THE RESEARCH DIALOGUE
An Online Quarterly Multi-Disciplinary
Peer-Reviewed / Refereed Research Journal
ISSN: 2583-438X
© The Research Dialogue | Volume-05 | Issue-01 | April-2026
Available online at: https://theresearchdialogue.com/
DOI : https://doi.org/10.64880/theresearchdialogue.v5i1.37

Is Digital Learning Truly Inclusive? A Critical Examination

Prof. (Dr.) Vinod Kumar Kanvaria[1], Surabhi Verma[2]
[1]Professor, Department of Education, University of Delhi, Delhi, India
[2]M.Ed. Student, Department of Education, University of Delhi, Delhi, India
Email: vinodpr111@gmail.com, Email: verma.surabhi22@gmail.com

Abstract

Digital learning has become foundational to contemporary education and the production and consumption of knowledge in schools, media, the workplace, and everyday life. The most prominent issues of curricular digital education involve matters of access, infrastructure, language, disability, and design. In this article the assumption of technological neutrality supporting digital learning infrastructures (VLEs, LMSs, etc.) is questioned. These infrastructures are, it is argued, socio-technical infrastructures that either reproduce or reduce discrimination. Drawing on inclusive education, Science and Technology Studies (STS), Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and digital equity, inequalities in the provision of education are explored. Fourth, it analyses and discusses discrepancies in infrastructures, interfaces, languages and datafication in regards to education. Fifth, it highlights the 4Ps (Presence, Participation, Protection, Progress) framework as an approach for evaluation of inclusive digital learning environments. More broadly, the review discusses umbrella topics of multilingual scaffolding, accessibility, teacher mediation and the TPACK model, and ethical considerations of AI and data governance. The case studies of First Bell in Kerala, India and Aprendo en Casa in Peru illustrate that inclusive education requires a multimodal, low-bandwidth, and learner-centered approach that is firmly rooted in values of social justice and public interest design.

Keywords: Digital inclusion; Educational technology; Universal Design for Learning (UDL); Digital divide; Inclusive education

1. Introduction

The rise of online education changes education systems, and as global society transitions from physical schools to hybrid/remote learning, ensuring that these systems are designed for and support this social change becomes an issue of social justice (Selwyn, 2021). In India, the Ministry of Education's National Education Policy 2020 outlines how the role of technology in education can be transformative in access, equity and inclusion, but highlights the need to consider how technology can exacerbate the digital divide and unequal access to technology (Ministry of Education, 2020). Not value neutral tools, digital learning systems are structural forces that shape, constrain or expand the opportunities available to learners (Williamson, 2017). Without an intentional commitment to inclusion as the foundation of the design and construction of architectural projects, the default is often to secure existing social, economic and physical hierarchies (Eubanks, 2018; Benjamin, 2019). The design and construction of the digital learning landscape in its current form is a conditional path to inclusion, predicated on the alignment to the "public-interest" framework for the targeting of the most marginal learners (UNESCO, 2021). The present article is concerned with how inclusive digital learning systems can attenuate or reinforce educational inequalities based on their design, access, and infrastructure. The factors of inclusive pedagogy, accessibility and multilingualization as well as teacher mediation are discussed in regard to their impact on educational inequalities. Further ethical discussions around data policy, artificial intelligence/algorithmic systems, and social justice are also featured in the article, especially in terms of how public interest design can be used to ensure Presence, Participation, Protection and Progress of marginalized students.

2. The Design Fallacy: Inclusion is Not a Default

Technological neutrality is the idea that digital technologies are themselves neutral, that is, they do not have intrinsic and intrinsic values of their own. According to this view, whether a technology is good or a threat depends not on the technology itself, but on how humans use the technology. However, some more recent scholarship has challenged this presumption, particularly in relation to digital technologies which represent socio-political, cultural and ethical values through their design architectures (Ross & Collier, 2022). In an educational context, the fallacy leads to the mistaken assumption that simply providing an educational technology platform is sufficient in the pursuit for inclusion. Every design choice from the hardware requirements of an app to the data intensity of its interface implies assumptions that privilege some users and marginalize others. The literature on digital inequality also suggests that unequal access and design bias as well as the digital divide can easily reproduce inequalities rather than ameliorate

them, although most of the work has focused on education (Meng et al., 2024; Gottschalk & Weise, 2023).

2.1. The Critique of the Neutrality Myth

In the field of Science and Technology Studies (STS), the "technological neutrality myth" has also been increasingly viewed as an epistemological fallacy by which technical artifacts tend to be abstracted from the social, political, and economic contexts in which they are produced. Contemporary STS scholarship has argued that technical artifacts are active structural forces that shape social relations and reproduce existing power relations (e.g., Benjamin, 2019; Eubanks, 2018). Digital platforms, for example, tend to assume stable, high-speed internet access, thereby privileging those already connected and excluding other communities within the global digital divide (van Dijk, 2020).

The appearance of neutrality in technical systems can often act as a form of "ethics-washing" (Bietti, 2020); organizations often adopt ideals of fairness or standards of accessibility, without considering that the technical infrastructure is itself produced within systems of structural inequality. An example of this is the algorithm used by the Office of Qualifications and Examinations Regulation (Ofqual) in the United Kingdom during the COVID-19 pandemic, which presented a form of algorithmic neutrality but introduced class inequalities into education by disadvantaging students from relatively lower-income schools. Consequently, recent discussions of responsible or ethical technology advocate for value alignment, or the need for technology to be more aligned with well-being, social justice, and equality, rather than merely the efficient use of resources (Gabriel, 2020).

3. The Four-Part Test of Inclusive Education

In order to assess what works for inclusive design in education, inclusion needs to be understood beyond participation and accessibility, and in relation to equity and justice. The 4Ps (Presence, Participation, Protection and Progress) are proposed as a framework for thinking about inclusion in education (UNESCO, 2020). This focuses attention not just on accessibility but also on the structural conditions necessary to achieve equitable learning outcomes through the use of digital technology.

Dimension	**Definition in Inclusive Design**	**Architectural Responsibility**
Presence	The physical and digital access and continuity of all learners in learning environments.	Designing for low-bandwidth, offline-first functionality and device agnosticism.

Participation	The ability of students to have a voice, build relationships, and experience a sense of belonging.	Ensuring accessibility for learners with disabilities and providing diverse interaction modalities.
Protection	Safeguarding learners' rights, privacy, dignity, and psychological well-being.	Implementing strong security measures, data minimization practices, and transparent privacy policies.
Progress	Meaningful academic and social advancement tailored to individual learner needs and abilities.	Using context-sensitive AI and human-centered scaffolding to avoid "digital sorting" and exclusionary personalization.

In the context, inclusion is not considered merely as a remedy for "special needs" students. Inclusion becomes one of the organizing principles of the entire educational system. According to United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (2020): inclusive education requires the systematic removal of barriers that restrict the participation and achievement of learners. Likewise, the World Bank notes that inclusive education means creating systems and learning environments that provide equal access and meaningful learning opportunities for all students, particularly those who are disadvantaged because of poverty, disability, and other overlapping factors (World Bank, 2025).

4. Infrastructure as a Design Constraint

4.1. The Baseline Problem: The Widening Quality Gap

This "baseline problem" of digital inclusion has led to increased inequality in internet access and use in terms of quality, affordability, and reliability. In 2024, approximately 68% of the global population will be connected to the internet, with meaningful variation both between and within countries (International Telecommunication Union, 2024). A concern of inclusive design is that, as of 2023, approximately one-third of the world's population was completely offline, largely in low-income countries, and that connection quality may also be inequitable. According to the World Bank (2024), from 2023 to 2024, high-income economies saw broad increases in broadband speeds while many lower-middle-income economies continued to experience a slow and unstable internet experience.

This "speed inequality" has broad ramifications for EdTech. Many systems assume a wired infrastructure and multiple devices, often with the ability to stream media-heavy off-device

content. As a consequence, many EdTech systems designed today are architecturally exclusionary to learners in low-resourced or marginalized situations with unreliable, prohibitively expensive, or non-existent bandwidth (Hilbert, 2016; Warschauer & Matuchniak, 2010). However, inclusive digital learning systems must favor low-bandwidth, offline-first, and device-flexible infrastructures and interfaces instead of favoring usage among users with high levels of technological privilege.

4.2. Rural vs. Urban UI Paradigms in India

In India, despite overall rising digital penetration, the urban-rural divide still remains, and there is a disparity in tele density, internet penetration, and internet speed between urban and rural India (Telecom Regulatory Authority of India, 2025). This suggests the need for designers to move past the assumption of always-on broadband access and explore lower-bandwidth, asynchronous and device-agnostic learning systems.

Metric (2024–2025)	**Urban India**	**Rural India**
Mobile Penetration (Teledensity)	131.86%	58.48%
Internet Density	112.74%	44.85%
Urban–Rural Internet Divide	68% gap (plateaued)	—
Primary Access Technology	5G / Fiber / Mobile Data	4G Mobile / FWA

These infrastructure inequities also show that synchronous learning reliant on video conferencing may unintentionally exclude rural learners reliant on infrequent, and expensive, data access. Ensuring inclusive learning systems with "web-light" functionality, such as Aprendo en Casa (Muñoz-Najar et al., 2021), designed for low-connectivity environments is needed.

4.3. Device Ecologies and the “Shared-Device” Reality

Ethnographic studies of household-level uses of digital learning tools in India find mobile devices are more likely to be used when individual households do not have laptops and tablets (Arora, 2019). These uses can reproduce gendered and household power structures that limit women's access to shared devices.

Phenomenon	**Impact on Learning Design**	**Mitigation Strategy**
Asynchronous Gap	Students can only access the “father’s phone” after work hours.	Support offline downloads and delayed evening-sync capabilities.
Proxy User Phenomenon	Parents with limited digital literacy must navigate the platform for children.	Use icon-driven interfaces and voice prompts in local languages.

Time Poverty	Women and girls have reduced discretionary learning time due to domestic responsibilities.	Design short modular lessons completable in 10–15 minute intervals.

Such realities require systems built for asynchronous participation, offline access, and multi-user device architectures, ensuring learners who are not present live are not disenfranchised.

5. UDL and Scaffolding

Instructional design provides the architecture of the learning environment, the organization of the knowledge, and the way in which the learner interacts with the material. Inclusive education theorists argue that equity is incompatible with a 'one-size-fits-all' model of instruction, and it is necessary to move towards pedagogies that recognize diversity as a normal condition of learning (Rose & Meyer, 2002).

5.1. Universal Design for Learning (UDL)

The CAST model of Universal Design for Learning (UDL) is well-established as a model of inclusive education that can be implemented in everyday classroom practice (CAST, 2024). UDL represents flexible and barrier-free learning environments that can support students with a range of cognitive, sensory, language, and social learning needs. According to David H. Rose and Anne Meyer (2002), UDL is based on three main principles:

- **Multiple Means of Representation:** presenting information in multiple formats (e.g., text, audio, video, tactile, and visual) to effectively reach learners across the full range of sensory and cognitive profiles.
- **Multiple Means of Action and Expression:** allowing students to show what they know and can do through presentations, projects, performances, or digital portfolios.
- **Multiple Means of Engagement:** offering diverse learning pathways and choices that connect with learners' interests, motivations, and cultural backgrounds to strengthen participation and persistence.

Inclusive digital learning environments that employ UDL principles may be best achieved through the study of teacher education in UDL and the encouragement of learner-centered, multimodal pedagogies within their classrooms (Meyer et al., 2014). Studies of programs such as IMMAS (Interactive Mobile Multimedia Applications) have shown that teachers trained in UDL principles are better suited to design flexible, inclusive learning environments (Hanna & Daoust, 2014). In higher education and HyFlex (Hybrid-Flexible) learning environments, in particular, students

engaged in different modes must be provided with equivalent opportunities to engage in a learning experience (Beatty, 2019).

5.2. The Language Barrier: Beyond English Dominance

Language remains a central dimension of educational inclusion. The dominance of English-language digital content can marginalize learners from multilingual and indigenous communities. Recognizing this, Ministry of Education's National Education Policy 2020 advocates multilingual and mother-tongue-based education (Ministry of Education, 2020).

Feature	Design Implementation	Social Justice Impact
QR-Enabled Content	QR codes in textbooks connect learners to regional-language videos.	Bridges print-based and digital regional learning resources.
Bilingual Scaffolding	Side-by-side vocabulary banks and translation spaces.	Supports second-language transition while affirming learner identity.
Multilingual Dictionary	Digital dictionaries incorporating regional and tribal languages.	Validates indigenous knowledge and linguistic diversity.

Research suggests that multilingual scaffolding strengthens both participation and identity affirmation among marginalized learners (Mohanty, 2019).

5.3. Accessibility Standards: WCAG 2.2 as a Roadmap

Accessibility should be understood not merely as compliance but as a philosophy of inclusive educational design (World Wide Web Consortium, 2023). Effective accessibility frameworks must accommodate sensory, cognitive, and neurodiverse learning needs.

User Profile	Design Constraint	Inclusive Architectural Pattern
Dyslexia	Difficulty with dense text and inconsistent layouts.	Use left-aligned text, consistent formatting, and audio/video alternatives.
Dyscalculia	Stress from fractions, decimals, and countdowns.	Use simplified statistical language and avoid excessive timers.
Autism	Overstimulation from flashing visuals and complex layouts.	Use predictable layouts, plain language, and descriptive navigation buttons.
Low Vision	Difficulty reading low-contrast or small text.	Support high-contrast modes, adjustable fonts, and screen-reader compatible navigation.

Designing with these needs in mind reduces cognitive overload and ensures that neurodivergent learners are not structurally excluded from digital educational environments (Clark & Mayer, 2016).

6. The Human Element: Teacher Mediation

Technology does not close the education gap, and the benefits of technology are mediated through pedagogy, teacher agency, and teachers' subject knowledge (Selwyn, 2021). Digital learning infrastructures fail when they do not take teachers' preparedness, autonomy, and professionalism into account. Consequently, some researchers have argued that for educational technology to enact meaningful change, teachers must engage and critically integrate technology into their teaching practice (Mishra & Koehler, 2006).

6.1. The TPACK Necessity

The Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) framework developed by Punya Mishra and Matthew J. Koehler has become one of the key frameworks in the field of digital education (Mishra & Koehler, 2006). TPACK posits that successful digital education requires not just technical know-how, but an intrinsic interplay of the interrelated domains of technology, pedagogy, and content knowledge.

Knowledge Domain	**Description in Inclusive Digital Pedagogy**
Pedagogical	Mastery of learner-centered approaches such as UDL and interactive learning strategies.
Content	Deep understanding of subject matter and the ability to adapt it for diverse learners.
Sustainable Professionalism	Capacity to reflect critically on technological change and lead ethical educational innovation.

International research from multiple settings in Europe and Mongolia suggest that there is a "policy-practice gap" between teachers' pedagogical knowledge and their limited training in accessible/inclusive digital technologies (Redecker, 2017). Digital transformation in education is more likely when teachers are participants in "sustainable professionalism" engaged as reflective practitioners, innovators, and creators rather than passive consumers of edtech (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012).

6.2. Scaling Competency vs. Mass Training

Many teacher education programs promote technical teacher professional development over pedagogical transformation (Selwyn, 2021). Teacher development programs must move away from short-term technical development programs to pedagogical development programs to support more equitable digital education.

Professional development should therefore be:

- **Differentiated:** recognizing that teachers at different points in their careers need different types of support.
- **Sustained:** long-term collaboration between teams with peer learning and continuing professional development rather than occasional workshops.
- **Context-Sensitive:** addressing the specific infrastructural and institutional realities of schools and communities.

Programs such as IMMAS (Interactive Mobile Multimedia Applications), among others, highlight the importance of supporting educators as they transition from passive technology users to active mentors and facilitators within inclusive learning communities, contributing to the establishment of sustainable learning ecosystems that embrace learner diversity and equitable participation (UNESCO, 2021).

7. Case Studies in Design Philosophy: Multimodal Success in Kerala and Peru

The most inclusive approaches to providing digital learning in times of crisis have often been those that combined a variety of digital and analog communication technologies through multimodal delivery systems (UNESCO, 2021). Successful approaches have often employed a mix of television, radio, print material and mobile content as well as high bandwidth internet-based platforms.

7.1. First Bell (Kerala, India)

Due to COVID-19 lockdown, the state of Kerala, despite being more advanced on the technology infrastructure side with a good pool of free software solutions, implemented its learning program named First Bell on KITE, by broadcasting lessons through television and radio through KITE Victers channel targeting students with poor Internet connectivity, lack of a digital gadget or neither (KITE, 2020). In this way, 'presence' in education was not synonymous with the household income of the students or their access to technology, and the use of channels for broadcasting and digital learning materials reduced exclusion for disadvantaged or remote learners.

7.2. Aprendo en Casa (Peru)

Peru's Aprendo en Casa ('I Learn at Home') was established likewise as an emergency response to the closure of in-person learning, within days of the implementation of lockdown. The program aligned all modes of distance learning with the national curriculum and took a multimodal approach comprised of television, radio, internet and print (Muñoz-Najar et al., 2021). The platform also uses "web-light" technologies, which makes it feasible for learners to take advantage of the platform in low-bandwidth scenarios.

A central part of the program was its linguistic accessibility: educational radio programs were translated into a range of indigenous languages for use in classrooms in areas with high populations of non-Spanish speakers, which had previously been a point of technological and educational exclusion (UNICEF, 2021). However, some more remote rural areas had no access to radio broadcasts. This calls attention to the need for multimodal educational systems to address structural inequity, rather than assume that access to new ed-tech for broadcast delivery guarantees access.

These case studies offer a model that values flexibility, multimodal access, and attention to the lived experience of marginalized students over mere technological sophistication in inclusive design.

8. Conclusion

Digital education is not a magic bullet for solving the education crisis; it is a contingent remedy that is capable of either reducing or exacerbating social inequalities. Access and inclusion, through technology, should not be incidental or an afterthought, but should be an intentional result of socially just design decisions.

Above all, accessibility and language need to be treated as core infrastructure. Platforms that are designed to be accessible and multilingual from the beginning need to ensure that accessibility standards and multilingual support are considered and applied by default.

Second, infrastructure constraints should be part of educational system design, and low-bandwidth, "rural-first" approaches that incorporate scenarios like device sharing, variable internet connectivity, and asynchronous learning would address real needs among disenfranchised populations.

Third, focus on ethical stewardship of AI and data, including algorithmic transparency, data stewardship and protections, and meaningful human oversight, to safeguard learner privacy, dignity, and agency, and avoid "ethics-washing" to maintain trustworthy AI for learning.

Furthermore, technology can be used to support the human element of inclusion. Frameworks such as TPACK and the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) framework illustrate that technology is supportive when teachers are empowered in a flexible, learner centered pedagogy.

Indeed, digital learning ecosystems should be assessed by how well they help enable Presence, Participation, Protection and Progress for all learners, especially those who are most marginalized, rather than by how new or widely used they are.

References

- Arora, P. (2019). *The next billion users: Digital life beyond the West*. Harvard University Press.
- Beatty, B. J. (2019). *Hybrid-flexible course design: Implementing student-directed hybrid classes*. EdTech Books.
- Benjamin, R. (2019). *Race after technology: Abolitionist tools for the new Jim code*. Polity.
- Bietti, E. (2020). From ethics washing to ethics bashing: A view on tech ethics from within moral philosophy. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (pp. 210–219). Association for Computing Machinery. https://doi.org/10.1145/3351095.3372860
- Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2016). *Index for inclusion: Developing learning and participation in schools* (4th ed.). Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education.
- CAST. (2024). *Universal Design for Learning guidelines version 3.0*. https://udlguidelines.cast.org
- Clark, R. C., & Mayer, R. E. (2016). *E-learning and the science of instruction: Proven guidelines for consumers and designers of multimedia learning* (4th ed.). Wiley.
- Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor*. St. Martin's Press.
- Gabriel, I. (2020). Artificial intelligence, values, and alignment. *Minds and Machines, 30*(3), 411–437. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-020-09539-2
- Gottschalk, F., & Weise, C. (2023). *Digital equity and inclusion in education: An overview of practice and policy in OECD countries* (OECD Education Working Paper No. 299). OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/7cb15030-en
- Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2012). *Professional capital: Transforming teaching in every school*. Teachers College Press.
- Hilbert, M. (2016). The bad news is that the digital access divide is here to stay: Domestically installed bandwidths among 172 countries for 1986–2014. *Telecommunications Policy, 40*(6), 567–581. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.telpol.2016.01.006
- International Telecommunication Union. (2024). *Facts and figures 2024: Measuring digital development*. ITU.
- Ross, J. N., & Collier, D. R. (2022). The power behind the screen: Educating competent technology users in the age of digitized inequality. *Telematics and Informatics Reports, 8*, Article 100024. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.teler.2022.100024
- Kerala Infrastructure and Technology for Education. (2020). *First Bell educational initiative report*. Government of Kerala.
- Meng, Y., Xu, W., Liu, Z.-Q., & Yu, Z.-G. (2024). Scientometric analyses of digital inequity in education: Problems and solutions. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 11*, Article 1052. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03480-w

- Meyer, A., Rose, D. H., & Gordon, D. (2014). *Universal Design for Learning: Theory and practice*. CAST Professional Publishing.
- Ministry of Education. (2020). *National Education Policy 2020*. Government of India.
- Mohanty, A. K. (2019). *The multilingual reality: Living with languages*. Multilingual Matters.
- Muñoz-Najar, A., Gilberto, A., Hasan, A., Cobo, C., Azevedo, J. P., & Akmal, M. (2021). *Remote learning during COVID-19: Lessons from today, principles for tomorrow*. World Bank.
- Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. *Teachers College Record, 108*(6), 1017–1054. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2006.00684.x
- Redecker, C. (2017). *European framework for the digital competence of educators: DigCompEdu*. Publications Office of the European Union. https://doi.org/10.2760/159770
- Rose, D. H., & Meyer, A. (2002). *Teaching every student in the digital age: Universal Design for Learning*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Selwyn, N. (2021). *Education and technology: Key issues and debates* (3rd ed.). Bloomsbury Academic.
- Telecom Regulatory Authority of India. (2025). *The Indian telecom services performance indicators*. TRAI.
- United Nations Children's Fund. (2021). *Remote learning and indigenous language inclusion in Latin America*. UNICEF.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2020). *Global education monitoring report 2020: Inclusion and education—All means all*. UNESCO Publishing.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2021). *Education in a post-COVID world: Nine ideas for public action*. UNESCO Publishing.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2021). *Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education*. UNESCO Publishing.
- van Dijk, J. (2020). *The digital divide*. Polity.
- 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
- Williamson, B. (2017). *Big data in education: The digital future of learning, policy and practice*. SAGE.
- Williamson, B., & Eynon, R. (2020). Historical threads, missing links, and future directions in AI in education. *Learning, Media and Technology, 45*(3), 223–235. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2020.1798995
- World Bank. (2024). *Digital progress and trends report 2024*. World Bank.

- World Bank. (2025, March 31). *Inclusive education.* https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/education/brief/inclusive-education
- World Wide Web Consortium. (2023). *Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 2.2*. W3C.

Cite this Article:

Prof. (Dr.) Vinod Kumar Kanvaria[1], Surabhi Verma[2], "Is Digital Learning Truly Inclusive? A Critical Examination" The Research Dialogue, Open Access Peer-reviewed & Refereed Journal, Pp-303–315, Volume-05, Issue-01, April-2026, https://theresearchdialogue.com/

CERTIFICATE

of Publication

This Certificate is proudly presented to

Prof. (Dr.) Vinod Kumar Kanvaria, Surabhi Verma

For publication of Research Paper title

Is Digital Learning Truly Inclusive? A Critical Examination

Published in 'The Research Dialogue' Peer-Reviewed / Refereed Research Journal and E-ISSN: 2583-438X, Volume-05, Issue-01, Month April, Year-2026, Impact Factor (RPRI-4.73)

Dr. Lohans Kumar Kalyani
Editor- In-chief

Dr. Neeraj Yadav
Executive-In-Chief- Editor

Note: This E-Certificate is valid with published paper and the paper must be available online at: https://theresearchdialogue.com/

DOI : https://doi.org/10.64880/theresearchdialogue.v5i1.37