INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND PEDAGOGY (IJEP)
(Open Access, Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Journal)
ISSN Online: 3108-1800 ISSN Print:

Technology Integration and Student Learning Outcomes in K-12 Education

Kochumol Abraham

Assistant Professor, Department Of Computer Applications, Marian College Kuttikanam, Kerala, India.

Article information

Received:5th January 2026
Received in revised form:3rd February 2026
Accepted:8th March 2026
Available online:9th April 2026

Volume: 2
Issue: 2
DOI: https://doi.org/10.63090/IJEP/3108.1800.0032

Abstract

The rapid integration of digital technologies into K-12 classrooms has fundamentally altered how teaching and learning occur in contemporary educational settings. This study employs a secondary data analysis framework to examine the relationship between technology integration and student learning outcomes across primary and secondary school levels. Drawing upon peer-reviewed databases, national educational surveys, Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) datasets, and reports published by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), and the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), the present research synthesizes empirical evidence spanning from 2015 to 2024. The findings reveal that structured, pedagogically guided technology integration correlates with statistically significant gains in student achievement in literacy, mathematics, and science. However, equity-related disparities — particularly the digital divide — moderate these outcomes considerably across socioeconomic and geographic lines. The paper concludes by offering evidence-based recommendations for policymakers, school administrators, and curriculum designers committed to harnessing technology equitably and effectively to improve student outcomes on a global scale.

Keywords:- Technology Integration, Student Learning Outcomes, K-12 Education, Digital Divide, Educational Equity, Secondary Data Analysis, PISA, OECD

I. INTRODUCTION

The twenty-first century has witnessed an unprecedented proliferation of digital technology in virtually every domain of human life, and education is no exception. From interactive whiteboards and personal computing devices to cloud-based learning management systems and artificial intelligence-driven tutoring platforms, the educational landscape has been irrevocably transformed (Voogt & Knezek, 2018). Governments and educational institutions worldwide have invested billions of dollars in infrastructure, hardware, and software to equip schools with technological tools that promise to enhance the quality of teaching and learning (OECD, 2019).

Despite these substantial investments, the empirical evidence regarding the effectiveness of technology integration on student learning outcomes remains nuanced and at times contradictory. While a substantial body of literature documents positive associations between purposeful technology use and academic achievement (Cheung & Slavin, 2013; Higgins et al., 2019), other studies caution that technology alone without appropriate pedagogical frameworks, teacher training, and supportive institutional cultures may yield limited or even detrimental effects (OECD, 2015; Trucano, 2016). Moreover, the promise of technology as an equalizer of educational opportunity is tempered by persistent structural inequalities manifested as the digital divide, which continues to disproportionately affect students from low-income households, rural communities, and developing nations (UNESCO, 2020; van Dijk, 2020).

This research article seeks to contribute to this ongoing scholarly dialogue by conducting a rigorous secondary data analysis that synthesizes findings from established datasets and peer-reviewed literature. The overarching aim is to provide a comprehensive, evidence-based assessment of how technology integration influences student learning outcomes in K-12 education, with particular attention to mediating variables such as socioeconomic status, teacher competency, and instructional design.

II. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The specific objectives of this study are as follows:

- To examine the empirical relationship between technology integration and student academic achievement in K-12 education based on existing large-scale datasets.
- To identify key mediating and moderating variables that influence the effectiveness of educational technology interventions.
- To evaluate equity dimensions of technology integration, with a focus on the digital divide across socioeconomic and geographic contexts.
- To formulate evidence-based policy and practice recommendations for maximizing the educational benefits of technology integration.

III. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study is guided by the following research questions:

- RQ1: To what extent does technology integration in K-12 classrooms correlate with improved student learning outcomes, as evidenced by large-scale secondary datasets?
- RQ2: What factors mediate or moderate the relationship between technology integration and student academic performance?
- RQ3: How does the digital divide influence the equitable distribution of technology-related educational benefits among diverse student populations?

IV. LITERATURE REVIEW

4.1. Theoretical Framework

The theoretical underpinning of this study draws from two complementary frameworks: the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) proposed by Davis (1989) and the Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) framework developed by Mishra and Koehler (2006). TAM posits that perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use are the primary determinants of an individual's intention to use a technology. In educational contexts, this framework helps explain why some teachers and students embrace digital tools more readily than others, and why acceptance rates vary significantly across different school environments and cultural contexts (Teo, 2011).

TPACK extends this understanding by emphasizing that effective technology integration requires not merely technical proficiency but a dynamic synthesis of technological knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, and content knowledge. Koehler and Mishra (2009) argue that teachers who successfully integrate technology into instruction possess a nuanced understanding of how specific technologies can be deployed to teach particular subject matter in ways that enhance student comprehension. This framework has gained widespread acceptance in the educational technology research community and has been empirically validated across multiple subject areas and grade levels (Chai et al., 2013; Valtonen et al., 2019).

The constructivist learning theory, particularly as elaborated by Vygotsky (1978), also provides a relevant lens through which to examine technology-enhanced learning. Digital tools can function as mediating artifacts that scaffold student thinking and support learning within the zone of proximal development, enabling learners to accomplish tasks that would otherwise exceed their independent capacity. This theoretical connection reinforces the pedagogical logic of technology integration as more than a mere technical exercise (Jonassen, 2000).

4.2. Empirical Evidence on Technology and Academic Achievement

A growing corpus of empirical research documents the positive relationship between technology integration and student academic achievement. Cheung and Slavin (2013) conducted a systematic review of 84 studies examining the effects of educational technology on mathematics achievement in K-12 students and found a moderate positive effect size ($d = 0.16$). The authors noted that the quality of the intervention design and the degree of teacher training were critical determinants of effectiveness. Similarly, Higgins et al. (2019), in a comprehensive meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials commissioned by the Education Endowment Foundation in the United Kingdom, reported that digital technologies, when implemented with strong pedagogical guidance, were associated with an additional three to five months of learning progress per year for students.

PISA 2018 data, encompassing approximately 600,000 students across 79 countries, provided important insights into patterns of technology use and reading performance. OECD (2019) reported that students who used digital devices for a moderate duration during school hours specifically between one and three hours per day demonstrated higher mean reading scores compared to students who used devices either minimally or excessively. This curvilinear relationship suggests that the volume of technology use alone does not determine educational benefit; rather, the manner and pedagogical context of use are paramount.

The COVID-19 pandemic served as an unprecedented natural experiment that accelerated technology integration on a global scale. UNESCO (2020) estimated that at the peak of pandemic-related school closures in April 2020, approximately 1.6 billion learners in 190 countries were affected, precipitating a massive, largely unplanned shift to remote and hybrid learning modalities. Subsequent analyses revealed highly variable learning outcomes, with technology-enabled remote instruction yielding significantly better results in countries and districts characterized by strong pre-existing digital infrastructure and higher levels of teacher digital literacy (World Bank, 2021).

Zheng et al. (2016) performed a meta-analysis of 96 studies exploring the impact of one-to-one computing programs in which each student receives a dedicated personal device and found a mean effect size of 0.16 across measures of academic

achievement, with stronger effects observed for writing and science than for mathematics and reading. The researchers emphasized that device availability is a necessary but not sufficient condition for academic improvement, with instructional integration quality serving as the critical mediating variable.

4.3. The Role of Teacher Competency and Professional Development

Teacher competency emerges consistently in the literature as one of the most powerful determinants of whether technology integration yields meaningful educational benefits. A landmark study by NCES (2016) found that only 40% of U.S. teachers reported feeling well-prepared to integrate technology into their instruction, despite the majority reporting regular access to digital devices in their classrooms. This preparedness gap reflects systemic shortfalls in pre-service and in-service professional development related to educational technology.

Ertmer et al. (2012) distinguished between first-order barriers to technology integration those related to resource availability such as hardware, software, and connectivity and second-order barriers, which are rooted in teachers' beliefs, attitudes, and self-efficacy regarding technology use. Their research indicated that while many educational systems have made substantial progress in addressing first-order barriers, second-order barriers remain largely unresolved and represent the greater impediment to effective integration. Teacher beliefs about the role of technology in supporting constructivist or transmissionist pedagogical approaches strongly influenced the depth and quality of technology integration observed in classrooms.

The OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) 2018, which surveyed over 260,000 teachers in 48 countries, reported that only 56% of teachers in participating countries indicated that their initial teacher education had prepared them to use information and communication technologies (ICT) for teaching (OECD, 2019b). Furthermore, teachers who participated in collaborative professional development activities focused on technology integration demonstrated higher self-efficacy and more sophisticated patterns of technology use in their classrooms compared to those who received only individualized or lecture-based professional development.

4.4. The Digital Divide and Educational Equity

The concept of the digital divide referring to the differential access to and effective use of digital technologies based on socioeconomic status, geographic location, race, ethnicity, gender, or age represents a critical challenge to the equitable realization of technology's educational potential. Van Dijk (2020) elaborated a multi-dimensional model of the digital divide that encompasses not only access disparities but also differences in digital skills, motivational engagement with technology, and the benefits individuals ultimately derive from technology use. This broader conceptualization is particularly relevant to educational contexts, as it reveals that simply providing devices and connectivity does not guarantee equitable educational outcomes.

In the United States, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC, 2020) reported that approximately 21 million Americans lacked access to broadband internet, with rural, low-income, and minority communities disproportionately represented among the unconnected. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2021) further documented that students in the lowest income quartile were significantly less likely to have home access to computers and high-speed internet compared to their higher-income peers, a disparity that translates directly into differential access to technology-enhanced learning opportunities.

Globally, UNESCO's Global Education Monitoring Report (2020) highlighted that the digital divide operates at both international and sub-national levels. Low- and middle-income countries face structural deficits in digital infrastructure that severely limit the scope and quality of technology integration in their schools. Even within relatively prosperous nations, students from rural areas, indigenous communities, and households with limited financial resources experience systematic disadvantages in accessing technology-rich educational environments. The pandemic-era shift to remote learning starkly exposed and exacerbated these pre-existing inequalities, with research by the World Bank (2021) suggesting that learning loss during school closures was two to three times greater for students from disadvantaged backgrounds compared to their more affluent peers.

V. METHODOLOGY

5.1. Research Design

This study adopts a secondary data analysis design, which involves the systematic examination, synthesis, and interpretation of data collected by other researchers or institutions for purposes other than, or in addition to, those of the present study (Boslaugh, 2007). Secondary data analysis is a well-established and methodologically rigorous approach in educational research, offering researchers the opportunity to derive new insights from existing high-quality datasets without incurring the resource demands associated with primary data collection (Smith, 2008). This approach is particularly appropriate for the present study, given the breadth of the research questions and the necessity of examining cross-national and longitudinal patterns in the relationship between technology integration and student outcomes.

5.2. Data Sources

The present analysis draws upon the following authoritative secondary data sources:

5.2.1. Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA)

PISA is a triennial survey administered by the OECD that measures 15-year-old students' knowledge and skills in reading, mathematics, and science. The 2018 cycle, the most recent available at the commencement of this study, encompassed approximately 600,000 students from 79 countries and included measures of ICT access, use, and attitudes, making it an

invaluable source for examining the relationship between technology and academic performance in a cross-national comparative context (OECD, 2019).

5.2.2. OECD Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS)

TALIS 2018 surveyed teachers and school leaders in 48 countries regarding their professional backgrounds, working conditions, pedagogical practices, and professional development activities, including those related to ICT integration. The survey data enables analysis of the relationships between teacher professional development in technology, self-efficacy, and classroom practices (OECD, 2019b).

5.2.3. UNESCO Global Education Monitoring Reports

UNESCO's annual and biennial Global Education Monitoring Reports provide comprehensive global assessments of progress toward Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG4) ensuring inclusive and equitable quality education and include dedicated analyses of digital technology's role in education, with particular attention to equity dimensions (UNESCO, 2020, 2023).

5.2.4. National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Data

NCES, the primary federal entity for collecting and analyzing educational data in the United States, provides datasets including the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), the School Survey on Crime and Safety, and the Digest of Education Statistics, which contain relevant information on technology access, use, and academic performance at the national and state levels (NCES, 2021).

5.2.5. Peer-Reviewed Meta-Analyses and Systematic Reviews

In addition to large-scale institutional datasets, the study synthesizes findings from peer-reviewed meta-analyses and systematic reviews published in indexed educational research journals between 2013 and 2024. These sources were identified through searches of the ERIC, PsycINFO, Web of Science, and Google Scholar databases using keywords including "technology integration," "educational technology," "ICT in education," "student achievement," "digital learning," and "K-12 education."

5.3. Data Analysis Procedures

The secondary data analysis proceeded through three sequential phases. In the first phase, data extraction, relevant quantitative and qualitative data were systematically extracted from identified sources, with attention to sample characteristics, measures of technology integration, outcome variables, and key findings. In the second phase, data synthesis, extracted findings were organized thematically around the three research questions, and patterns of convergence and divergence across sources were identified and documented. In the third phase, interpretive analysis, the synthesized evidence was interpreted in light of the theoretical frameworks outlined in the literature review, and implications for policy and practice were derived. Potential sources of bias and limitations in the secondary data sources were systematically identified and discussed.

5.4. Ethical Considerations

As a secondary data analysis, the present study did not involve direct interaction with human participants and therefore did not require institutional review board approval. All datasets and published works utilized in this study are publicly available or cited in full accordance with applicable copyright and attribution requirements. The analysis is conducted in strict adherence to principles of scholarly integrity, including transparency regarding data sources, limitations, and interpretive decisions.

VI. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

6.1. Technology Integration and Academic Achievement: Evidence from Secondary Datasets

Analysis of PISA 2018 data reveals a nuanced but generally positive relationship between technology integration and student academic performance. OECD (2019) reported that students in OECD countries who used school computers for between one and three hours per day scored an average of 23 points higher on the PISA reading scale equivalent to approximately one year of schooling compared to non-users. However, students who reported using computers for more than four hours per day showed declining performance, reinforcing the importance of structured, purposeful technology use rather than unrestricted access.

Cross-national comparisons from PISA 2018 further reveal significant variation in the strength of the technology-achievement relationship across countries, suggesting that national context including educational culture, infrastructure quality, and systemic integration of technology into curriculum frameworks plays a crucial moderating role (OECD, 2019). Countries such as Estonia, South Korea, and Singapore, which have developed comprehensive national strategies for digital education, consistently outperform peer nations in both technology integration depth and student academic achievement.

The meta-analytic evidence similarly supports a positive but effect-size-modest association between technology integration and achievement. Tamim et al. (2011), in a second-order meta-analysis synthesizing 25 years of research, reported an average weighted effect size of 0.35 in favor of technology-enhanced instruction over traditional instruction across subject areas and grade levels. More recent meta-analyses report comparable findings: Sung et al. (2016) found a mean effect size of 0.52 for mobile device use on student achievement, while Hillmayr et al. (2020) documented a mean effect size of 0.65 for digital tools in secondary school STEM subjects when tools were embedded in structured pedagogical frameworks.

6.2. Mediating and Moderating Factors

The secondary data analysis consistently identifies several key factors that mediate or moderate the relationship between technology integration and student learning outcomes. These are discussed below.

6.2.1. Instructional Design and Pedagogical Approach

Perhaps the most consistently identified mediating variable is the quality of instructional design surrounding technology use. Studies synthesized in this analysis converge on the conclusion that technology used as a supplement to, rather than a replacement for, effective pedagogical practices yields the strongest positive outcomes (Hattie, 2009; Marzano et al., 2011). Specifically, approaches that leverage technology to facilitate active learning, collaborative problem-solving, immediate feedback, and self-regulated learning are associated with the largest achievement gains (Pane et al., 2015). OECD (2019) noted that countries in which technology integration was embedded within clearly articulated pedagogical frameworks rather than deployed as an add-on resource demonstrated significantly stronger positive associations between ICT use and student performance.

6.2.2. Teacher Digital Literacy and Professional Development

As established in the literature review, teacher competency functions as a critical mediator of technology integration outcomes. TALIS 2018 data indicate that teachers who received professional development specifically focused on ICT integration in the preceding 12 months were significantly more likely to report using digital technologies for collaborative student projects (74% vs. 44%) and for student self-directed activities (67% vs. 38%) compared to teachers who had not received such professional development (OECD, 2019b). These patterns of more sophisticated technology use are, in turn, associated with stronger student outcomes (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017).

6.2.3. Socioeconomic Status

Socioeconomic status (SES) emerges as a powerful moderator of the technology-achievement relationship. NCES (2021) data demonstrate that in the United States, the gap in home computer access between the lowest and highest income quintile students, while narrowing over time, remained substantial at approximately 15 percentage points as of 2019. Students from lower SES backgrounds who do gain regular access to technology in school settings demonstrate learning gains that partially offset home-based disadvantages; however, the compounding nature of SES-related inequalities affecting not only technology access but also the quality of devices, connectivity speed, and availability of technical support means that technology integration alone is insufficient to bridge socioeconomic achievement gaps (Warschauer & Matuchniak, 2010).

6.3. The Digital Divide: Equity Implications

The digital divide represents the most significant equity-related finding to emerge from this secondary data analysis. UNESCO's Global Education Monitoring Report (2023) documented that as of 2022, approximately 2.2 billion young people worldwide lacked access to computers at home, and 2.7 billion lacked home internet access. In sub-Saharan Africa, only 7% of students have access to a computer at home, compared to 95% in high-income OECD countries, representing a disparity so vast as to render aspirations of technology-enhanced learning largely theoretical for hundreds of millions of the world's students.

Even within high-income nations, the digital divide manifests in dimensions that extend beyond mere device access. Van Dijk's (2020) skills-based conception of the divide is particularly relevant here: OECD (2019) PISA data reveal that even when controlling for device availability, students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds score significantly lower on measures of digital literacy and information problem-solving, suggesting that access to technology does not automatically translate into the development of the skills required to use it effectively for learning.

The COVID-19 pandemic provided the starkest possible demonstration of the equity consequences of the digital divide. World Bank (2021) analyses estimated that across low- and middle-income countries, the shift to remote learning which was premised on digital access that vast numbers of students did not possess resulted in a loss of approximately 0.6 learning-adjusted years of schooling on average, with losses disproportionately concentrated among the most disadvantaged student populations. In some countries, learning loss among the bottom income quintile was estimated at more than twice the national average, suggesting that the pandemic's educational consequences will contribute to widening inequality for years to come.

6.4. Policy and Practice Recommendations

Based on the findings of this secondary data analysis, the following evidence-based recommendations are offered for policymakers, school administrators, and curriculum designers:

First, educational technology policies must move beyond a focus on device procurement to prioritize the development of comprehensive digital ecosystems that include reliable connectivity, ongoing technical support, and clear pedagogical frameworks for technology integration (UNESCO, 2020). National and subnational digital education strategies should specify learning goals and outcomes associated with technology use, rather than treating technology as an end in itself.

Second, substantial and sustained investment in teacher professional development related to digital pedagogy is essential. Professional development must extend beyond instrumental training in specific tools to encompass deeper engagement with TPACK principles, enabling teachers to develop the nuanced understanding required to deploy technology in ways that genuinely enhance learning (Koehler & Mishra, 2009). Collaborative, school-based professional learning communities structured around technology integration have demonstrated particular effectiveness and should be prioritized over isolated, workshop-based training models (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017).

Third, addressing the digital divide must be recognized as a prerequisite for equitable technology-enhanced education, not an afterthought. Policies should target the multiple dimensions of the divide identified by Van Dijk (2020), including not only device and connectivity access but also the development of digital literacy skills, particularly among students from

disadvantaged backgrounds. School-based programs that provide devices, internet connectivity, and digital literacy instruction to students who lack home access represent an important, if partial, mitigation strategy.

Fourth, research and evidence-use infrastructure in educational technology should be strengthened. The heterogeneity of findings regarding technology integration's effects underscores the need for rigorous, context-specific evaluation of educational technology programs. Educational systems should build capacity for continuous improvement cycles that incorporate evidence from multiple sources, including large-scale secondary datasets such as those analyzed in this study, to inform iterative refinement of technology integration strategies (Hattie, 2009).

VII. CONCLUSION

This secondary data analysis has synthesized evidence from large-scale international surveys, national educational datasets, and peer-reviewed meta-analyses to examine the relationship between technology integration and student learning outcomes in K-12 education. The findings confirm that when implemented with deliberate pedagogical intent, adequate teacher preparation, and appropriate institutional support, technology integration is associated with meaningful gains in student academic achievement across subject areas and grade levels.

At the same time, the analysis underscores the profound importance of equity considerations in the design and implementation of educational technology initiatives. The digital divide in its multi-dimensional manifestations represents a substantial threat to the realization of technology's potential as a catalyst for educational improvement. Unless concerted policy action is taken to address inequalities in technology access, digital literacy, and the quality of technology-enhanced instruction, there is a real risk that expanding technology use in education will exacerbate rather than ameliorate existing educational inequalities.

The theoretical frameworks of TAM, TPACK, and Vygotskian constructivism collectively illuminate the complex interplay of technological, pedagogical, and socio-contextual factors that determine whether technology integration yields meaningful educational benefits. Future research should continue to leverage the rich secondary datasets available through international organizations to track longitudinal trends in the technology-achievement relationship, with particular attention to the evolving landscape of artificial intelligence, adaptive learning systems, and other emerging technologies that are poised to further transform K-12 education in the years ahead.

In conclusion, technology is neither a panacea for the challenges facing contemporary education nor a threat to be resisted. It is a powerful tool whose educational value is determined not by its presence in schools, but by the wisdom, equity, and pedagogical sophistication with which it is deployed. The evidence examined in this study offers a compelling roadmap for maximizing technology's educational potential while mitigating its risks a roadmap that educational leaders at all levels would do well to follow.

REFERENCES

Boslaugh, S. (2007). *Secondary data sources for public health: A practical guide*. Cambridge University Press.

Chai, C. S., Koh, J. H. L., & Tsai, C. C. (2013). A review of technological pedagogical content knowledge. *Educational Technology & Society, 16*(2), 31–51.

Cheung, A. C. K., & Slavin, R. E. (2013). The effectiveness of educational technology applications for enhancing mathematics achievement in K–12 classrooms: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review, 9*, 88–113. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2013.01.001

Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute.

Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly, 13*(3), 319–340. https://doi.org/10.2307/249008

Ertmer, P. A., Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A. T., Sadik, O., Sendurur, E., & Sendurur, P. (2012). Teacher beliefs and technology integration practices: A critical relationship. *Computers & Education, 59*(2), 423–435. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2012.02.001

Federal Communications Commission. (2020). *Broadband deployment report*. https://www.fcc.gov/reports-research/reports/broadband-progress-reports

Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. Routledge.

Higgins, S., Katsipataki, M., Villanueva-Aguilera, A. B., Coleman, R., Henderson, P., Major, L. E., Coe, R., & Mason, D. (2019). *The Teaching and Learning Toolkit*. Education Endowment Foundation. https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit

Hillmayr, D., Ziernwald, L., Reinhold, F., Hofer, S. I., & Reiss, K. M. (2020). The potential of digital tools to enhance mathematics and science learning in secondary schools: A context-specific meta-analysis. *Computers & Education, 153*, 103897. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2020.103897

Jonassen, D. H. (2000). *Computers as mindtools for schools: Engaging critical thinking* (2nd ed.). Prentice Hall.

Koehler, M. J., & Mishra, P. (2009). What is technological pedagogical content knowledge? *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education, 9*(1), 60–70.

Marzano, R. J., Pickering, D. J., & Heflebower, T. (2011). *The highly engaged classroom*. Marzano Research Laboratory.

Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. *Teachers College Record, 108*(6), 1017–1054. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2006.00684.x

National Center for Education Statistics. (2016). *Teachers' use of educational technology in U.S. public schools: 2009*. U.S. Department of Education. https://nces.ed.gov

National Center for Education Statistics. (2021). *Digest of education statistics 2020*. U.S. Department of Education. https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d20/

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2015). *Students, computers and learning: Making the connection*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264239555-en

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019a). *PISA 2018 results (Volume I): What students know and can do*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/5f07c754-en

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2019b). *TALIS 2018 results (Volume I): Teachers and school leaders as lifelong learners*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/1d0bc92a-en

Pane, J. F., Steiner, E. D., Baird, M. D., & Hamilton, L. S. (2015). *Continued progress: Promising evidence on personalized learning*. RAND Corporation. https://doi.org/10.7249/RR1365

Smith, E. (2008). *Using secondary data in educational and social research*. Open University Press.

Sung, Y. T., Chang, K. E., & Liu, T. C. (2016). The effects of integrating mobile devices with teaching and learning on students' learning performance: A meta-analysis and research synthesis. *Computers & Education, 94*, 252–275. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2015.11.008

Tamim, R. M., Bernard, R. M., Borokhovski, E., Abrami, P. C., & Schmid, R. F. (2011). What forty years of research says about the impact of technology on learning: A second-order meta-analysis and validation study. *Review of Educational Research, 81*(1), 4–28. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654310393361

Teo, T. (2011). Factors influencing teachers' intention to use technology: Model development and test. *Computers & Education, 57*(4), 2432–2440. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2011.06.008

Trucano, M. (2016). *More of the same is not enough: Technology and learning*. World Bank.

UNESCO. (2020). *Global education monitoring report 2020: Inclusion and education—All means all*. UNESCO Publishing. https://gem-report-2020.unesco.org

UNESCO. (2023). *Global education monitoring report 2023: Technology in education—A tool on whose terms?* UNESCO Publishing. https://doi.org/10.54676/UZQV8501

Valtonen, T., Hoang, N., Sointu, E., Näykki, P., Virtanen, A., Pöntinen, S., Räikkönen, M., Kukkonen, J., Järvelä, S., & Mustonen, T. (2019). How pre-service teachers perceive their 21st-century skills and dispositions: A longitudinal perspective. *Computers in Human Behavior, 116*, 106643. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106643

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

Voogt, J., & Knezek, G. (Eds.). (2018). *International handbook of information technology in primary and secondary education*. Springer.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

Warschauer, M., & Matuchniak, T. (2010). New technology and digital worlds: Analyzing evidence of equity in access, use, and outcomes. *Review of Research in Education, 34*(1), 179–225. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X09349791

World Bank. (2021). *The state of the global education crisis: A path to recovery*. World Bank Group. https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/education/publication/the-state-of-the-global-education-crisis-a-path-to-recovery

Zheng, B., Warschauer, M., Lin, C. H., & Chang, C. (2016). Learning in one-to-one laptop environments: A meta-analysis and research synthesis. *Review of Educational Research, 86*(4), 1052–1084. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654316628645