

---

# The Digital Education Divide and Educational Inequality: A Systematic Literature Review

Yujie Zhang\*

*University of Wollongong, Northfields Ave Wollongong, NSW 2522, Australia*

*\*Corresponding author: Yujie Zhang.*

---

## Abstract

This study examines how the digital education divide contributes to educational inequality and identifies strategies for promoting digital equity in contemporary education systems. Using a systematic literature review approach, the study analyses 20 peer-reviewed studies selected from Scopus, Web of Science, and China National Knowledge Infrastructure. The review focuses on formal education contexts, including primary, secondary, and higher education. A Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses-informed screening process was adopted, and thematic coding was used to synthesise findings across different national and educational settings. The review finds that the digital education divide is a multidimensional problem that extends beyond unequal access to devices and internet connectivity. It is also shaped by differences in digital literacy, quality of participation, teacher digital competence, institutional support, policy design, and cultural inclusion. These factors interact with wider socioeconomic, regional, linguistic, and cultural inequalities, creating uneven opportunities for students to engage meaningfully in digital learning. The findings further suggest that technology expansion alone cannot reduce educational inequality unless it is supported by inclusive pedagogy, sustained teacher development, equitable infrastructure, and context-sensitive policy interventions. The study concludes that addressing the digital education divide requires a shift from access-based solutions to a broader equity-oriented approach that values meaningful participation, cultural responsiveness, and systemic support. This review contributes to a clearer understanding of the mechanisms through which digital inequality reproduces educational disadvantage and highlights future directions for research, policy, and educational practice.

## Keywords

digital education divide, educational inequality, digital equity, digital literacy, systematic review

---

## 1. Introduction

Over the past two decades, digital technologies have significantly reshaped education worldwide. Online platforms, digital resources, and networked learning environments have created new opportunities for flexible and personalized learning. At the same time, these developments have exposed persistent inequalities in access, skills, and participation. The COVID-19 pandemic further accelerated the shift to remote and technology-mediated learning, making disparities in digital readiness more visible across educational systems [1].

The concept of the digital divide has evolved beyond differences in device ownership or internet access. It is now widely understood as a multidimensional phenomenon involving technological access, digital literacy,

quality of participation, and learning outcomes [2, 3]. Students from low-income households, rural areas, and culturally or linguistically marginalized communities often face overlapping barriers in digital learning environments, which can limit participation, reduce academic performance, and reinforce existing educational inequalities [4, 5].

Existing research also shows that digital inequality is closely linked to broader structural and pedagogical conditions. Unequal access to infrastructure reflects socioeconomic and regional disparities, while differences in digital literacy are shaped by prior experience, language, and cultural context [6, 7]. In addition, teacher preparedness and institutional support play a critical role in determining whether digital tools are used in inclusive and pedagogically effective ways. Without sufficient training and support, digital technologies may reproduce rather than reduce educational inequality [8, 9].

At the policy level, scholars increasingly argue that digital inequality should be understood not only as a technical issue, but also as a matter of social justice, cultural inclusion, and educational opportunity [10, 11, 12]. To ensure analytical consistency, this review focuses on formal education sectors, namely primary, secondary, and higher education, where learning processes, institutional structures, and outcomes are more systematically documented and comparable across contexts. Rather than presenting individual studies separately, this review synthesizes existing research into key thematic areas to provide a coherent understanding of how digital inequality operates across education systems.

This study therefore conducts a systematic review of research examining the relationship between digital inequality and educational disparity. It aims to identify the key mechanisms through which digital divides shape unequal learning opportunities and to synthesize policy and pedagogical strategies that may promote digital equity.

The research questions guiding this review are:

- What key mechanisms contribute to the digital education divide in contemporary education systems?
- What policy and educational interventions have been proposed to reduce the digital education divide and promote greater educational equity?

## **2. Method**

This study adopts a systematic review methodology to examine empirical and conceptual research on the digital education divide and its relationship to educational inequality. It also investigates strategies, policies, and pedagogical practices proposed to promote digital equity. The review generally follows the principles of the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) framework, adapted to the scope of this topic [13].

### **2.1 Search Strategy**

To enhance the breadth and reliability of the data sources, multiple academic databases were used in this review. Scopus was selected as the primary database due to its extensive coverage of peer-reviewed literature in education, social sciences, and technology-enhanced learning. In addition, Web of Science was included to ensure comprehensive coverage of high-impact international research, and China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI) was incorporated to capture relevant studies published in the Chinese context. The inclusion of multiple databases helps reduce selection bias and improves the robustness of the review.

Search terms were designed to reflect the multidimensional nature of the digital divide, including: digital education divide, educational inequality, digital equity, technology access, digital literacy, online learning resources, educational policy, remote learning, socioeconomic gap, ICT in education, digital inclusion, and educational justice. Boolean operators (AND, OR) were applied to combine keywords and refine the search results.

To ensure relevance and recency, the search was limited to studies published from 2009 onward. Only peer-reviewed journal articles, including both empirical and conceptual studies, were included.

## 2.2 Eligibility Criteria

Studies were included if they focused on the digital divide within formal education contexts, specifically primary, secondary, and higher education. This focus was adopted to ensure consistency and comparability across studies, as these stages represent structured educational systems with established curricula, institutional support, and relatively clear learning outcomes. Compared with early childhood or vocational education, these sectors are more frequently examined in the literature on digital inequality and therefore provide a stronger basis for synthesis.

In addition, studies were included if they addressed educational inequality, digital participation, or equity issues; examined digital access, digital skills, teacher competence, institutional support, or learning outcomes; proposed or evaluated strategies to reduce digital inequality; and were published in English in peer-reviewed journals.

Studies were excluded if they focused mainly on technical ICT development without clear educational relevance, discussed digital divide issues outside learning environments, concentrated solely on early childhood or vocational training without broader implications for formal education, or were commentary pieces without empirical or theoretical support.

## 2.3 Screening Process

The screening process followed the PRISMA framework [13]. Records from Scopus, Web of Science, and CNKI were first combined, and duplicates were removed [14].

A title and abstract screening was then conducted to exclude studies not related to education or digital inequality. The remaining articles underwent full-text screening based on the predefined inclusion criteria, including educational context and relevance to digital equity. Studies focusing only on technical ICT issues were excluded.

The process was iterative, with studies rechecked where necessary to ensure consistency [15]. From an initial 58 records, 20 studies were finally included.

## 2.4 Data Extraction and Thematic Coding

Key information from each study (e.g., author, context, participants, design, and focus) was extracted and summarised in Appendix A.

The analysis used thematic coding, following Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke [16].

First, all studies were read several times to become familiar with the data. Initial codes were then generated from relevant text segments (e.g., access issues, digital skills, teacher support), following an inductive approach [17].

Next, codes were grouped into broader categories. A semantic coding approach was applied, meaning themes were developed from explicit meanings in the data rather than deeper interpretation [16].

Finally, themes were reviewed and refined to ensure consistency across studies. This iterative process helps improve credibility and transparency in qualitative analysis [18].

## 3. Results and Findings

Twenty peer-reviewed journal articles met the eligibility criteria for inclusion in this review. Together, these studies represent a range of educational contexts across Europe, Asia, North America, Africa, and the Middle East, and cover primary, secondary, and higher education. Although the studies differ in method, including surveys, qualitative interviews, modelling, and conceptual analysis, they consistently show that the digital education divide is a layered phenomenon shaped by access, skills, pedagogy, policy, and culture.

### 3.1 Access and Infrastructure

The reviewed studies consistently indicate that unequal access to devices, reliable internet, and supportive learning environments remains a major driver of educational inequality. Across both high-income and lower-

resource contexts, students from disadvantaged, immigrant, and rural backgrounds experienced reduced learning time and weaker engagement, especially during remote learning [1, 3]. In addition, regional disparities in infrastructure investment and digital opportunity suggest that access inequality is closely linked to broader structural inequality rather than being a purely technical issue [5, 6].

### **3.2 Digital Literacy and Participation**

The findings also show that digital inequality is shaped by uneven digital literacy, confidence, and prior experience. Students from linguistically and culturally diverse backgrounds often face additional barriers to meaningful participation, particularly when digital environments are not language-responsive or culturally inclusive [4, 7]. Evidence from higher education further suggests that prior familiarity with digital tools influences academic performance and engagement, indicating that digital literacy functions as a form of social and educational capital [11, 12, 19].

### **3.3 Teacher Competence and Pedagogical Practice**

Another major finding is that teacher readiness strongly affects the inclusiveness and effectiveness of digital learning. Where teachers lacked confidence, training, or pedagogical understanding, digital tools were often used in limited and transmissive ways, reducing opportunities for student interaction and engagement [20, 21]. By contrast, stronger pedagogical competence and better institutional support were associated with more interactive and equitable learning experiences [9, 22]. These findings suggest that teacher digital competence is central to digital equity.

### **3.4 Policy and Structural Inequality**

The reviewed studies further demonstrate that digital inequality is embedded in policy and system design. Emergency remote teaching and policy reforms that did not adequately account for socioeconomic differences often intensified existing disparities, as more advantaged students and families were better able to compensate for disruption through additional resources and support [8, 23]. This supports the view that effective responses must address not only access, but also use, school-level conditions, and wider structural disadvantage [2, 24].

### **3.5 Cultural and Social Dimensions**

Finally, the studies indicate that digital inequality also has important cultural, linguistic, and ethical dimensions. Students from minority and marginalized communities may be excluded not only because of limited access, but also because digital learning environments fail to reflect their identities, languages, and lived experiences [4, 7]. Approaches grounded in cultural responsiveness, community engagement, and digital justice have therefore been identified as important for improving belonging, participation, and equity in digital learning [10, 25].

## **4. Discussion and Future Directions**

The findings of this review suggest that the digital education divide is not simply a descriptive pattern of inequality, but a structurally produced phenomenon shaped by the interaction of social, institutional, and policy-related factors. Rather than reiterating the results, this section interprets the underlying mechanisms that explain why these inequalities persist across contexts.

First, the persistence of access inequality reflects broader socioeconomic and regional disparities rather than purely technological limitations. As highlighted by Digital Divide Research literature, unequal infrastructure distribution is closely tied to patterns of economic investment and social stratification [2, 6]. This explains why even in high-income countries, marginalized groups continue to experience reduced access and weaker learning conditions. In this sense, digital inequality should be understood as an extension of existing social inequality rather than a new, independent problem.

Second, differences in digital literacy and participation can be explained through the concept of digital capital. Students who possess prior technological experience, language resources, and cultural familiarity with digital environments are better positioned to benefit from online learning [11]. Conversely, students from disadvantaged or linguistically diverse backgrounds face cumulative barriers that limit meaningful

participation. This supports the argument that access alone is insufficient, as unequal capacity to use technology effectively continues to reproduce educational disparities.

Third, the central role of teacher competence reflects deeper issues in professional preparation and institutional support. The findings indicate that when teachers lack pedagogical training in digital environments, technology tends to be used in passive and transmissive ways. This aligns with previous research suggesting that technological innovation without pedagogical transformation often reinforces, rather than reduces, inequality [8]. Therefore, teacher digital competence should be viewed not only as a technical skill, but as a form of pedagogical and equity-oriented expertise.

At the policy level, the findings can be explained by the mismatch between rapid technological implementation and slower institutional adaptation. During the COVID-19 pandemic, many education systems adopted emergency remote teaching without sufficiently accounting for socioeconomic differences [5]. As a result, policies that aimed to ensure continuity of learning often unintentionally advantaged already privileged groups. This highlights the importance of policy design that is sensitive to context, equity, and long-term sustainability.

In addition, the cultural dimension of digital inequality reveals that exclusion is not only material but also symbolic. When digital content does not reflect students' languages, identities, or lived experiences, participation becomes limited even in the presence of adequate access [4]. This supports the growing emphasis on digital justice, which frames digital inclusion as a matter of representation, agency, and belonging rather than access alone.

Building on these interpretations, several directions for future research and practice emerge. Future studies should move beyond cross-sectional analysis and adopt longitudinal approaches to examine how digital inequality evolves over time, particularly in hybrid and AI-supported learning environments. In addition, more intersectional research is needed to explore how digital exclusion is shaped by overlapping factors such as class, gender, language, and disability.

From a practical perspective, greater attention should be given to evaluating the effectiveness of policy interventions. While many strategies have been proposed, there is still limited evidence on which approaches produce sustained improvements in digital equity. Future research should therefore focus on implementation and impact rather than conceptual discussion alone.

Finally, participatory approaches that involve students, teachers, and communities in the design of digital learning environments may offer more context-sensitive and inclusive solutions. Such approaches can help bridge the gap between policy intentions and classroom realities, ensuring that digital transformation contributes to meaningful educational change.

## 5. Conclusion

This study demonstrates that the digital education divide is a complex and systemic form of educational inequality shaped by the interaction of access, digital literacy, teacher competence, policy design, and cultural inclusion. The evidence shows that technological expansion alone does not guarantee equitable learning opportunities, as existing social and institutional inequalities continue to influence how digital resources are accessed and used. Addressing this issue therefore requires a shift from a narrow focus on access to a broader emphasis on meaningful participation, pedagogical transformation, and equity-oriented policy design. Ultimately, achieving digital equity depends on coordinated efforts across educational, institutional, and policy levels to ensure that digital technologies contribute to inclusion rather than the reproduction of inequality.

## References

- [1] Walper, S., & Kuger, S. (2023). Bildung und Bildungsdefizite in Kita und Schule im Rahmen der Coronapandemie. *Monatsschrift Kinderheilkunde*, 171(7), 615–622. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00112-023-01779-7>

- [2] 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>
- [3] Mwansa, G., Ngandu, M. R., & Mkwambi, Z. (2025). Bridging the digital divide: Exploring the challenges and solutions for digital exclusion in rural South Africa. *Discover Global Society*, 3(54), Article 54. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44282-025-00189-2>
- [4] Child, G. S., & Song, K. (2023). Digital inequities: Promoting digital justice during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Sustainability*, 15(17), 12862. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su151712862>
- [5] Hao, X. (2023). Does COVID-19 persistently affect educational inequality after school reopening? Evidence from Internet search data in China. *PLOS ONE*, 18(10), e0293168. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0293168>
- [6] Niembro, A. (2014). Brechas regionales y provinciales de desarrollo educativo en Argentina: Disparidades crecientes en la última década (2000–2009). *Revista Iberoamericana de Educación Superior*, 5(14), 3–26. <https://doi.org/10.22201/iisue.20072872e.2014.14.128>
- [7] Frei-Landau, R., & Avidov-Ungar, O. (2022). *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 111, 103623. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103623>
- [8] Anderson, L. W. (2021). Schooling interrupted: Educating children and youth in the Covid-19 era. *Center for Educational Policy Studies Journal*, 11(Special Issue), 17–38. <https://doi.org/10.26529/cepsj.1128>
- [9] Taşkın, N., Kandemir, B., & Erzurumlu, K. (2023). University student satisfaction and behavioural engagement during emergency remote teaching. *Canadian Journal of Learning and Technology / La revue canadienne de l'apprentissage et de la technologie*, 49(1). <https://doi.org/10.21432/cjlt28242>
- [10] Anthony, J., & Padmanabhan, S. (2010). Digital divide and equity in education: A Rawlsian analysis. *Journal of Information Technology Case and Application Research*, 12(4), 37–62. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15228053.2010.10856195>
- [11] Pangrazio, L., & Sefton-Green, J. (2021). Digital rights, digital citizenship and digital literacy: What's the difference? *Journal of New Approaches in Educational Research*, 10(1), 15–27. <https://doi.org/10.7821/naer.2021.1.616>
- [12] Livingstone, S., & Stoilova, M. (2021). Using global evidence to benefit children's online opportunities and minimise risks. *Contemporary Social Science*, 16(2), 213–226. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21582041.2019.1608371>
- [13] Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J., Altman, D. G., & The PRISMA Group. (2009). *Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement*. *PLoS Medicine*, 6(7), e1000097. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097>
- [14] Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., ... Moher, D. (2021). *The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews*. *BMJ*, 372, n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
- [15] Petticrew, M., & Roberts, H. (2006). *Systematic reviews in the social sciences: A practical guide*. Blackwell Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470754887>
- [16] Virginia Braun, & Victoria Clarke. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- [17] Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). *Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria*. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 16(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847>
- [18] Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE Publications.

- [19] Bacci, S., Bertaccini, B., Del Sarto, S., Grilli, L., & Rampichini, C. (2023). Statistical methods to estimate the impact of remote teaching on university students' performance. *Springer Nature Quality & Quantity*, 57, 5513–5531. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-023-01612-z>
- [20] Abdallah, A. K., & Alriyami, R. (2022). *Changes in the education landscape caused by COVID-19: Opportunities and challenges from UAE perspective. World Journal on Educational Technology: Current Issues*, 14(3), 544–559. <https://doi.org/10.18844/wjet.v14i3.7193>
- [21] Slepneva, M., & Ladosha, O. M. (2022). Mobile Literacy and Digital Competences of Foreign Language Teachers in Higher School. In 2022 VI International Conference on Information Technologies in Engineering Education (Inforino) (pp. 1–4). IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/Inforino53888.2022.9782998>
- [22] Gordillo, A., Barra, E., López-Pernas, S., & Quemada, J. (2021). Development of teacher digital competence in the area of e-safety through educational video games. *Sustainability*, 13(15), 8485. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13158485>
- [23] Liu, H., Zhang, K., Wang, L., & Chen, J. (2025). Educational burden reduction, educational inequality, and enrollment pressure: Evidence from China. *Economics and Human Biology*, 56, 101459. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ehb.2024.101459>
- [24] Sanz Ponce, R., & López-Luján, E. (2022). Aprendizajes educativos como consecuencia de la pandemia COVID-19. ¿Qué papel debe jugar la escuela en el nuevo escenario mundial? *Revista Complutense de Educación*, 33(2), 215–223. <https://doi.org/10.5209/rced.73928>
- [25] Boison, B., & Burke, A. (2025). Fostering cultural responsiveness online: Elementary educators' experiences during the COVID-19 shift to online education. *Computers in the Schools*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07380569.2025.2453728>

## **Funding**

This research received no external funding.

## **Conflicts of Interest**

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## **Acknowledgment**

This paper is an output of the science project.

## **Copyrights**

Copyright for this article is retained by the author (s), with first publication rights granted to the journal. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).