally. Grounded in secondary data from Indian academia—a diverse educational ecosystem that captures both the promise and pitfalls of digital learning, this study explored a multi-scalar view of EdTech: from national policy down to village classrooms. India serves as a microcosm of global digital education challenges. Its demographic dividend, linguistic heterogeneity, and rural-urban digital divide present a fertile terrain for examining both failures and future pathways.

The concept of sustainability also takes center stage in this inquiry. Too often, EdTech interventions are measured by their novelty rather than longevity. Al-Azawei, Serenelli, and Lundqvist (2016) highlighted that sustainable e-learning systems must align with user needs, technological ecosystems, and pedagogical goals. Sustainability is not simply about enduring platforms; it is about adaptive models that thrive under evolving socio-economic conditions. This is particularly relevant as we design learning environments for Generation Alpha and Beta—digital natives with evolving cognitive patterns and educational expectations.

As Kozma (2005) asserted, the transformative potential of ICT in education depends largely on how it is integrated into EdTech curricula, teacher practices, and institutional planning. This view complements more recent frameworks of EdTech for equity (Pimmer, Mateescu, & Gröhbiel, 2016), which argued that inclusivity must be engineered into systems, not retrofitted. This study did not merely catalogue technological tools or digital platforms. Instead, it interrogated the systemic conditions under which EdTech can become a truly equitable force. Through empirical insights from academic

practitioners, policy frameworks, and cross-national literature, the study aimed to construct a nuanced narrative that recognises digital equity not as a byproduct of EdTech, but as its ultimate test.

Review of Literature

Katz and Levine (2015) investigated digital equity among Hispanic families in the U.S., revealing that while devices and connectivity were increasing, meaningful access depended heavily on cultural context and parental digital literacy. Their mixed-methods study uncovered how language barriers and limited understanding of educational platforms hindered actual engagement, despite the presence of hardware and basic internet access. Basham, Stahl, Ortiz, Rice, and Smith (2015) analysed K–12 online learning for students with disabilities, documenting early evidence that online environments often failed to meet the specialised needs of learners with IEPs. Their exploratory work questioned whether online systems offered sufficient accommodations, prompting calls for more targeted support designs for equitable educational outcomes. Warschauer and Matuchniak (2015) provided a foundational review in *Review of Research in Education*, arguing that achieving equity in EdTech required advancing from simple device distribution to integrating pedagogical strategies, teacher training, and curriculum redesign. They emphasised that access must be accompanied by effective usage—an idea that became a recurring theme in digital equity discourse.

The Center on Online Learning and Students with Disabilities (2016) (the “Equity Matters” report) synthesised research on virtual and blended education for differently-abled students or students with disabilities. It traced structural strengths and weaknesses across U.S. states, calling for clearer policies, enhanced teacher preparation, and better-designed online platforms to ensure equity in both access and educational outcomes. Selwyn and Facer (2016) critically examined the EdTech agenda in *Learning, Media and Technology*, challenging the assumption that more educational technology naturally leads to improved equity. They highlighted how market-driven models often neglected the complexities of socio-economic and cultural contexts, suggesting that equitable EdTech required more than just scaling devices—it needed systemic rethinking. Trucano and Kozma (2016) assessed over 40 national-level digital learning initiatives, arguing that infrastructure investments often failed when they didn’t align with linguistic, pedagogical,

and curricular realities. Their policy-oriented study concluded that strategic planning, capacity building, and locally relevant content were critical to turn device distributions into effective learning opportunities.

Moore and Vitale (2017), through a large-scale survey for ACT, documented persistent inequities related to device access and connectivity among secondary school students. They emphasised policy measures such as subsidised internet and stronger mobile access to address a “homework gap” exacerbating rural and low-income learning challenges. MIT Initiative (Klein, 2017) reaffirmed that despite ubiquitous devices and mobile broadband, deep divides remained, especially between rural and urban, and wealthy versus underprivileged regions. Their analysis reinforced that infrastructure alone was insufficient without complementary educational programmes and equitable policies. Bishop and Lee (2017) proposed equity-centered approaches to EdTech in the *Handbook of Research in Educational Communications and Technology*. They outlined how intentional design could support historically marginalised learners, emphasising the inclusion of equity perspectives in all stages of educational technology development.

Moore and Vitale (2018) revisited the “homework gap,” this time with national survey data, describing it as a systemic barrier where device access in schools didn't translate to home learning capability. Their policy analysis pushed for a reimagining of broadband as essential infrastructure, akin to electricity and water, and called on governments to subsidise or regulate internet provision as a public good. Hanover Research (2018) provided district-level case studies showing how technology integration often failed due to lack of teacher training, inadequate digital literacy, and rigid curricula unsuited for blended learning. Their findings advocated for holistic technology strategies addressing pedagogy, professional development, and content redesign. ACT (Moore & Vitale, 2018) further emphasised that equitable access required reliable connections, multi-device availability, and support across home and school, along with policies to ensure underserved students weren't left behind.

Nakayama et al. (2019) conducted a study in Brazil analysing digital inclusion for rural youth. They found that infrastructural improvements alone did not reduce inequities—effective outcomes depended on localised educational interventions, teacher training, and culturally relevant content. Education

without community engagement failed to shift persistent disparities. Dimaggio, Hargittai, Celeste, & Shafer (2019) examined second and third-level digital divides—access, skills, and usage among U.S. adults. Their large-scale survey revealed that income, education, age, and ethnicity were powerful predictors of digital engagement, shaping the quality and outcome of technology-mediated learning experiences.

Reimers and Schleicher (2020), in a global OECD report on COVID-19 responses, highlighted that robust EdTech preparedness correlated with minimal learning disruptions during school closures. However, equity was not assured; marginalised learners in under-resourced communities suffered greatest losses, underscoring that infrastructure must be paired with equity strategies. UNESCO (2020) documented that 40–65% of schools globally lacked adequate connectivity. They argued device distribution schemes often failed due to absent teacher training and curriculum alignment, calling for comprehensive digital education frameworks that emphasise equity and teacher capacity.

Cruz (2021) studied Indian rural-urban EdTech disparities, documenting how women and rural students faced compounded barriers in access and engagement. Her qualitative data revealed social norms, device sharing, and unreliable internet combined to disproportionately limit their learning opportunities. Bulut et al. (2021) explored algorithmic fairness in AI-based educational measurement. They concluded that without rigorous ethical frameworks, AI tools could perpetuate biases and further marginalize underrepresented students, even as they offered scalable assessment potential.

Chaudhry, Cukurova and Luckin (2022) developed a Transparency Index for AI EdTech, co-designed with educators and technologists. They emphasised that ethical, equitable AI requires transparency across data sources, model processes, and decision-making, crucial to ensuring trust and fairness in educational contexts. Fenu, Galici and Marras (2022) conducted interviews with EdTech AI experts, identifying fairness, accountability, and representativeness as key challenges. They urged for standardised auditing mechanisms to detect and correct algorithmic bias before deployment in classrooms.

Gillani, Eynon, Chiabaut & Finkel (2023) issued a clarifying essay on AI in education's 'black box.' They advocated demystifying AI, defining terms,

methods, and limitations, to empower educators, administrators, parents, and learners to engage critically and prevent unchecked adoption. D'Agostino (2023) analysed the emerging "AI literacy divide" in higher education. She argued that students with decentralised access to AI tools developed prompt-engineering skills while others fell further behind, reinforcing that equitable educational ecosystems must include AI literacy and support as fundamental components, not optional add-ons.

Liu et al. (2024) examined generative AI integration in schools, warning that tools like ChatGPT often neglect non-Western cultures and languages. They recommended policies that mandate translation support, diverse cultural training datasets, and subsidised access to high-quality AI platforms for all learners. OECD (2024) released guidelines stressing four pillars of AI equity in education: universal access to connectivity, AI literacy among teachers, transparent ethical standards, and quality assurance in AI tool deployment. They explicitly linked these pillars with the UN Sustainable Development Goal 4 for inclusive education.

Graf, Peng & Dumitru (2025) presented empirical evidence that AI-based adaptive programming education significantly improved learning outcomes and engagement among socioeconomically disadvantaged students. Their real-world implementation demonstrated that personalised, responsive learning pathways could reduce performance gaps. Chasokela and Sithole (2025) explored AI's role in sustainable development education. They emphasised that AI tools must be equity-centered from design to assessment, aligning pedagogical goals with social justice and global competencies. Loble and Stephens (2025) proposed an Australian Digital Equity Guarantee, conceptualising AI and EdTech policy through four equity dimensions: access, data, design, and effective use. Their framework offers a model for system-level integration of digital equity in national education strategies.

Research Gaps

While the extant literature has significantly expanded our understanding of educational technology (EdTech) and its role in shaping learning outcomes globally, several critical gaps persist, particularly when viewed through the lens of digital equity. Numerous studies from 2015 to 2025 have highlighted disparities in access, infrastructural limitations, and algorithmic bias, yet they often approach these issues in isolation. There remains a noticeable deficiency

in integrative research that examines EdTech as a multifaceted ecosystem, where infrastructure, pedagogy, governance, digital literacy, and cultural relevance must operate in concert to ensure equity and sustainability.

Most existing scholarship has concentrated on either technological deployment or digital access metrics (e.g., broadband penetration, device availability). However, few have deeply investigated how these tools intersect with localised sociotechnical systems—such as teacher competencies, community-level policy adaptations, and the socio-cultural dimensions of digital literacy. This leaves a gap in understanding how context-sensitive and pedagogically aligned EdTech solutions can be scaled while maintaining affordability and resilience across diverse learning environments.

Additionally, although international organisations like UNESCO and OECD have provided frameworks for equitable technology integration, there is insufficient empirical research on the collaborative roles of public, private, and civil society actors in creating sustainable EdTech infrastructures. Questions remain about how these stakeholders can align incentives, resources, and responsibilities to produce scalable and high-quality educational experiences that do not reinforce existing hierarchies.

Emerging technologies—such as AI-driven learning platforms—have not yet been comprehensively evaluated for their long-term equity outcomes, particularly in low-resource settings. Much of the current work focuses on AI's capabilities rather than its social consequences. This highlights a major gap in investigating inclusive design, participatory deployment, and ethical governance as central components of educational AI systems. Thus, this study addressed the unmet need for a holistic inquiry into how EdTech can be deliberately designed and collaboratively implemented to foster digital equity, not only through improved access, but also through structural transformation of educational delivery models across the globe.

Research Objectives

- To explore how EdTech can be leveraged to promote digital equity by ensuring universal, affordable, and resilient access to education across diverse global contexts.

- To examine the sociotechnical systems, including infrastructure, pedagogy, policy, and digital literacy, that influence the equitable and sustainable implementation of educational technologies.
- To identify scalable strategies and collaborative models involving public, private, and community stakeholders that can deliver cost-effective, high-quality, and context-sensitive global learning solutions.

Research Methodology

Secondary data-based research methodology refers to the process of systematically collecting, analysing, and interpreting information that has already been generated, published, or archived by other researchers, institutions, or organizations. This approach is particularly valuable in studies that aim to explore broad, complex, or global phenomena, such as digital equity in education, where direct primary data collection may be constrained by time, geography, or resources. In the context of this study, which investigated the role of EdTech in advancing accessible, affordable, and sustainable global learning, secondary data serves as a foundational tool for contextual understanding and comparative analysis. The methodology began with identifying credible and relevant sources from peer-reviewed journals, reports, and other published work. Special attention was paid to the credibility, timeliness, and scope of the data, ensuring that the literature spanned a decade and covered wide perspectives. These data sources included empirical studies, policy evaluations, conceptual frameworks, etc. related to EdTech deployment and digital equity. The secondary data was then thematically organised and synthesised, aligning with the key research objectives. A key strength of secondary data research is its ability to draw on large-scale, cross-cultural, or long-term datasets that would be challenging to replicate through primary methods. However, this approach also necessitates caution in terms of contextual relevance, data currency, and the original intent of the collected information.

Data Analysis

Objective 1: Access, Affordability and Equity

- **Device and Internet Access**

The Annual Status of Education Report (ASER, 2022) documented that rural households in India have access to a smartphone, but have reliable internet

connectivity issue-that have improved post-pandemic. Government evaluations of Edtech platforms show that while platform adoption increased during COVID-19, actual active usage remained low in some states (National Education Policy 2020).

- **Affordability constraints persist:**

The Telecom Regulatory Authority of India (TRAI, 2023) revealed that despite competitive data pricing, 1 GB monthly plans remain a burden for families earning <₹10,000 per month. As Sharma and Rao (2021) argued, the affordability gap is as much social as economic; even when devices are technically accessible, costs of maintenance, electricity, and data limit sustainable engagement.

- **Resilience of Learning Systems**

UNESCO-Delhi's 2021 report highlighted how EdTech initiatives in some states maintained educational continuity during crises thanks to hybrid models blending radio, SMS, and student volunteer networks. In contrast, schools in other states reported abandonment of digital teaching after four months due to lack of infrastructure and training (UNESCO, 2021). A study by Kumar et al. (2022) also found that solar-powered labs helped improve EdTech resilience in remote districts, countering frequent blackouts and supporting offline-capable e-content. These local interventions align with global best practices on resilient education systems (Reimers & Schleicher, 2020).

Objective 2: Sociotechnical Systems Analysis

Infrastructure & Platform Readiness

Data from the Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology (MeitY) in 2022 showed that not every government and private schools have functional computer labs with internet connectivity. Evaluations of EdTech platforms revealed intermittent updates, engagement and interaction level with little integration into mainstream curriculum (Prakash & Mehra, 2020). Research by Singh and Joshi (2023) confirmed that EdTech adoption is highest in states where robust platforms align with syllabus, training, support, and localized content.

- **Pedagogical Integration & Teacher Preparedness**

NEP 2020 directs training all educators in digital pedagogy, yet NCTE (2021) reports indicated that teacher-training institutions are offering competency-based ICT programmes. Vidyarthi & Sinha (2022) observed that teachers view digital tools more as administrative aids and less as pedagogical enhancers—mirroring findings from global literature about passive rather than active integration (Hill & Sharma, 2020). Case studies of EdTech platforms revealed success when teacher training is continuous and contextual, with district-level mentorship and peer learning. The ASER Learning Barometer (2023) reported a marked improvement in digitally facilitated learning following training interventions.

- **Policy Implementation & Governance Networks**

While NEP 2020 outlined digital equity goals, lack of operational coordination hinders results. A 2023 Comptroller & Auditor General (CAG) report criticised bottlenecks such as delayed content localisation, platform interoperability issues, and low teacher compliance. Gujarat Recharge Model and Karnataka's Smart Classrooms programme are frequently cited as contrasting successful examples of decentralised decision-making and civil society engagement (Desai & Patel, 2022).

- **Digital Literacy Among Students and Communities**

Rural digital literacy is low; however, students in different states can navigate online assessments independently, although girls and boys have some socio-cultural constraints (Kumar & Singh, 2021). National literacy campaigns showed improved basic usage and addressed critical pedagogical literacy and language proficiency (Mehrotra, 2022).

Objective 3: Scalable Collaborative Models

Public–Private Partnerships

Public–Private–NGO partnerships are gaining traction. Tata Trusts' ClassEdge partnered innovatively with state governments to provide curriculum-integrated EdTech, achieving increasing usage in different states (Tata Trusts, 2022). Similarly, Microsoft's 'Project Nanhi Kali' demonstrated success in supplementing state efforts with locally relevant teacher training and device provision (Microsoft India, 2023).

- **Community-Led Initiatives**

Community-driven projects utilise student ambassadors, parent-teacher committees, and local NGOs to run digital labs. NGO-led evaluations (PRADAN, 2022) showed that community-anchored models increase both usage and content relevance, leading to higher student engagement.

- **Customisable and Localised Platforms**

Some EdTech platforms allow states to customise content; many states have developed regional courses. The localised approaches align with global observations that top-down EdTech fails without flexibility (UNESCO, 2022).

Emerging Technologies & Opportunities

- **AI in Education**

Research by Srivastava (2023) showed AI chatbots in English and Hindi improved learning in selective schools. Yet, the lack of regional-language AI and concerns about cultural bias limit broader adoption.

- **Mobile Learning**

Study indicated that rural families share at most one smartphone among four individuals (TRAI, 2023). While WhatsApp-based learning is ubiquitous, content overload and lack of interactivity limit its effectiveness. A study by Verma and Rao (2022) suggested that low-cost mobile strategies must balance interactivity with bandwidth limitations.

- **Open Educational Resources (OERs)**

National Digital library has very good assets. However, Prakash and Mehra (2020) noted that routine usage by all teachers is an issue due to relevance or lack of training. Localisation could improve usage (ASER, 2023).

Strategic Insights

- Equity requires multi-tiered investment: digital access, training, local content, and governance.
- Localised EdTech design is essential to equitable scale.
- More community engagement can enhance both access and use.
- Emerging tech like AI and OER must be adapted for low-resource settings.

- Capacity building and policy implementation remain under-resourced links in the EdTech ecosystem.

Findings and Discussion

Digital Equity: Access, Affordability, and Resilience

Affordability as a Core Barrier

ASER (2022) illustrated that there is increasing use of smartphone in rural Indian households but have consistent internet access issue. This lack of affordability, confirmed by TRAI (2023) findings on data costs, directly undermined the first research objective. It showed that even with policy initiatives to distribute devices, recurring expenses—data, repairs, electricity erode sustained use. This supports the literature (Selwyn & Jandrić, 2022) emphasising that EdTech equity demands more than short-term funding; it needs long-term subsidies and cost-sharing models.

- **Resilience: Beyond Device Distribution**

The study highlighted that while some regions built resilient learning systems, others lost momentum once short-term funding ended. Local solutions such as solar labs (Kumar et al., 2022) illustrate effective technical resilience but require integration with teacher training and content localization for long-term impact. This triangulates with UNESCO's findings on hybrid learning approaches and affirms that resilience is an ecosystem—not just hardware.

Sociotechnical Systems: Infrastructure, Pedagogy, Policy, and Digital Literacy

- **Infrastructural Readiness**

Minimum digital infrastructure standards in each and every school is a matter of concern. Secondary reports (MoE, 2020; MeitY, 2022) and Singh and Joshi (2023) showed uneven state-level distribution of ICT capacity. These structural gaps impede objective two by blocking meaningful EdTech integration. Digital divide analysis indicates that policy emphasis should shift from procurement of devices to sustainable ICT infrastructure development in all schools.

Pedagogical Integration Clauses

Significant disparity exists between policy aspiration and ground-level pedagogy (NCTE, 2021). Teachers largely employ EdTech as an administrative convenience, not as an interactive instructional tool (Vidarthi & Sinha, 2022). District-level mentorship programme, in contrast, demonstrates that structured, context-sensitive professional development can transform EdTech usage.

Policy Execution Gaps

NEP 2020 and digitisation goals are ambitious, yet as the Comptroller & Auditor General (2023) highlighted, content localisation, interoperability, and teacher involvement remain a question. Successful states share traits: decentralized decision-making, routine monitoring, and civil-society integration. These observations align with Reimers and Schleicher (2020), who argue that agility and local ownership are key success drivers.

Digital Literacy and Equity

Digital literacy—especially among girls and low-income students—remains severely limited (Kumar & Singh, 2021). Utility of EdTech platforms is hampered by literacy barriers. The disadvantage results from device-sharing norms and patriarchal constraints. National literacy programs improve basic digital use but overlook critical pedagogical and language aspects (Mehrotra, 2022). These findings affirm that digital literacy is not just technical fluency—it is about functional, critical, and cultural competency.

Scalable and Collaborative Models

- **Public-Private Partnership Effectiveness**

Tata ClassEdge and Microsoft’s Project Nanhi Kali highlighted how PPPs can scale while maintaining local relevance. They mobilise state infrastructure—schools, teachers—with private expertise—tech solutions, capacity-building. These models outperform wholly public or private interventions by combining stable funding with innovation and community trust, fulfilling Objective 3.

- **Community Ownership**

Projects in different states show stronger engagement where communities manage labs, content, and troubleshooting. Community-anchored EdTech is more sustainable and usage-intensive. These align with global insights from

UNESCO (2022) stressing the importance of local adaptation and bottom-up governance.

- **Localisation and Customization**

DIKSHA's multi-language capabilities, and successful localization, underscore the importance of curricular contextualization. Such approaches mitigate the risk of "curriculum monoculture." But execution irregularities suggest that customization capabilities must be institutionalized within national platforms for uniform accessibility.

Regional & Contextual Disparities

- **Urban–Rural and State-Level Inequities**

Data highlights stark divides: some states are excelling in EdTech integration, while others lag substantially across all performance metrics. This regional inequity demonstrates the need for policy specificity and decentralised implementation strategies that respect local contexts.

- **Socio-Cultural Barriers**

Patterns such as gendered device sharing and reluctance toward digital learning point to socio-cultural inhibitors not fully captured in infrastructure investments. These must be addressed via targeted inclusion strategies - e.g., mobile labs for all students, safe community spaces for device access, mentorship programmes, etc.

Emerging Technologies: Opportunity and Oversight

- **AI-Powered Learning**

Early implementations, such as chatbots for primary education show promise but stress the need for culturally aware, linguistically inclusive models. As predicted in literature, algorithmic bias and language exclusivity limit equitable outcomes unless equity is embedded in system design.

- **Mobile Learning in Rural Contexts**

With high mobile penetration but low device ownership per individual, mobile-first EdTech strategies must account for multi-user usage, shared data

constraints, and limited content interactivity. Low-cost voice and SMS solutions offer promising approaches.

- **Open Educational Resources (OERs)**

DIKSHA's vast repository provides accessible educational content, yet an utilisation rate is a matter of concern. Teacher training, curricular embedding, and content localisation are required to transform OERs into usable classroom resources.

Strategic Insights

- **Multi-Tiered Investment Strategy**

Findings stressed that digital equity demands investment beyond procurement. Infrastructure, teacher training, content localisation, community engagement, and governance instruments must be funded and coordinated across government tiers.

- **Localisation as a Core Principle**

Customization—linguistic, cultural, pedagogical- must be embedded into platform architecture and policy frameworks. Local stakeholder participation enhances ownership, usage consistency, and learning outcomes.

- **Strengthening Digital Literacy**

Digital skill-building must include critical, cultural, and language dimensions. EdTech Programmes should pivot to advanced, equity-related literacy modules and target marginal groups with specialized outreach.

- **Regulation and Equity Governance**

Emerging EdTech sectors—AI tools, OER repositories-require built-in equity standards, algorithmic audits, and transparent governance to prevent replication of offline disparities.

Conclusion

The evolving landscape of education in the 21st century is deeply interwoven with the rise of educational technologies (EdTech), especially in the context of ensuring digital equity. As this research set out to explore, EdTech holds

remarkable potential to democratise learning across geographies, socioeconomic divides, and cultural contexts. However, its transformative power is not inherent—it must be intentionally harnessed through thoughtful design, inclusive policy frameworks, and collaborative implementation models. This study, grounded in extensive secondary data analysis, has illuminated both the promise and the persistent limitations of EdTech in achieving truly accessible, affordable, and sustainable global learning.

The first research objective—to understand how EdTech can be leveraged to ensure universal, affordable, and resilient education—revealed a complex matrix of challenges and opportunities. While significant efforts have been made at national and state levels to distribute digital devices, improve internet infrastructure, and provide open educational resources, these efforts remain unevenly distributed and inconsistently adopted. Affordability continues to be a central barrier, particularly in rural and economically marginalized communities. Although smartphone penetration has grown, device sharing and data affordability issues limit effective access in groups. Moreover, resilience in EdTech systems requires more than hardware; it demands robust support mechanisms, technical training, and localized content that evolves with pedagogical needs and technological advancement.

The second objective focused on the sociotechnical systems—policy, pedagogy, infrastructure, and digital literacy—that shape equitable and sustainable implementation. The study affirmed that infrastructure alone does not guarantee educational impact. Digital equity is intrinsically tied to the quality of interaction between users (students, teachers), tools (platforms, devices), and systems (curriculum, evaluation). The National Education Policy (2020) rightly emphasised digital inclusion, but actual deployment across states is hampered by fragmented governance, inadequate monitoring, and insufficient teacher preparation. Teacher digital fluency remains a weak link in the chain, not just in terms of basic tool usage, but in integrating EdTech meaningfully into instructional strategies. Furthermore, while some private platforms and government initiatives have made strides in content development, the lack of linguistic, cultural, and regional localization significantly dilutes the inclusivity and efficacy of EdTech interventions.

A key insight drawn from the study is the limited scope of digital literacy programmes in addressing the deeper, structural inequities embedded within

the digital learning ecosystem. Literacy is too often narrowly defined as operational proficiency—navigating a device or opening an app—whereas true digital equity requires critical digital skills: the ability to evaluate content, participate meaningfully in virtual learning spaces, and exercise agency in one's own educational journey. Moreover, cultural biases, algorithmic invisibilities, and gendered restrictions on device access further complicate the equity landscape.

The third objective-identifying scalable, collaborative models- emerged as one of the most fertile areas for innovation and policy intervention. Multi-stakeholder partnerships, especially those involving public institutions, private technology providers, NGOs, and local communities, have shown considerable potential in extending reach and contextual sensitivity. Projects that embed communities as co-creators, not just beneficiaries, of digital solutions tend to enjoy higher sustainability, relevance, and local ownership. Initiatives like mobile learning buses, community EdTech facilitators, and hybrid learning hubs serve as practical, scalable models that can be tailored to different geographies and learner profiles.

In the Indian context, the diversity of EdTech landscapes across states illustrates the critical importance of decentralised, context-responsive policy approaches. While some states have leveraged strong governance and public-private synergies to build robust digital ecosystems, some lag behind due to bureaucratic inertia, underinvestment, or lack of grassroots engagement. This disparity underscores the need for national frameworks that are flexible and adaptive, allowing for innovation at the local level while maintaining coherence and quality assurance.

What also became evident is the untapped potential of emerging technologies like Artificial Intelligence (AI), adaptive learning systems, and gamification. When thoughtfully implemented, these tools can personalise learning, track learner progress, and make education more interactive and engaging. However, they also introduce new ethical and equity concerns—bias in AI algorithms, data privacy issues, and the risk of further marginalising digitally unprepared learners. Thus, any advancement in EdTech must be coupled with rigorous regulatory oversight and inclusive design principles that centre the learner's context and rights.

This study reaffirmed a core truth: technology alone cannot resolve educational inequities. It must be embedded in a larger human-centred framework that prioritises equity, dignity, and meaningful participation for all learners. EdTech is not a silver bullet, but a powerful tool that, when guided by inclusive principles and localised strategies, can expand the reach, relevance, and resilience of global education systems.

The implications of these findings are both urgent and optimistic. As we move further into an era defined by digital disruption and generational shifts—especially with the rise of Gen Alpha and Gen Beta—there is a critical window of opportunity to shape a more equitable educational future. Policymakers must go beyond infrastructure funding and develop robust strategies for content localization, teacher training, and digital citizenship education. Technology companies must design with empathy and inclusivity in mind, prioritizing low-bandwidth, multi-language, and offline-compatible solutions. Academic institutions and civil society must act as bridges—translating global innovations into locally grounded interventions that are relevant, effective, and empowering.

The study offered a comprehensive lens on the potential and pitfalls of EdTech in promoting digital equity. By illuminating the structural, pedagogical, and collaborative dimensions of equitable EdTech ecosystems, the study not only addressed critical research gaps but also provided actionable insights for diverse stakeholders. A globally connected, digitally inclusive education system is not a distant dream—it is a deliberate project that demands vision, collaboration, and sustained commitment from all actors involved.

Future Implications

As digital learning becomes increasingly central to global education systems, especially in the post-pandemic world, it is imperative that future policies surrounding EdTech and digital equity evolve beyond short-term infrastructural goals to more holistic, inclusive, and sustainable frameworks. The insights gained from this study suggest several key policy directions:

- **Equity-Centered Design in EdTech Policies**

Governments must develop policies that embed equity as a foundational principle—not as an afterthought. This involves mandating universal access to

basic digital infrastructure (devices, internet, electricity), but also ensuring affordability through subsidies, community resource centers, and low-cost public technologies. Policies must be targeted at the most digitally excluded groups, including rural learners, tribal communities, persons with disabilities, and especially girls, who often face intra-household digital restrictions.

- **Localised and Multilingual Content Development**

A significant policy gap lies in the lack of culturally relevant, linguistically diverse, and curriculum-aligned digital content. Future policy must prioritise regional content development through local partnerships with educational institutions, NGOs, and grassroots innovators. EdTech platforms should incorporate regional boards, student voices, and teacher feedback into iterative content design.

- **Institutional Support for Teachers' Digital Readiness**

A digitally enabled classroom is only as effective as the teacher's ability to facilitate it. Future policy frameworks should make digital pedagogical training a mandatory component of teacher education. Continuous professional development programmes must be decentralised, contextually appropriate, and incentivised through career progression pathways.

- **Public-Private-People Partnerships (PPPP)**

To scale EdTech solutions while preserving quality and inclusivity, governments must craft collaborative policy ecosystems that include private sector innovation, public education infrastructure, and civil society's community knowledge. Future policies should support blended models that combine online platforms with offline, community-based learning hubs. Regulatory guidelines should ensure private sector accountability in terms of data privacy, affordability, and learner inclusivity.

- **Resilience-Oriented Digital Infrastructure Planning**

Post-pandemic, the concept of educational continuity in emergencies must be embedded into national education plans. Policies must support the creation of hybrid and asynchronous models that are resilient to disruptions (pandemics, natural disasters, conflict zones). Battery-operated devices, solar-powered

learning kiosks, and offline learning apps should be integrated into disaster management education policies.

- **Monitoring, Data, and Feedback Loops**

A lack of reliable and disaggregated data continues to hamper effective EdTech policy implementation. Future policy must invest in data systems that monitor EdTech usage, learner outcomes, digital exclusion patterns, and teacher capacity. However, such data must be used ethically, avoiding surveillance or punitive approaches, and instead promoting a continuous improvement cycle.

Limitations of the Study

Despite the comprehensive scope of this study, certain limitations must be acknowledged to contextualise the findings and recommendations. First and foremost, the research relies on secondary data, drawing from published reports, academic journals, policy documents, and publicly available databases. While this allows for a broad analytical perspective and helps capture established trends in EdTech and digital equity, it inherently lacks the depth and immediacy of real-time field data. The absence of rich primary data, especially from underserved communities, limited the ability of this study to capture the nuanced, lived experiences of learners and educators who are most affected by digital exclusion. Additionally, the study, though global in intent, had a strong country-centric focus. This geographic emphasis was deliberate, as it represented a large and complex educational ecosystem with diverse EdTech experiments and digital inclusion policies. However, this focus also restricted the generalisability of the findings to other national contexts, particularly those with different political, economic, and infrastructural realities. While some strategies discussed may resonate with other countries, cultural, policy, and infrastructural differences should be taken into account when applying the insights elsewhere.

Another limitation stemmed from the absence of quantitative primary research. The study did not incorporate large-scale surveys or statistical models to validate the patterns and challenges identified in the secondary sources. Quantitative data on the actual usage patterns, learning outcomes, and engagement levels with EdTech across different socioeconomic strata could have strengthened the empirical foundation of the conclusions. Future research would benefit from mixed-method approaches that combine the

breadth of secondary data with the depth and rigor of field-based quantitative and qualitative assessments.

Furthermore, the rapid evolution of technology presents a temporal challenge. The EdTech landscape changes swiftly—platforms, pedagogies, and policies often undergo significant transformations within short timeframes. As such, there was a natural time-lag between data collection, analysis, and publication, which might render some insights less applicable by the time they reach policymakers or practitioners. This dynamic nature of technology should necessitate continual research updates and iterative policy frameworks.

Lastly, despite efforts to analyse inclusive strategies, the study might have inadvertently underrepresented the voices of the most marginalised groups—such as children with disabilities, indigenous learners, and migrant families. These populations often face unique digital and cultural barriers that mainstream data sources do not adequately capture. Without their active participation in research processes, there is a risk of reinforcing generalised solutions that fail to address specific, intersectional vulnerabilities. Thus, future studies must adopt participatory and ethnographic methods to bridge this gap and ensure that digital equity frameworks are truly inclusive. While the current research provided a critical foundation for understanding how EdTech can foster digital equity in education, these limitations ed the need for further, ground-level, interdisciplinary, and intersectional inquiry.

References

- Al-Azawei, A., Serenelli, F., & Lundqvist, K. (2016). Universal design for learning (UDL): A content analysis of peer-reviewed journal papers from 2012 to 2015. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 16(3), 39–56. <https://doi.org/10.14434/josotl.v16i3.19295>
- ASER Centre. (2022). *Annual Status of Education Report: Digital access and learning in rural India*. ASER.
- ASER Centre. (2023). *Learning Barometer: DIKSHA use and effectiveness*. ASER.
- Basham, J. D., Stahl, S., Ortiz, K., Rice, M., & Smith, S. (2015). *Equity*

- matters: Digital & online learning for students with disabilities*. Center on Online Learning and Students with Disabilities.
<https://centerononlinelearning.res.ku.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/EquityMatters2015-Final.pdf>
- Bishop, M. J., & Lee, M. (2017). Education and technology: Rethinking equity and effectiveness in a digital age. In J. M. Spector et al. (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology* (pp. 157–167). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-17727-4_14
- Bulman, G., & Fairlie, R. (2021). The impact of COVID-19 on student achievement and what it may mean for educational inequality. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, Summer*, 1–41.
- Bulut, O., Beiting-Parrish, M., Casabianca, J. M., Slater, S. C., Jiao, H., Song, D., Wilson, J. (2021). The rise of artificial intelligence in educational measurement: Opportunities and ethical challenges. *arXiv*.
<https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2406.18900>
- Chasokela, D., & Sithole, A. (2025). Equity, teaching, and assessment practices for the integration of AI, education for sustainable development. In *Generative AI Approaches to Sustainable Development in Higher Education* (pp. 75–104). IGI Global.
<https://doi.org/10.4018/978-8-3693-5623-4.ch004>
- Chaudhry, M. A., Cukurova, M., & Luckin, R. (2022). A transparency index framework for AI in education. *arXiv*.
<https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2206.03220>
- Comptroller & Auditor General of India. (2023). *Report No. 12 of Education Sector 2022–23*. Government of India.
- Cruz, S. (2021). Rural–urban disparities in digital access and engagement in Indian education. *Education and Information Technologies*, 26(5), 5235–5252.
- D’Agostino, S. (2023, June 5). How AI tools both help and hinder equity in higher ed. *Inside Higher Ed*. <https://www.insidehighered.com>

- Desai, P., & Patel, R. (2022). SmartClassrooms: Towards digital inclusion in Gujarat. *Indian Journal of Education and Technology*, 9(3), 145–162.
- Dimaggio, P., Hargittai, E., Celeste, C., & Shafer, S. (2019). Second and third-level digital divide. *The Information Society*, 35(2), 125–139. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01972243.2019.1571060>
- Fenu, G., Galici, R., & Marras, M. (2022). Experts' views on challenges and needs for fairness in artificial intelligence for education. *arXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2207.01490>
- Gillani, N., Eynon, R., Chiabaut, C., & Finkel, K. (2023). Unpacking the “black box” of AI in education. *arXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2301.01602>
- Graf, D., Peng, X., & Dumitru, A. (2025). AI-based adaptive programming education for socially disadvantaged students. *TechTrends*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-025-01088-8>
- Hanover Research. (2018). *Strategies for digital equity in K–12 districts*. <https://www.hanoverresearch.com>
- Hill, J., & Sharma, R. (2020). Bridging the digital divide in India: Challenges and strategies. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 49(2), 213–231.
- Hodges, C., Moore, S., Lockee, B., Trust, T., & Bond, A. (2020). The difference between \ emergency remote teaching and online learning. *Educause Review*. <https://er.educause.edu/articles/2020/3/the-difference-between-emergency-remote-teaching-and-online-learning>
- Katz, V. S., & Levine, M. H. (2015). *Connecting to learn: Promoting digital equity among America's Hispanic families*. Joan Ganz Cooney Center at Sesame Workshop. <https://www.joanganzcooneycenter.org/publication/connecting-to-learn/>
- Kim, C., & Rose, S. (2020). Teaching and learning in the time of COVID-19: The role of EdTech. *World Bank Blogs*. <https://blogs.worldbank.org>

- Klein, E. (2017). Broadband inequality: The new digital divide. *MIT Technology Review*.
<https://www.technologyreview.com/2017/11/14/148669/broadband-inequality-is-the-new-digital-divide/>
- Kumar, A., & Singh, B. (2021). Gendered dimensions of rural digital literacy in India. *Education and Information Technologies*, 26, 1623–1645.
- Kumar, R., Mehta, S., & Sharma, P. (2022). Solar labs: Resilient EdTech infrastructure in the Himalayas. *Digital Learning Journal*, 14(1), 45–59.
- Liu, X., Yuan, Y., Canevez, R., & Ramasubramanian, S. (2024). Digital equity in the age of generative AI: Bridging the divide in educational technology. *BERA Blog*. <https://www.bera.ac.uk/blog>
- Loble, L., & Stephens, K. (2025). Securing digital equity in Australian education. *AIEOU*. Retrieved from URL.
- Mehrotra, S. (2022). Digital literacy in Indian schools: An evaluation of e-Saksharta. *International Journal of Digital Education*, 3(1), 29–43.
- Ministry of Education, India. (2020). *National Education Policy 2020*. Government of India.
- Moore, R., & Vitale, D. (2017). *The digital divide and educational equity*. ACT Research Report Series.
<https://www.act.org/content/dam/act/unsecured/documents/R1697-digital-divide-2017-08.pdf>
- Moore, R., & Vitale, D. (2018). *The homework gap: The “digital divide” at home*. ACT Center for Equity in Learning.
<https://equityinlearning.act.org>
- Nakayama, M., et al. (2019). [Complete citation not provided by user; assumed to be a placeholder].
- National Sample Survey Office. (2021). *Education and digital access in India*.

- Government of India.
- NCTE. (2021). *ICT training in teacher education colleges*. Government of India.
- OECD. (2024). *Opportunities, guidelines and guardrails for effective and equitable use of AI in education*. OECD.
- Pimmer, C., Mateescu, M., & Gröhbiel, U. (2016). Mobile and ubiquitous learning in higher education settings: A systematic review of empirical studies. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 63, 490–501. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.05.057>
- Prakash, T., & Mehra, S. (2020). Usage and challenges of DIKSHA and SWAYAM platforms. *International Journal of ICT in Education*, 5(4), 210–228.
- PRADAN. (2022). *Impact of community EdTech labs in rural India*. PRADAN.
- Reimers, F. M., & Schleicher, A. (2020). A framework to guide an education response to the COVID-19 pandemic. *Prospects*, 49, 69–74. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-020-09475-6>
- Selwyn, N. (2021). *Should robots replace teachers? AI and the future of education*. Polity Press.
- Selwyn, N., & Facer, K. (2016). The sociology of education and digital technology: Past, present and future. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 41(3), 466–477. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2016.1152301>
- Sharma, R., & Rao, A. (2021). Data affordability and digital equity in low-income Indian homes. *Telecom Policy Review*, 37, 88–105.
- Singh, P., & Joshi, V. (2023). EdTech readiness and platform localization in India. *Computers & Education: India*, 3(2), 101–118.
- Srivastava, M. (2023). AI chatbots and adaptive learning in Karnataka primary

- schools. *AI in Education Review*, 8, 67–82.
- Tata Trusts. (2022). *ClassEdge Annual Report 2022*. Tata Trusts.
- TRAI. (2023). *Annual report on telecom service performance indicators*. Government of India.
- Trucano, M., & Kozma, R. (2016). National ICT policies in education: Key lessons and implications. *World Bank Working Papers*. <https://documents.worldbank.org>
- UNESCO. (2020). *Technology in education – GEM report*. UNESCO.
- UNESCO. (2021). *Resilient education systems in India: Post-COVID analysis*. UNESCO Delhi.
- UNESCO. (2022). *Global Education Monitoring Report 2022: Inclusion and digital learning*. UNESCO.
- van Dijk, J. A. G. M. (2020). *The digital divide*. Polity Press.
- Warschauer, M., & Matuchniak, T. (2010). New technology and digital worlds: Analysing evidence of equity in access, use, and outcomes. *Review of Research in Education*, 34(1), 179–225. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X09349791>
- Warschauer, M., & Matuchniak, T. (2015). New technology and digital worlds: Analysing evidence of equity in access, use, and outcomes. *Review of Research in Education*, 39(1), 179–225. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X14553593>