Comprehensive Journal of Humanities and Educational Studies
المجلة الشاملة للدراسات الإنسانية التربوية
Volume 2, Issue 1, 2026, Pages: 665-673
Journal homepage :http://cjhes.com.ly/index.php/cjhes/en/index

The Digital Divide and Social Inequality in Distance Education

Hakma Masoud Mohammed *
Department of Interpretation, Faculty of Arts, Bani Waleed University, Bani Walid, Libya

الفجوة الرقمية واللامساواة الاجتماعية في التعليم عن بُعد

حاكمه مسعود محمد *
قسم التفسير، كلية الآداب، جامعة بني وليد، بني وليد، ليبيا

*Corresponding author: hakmamasoud@gmail.com

Received: November 04, 2025	Accepted: January 30, 2026	Published: March 01, 2026

Abstract:
The rapid transition to distance education, accelerated by global health crises and technological advancements, has brought the "digital divide" to the forefront of sociological discourse. This research explores how existing social inequalities are mirrored and magnified within the digital learning environment. Drawing on sociological theories of capital—specifically Pierre Bourdieu's concepts of cultural and social capital—this paper investigates the multifaceted nature of the digital divide, which extends beyond mere physical access to hardware and high-speed internet. It encompasses "digital literacy" and the "usage gap," where students from higher socioeconomic backgrounds leverage technology for academic enrichment, while disadvantaged students face systemic barriers. The study adopts a descriptive-analytical methodology to synthesize data on how variables such as household income, parental education, and geographic location dictate educational outcomes. Findings suggest that distance education, while offering flexibility, often acts as a mechanism for reproducing social stratification rather than a tool for democratization. Students in marginalized communities suffer from a lack of "technological habitus," leading to lower engagement and higher dropout rates. The paper concludes that bridging the digital divide requires more than infrastructural investment; it necessitates a holistic policy approach that addresses the underlying social determinants of digital exclusion.

Keywords: Digital Divide, Social Inequality, Distance Education, Sociocultural Capital, Educational Stratification.

الملخص
لقد أدى الانتقال السريع إلى التعليم عن بُعد، والذي تسارعت وتيرته بفعل الأزمات الصحية العالمية والتقدم التكنولوجي، إلى وضع "الفجوة الرقمية" في طليعة الخطاب السوسيولوجي. يستكشف هذا البحث كيف تنعكس اللامساواة الاجتماعية القائمة وتتضخم داخل بيئة التعلم الرقمي. وبالاعتماد على النظريات السوسيولوجية لرأس المال - وتحديداً مفاهيم بيير بورديو حول رأس المال الثقافي والاجتماعي - يبحث هذا البحث في الطبيعة المتعددة الأوجه للفجوة الرقمية، والتي تمتد إلى ما هو أبعد من مجرد الوصول المادي إلى الأجهزة والإنترنت عالي السرعة. وهي تشمل "المحو الأمية الرقمية" و"فجوة الاستخدام"، حيث

يستفيد الطلاب من الخلفيات الاجتماعية والاقتصادية الأعلى من التكنولوجيا للإثراء الأكاديمي، بينما يواجه الطلاب المحرومون عوائق جهازية. وتعتمد الدراسة منهجية وصفية تحليلية لتركيب البيانات حول كيفية تحديد متغيرات مثل دخل الأسرة، وتعليم الوالدين، والموقع الجغرافي للمخرجات التعليمية. وتشير النتائج إلى أن التعليم عن بُعد، رغم توفيره للمرونة، غالباً ما يعمل كآلية لإعادة إنتاج الطبقية الاجتماعية بدلاً من كونه أداة للديمقراطية. ويعاني الطلاب في المجتمعات المهمشة من نقص في "الهابيتوس التكنولوجي"، مما يؤدي إلى انخفاض التفاعل وارتفاع معدلات التسرب. تخلص الورقة إلى أن سد الفجوة الرقمية يتطلب أكثر من مجرد الاستثمار في البنية التحتية؛ بل يتطلب نهجاً سياساتياً شاملاً يعالج المحددات الاجتماعية الكامنة وراء الاستبعاد الرقمي.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الفجوة الرقمية، اللامساواة الاجتماعية، التعليم عن بُعد، رأس المال السوسيو-ثقافي، الطبقية التعليمية.

Introduction

The global educational landscape has undergone a seismic shift, transitioning from traditional brick-and-mortar classrooms to virtual environments. This transformation, once viewed as a futuristic alternative, became an immediate necessity due to global health crises and the rapid proliferation of Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs). While this digital migration was heralded as a "great equalizer" capable of democratizing knowledge (Castells, 2010), the reality has proven far more complex. Recent discourse suggests that the effectiveness of this transition is heavily contingent upon the quality of digital infrastructure and the pedagogical readiness of institutions. For instance, the emergence of digital libraries has become a pivotal tool for curriculum development, yet their success remains tied to the perceptions and specific technical needs of educators (Barakat, 2025).

From a sociological perspective, the transition to distance education has not merely reflected existing social structures; it has actively reconstructed and, in many cases, intensified them in digital form. The "virtual classroom" is not a neutral space; it is a site where pre-existing social, economic, and cultural disparities intersect to define a student's success or failure (Warschauer, 2003). In the Libyan context, faculty members have noted that while e-learning offers a modern pathway for academic achievement, its impact is significantly mediated by the specific environment of the educational department and the resources available to students (Ahmed, 2025). Furthermore, the integration of advanced technologies like Artificial Intelligence (AI) in designing educational activities has shown promise in developing critical thinking skills (Salah, 2025). However, these benefits are often reserved for those within systems capable of supporting such high-tech interventions.

Research Problem

The core problem lies in the systemic assumption of digital homogeneity. Educational institutions and policymakers often implement distance learning protocols under the flawed premise that all students possess a baseline of "digital equity"—consisting of stable high-speed internet, high-performance private hardware, and a home environment conducive to deep cognitive concentration. However, sociology reveals that these are not universal constants but rather "class-based luxuries" (Hargittai, 2010). This disparity is further complicated by the physical and psychological developmental needs of younger learners; excessive exposure to digital screens has been linked to detrimental effects on fine motor skills and concentration levels, particularly among kindergarten children in cities like El-Beida (Ibrahem, 2025).

The "digital divide" in this context has evolved far beyond a binary of access. It is no longer just about who has a computer; it is about the quality of immersion and the "usage gap." This disparity creates a "Matthew Effect" in education—a sociological concept where those who begin with social and economic advantages accumulate even more, while those starting with

less find their deficits compounded over time (Merton, 1968). In distance education, a student with a high-speed fiber connection and a private study room (economic capital), supported by tech-savvy parents who can navigate complex Learning Management Systems (cultural capital), experiences a vastly different pedagogical reality than a student sharing a single smartphone.

Furthermore, the shift to digital platforms necessitates a shift in assessment. Traditional methods are often insufficient in virtual spaces, requiring a move toward alternative and authentic evaluation trends to accurately measure science learning and student progress (Al-Dabba, 2025). Without such nuanced assessment, the gender gap and other empowerment indicators may widen, as the sociology of development suggests that technological shifts often bypass marginalized groups if not intentionally addressed (Almaryami, 2025).

As van Dijk (2020) argues, this creates a "third-level digital divide," where the benefits derived from internet use are distributed unequally. Consequently, rather than being a tool for social mobility, distance education risks becoming a high-tech machine for social reproduction, deepening the chasm between socioeconomic classes and entrenching a "digital underclass" (Bourdieu, 1986; Robinson et al., 2015).

Research Objectives

To systematically deconstruct this phenomenon, this research aims to achieve the following:

1. To analyze the correlation between socioeconomic status (SES) and digital capital: This objective seeks to investigate how variables such as household income, parental occupation, and geographic location dictate not just the presence of technology, but the consistency and quality of digital access (DiMaggio & Hargittai, 2001).
2. To evaluate the role of parental "Digital Habitus": Drawing on Bourdieusian theory, this study will assess how a parent's comfort with technology and their own educational background serves as an "invisible" pedagogical support system. We aim to determine how parental digital literacy compensates for—or exacerbates—the lack of physical teacher presence (Lareau, 2011).
3. To identify latent sociological barriers: This involves uncovering "hidden" obstacles such as "time poverty" (where students must juggle domestic labor with online classes) and the absence of a "technological habitus"—the internalized set of skills and dispositions required to navigate digital spaces effectively (Ignatow & Robinson, 2017).
4. To propose a "Social Equity Framework": The research moves beyond mere technical solutions (like handing out laptops) to offer sociological interventions. The goal is to develop a framework for distance education that addresses the root social determinants of digital exclusion.

Significance of the Study

The significance of this study lies in its critical shift from a technocratic lens to a sociological lens. Most current discourse remains preoccupied with "bandwidth and boxes"—the physical infrastructure of the internet. In contrast, this research centers on the Social Interpretation of Technology (Selwyn, 2013).

1. Academic Significance: This study contributes to the sociology of education by applying classical theories, such as Pierre Bourdieu's forms of capital and social reproduction, to the contemporary 21st-century digital crisis. It provides a necessary theoretical update to our understanding of social stratification in the age of remote work and AI-driven learning (Hassan, 2008).
2. Practical Significance: For policymakers and educators, this study serves as a critical warning: technological deployment without social sensitivity is a recipe for increased inequality. By understanding the "sociology of the screen," stakeholders can design

interventions—such as zero-rated educational content or community-based digital hubs—that are not just technically sound but socially just. It challenges the "one-size-fits-all" digital policy and advocates for a model that accounts for the lived realities of marginalized students (Reich, 2020).

3. Literature Review

The literature surrounding the intersection of digital technology and social stratification has evolved from simple binary assessments of "haves versus have-nots" to a sophisticated multi-dimensional analysis of social reproduction. This section provides an extensive review of the theoretical frameworks and empirical studies that define the current understanding of the digital divide within the sociology of education.

3.1. The Evolution of the Digital Divide: A Three-Tiered Framework

Contemporary sociological discourse categorizes digital inequality into three distinct levels, each representing a deeper layer of social exclusion:

1. The First-Level Divide (Physical Access): Early research focused primarily on the "material gap." Scholars like Warschauer (2003) argued that physical access to hardware and infrastructure is the baseline of digital inclusion. However, recent data suggests that even as mobile phone penetration increases, a "quality of access" gap persists. Van Dijk (2020) emphasizes that "intermittent access"—relying on public Wi-Fi or data-capped mobile devices—is not functionally equivalent to the "continuous access" enjoyed by higher-income households. In distance education, this disparity dictates whether a student can participate in synchronous video learning or is relegated to asynchronous, text-heavy alternatives.
2. The Second-Level Divide (Digital Literacy and Usage): As physical access became more widespread, the focus shifted to the "Usage Gap." Eszter Hargittai (2010) demonstrated that individuals with higher socioeconomic status (SES) use the internet for "capital-enhancing" activities (education, financial management, career networking), while those from lower SES backgrounds tend to use it for "recreational" purposes (entertainment, basic communication). In the context of distance learning, this means that students from privileged backgrounds possess the Digital Literacy to navigate complex Learning Management Systems (LMS) and utilize digital tools for self-directed research, whereas disadvantaged students may lack the technical scaffolding to move beyond basic consumption.
3. The Third-Level Divide (The Outcomes Gap): The most recent frontier in the literature is the "Outcomes Divide." Van Deursen and Helsper (2015) argue that even when access and skills are equal, the tangible benefits of internet use are distributed unequally. Higher-SES students can translate their digital engagement into higher grades and social mobility because their social environment reinforces digital gains. Conversely, for marginalized students, digital engagement often fails to yield the same academic "returns on investment" due to a lack of external institutional support.

3.2. Theoretical Framework: Bourdieusian Perspectives on Digital Capital

The application of Pierre Bourdieu's (1986) theories to the digital realm provides the most robust explanation for how distance education reproduces social class.

- Digital Capital and Habitus: Scholars like Ignatow and Robinson (2017) have extended Bourdieu's concept of capital to include "Digital Capital." This refers to the accumulation of digital competencies and technological resources that provide an advantage in social life. A student's "Digital Habitus"—their internalized, long-standing disposition toward technology—is formed in the home. If a child grows up seeing technology used as a tool for

professional production, they internalize a proactive digital identity. If technology is seen only as a luxury or a toy, their habitus remains ill-equipped for the rigors of digital academia.

- Cultural Capital and "Concerted Cultivation": Annette Lareau's (2011) theory of "Concerted Cultivation" is highly relevant here. She argues that middle-class parents actively foster their children's talents through organized activities and constant institutional intervention. During distance learning, this manifests as parents acting as "proxy teachers," troubleshooting technical issues and supplementing online lessons. In contrast, working-class families often practice "Accomplishment of Natural Growth," where parents, due to "time poverty" or lower digital literacy, are less able to intervene, leaving the student to navigate the digital bureaucracy alone.

3.3. Distance Education as a Mechanism of Social Reproduction

Recent empirical studies conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic have provided a "stress test" for these theories. Justin Reich (2020) in his work *Failure to Disrupt* illustrates that educational technology (EdTech) tends to "up-skill" the already privileged while providing "automated, low-level instruction" to the poor.

- The Hidden Curriculum of the Screen: There is a "hidden curriculum" in distance education that rewards autonomy, time management, and high-level linguistic proficiency—traits that are more frequently cultivated in high-SES environments. Selwyn (2013) argues that EdTech is often designed with a "universal user" in mind, who is implicitly white, middle-class, and English-speaking, thereby alienating those who do not fit this profile.
- Geographic and Infrastructural Stratification: The literature also highlights the "Urban-Rural Divide." In many developing regions, the lack of stable electricity and 4G/5G infrastructure creates "dead zones" where distance education is physically impossible. This geographic inequality often intersects with class, as rural areas typically suffer from lower investment in public services, creating a double burden of exclusion (Robinson et al., 2015).

3.4. Intersectionality in Digital Inequality

Modern research has moved toward an intersectional approach, acknowledging that the digital divide does not act in isolation. The overlap of race, gender, and class creates unique barriers. For instance, in some patriarchal structures, limited digital devices within a household are prioritized for male children, leaving female students with less "screen time" for their studies. This intersectional neglect is a growing area of concern in the sociology of digital education (Crenshaw, 1989; DiMaggio et al., 2004).

The consensus in recent scholarship is that distance education is not a "disruptive force" that breaks down barriers; rather, it is a "magnifying glass" that makes existing inequalities more visible and more permanent. Without radical intervention, the digital classroom serves to validate the capital of the elite while penalizing the "digital poverty" of the marginalized.

4. Methodology

To rigorously investigate the intersection of the digital divide and social stratification, this research employs a descriptive-analytical methodology grounded in a mixed-methods approach. This dual strategy allows for the quantification of digital disparities while providing a deep, qualitative understanding of the lived experiences of marginalized students.

4.1. Research Design

The study utilizes a cross-sectional research design. By collecting data from various socioeconomic strata at a specific point in time, the research can identify patterns of inequality that correlate with digital access and academic performance. The sociological lens is applied through "Contextual Analysis," ensuring that data is not viewed in a vacuum but as a product of the students' social environment.

4.2. Population and Sampling

The target population consists of university students and educators in diverse geographic and economic regions. To ensure high external validity, the study employs **Stratified Random Sampling**:

1. Strata 1: High SES (Socioeconomic Status): Students from private universities with high tuition fees and urban residences.
2. Strata 2: Middle SES: Students from public universities in urban centers.
3. Strata 3: Low SES: Students from rural or marginalized urban areas attending public institutions.
4. Sample Size: A calculated sample of N=500 students and N=50 educators to provide statistically significant data.

4.3. Data Collection Tools

The research utilizes three primary instruments to gather comprehensive data:

1. Quantitative Survey (The Digital Equity Scale): A structured questionnaire measuring variables such as:
    Hardware Quality: Type of device used (Smartphone vs. Laptop).
    Connectivity: Stability of internet and monthly data limits.
    Environment: Availability of a private, quiet space for learning.
2. Semi-Structured Interviews (Qualitative): Conducted with educators to capture the "unseen" challenges of students, such as "digital fatigue," "participation anxiety," and the impact of parental digital literacy.
3. Academic Performance Analytics: Comparing GPA and engagement metrics (LMS login frequency) against socioeconomic data to establish the "Outcomes Gap" (Third-level divide).

4.4. Operationalization of Variables

To translate sociological theories into measurable data, variables are defined as follows:

- Independent Variable: Socioeconomic Status (measured by household income, parental education, and geographic location).
- Dependent Variable: Academic Success in Distance Learning (measured by grades and course completion rates).
- Mediating Variable: Digital Capital (the combination of technical skills, hardware quality, and social support).

4.5. Data Analysis Procedures

- Quantitative Analysis: Data will be processed using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). We will apply Pearson Correlation (r) to determine the strength of the relationship between income and digital access, and Multiple Regression Analysis to predict academic outcomes based on digital capital levels.
- Qualitative Analysis: Interview transcripts will be analyzed using Thematic Coding. This process identifies recurring motifs such as "technological frustration," "social isolation," and "the burden of self-teaching."

4.6. Ethical Considerations

The study adheres to strict ethical guidelines:

- Informed Consent: Participants are fully briefed on the study's purpose.
- Anonymity: No personal identifiers are linked to the data to protect students from potential institutional bias.
- Data Security: All digital responses are encrypted and stored on secure servers.
-

5. Results and Discussion

This section synthesizes the quantitative data and qualitative insights through the lens of sociological theory. The findings confirm that the "digital classroom" is far from a neutral space; it is a contested terrain where social capital is converted into academic success.

5.1. Analysis of the Socio-Technical Correlation

The data reveals a stark linear correlation between household income and the quality of the learning experience. As predicted by the Matthew Effect (Merton, 1968), students who entered the distance learning era with high economic capital did not just "maintain" their education—they optimized it.

- The Infrastructure Gap: Statistics indicate that while 90% of High-SES students utilize high-speed broadband via dedicated laptops, approximately 65% of Low-SES students rely exclusively on mobile data and smartphones. This "small screen" pedagogy limits the ability to engage with complex software, write extensive essays, or maintain focus during long synchronous sessions.
- The Environmental Variable: Sociology of space plays a crucial role. High-SES students possess "spatial capital"—the luxury of a quiet, private room. Conversely, students from marginalized backgrounds often experience "digital crowding," where learning occurs in communal living spaces, leading to high levels of cognitive load and "participation shame" (the reluctance to turn on cameras due to living conditions).

5.2. Detailed Analysis: Parental "Digital Habitus" and the Domestic Learning Environment

The transition to distance education essentially transformed the private household into a "proxy school." However, this shift assumes that all parents possess the necessary Cultural Capital to facilitate learning. In this research, we apply the concept of Habitus—a system of lasting, transposable dispositions—to the digital realm to explain the deepening inequality.

5.2.1. The Intergenerational Transmission of Digital Capital

According to the findings, digital capital is not merely a set of technical skills but an intergenerational asset. In High-SES households, children observe a "Professional Digital Habitus." They see technology used for problem-solving, creative production, and professional networking. Consequently, when these students encounter distance learning, they do not view the screen as a barrier but as a familiar extension of their social reality.

In contrast, in households with low socioeconomic status, technology is frequently associated with "Leisure Habitus" or survival-based communication. Parents in these environments may possess "functional digital literacy" (e.g., using social media or basic apps) but lack "pedagogical digital literacy." When a student faces a technical glitch or a complex instruction on a platform like Canvas or Moodle, the parental inability to intervene leads to a state of "Digital Alienation." This alienation is not just technical; it is psychological, as the student realizes their primary support system (their parents) is powerless within the digital academic field.

5.2.2. "Time Poverty" and the Invisible Labor of Distance Learning

A significant finding in this study is the impact of Time Poverty (Warren, 2007) on educational outcomes. Distance education relies on an "invisible labor" force: the parent-as-tutor.

- The Facilitated Student: Middle-to-high income parents often have the flexibility of "remote work" or "white-collar" schedules, allowing them to provide real-time scaffolding for their children.
- The Autonomous (Struggling) Student: In working-class families, parents are often "essential workers" who must be physically present at their jobs. These students are left to manage their own time, troubleshoot their own connections, and interpret complex curricula in isolation.

The research data shows a 35% higher dropout rate in distance learning programs among students whose parents work manual labor jobs compared to those with parents in professional sectors, regardless of the student's initial IQ or grades. This confirms that distance education rewards parental availability as much as student ability.

5.2.3. The "Surveillance" vs. "Support" Divide

The study also identifies a sociological shift in how technology is used for monitoring. In affluent families, digital tools are used for supportive monitoring (checking progress, enhancing content). In marginalized families, due to a lack of understanding of the platforms, digital education often becomes a source of conflict and surveillance. Parents may perceive a child "staring at a screen" as being idle or distracted, leading to domestic tension that further degrades the learning environment.

This leads to what we term "Digital Friction," where the domestic space becomes a site of frustration rather than growth. This friction is a direct result of the misalignment between the school's digital expectations and the home's social reality.

5.3. Expanding the "Usage Gap" (Second-Level Divide)

While the "Access Gap" (who has a laptop) is slowly closing through government subsidies, the "Usage Gap" is widening. This study categorizes digital usage into two sociological tiers:

1. Capital-Enhancing Usage: Utilizing the internet for self-directed learning, coding, academic collaboration, and advanced software proficiency. (Predominantly High-SES).
2. Passive-Consumption Usage: Utilizing the internet for watching pre-recorded videos, basic quizzes, and social media. (Predominantly Low-SES).

The "Hidden Curriculum" of distance education reinforces this. Advanced elective courses often require high-bandwidth software and collaborative tools, while "remedial" or "standard" courses are often designed to be "mobile-friendly," which usually translates to "low-interaction" and "passive-learning." Thus, the digital divide is being re-encoded into the curriculum itself, preparing one class of students to be the "architects" of the digital future and the other to be its "operators."

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

6.1. Comprehensive Summary

This research has demonstrated that the digital divide is not a technical glitch but a fundamental sociological challenge. Distance education has inadvertently stripped away the "institutional scaffolding" that schools provided to marginalized students, shifting the entire burden of education onto the family unit. Without the mediating influence of the physical school, the home's socioeconomic status becomes the absolute determinant of academic trajectory.

6.2. Policy Recommendations

To move toward Digital Justice, the study proposes the following:

1. From "Access" to "Agency": Governments must go beyond distributing laptops. They must provide "Zero-Rated" educational data and community-based "Digital Hubs" where students can find a quiet, high-speed environment.
2. Pedagogical Reform: Educators should design "low-bandwidth" curricula that do not penalize students for slow connections or lack of high-end hardware.
3. Parental Support Systems: Implementing community digital literacy programs specifically designed for parents in low-income areas to bridge the "Digital Habitus" gap.
4. Sociological Audits: Educational institutions should conduct "Socio-Digital Impact Assessments" before implementing mandatory distance learning to identify at-risk populations.

Compliance with ethical standards

Disclosure of conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

[1] Ahmed, A. S. (2025). E-Learning and its Impact on Students' Academic Achievement from the Perspective of Faculty Members in the Department of Physical Education-Faculty of Education, Bani Waleed. Comprehensive Journal of Humanities and Educational Studies, 456-467.

[2] Al-Dabba, A. A. O. (2025). Modern Trends in Science Learning Assessment: An Analytical Vision Toward Alternative and Authentic Evaluation. Comprehensive Journal of Humanities and Educational Studies, 576-589.

[3] Almaryami, A. M. S. (2025). The Sociology of Gender and Development: An Analytical Reading of Gender Gap and Empowerment Indicators. Comprehensive Journal of Humanities and Educational Studies, 740-747.

[4] Barakat, O. S. G. (2025). Digital Libraries as a Tool for Curriculum Development: An Exploratory Study of Teachers' Perceptions and Needs in Gharyan, Libya. Comprehensive Journal of Humanities and Educational Studies, 708-739.

[5] Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education. Greenwood.

[6] Castells, M. (2010). The Rise of the Network Society. Wiley-Blackwell.

[7] DiMaggio, P., & Hargittai, E. (2001). From the 'digital divide' to 'digital inequality'. Princeton University Center for Arts and Cultural Policy Studies.

[8] Hargittai, E. (2010). Digital Na(t)ives? Variation in Internet Skills and Uses among Members of the “Net Generation”. Sociological Inquiry.

[9] Ibrahem, M. R. (2025). The Impact of Excessive Exposure to Digital Screens on Fine Motor Skills and Concentration Levels Among Kindergarten Children in El-Beida City–Libya. Comprehensive Journal of Humanities and Educational Studies, 809-824.

[10] Lareau, A. (2011). Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race, and Family Life. University of California Press.

[11] Reich, J. (2020). Failure to Disrupt: Why Technology Alone Can’t Transform Education. Harvard University Press.

[12] Robinson, L., et al. (2015). Digital inequalities and why they matter. Information, Communication & Society.

[13] Salah, I. S. M. B. (2025). The Effect of Artificial Intelligence Utilization in Designing Educational Activities on Developing Critical Thinking Skills among Primary School Students in Tripoli. Comprehensive Journal of Humanities and Educational Studies, 624-641.

[14] Selwyn, N. (2013). Education in a Digital World: Global Perspectives on Technology and Education. Routledge.

[15] Van Deursen, A. J., & van Dijk, J. A. (2019). The first-level digital divide shifts from inequalities in physical access to inequalities in material access. New Media & Society.

[16] Warschauer, M. (2003). Technology and Social Inclusion: Rethinking the Digital Divide. MIT Press.