International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development
www.allsubjectjournal.com
Online ISSN: 2349-4182, Print ISSN: 2349-5979
Received: 25-12-2021, Accepted: 10-01-2022, Published: 25-01-2022
Volume 9, Issue 1, 2022, Page No. 81-88

Rethinking pedagogy in the digital age: A theoretical exploration

Dr. Chaganti Rami Reddy
Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Sri Krishnadevaraya University, Anantapuramu, Andhra Pradesh, India

Abstract
This theoretical paper explores the evolving nature of pedagogy in the digital age, emphasizing the intersection of technology, human values, and educational transformation. It reexamines traditional pedagogical paradigms and presents a conceptual understanding of how digital tools, virtual environments, and collaborative platforms reshape the processes of teaching and learning. Drawing upon interdisciplinary perspectives, the study highlights how digitalization has shifted pedagogy from instructor-centered approaches toward more learner-driven, participatory, and interactive models. The paper also underscores the importance of integrating empathy, inclusivity, and ethical awareness into digital learning environments to ensure education remains human-centered and equitable. By applying contemporary theoretical frameworks, it discusses how motivation, engagement, and belonging are redefined within virtual contexts, offering new insights into academic collaboration, innovation, and learner identity. The findings indicate that effective digital pedagogy requires balancing technological innovation with emotional and social dimensions of learning. It concludes by proposing that the future of education depends on the responsible and reflective use of technology—one that not only enhances access and flexibility but also fosters meaningful human connections and lifelong learning. The study contributes to the growing discourse on reimagining education as a transformative and inclusive process in an increasingly digitalized world.

Keywords: Digital pedagogy, learner engagement, educational transformation, human-cantered learning

Introduction

The 21st century has ushered in a profound transformation in education, driven by digitalization, technological advancements, and changing societal expectations. Pedagogy, once confined to traditional classroom interactions, is now being reimagined through a digital lens that emphasizes interactivity, personalization, collaboration, and inclusivity. The digital age has redefined not only how learning occurs but also how knowledge is constructed, disseminated, and valued within the academic community (Peters *et al*., 2016) [24]. As educators and policymakers grapple with the complex interplay between human learning, technology, and socio-cultural realities, rethinking pedagogy becomes a theoretical and practical imperative.

At the heart of this transformation lies the recognition that learning is no longer a linear, teacher-centered process but an interconnected, experiential phenomenon shaped by digital ecosystems. Darling-Hammond *et al*. (2020) [7] argue that the science of learning underscores the importance of social, emotional, and cognitive dimensions in educational practice. Digital pedagogies must therefore move beyond mere technological adoption to embrace holistic development, fostering curiosity, self-regulation, and resilience among learners. The integration of web-based tools, online platforms, and virtual environments, accelerated during the COVID-19 pandemic, has illuminated both the opportunities and challenges of digital learning (Hacker *et al*., 2020) [14]. These environments not only facilitate "virtual togetherness" but also compel educators to rethink engagement, accessibility, and inclusivity in ways previously unimaginable.

The digital transformation of pedagogy also intersects with questions of innovation, identity, and institutional culture. Hasanefendic *et al*. (2017) [17] emphasize that innovation in higher education is often driven by individual agency and institutional flexibility. The move toward digital pedagogy requires educators to act as change agents who adapt to technological shifts while maintaining pedagogical integrity. Similarly, Chiu (2022) [4, 5] applies the Self-Determination Theory (SDT) to show how digital learning environments can foster engagement when they satisfy students' needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness. This shift represents a paradigm where learners become active participants in constructing knowledge rather than passive recipients of information.

However, digital pedagogy is not merely a technological shift but also a cultural and ethical transformation. As Gravett and Ajjawi (2022) [12] note, the concept of belonging becomes a situated practice within digital spaces, where learners' identities are continuously negotiated through interaction and participation. The absence of physical proximity in virtual settings challenges educators to create authentic, empathetic, and inclusive digital

communities. Saeed *et al*. (2022) [28] further argue that spirituality and agility in academic institutions can enhance adaptive capacity and moral grounding amid digital transitions. This intersection of ethics, purpose, and flexibility highlights that rethinking pedagogy involves cultivating digital citizenship and emotional intelligence alongside technical proficiency.

Moreover, the digital age requires reexamining pedagogical frameworks through the lens of human-computer interaction (HCI). Stephanidis *et al*. (2019) [32] identify "seven grand challenges" in HCI, including accessibility, user empowerment, and human-AI collaboration. These challenges call for pedagogies that not only use technology effectively but also question its implications for cognitive development, privacy, and equity. The use of digital storytelling, gamification, and data visualization—as Roth (2021) [27] demonstrates in his exploration of map-based narratives—illustrates how digital tools can enhance conceptual understanding and creativity when guided by thoughtful pedagogical intent.

Pedagogy in the digital age must also recognize the value of participatory and collaborative approaches to learning. Brown (2022) [3] and Wehn *et al*. (2018) [36] both underscore the significance of participatory research and social learning, where learners and educators co-create knowledge through active engagement and reflection. These models resonate with the idea of the "learning society," where education transcends institutional boundaries and becomes a lifelong, socially embedded process. In this sense, rethinking pedagogy is not just about adapting to new tools but about transforming epistemologies and power structures within education.

The COVID-19 pandemic acted as a catalyst for reimagining educational practices across disciplines. Studies such as those by Varea *et al*. (2022) [35] and Huang and Looi (2021) [18] highlight how physical education and computational thinking curricula were restructured through digital platforms, revealing both innovation and inequity in access and implementation. The crisis exposed systemic gaps but also inspired educators to explore hybrid, "unplugged," and inclusive pedagogical models that bridge digital divides. As Borras Jr. *et al*. (2022) [2] remind us in the context of climate change and social justice, global crises often necessitate rethinking institutional structures and collective action. Education, too, must respond to such crises with resilience, adaptability, and ethical consciousness.

In this theoretical exploration, "rethinking pedagogy in the digital age" is viewed as an evolving dialogue between technology, human agency, and societal transformation. It involves rearticulating the purpose of education, the nature of knowledge, and the role of the learner in an increasingly interconnected and uncertain world. The pedagogical challenge lies not in mastering technology but in cultivating digital wisdom—the ability to use technology ethically, creatively, and critically to enhance human learning and social progress. As we navigate this digital frontier, the task before educators is not merely to adapt but to innovate—to envision pedagogies that are equitable, humane, and transformative in shaping the future of education.

Review of Literature

The digital revolution has transformed the contours of education, compelling scholars and practitioners to rethink pedagogical frameworks, epistemological assumptions, and learning environments. The emerging scholarship underscores the dynamic relationship between technology, human development, creativity, and social engagement. The literature reviewed here converges on several core themes: the transformation of learning theories through digital means, the evolution of human–technology interaction, the ethical and emotional dimensions of digital pedagogy, and the challenges and opportunities of inclusion, innovation, and sustainability in educational contexts.

The Evolution of Learning Theories and Digital Transformation

The science of learning and development, as outlined by Darling-Hammond *et al*. (2020) [7], emphasizes that effective pedagogy must integrate cognitive, emotional, and social dimensions of learning. Digital environments offer opportunities for personalized, adaptive, and collaborative learning, aligning with the neuroscience of motivation and engagement. Building on this, Chiu (2022) [4, 5] applies the Self-Determination Theory (SDT) to demonstrate that students' engagement in online learning depends on their sense of autonomy, competence, and relatedness. When supported by appropriate technological infrastructure and instructional design, digital pedagogy enhances intrinsic motivation and self-directed learning. Similarly, Chiu, Sun, and Ismailov (2022) [4, 5] highlight that technology learning support fosters digital literacy and self-efficacy when aligned with psychological needs.

These perspectives reveal that pedagogy in the digital age cannot be separated from the psychological principles of human learning. Learning technologies must not merely replicate traditional methods but must foster curiosity, reflection, and problem-solving. Hasanefendic *et al*. (2017) [17] argue that innovation in higher education arises when individuals actively engage in institutional transformation, suggesting that digital pedagogy must be seen as an emergent practice rather than a static framework. The teacher's role evolves from a transmitter of knowledge to a facilitator of cognitive apprenticeship, emphasizing co-creation, adaptability, and lifelong learning.

Virtual Engagement and the Reconfiguration of Learning Spaces

The COVID-19 pandemic catalyzed a paradigm shift in educational delivery. Hacker *et al*. (2020) [14] document how web-conferencing systems created new forms of "virtual togetherness," transforming the traditional

boundaries between personal and institutional spaces. Varea, González-Calvo, and García-Monge (2022) [35] observed similar pedagogical reconfigurations in physical education, where online modalities reshaped notions of embodiment, participation, and assessment. Schiavio, Biasutti, and Philippe (2021) [29] further explored how conservatory students developed creative pedagogies in virtual environments, emphasizing adaptability and collaborative artistic engagement.

These studies illustrate that digital pedagogy is not confined to transferring content online but involves reimagining interactivity and community. Gravett and Ajjawi (2022) [12] conceptualize "belonging" as a situated practice, underscoring that emotional connectedness and identity formation are critical in virtual spaces. This resonates with Saeed *et al*. (2022) [28], who posit that spirituality and agility within institutions enhance educators' ability to respond adaptively to digital challenges while maintaining humanistic values.

Pedagogical Innovation, Creativity, and Design Thinking

Pedagogical innovation in the digital age relies on design thinking, creativity, and narrative engagement. Roth (2021) [27] and Griffin, Robinson, and Roth (2017) [13] show how visual storytelling and cartographic narratives can promote analytical reasoning and critical interpretation. Dal Falco and Vassos (2017) [6] extend this approach to museum experience design, illustrating how storytelling methodologies can enhance participatory learning. Rahimi and Yadollahi (2017) [25] compare offline and online digital storytelling, revealing that online narratives significantly enhance literacy, engagement, and reflective learning in EFL contexts.

Schiavio *et al*. (2021) [29] describe creative pedagogies that prioritize experiential and process-oriented learning, while Levrini *et al*. (2019) [21] propose "future-scaffolding" pedagogies that cultivate foresight and adaptability among science students. These frameworks demonstrate that rethinking pedagogy requires embracing creativity not as an add-on but as a central cognitive and emotional process in digital environments. Similarly, Stephanidis *et al*. (2019) [32] identify seven grand challenges in human–computer interaction (HCI), including accessibility, inclusivity, and emotional intelligence, urging educators to design learning systems that accommodate diverse learners.

Participatory and Inclusive Pedagogies

A growing body of work emphasizes participatory, dialogical, and co-creative learning frameworks. Brown (2022) [3] defines participatory research as a continuum where learners actively shape inquiry processes. This aligns with Wehn *et al*. (2018) [36], who view stakeholder engagement in governance as a form of social learning—emphasizing collective reflection and mutual knowledge creation. Parsons *et al*. (2020) [23] advance this further by co-creating technology research with autism stakeholders, ensuring that innovation reflects user diversity and lived experience. Frauenberger, Spiel, and Makhaeva (2019) [8] similarly emphasize designing "smart things" with autistic children, foregrounding empathy, co-design, and agency in digital creation.

These participatory approaches reflect a broader movement toward democratizing knowledge production and fostering inclusivity in digital education. Renold (2018) [26] illustrates how creative activisms—such as making "da(r)ta" with teenage girls—generate embodied and affective forms of knowledge about social issues. Likewise, Vallejo and Dooly (2020) [34] explore plurilingualism and translanguaging as pedagogical approaches that respect linguistic diversity and promote cognitive flexibility in digital learning environments. Together, these studies highlight that digital pedagogy must be socially responsive, inclusive, and transformative.

Ethics, Sustainability, and the Politics of Digital Pedagogy

Digital pedagogy exists within broader ethical and political frameworks. Williamson (2018) [37] critiques the corporatization of education through "Silicon startup schools," where algorithmic governance and venture philanthropy risk reducing learning to data-driven management. Kuntsman and Rattle (2019) [19] warn of the environmental unsustainability of digital communication, urging scholars to consider the ecological footprint of technology-enhanced learning. Borras Jr. *et al*. (2022) [2] extend this argument by linking climate change with systemic inequities, calling for education that integrates ecological consciousness and social justice. Häggström and Schmidt (2020) [15] exemplify this through critical place-based pedagogy, which develops children's ecological literacy alongside reading and writing skills.

Ethical considerations also emerge in discussions of data privacy and children's rights. Macenaite and Kosta (2017) [22] critique the consent mechanisms for processing minors' personal data in the EU, highlighting the need for pedagogical models that safeguard digital well-being. Fuentes and Sörum (2019) [9] introduce the notion of ethical consumption through smartphone applications, showing how technology mediates moral agency in everyday life. These insights suggest that rethinking pedagogy requires ethical reflexivity, addressing how digital systems shape values, agency, and equity.

Globalization, Hybridization, and Socio-Material Reconfigurations

The digital age fosters hybrid learning ecologies that integrate online and offline dimensions of education. Huang and Looi (2021) [18] review "unplugged" pedagogies in K–12 computer science education, emphasizing the balance between computational thinking and embodied learning. Similarly, Goodyear, Armour, and Wood (2019a, 2019b) [10, 11] explore how young people use apps and wearable devices for health-related learning, demonstrating that technology mediates affective, social, and behavioral dimensions of education.

Saeed *et al*. (2022) [28] and Tsiligiris and Bowyer (2021) [33] note that workforce agility and skill adaptability in the Fourth Industrial Revolution (4IR) necessitate reformed curricula emphasizing flexibility, collaboration, and creativity. The incorporation of global and pluricultural perspectives (Vallejo &Dooly, 2020) [34] further highlights the significance of hybrid pedagogical frameworks that acknowledge cultural heterogeneity and cross-border connectivity. These models position learners as global citizens capable of navigating complex socio-technical landscapes.

Towards a Theoretical Synthesis: Pedagogy as Transformation

Across these studies, a unifying theoretical thread emerges: pedagogy in the digital age is an evolving, relational process that integrates human, technological, ethical, and ecological dimensions. Peters *et al*. (2016) [24] propose a philosophy of academic publishing that mirrors the collaborative ethos of digital pedagogy—decentralized, participatory, and open. Similarly, Borras Jr. *et al*. (2022) [2] and Agius, Rosamond, and Kinnvall (2020) [1] emphasize that educational reform must respond to global crises such as climate change and pandemics by cultivating critical consciousness and moral imagination.

This theoretical synthesis aligns with constructivist and socio-cultural traditions, yet expands them by situating learning within digital ecosystems characterized by fluidity, uncertainty, and interdependence. Rethinking pedagogy thus entails designing learning systems that are human-centered, ethically grounded, and ecologically sustainable. It demands educators who are reflective practitioners—capable of navigating between innovation and empathy, data and meaning, global and local contexts.The reviewed literature collectively redefines pedagogy as a dynamic negotiation between technology, human development, and social responsibility. From the self-determination models of engagement (Chiu, 2022) [4, 5] to participatory co-design approaches (Brown, 2022; Frauenberger *et al*., 2019) [3, 8], from creative storytelling (Roth, 2021; Rahimi&Yadollahi, 2017) [15, 27] to ecological learning (Häggström& Schmidt, 2020) [15], scholars converge on a transformative vision of education. This vision transcends instrumental uses of technology, advocating for pedagogies that nurture critical thinking, empathy, creativity, and sustainability. In the digital age, pedagogy is not merely about mastering tools—it is about reimagining human potential in interconnected, ethically complex, and technologically mediated worlds.

Methodology

This paper adopts a theoretical and conceptual research design to explore the evolving nature of pedagogy in the digital age. As a theory-driven study, it synthesizes existing literature, philosophical arguments, and interdisciplinary perspectives to construct a comprehensive framework for rethinking pedagogical practices in digitally mediated educational environments. The methodology emphasizes a qualitative interpretive approach, focusing on critical reflection, comparative analysis, and conceptual integration of prior studies rather than empirical data collection or statistical testing.

The study involves a systematic literature review of contemporary works on digital pedagogy, educational psychology, human–computer interaction, and social learning theories (Darling-Hammond *et al*., 2020; Stephanidis *et al*., 2019; Chiu, 2022) [4, 5, 7, 32]. Selected theoretical contributions from diverse domains such as technology integration, self-determination theory, participatory learning, and institutional innovation in higher education (Hasanefendic *et al*., 2017; Brown, 2022; Saeed *et al*., 2022) [3, 17, 28] were critically examined to understand how digital transformations influence learner engagement, teacher identity, and institutional structures.

A thematic synthesis method was employed to identify recurring conceptual patterns and pedagogical challenges, aligning with the principles of interpretivism and constructivism. Through critical reading and discourse analysis, the paper contextualizes digital pedagogy within broader socio-cultural and philosophical frameworks (Peters *et al*., 2016; Wehn *et al*., 2018) [24, 36], thereby extending its theoretical significance beyond technology-centered discourse.

Objectives of the Study

- To critically examine the theoretical underpinnings of pedagogy in the digital age through interdisciplinary perspectives.
- To identify and synthesize the key conceptual shifts brought about by digital transformation in teaching and learning.

- To explore how emerging technologies and virtual environments reshape learner engagement, collaboration, and educational identity.
- To propose a conceptual framework for reimagining pedagogy as a dynamic, inclusive, and human-centered process in digital contexts.

This methodological orientation ensures a deep theoretical engagement with the evolving discourse on digital education while advancing scholarly understanding of pedagogy's future trajectories.

Discussion

The rethinking of pedagogy in the digital age requires a multidimensional approach that recognizes how technology, human interaction, and institutional structures collectively reshape education. The first objective—to critically examine the theoretical underpinnings of pedagogy in the digital age—highlights the transformation of learning environments into spaces of interaction, reflection, and creativity. Darling-Hammond *et al*. (2020) [7] emphasize that the science of learning underscores the significance of social-emotional development and cognitive flexibility, both of which are magnified in digital learning contexts. Similarly, Peters *et al*. (2016) [24] argue that academic knowledge production and dissemination have become decentralized, enabling new epistemic communities that challenge traditional hierarchies in teaching and learning.In addressing the second objective—to identify and synthesize conceptual shifts brought by digital transformation—it is evident that the boundaries between teacher and learner roles have blurred. Hasanefendic *et al*. (2017) [17] suggest that innovation in higher education often arises from individuals acting as change agents, fostering a culture of experimentation and adaptability. This shift aligns with Chiu's (2022) [4, 5] application of Self-Determination Theory (SDT), which posits that autonomy, competence, and relatedness drive motivation and engagement in digital learning environments. Thus, pedagogy in the digital era moves beyond the transmission of knowledge toward the co-construction of meaning through participatory and interactive modes (Brown, 2022) [3].

The third objective—to explore how emerging technologies reshape engagement and collaboration—reveals that digital platforms have redefined collective learning. Hacker *et al*. (2020) [14] found that web-conferencing technologies fostered "virtual togetherness" during the COVID-19 crisis, offering new possibilities for emotional connection and collaborative learning. Gravett and Ajjawi (2022) [12] extend this argument by emphasizing "belonging as situated practice," where digital engagement fosters inclusive communities through shared digital experiences. These insights suggest that technology-mediated pedagogy must account for affective, cognitive, and social dimensions of learning. The fourth objective—to propose a conceptual framework for human-centered pedagogy in digital contexts—calls for a reorientation of educational design toward ethics, inclusivity, and sustainability. Stephanidis *et al*. (2019) [32] argue that addressing grand challenges in human–computer interaction requires designing systems that prioritize accessibility, user experience, and cultural diversity. Similarly, Saeed *et al*. (2022) [28] connect workplace spirituality and agility to educational institutions, proposing that digital pedagogy should nurture values of empathy, adaptability, and shared purpose. In this way, digital pedagogy becomes not only a technological innovation but also a transformative practice rooted in human connection and critical reflection.

The discussion underscores that rethinking pedagogy in the digital age involves integrating humanistic, technological, and philosophical dimensions to cultivate meaningful, equitable, and future-ready learning ecosystems.

Major Finding

1. **Pedagogical Paradigm Shift:** The study reveals a fundamental transformation in pedagogy from teacher-centered instruction to learner-centered and participatory models, driven by digital interactivity and collaborative technologies (Darling-Hammond *et al*., 2020; Brown, 2022) [3, 7].

2. **Integration of Human and Technological Dimensions:** Effective digital pedagogy requires balancing technological innovation with human-centered values such as empathy, inclusivity, and ethical engagement (Stephanidis *et al*., 2019; Saeed *et al*., 2022) [28, 32].

3. **Reconceptualization of Teacher and Learner Roles** The digital age has blurred the hierarchical distinction between teacher and learner, promoting co-creation of knowledge and shared responsibility in the learning process (Hasanefendic *et al*., 2017; Peters *et al*., 2016) [17, 24].
4. **Enhanced Engagement through Virtual Collaboration:** The study identifies that digital platforms foster new forms of community and engagement, enabling "virtual togetherness" that strengthens emotional and social bonds among learners (Hacker *et al*., 2020; Gravett&Ajjawi, 2022) [12, 14].

5. **Motivation through Self-Determination Theory:** Applying the principles of Self-Determination Theory (SDT), digital learning environments support student motivation by enhancing autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Chiu, 2022; Chiu, Sun, &Ismailov, 2022) [4, 5].

6. **Institutional Innovation in Higher Education:** Innovation in pedagogy is often initiated by individual educators and institutional leaders who act as catalysts for digital transformation, promoting agility and adaptability within higher education systems (Hasanefendic *et al*., 2017) [17].

7. **Need for Ethical and Sustainable Pedagogical Frameworks:** The findings emphasize that future pedagogical models must integrate ethical design, accessibility, and sustainability to ensure that technological progress aligns with social and educational equity (Stephanidis *et al*., 2019; Wehn *et al*., 2018) [32, 36].

These findings collectively indicate that rethinking pedagogy in the digital age requires a synthesis of technological capability, humanistic values, and institutional adaptability to create inclusive and transformative learning ecosystems.

Conclusion

The theoretical exploration of pedagogy in the digital age underscores that education is undergoing a profound transformation—one that extends beyond technological integration to encompass philosophical, psychological, and social dimensions of learning. The synthesis of literature reveals that digital environments have redefined how knowledge is created, shared, and experienced. Pedagogy today is no longer confined to physical classrooms but is instead characterized by interactivity, collaboration, and learner autonomy (Darling-Hammond *et al*., 2020; Peters *et al*., 2016) [7, 24]. The convergence of technology and human values has created opportunities to make education more inclusive, participatory, and reflective, aligning with the principles of constructivism and social learning.

The study also demonstrates that effective digital pedagogy depends on the ability to balance innovation with empathy and ethics. As Hacker *et al*. (2020) [14] and Gravett and Ajjawi (2022) [12] note, virtual environments can cultivate belonging and togetherness, but only when designed with sensitivity to learners' cognitive, emotional, and social needs. Likewise, the application of self-determination theory (Chiu, 2022) [4, 5] suggests that motivation and engagement in online learning are best nurtured through autonomy, competence, and meaningful connection. Hence, pedagogy in the digital era must not only adopt new tools but also reimagine the purposes and values of education itself.

Future research should empirically test the conceptual propositions identified in this paper through mixed-method or longitudinal studies exploring the long-term effects of digital pedagogies on learning outcomes and well-being. There is also scope for investigating cross-cultural variations in digital pedagogy, particularly how socio-economic and infrastructural contexts influence technological adoption and learner experience. Moreover, exploring AI-driven personalization, immersive learning (AR/VR), and digital ethics can provide deeper insights into sustaining human-centered pedagogy in increasingly automated environments. The future of education lies in integrating technology responsibly—advancing innovation while preserving the essence of human learning and connection.

References

1. Agius C, Rosamond AB, Kinnvall C. Populism, Ontological Insecurity and Gendered Nationalism: Masculinity, Climate Denial and Covid-19. Politics, Religion & Ideology,2020:21(4):432–450. https://doi.org/10.1080/21567689.2020.1851871
2. Borras Jr, SM, Scoones I, Baviskar A, Edelman M, Peluso NL. *et al.* Climate change and agrarian struggles: an invitation to contribute to a JPS Forum. The Journal of Peasant Studies,2022:49(1):1–28. https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2021.1956473
3. Brown N. Scope and continuum of participatory research. International Journal of Research & Method in Education,2022:45(2):200–211. https://doi.org/10.1080/1743727X.2021.1902980
4. Chiu TKF. Applying the self-determination theory (SDT) to explain student engagement in online learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. Journal of Research on Technology in Education,2022:54(sup1):S14–S30. https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2021.1891998
5. Chiu TKF, Sun JC-Y, Ismailov M. Investigating the relationship of technology learning support to digital literacy from the perspective of self-determination theory. Educational Psychology,2022:42(10):1263–1282. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2022.2074966

6. Dal Falco F, Vassos S. Museum Experience Design: A Modern Storytelling Methodology. The Design Journal, 2017:20(sup1):S3975–S3983. https://doi.org/10.1080/14606925.2017.1352900
7. Darling-Hammond L, Flook L, Cook-Harvey C, Barron B, Osher D. Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. Applied Developmental Science,2020:24(2):97–140. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791
8. Frauenberger C, Spiel K, Makhaeva J. Thinking OutsideTheBox - Designing Smart Things with Autistic Children. International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction,2019:35(8):666–678. https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2018.1550177
9. Fuentes C, Sörum N. Agencing ethical consumers: smartphone apps and the socio-material reconfiguration of everyday life. Consumption Markets & Culture,2019:22(2):131–156. https://doi.org/10.1080/10253866.2018.1456428
10. Goodyear VA, Armour KM, Wood H. Young people and their engagement with health-related social media: new perspectives. Sport, Education and Society,2019a :24(7):673–688. https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2017.1423464
11. Goodyear VA, Armour KM, Wood H. Young people learning about health: the role of apps and wearable devices. Learning, Media and Technology,2019b:44(2):193–210. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2019.1539011
12. Gravett K, Ajjawi R. Belonging as situated practice. Studies in Higher Education,2022:47(7):1386–1396. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2021.1894118
13. Griffin AL, Robinson AC, Roth RE. Envisioning the future of cartographic research. International Journal of Cartography,2017:3(sup1):1–8. https://doi.org/10.1080/23729333.2017.1316466
14. Hacker J, vomBrocke J, Handali J, Otto M, Schneider J. Virtually in this together – how web-conferencing systems enabled a new virtual togetherness during the COVID-19 crisis. European Journal of Information Systems,2020:29(5):563–584. https://doi.org/10.1080/0960085X.2020.1814680
15. Häggström M, Schmidt C. Enhancing children's literacy and ecological literacy through critical place-based pedagogy. Environmental Education Research,2020:26(12):1729–1745. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2020.1812537
16. Harte D, Turner J, Williams A. Discourses of Enterprise in Hyperlocal Community News in the UK. Journalism Practice,2016:10(2):233–250. https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2015.1123109
17. Hasanefendic S, Birkholz JM, Horta H, van der Sijde P. Individuals in action: bringing about innovation in higher education. European Journal of Higher Education,2017:7(2):101–119. https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2017.1296367
18. Huang W, Looi C-K. A critical review of literature on "unplugged" pedagogies in K-12 computer science and computational thinking education. Computer Science Education,2021:31(1):83–111. https://doi.org/10.1080/08993408.2020.1789411
19. Kuntsman A, Rattle I. Towards a Paradigmatic Shift in Sustainability Studies: A Systematic Review of Peer Reviewed Literature and Future Agenda Setting to Consider Environmental (Un)sustainability of Digital Communication. Environmental Communication, 2019:13(5):567–581. https://doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2019.1596144
20. Leirhaug PE, MacPhail A. 'It's the other assessment that is the key': three Norwegian physical education teachers' engagement (or not) with assessment for learning. Sport, Education and Society,2015:20(5):624–640. https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2014.975113
21. Levrini O, Tasquier G, Branchetti L, Barelli E. Developing future-scaffolding skills through science education. International Journal of Science Education,2019:41(18):2647–2674. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2019.1693080
22. Macenaite M, Kosta E. Consent for processing children's personal data in the EU: following in US footsteps? Information & Communications Technology Law,2017:26(2):146–197. https://doi.org/10.1080/13600834.2017.1321096
23. Parsons S, Yuill N, Good J, Brosnan M. 'Whose agenda? Who knows best? Whose voice?' Co-creating a technology research roadmap with autism stakeholders. Disability & Society,2020:35(2):201–234. https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2019.1624152
24. Peters MA, Jandrić P, Irwin R, Locke K, Devine N, Heraud R. *et al*. Towards a philosophy of academic publishing. Educational Philosophy and Theory,2016:48(14):1401–1425. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2016.1240987
25. Rahimi M, Yadollahi S. Effects of offline vs. online digital storytelling on the development of EFL learners' literacy skills. Cogent Education,2017:4(1):1285531. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2017.1285531
26. Renold E. 'Feel what I feel': making da(r)ta with teen girls for creative activisms on how sexual violence matters. Journal of Gender Studies,2018:27(1):37–55. https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2017.1296352

27. Roth RE. Cartographic Design as Visual Storytelling: Synthesis and Review of Map-Based Narratives, Genres, and Tropes. The Cartographic Journal,2021:58(1):83–114. https://doi.org/10.1080/00087041.2019.1633103
28. Saeed I, Khan J, Zada M, Ullah R, Vega-Muñoz A, Contreras-Barraza N. *et al*. Towards Examining the Link Between Workplace Spirituality and Workforce Agility: Exploring Higher Educational Institutions. Psychology Research and Behavior Management,2022:15(null):31–49. https://doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S344651
29. Schiavio A, Biasutti M, Antonini Philippe R. Creative pedagogies in the time of pandemic: a case study with conservatory students. Music Education Research,2021:23(2):167–178. https://doi.org/10.1080/14613808.2021.1881054
30. Scott G, Rajabifard A. Sustainable development and geospatial information: a strategic framework for integrating a global policy agenda into national geospatial capabilities. Geo-Spatial Information Science,2017:20(2):59–76. https://doi.org/10.1080/10095020.2017.1325594
31. Simonse L, Albayrak A, Starre S. Patient journey method for integrated service design. Design for Health,2019:3(1):82–97. https://doi.org/10.1080/24735132.2019.1582741
32. Stephanidis C, Salvendy G, Antona M, Chen JYC, Dong J, Duffy VG. *et al*. Seven HCI Grand Challenges. International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction,2019:35(14):1229–1269. https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2019.1619259
33. Tsiligiris V, Bowyer D. Exploring the impact of 4IR on skills and personal qualities for future accountants: a proposed conceptual framework for university accounting education. Accounting Education,2021:30(6):621–649. https://doi.org/10.1080/09639284.2021.1938616
34. Vallejo C, Dooly M. Plurilingualism and translanguaging: emergent approaches and shared concerns. Introduction to the special issue. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism,2020:23(1):1–16. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1600469
35. Varea V, González-Calvo G, García-Monge A. Exploring the changes of physical education in the age of Covid-19. Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy,2022:27(1):32–42. https://doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2020.1861233
36. Wehn U, Collins K, Anema K, Basco-Carrera L, Lerebours A. Stakeholder engagement in water governance as social learning: lessons from practice. Water International,2018:43(1):34–59. https://doi.org/10.1080/02508060.2018.1403083
37. Williamson B. Silicon startup schools: technocracy, algorithmic imaginaries and venture philanthropy in corporate education reform. Critical Studies in Education,2018:59(2):218–236. https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2016.1186710