

Digital Citizenship and SDG 4: Reimagining Quality Education in India in the Post-Pandemic Era

Dr. Bhupinder Singh*

Associate Professor Commerce, College of Vocational Studies, University of Delhi, Delhi, India.

*Corresponding Author: singhbhupinder3@rediffmail.com

Citation: Singh, B. (2026). Digital Citizenship and SDG 4: Reimagining Quality Education in India in the Post-Pandemic Era. International Journal of Education, Modern Management, Applied Science & Social Science, 08(03(I)), 01–10. [https://doi.org/10.62823/IJEMMASSS/8.3\(I\).9195](https://doi.org/10.62823/IJEMMASSS/8.3(I).9195)

ABSTRACT

The COVID-19 pandemic triggered unprecedented disruptions in global education systems, exposing deep structural inequalities and accelerating the shift toward digital learning. In this context, digital citizenship has emerged as a critical framework for advancing Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4), which emphasises inclusive, equitable, and quality education. This study examines how digital citizenship is conceptualised and integrated within global and national education policies in the post-pandemic era. Adopting a qualitative and exploratory design, the research employs document analysis of policy reports, academic literature, and institutional frameworks published between 2020 and 2025. The findings reveal that while digital citizenship is increasingly recognised in policy discourse, its implementation remains fragmented and disproportionately focused on technical skills rather than ethical, civic, and critical dimensions. Persistent challenges such as the digital divide, limited teacher preparedness, and contextual disparities continue to hinder equitable integration. The study further identifies a gap between policy intent and measurable outcomes, particularly due to the lack of robust indicators to capture digital competencies within the SDG 4 framework. It concludes that effective integration of digital citizenship requires competency-driven curricula, strengthened teacher capacity, and context-sensitive policy design to ensure meaningful and inclusive educational transformation.

Keywords: Digital Citizenship, SDG 4, Post-COVID Education, Digital Divide, Educational Policy, Digital Equity.

Introduction

What happens to a generation of learners when classrooms close, teachers and peers become distant, and education pivots overnight to screens and home environments? This question, once theoretical, became reality for more than 1.5 billion students worldwide during the COVID-19 pandemic, which triggered the most significant disruption to education in modern times. As the world seeks to recover, urgent questions arise: How can education systems become more resilient? What role does quality education play in building a sustainable future? Amid this upheaval, the concept of digital citizenship emerged not just as relevant but as essential. As education systems strive to adapt to the post-COVID era, integrating digital citizenship into learning frameworks could accelerate progress toward Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4), which envisions inclusive, equitable, and quality education for all.

Background and Global Context

Digital citizenship refers to the ability to engage responsibly, ethically, and effectively in digital environments. It encompasses a range of competencies, including digital literacy, online safety, ethical

use of information, and civic engagement through digital tools (Ribble, 2011). As digital technology becomes increasingly embedded in everyday life, particularly in educational settings, fostering digital citizenship is critical to preparing learners for active participation in knowledge economies and democratic societies (OECD, 2021).

The COVID-19 pandemic fundamentally transformed the global education landscape. At the height of the crisis, over 90% of the world's enrolled learners—more than 1.6 billion students across 190 countries—were affected by school closures, spanning all levels from pre-primary to higher education. The sudden shift to remote and online learning exposed and deepened longstanding inequalities, with millions lacking access to digital devices, reliable internet, or supportive home environments. UNESCO reported that 826 million students lacked a computer at home and 706 million lacked internet connectivity, with the most severe deficits in low-income and rural regions. These disparities widened existing educational divides and

Relevance of SDG 4 in the Post-COVID World

Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4) aims to “ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all” by 2030. In the aftermath of COVID-19, the urgency of SDG 4 has grown. The pandemic's impact on SDG 4 targets has been profound. Learning continuity was disrupted, especially at pre-primary and primary levels, and the digital divide became a major obstacle to equitable access. The crisis highlighted the importance of digital skills, which are explicitly recognised in SDG 4.4, but also underscored the risks of leaving the most vulnerable behind. Analyses indicate that the gap between educational “haves” and “have-nots” will likely widen unless targeted interventions are adopted. In many countries, particularly in the Global South, deficits in digital infrastructure, teacher training, and resource allocation have slowed recovery and deepened inequalities.

Despite these challenges, the post-pandemic period offers a strategic opportunity to reimagine education in line with SDG 4 principles:

- Investing in digital infrastructure to ensure all students have access to remote and blended learning options.
- Strengthening teacher capacity for digital pedagogy and inclusive practices.
- Prioritising mental health and well-being as integral components of educational recovery.
- Developing flexible, resilient curricula that can adapt to changing circumstances and diverse learner needs.

The Rise of Digital Citizenship in Education

Digital citizenship has gained significant traction in global education discourse, particularly in the aftermath of the pandemic. Defined by ISTE (2022) as the “responsible and ethical use of technology to engage in society, politics, and education,” digital citizenship involves more than technical skills; it includes awareness of one's digital footprint, the ability to discern credible information, and the ethical use of technology to contribute positively to society.

The rapid digitalization of education during and after the pandemic has brought the concept of digital citizenship to the forefront of educational discourse. The launch of the European Year of Digital Citizenship Education 2025 by the Council of Europe exemplifies the growing recognition of digital citizenship as a core educational priority. This initiative aims to equip learners of all ages with the competencies needed to thrive in a digitally connected society, addressing challenges such as disinformation, cyberbullying, online privacy, and the responsible use of emerging technologies. Digital citizenship education extends beyond technical skills; it encompasses values, attitudes, and knowledge that empower individuals to participate actively and ethically in both online and offline communities.

In the post-COVID context, the rise of digital citizenship is both a response to and a driver of educational transformation. The pandemic accelerated the adoption of digital tools and platforms, making digital literacy and citizenship essential for learning continuity and participation. However, it also exposed gaps in digital access, safety, and preparedness, particularly among disadvantaged groups. National governments have also begun integrating digital citizenship into curricula—for instance, India's National Education Policy 2020 includes digital literacy as a foundational skill, and the EU has embedded digital competence in its DigComp framework (Carretero et al., 2017).

Literature Review

The Framework of Sustainable Development Goal 4

According to Unterhalter (2019), SDG 4 represents a significant evolution from previous global education goals, such as Education for All (EFA) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), by explicitly addressing equity, inclusion, and quality dimensions often overlooked in earlier frameworks. She emphasises that SDG 4 requires not only access to education but also a transformation in the structures, values, and pedagogical approaches of education systems.

Tikly (2017) reinforces this view, arguing that SDG 4 embodies a human capabilities approach, which calls for education systems that support learners' agency and well-being beyond traditional academic outcomes.

According to Srivastava and Noronha (2016), the inclusion of targets such as education for sustainable development (Target 4.7) reflects a normative shift towards preparing learners as responsible global citizens. This has implications for curriculum design, teacher training, and education governance. However, they also note that the broad, aspirational scope of the targets makes them difficult to measure and implement, particularly in resource-constrained settings.

McGrath and Powell (2016) caution that the global indicators for monitoring progress may not capture localised education needs, especially in the Global South. They argue for a more contextualised and participatory approach to assessing progress, which considers regional disparities, informal education pathways, and the socio-political determinants of learning outcomes. Similarly, Aikman, Halai, and Rubagiza (2011) highlight how gender, poverty, and language barriers continue to marginalise learners despite formal commitments to SDG 4, calling for intersectional frameworks that address overlapping inequalities in educational access and experience.

Schleicher (2020) notes that technology can be a powerful enabler of inclusive and equitable learning, but only if issues of access, teacher preparedness, and digital pedagogy are adequately addressed. The COVID-19 pandemic, in particular, has heightened awareness of the digital divide and its implications for the realisation of SDG 4 targets (Reimers & Schleicher, 2020).

Conceptual Foundations of Digital Citizenship

Heath (2018) defines critical digital citizenship as the intersection of technological proficiency, ethical responsibility, and civic engagement. This reconceptualisation reflects a shift from viewing digital users as passive recipients of information to recognising them as active, responsible participants in digital societies.

Contemporary scholarship emphasises multi-dimensional frameworks. Lee, Blanchard, and Williams (2021) proposed a model that integrates digital access, behavioural norms, civic participation, and global awareness. Their research underscores that effective digital citizenship is not only about navigating digital tools but also about contributing to democratic processes and engaging in socially responsible behaviour. This aligns with recent calls for "civic digital literacies", which advocate for equipping learners with the skills to both critique and participate in digital cultures (Barrett & Barnes, 2022).

Ethical engagement is another critical element. Scholars such as Camacho and Legare (2021) argue that digital citizenship education must include moral reasoning and awareness of social justice issues related to technology use, including data privacy, misinformation, and digital discrimination. Ahn et al. (2021) examined how adolescents interpret news and online content, finding that digital citizenship education must prioritise critical thinking and the ability to discern trustworthy sources. These findings are echoed by Livingstone and Third (2020), who emphasise the need for education systems to address young people's digital rights and agency while also protecting them from online harm.

Despite these conceptual advancements, challenges remain. A study by Choi, Glassman, and Cristol (2022) found inconsistencies in how digital citizenship is implemented across educational contexts, particularly in under-resourced schools. They advocate for context-sensitive frameworks that account for socio-economic and cultural diversity while ensuring equity in digital participation.

According to Pangrazio and Selwyn (2021), the increased reliance on digital platforms for learning and communication demands a rethinking of how schools prepare students to navigate digital spaces ethically and effectively. They emphasise that digital citizenship should be embedded across subjects, rather than treated as a standalone module.

Educational Disruptions and Digital Shifts Post-Pandemic

The COVID-19 pandemic triggered one of the most profound disruptions in the history of global education. With school closures affecting more than 1.6 billion learners at its peak, education systems worldwide were forced to transition rapidly to digital and remote learning (Pokhrel & Chhetri, 2021). This sudden shift exposed significant disparities in infrastructure, access, and digital preparedness, while simultaneously catalysing a transformation in pedagogical approaches and the delivery of education.

A recurring theme in recent literature is the deepening of educational inequalities during the pandemic. According to Dorn et al. (2020), students from low-income households faced greater learning losses due to limited access to internet connectivity, devices, and supportive home learning environments. Similarly, a comparative study by König, Jäger-Biela, and Glutsch (2020) found that many teachers were unprepared for the pedagogical and technical demands of digital instruction, particularly in under-resourced school systems. These studies highlight that the pandemic did not just expose digital divides—it exacerbated them.

At the same time, the crisis pushed educational institutions to adopt technology-enhanced learning at an unprecedented scale. Hodges et al. (2020) distinguish between traditional online learning and the “emergency remote teaching” (ERT) approach adopted during the pandemic, noting that the latter lacked careful instructional design and was often reactive. Nevertheless, the widespread use of video conferencing platforms, digital assessment tools, and online collaboration systems created momentum for the long-term integration of digital technologies in education.

The post-pandemic recovery period has seen efforts to shift from emergency solutions to more sustainable and equitable digital learning ecosystems. Bond et al. (2021) emphasise the need for pedagogical innovation, including blended and hybrid learning models that combine face-to-face and online instruction to improve flexibility and resilience. These approaches are increasingly being supported by policies that integrate digital literacy and citizenship into national curricula (Zhao et al., 2022).

Another emerging area is the psychosocial impact of remote learning. Studies report increased levels of student anxiety, disengagement, and digital fatigue (Aucejo et al., 2020; Daniella et al., 2023). These findings underscore the importance of social and emotional learning (SEL) in digital education, particularly in maintaining student well-being and motivation in virtual settings.

The pandemic also spurred innovation in teacher professional development. Trust and Whalen (2020) found that peer collaboration and digital communities of practice played a crucial role in helping teachers adapt. However, they argue that systemic support and training are essential to sustain educators' long-term digital competence.

In conclusion, the post-pandemic educational landscape is characterised by both challenges and opportunities. While the shift to digital learning revealed structural inequities and capacity gaps, it also provided a unique opportunity to reimagine education for the 21st century—centring flexibility, equity, digital competence, and emotional well-being as core principles for future-ready learning environments.

UNESCO, OECD, and National Approaches to Digital Citizenship

In the aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic, digital citizenship has emerged as a global educational priority. International organisations such as UNESCO and the OECD have played instrumental roles in shaping digital citizenship frameworks, while national governments have begun adopting varied policy approaches tailored to local contexts. From 2020 to 2025, academic scholarship has examined these efforts, focusing on inclusivity, digital equity, and the need for ethical digital engagement.

UNESCO's post-pandemic agenda places digital literacy and citizenship at the heart of quality education. According to Shah and Lister (2022), UNESCO emphasises a human rights-based approach, in which digital participation is framed not only in terms of skills but also in relation to freedom of expression, online safety, and cultural inclusion. The organisation's *Futures of Education* report (UNESCO, 2021) highlights the need for curricula that foster ethical reasoning, civic engagement, and critical media literacy in digital contexts. Scholars have noted that UNESCO's global frameworks offer a values-based model of digital citizenship that can guide curriculum reform and teacher training across diverse education systems (Manca et al., 2022).

The OECD's Learning Compass 2030 also reinforces the importance of digital competencies, particularly through the lens of lifelong learning and future-readiness. As noted by Zhang and Zhu (2021), the OECD views digital citizenship not merely as a set of technical skills but as a composite of knowledge, attitudes, and values necessary for participating in democratic societies. The Learning Compass framework includes digital literacy, responsibility, and civic engagement as core elements. This conceptualisation has influenced policy conversations in several OECD member countries, prompting reforms in both primary and secondary education.

At the national level, countries have adopted diverse strategies to embed digital citizenship into education systems. In the European Union, the DigComp 2.2 framework offers a comprehensive structure for evaluating digital competence, including safety, communication, and problem-solving skills (Carretero et al., 2022). According to Kampylis and Punie (2020), EU nations have used this framework to develop national digital education strategies, although implementation remains uneven due to disparities in teacher training and digital infrastructure.

In the Asia-Pacific region, national responses have shown both promise and limitations. India's National Education Policy (NEP) 2020 emphasises digital literacy as a foundational skill, while countries such as South Korea and Singapore have embedded cyber wellness and digital ethics into their K–12 curricula (Lee et al., 2021). However, gaps remain in translating policy into practice.

Manca et al. (2022) argue that while global frameworks provide guidance, successful implementation requires adaptation to socio-cultural and linguistic contexts. They advocate for participatory approaches that involve students, teachers, and communities in the co-creation of digital citizenship curricula.

Gaps in Literature: Digital Literacy and Equity

While digital literacy has become a central theme in global education policy post-COVID-19, recent scholarly work reveals persistent gaps in research and practice regarding digital equity, particularly in low-resource settings and among marginalised populations. Between 2020 and 2025, the urgency of integrating digital skills into formal education has grown—but the literature points to unresolved challenges around inclusivity, infrastructure, pedagogical readiness, and culturally responsive practices.

First, the digital divide remains a significant barrier to equitable education outcomes. Although digital literacy is often promoted as a universal competency, access to the internet, devices, and safe digital environments remains highly unequal across socio-economic, geographic, and gender lines (Hohlfeld et al., 2021). According to Warschauer et al. (2021), much of the existing literature focuses on access-related divides (first-level digital divide), while insufficient attention is paid to second- and third-level divides—differences in how people use technology and the outcomes they derive from it.

A major critique in the literature is that digital literacy frameworks are often decontextualised and skewed toward Western pedagogical models. Jandrić et al. (2021) argue that dominant frameworks do not adequately address the socio-cultural and linguistic realities of learners in the Global South. For instance, while students in urban centres may engage in critical digital practices, learners in rural or underserved areas are often limited to passive consumption due to both infrastructural constraints and a lack of context-sensitive curricula.

In addition, gendered inequities persist in digital literacy education. According to the findings of Alvi and Gillani (2022), female students in conservative or low-income communities face additional barriers such as social norms, digital surveillance, and limited digital autonomy. Despite global recognition of these challenges, mainstream digital literacy research lacks intersectional analysis that considers how gender, class, and ethnicity intersect to shape digital access and competence.

Another gap concerns teacher preparedness and professional development. Many studies, such as that by Laufer and Barak (2021), reveal that teachers themselves lack confidence and training in applying digital literacy pedagogies, particularly in primary and secondary education. While efforts to integrate digital literacy into teacher education have increased post-pandemic, the literature points to fragmented implementation and weak alignment between policy and practice (Pettersson, 2022).

Moreover, there is a lack of longitudinal and impact-focused studies on digital literacy initiatives. Most existing research examines short-term interventions without assessing the sustained impact of digital literacy programs on learners' educational and social mobility (Hohlfeld et al., 2021). There is also minimal research linking digital literacy education directly to SDG 4 outcomes in vulnerable populations.

In conclusion, although digital literacy is acknowledged as a pillar of 21st-century learning, scholarly literature from 2020–2025 indicates significant gaps in addressing equity, context relevance, and long-term impact. Future research must adopt inclusive, intersectional, and locally grounded approaches to close these gaps and make digital literacy truly transformative for all.

Research Objectives

- To examine how digital citizenship is conceptualised and integrated within global and national education policy frameworks in the context of Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4).
- To analyse the role of digital citizenship in promoting inclusive, equitable, and quality education in the post-pandemic era.
- To identify key challenges and best practices in implementing digital citizenship education, particularly in low-resource and marginalised educational settings.

Findings and Discussion

• Integration of Digital Citizenship in National Education Policies

Research shows that digital citizenship is being embedded through curriculum standards, teacher training, and policy frameworks, although the depth and breadth of integration vary significantly by context (Choi, 2016; Kara, 2018). India's National Education Policy 2020 includes digital literacy as a foundational skill and emphasises responsible use of technology across the school and higher education sectors (Chopra & Singh, 2022). Similarly, South Korea has established a national curriculum framework that promotes cyber wellness, covering digital ethics, online behaviour, and security in formal education (Lee et al., 2021). In Turkey, digital citizenship is explicitly included in the national curriculum, with a focus on responsible technology use, online safety, and digital rights (Öztürk, 2021). Similarly, Australia's Digital Technologies curriculum and the United States' Common Core State Standards both address aspects of digital citizenship, albeit with differing emphases on critical thinking, digital literacy, and civic participation (Choi, 2016).

While some countries have comprehensive frameworks, others address digital citizenship in fragmented or ad hoc ways, often as a response to emerging challenges such as cyberbullying or misinformation (Al-Abdullatif & Gameil, 2020). In many low- and middle-income countries, policy documents mention digital skills but lack clear operational strategies for integrating them into teacher training, assessment, or classroom instruction (Manca et al., 2022).

• The Role of Digital Tools in Promoting Access and Inclusion

Digital technologies have played a transformative role in expanding educational access and promoting inclusion, especially in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic. The shift to online and blended learning modalities accelerated the adoption of digital platforms, open educational resources, and assistive technologies, enabling more inclusive participation for learners from diverse backgrounds (Saputra & Siddiq, 2020). In contexts with adequate infrastructure, these tools were instrumental in sustaining education during prolonged school closures, supporting students who might otherwise have been excluded due to geographical remoteness or physical disabilities (Bond et al., 2021). Research indicates that digital tools can help bridge gaps for students with disabilities, linguistic minorities, and those in remote or underserved areas by providing flexible, personalised, and accessible learning experiences (Prasetivo et al., 2023). Moreover, digital tools support collaborative learning and foster global connections, enabling students to engage in cross-cultural exchanges and civic projects beyond their immediate environments (Atif & Chou, 2018).

However, the data also suggest that mere availability of digital tools does not automatically ensure inclusion. Successful cases typically involved intentional instructional design and support mechanisms. By contrast, in many low-income settings, digital tools were underutilised due to a lack of devices, connectivity, and digital content in local languages (Chaudhary & Bhattacharya, 2023). Furthermore, studies show that female students and learners from marginalised communities faced additional socio-cultural and economic barriers in accessing digital education (Alvi & Gillani, 2022). The findings suggest that while digital tools have the potential to enhance inclusion, their impact is mediated by structural and contextual factors.

• Challenges in Equitable Implementation (Urban-Rural Divide, Infrastructure Gaps)

Studies across Sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia, and parts of Latin America report that rural schools frequently lack electricity, internet connectivity, and digital devices (Warschauer et al., 2021).

Even when infrastructure is in place, teachers often lack the training to effectively integrate digital citizenship concepts into their teaching practices (Pettersson, 2022). A study by Laufer and Barak (2021) highlights that a lack of pedagogical support leads to a superficial adoption of technology, where digital tools are used for content delivery rather than for participatory, citizenship-oriented learning.

Language and cultural relevance further complicate equitable implementation. Curricula and resources are often developed in dominant languages and reflect urban-centric worldviews, marginalising indigenous knowledge systems and linguistic minorities (Jandrić et al., 2021). These systemic issues require targeted policy interventions that go beyond infrastructure to address social, cultural, and pedagogical inclusion.

• **Comparative Insights from Global Case Studies**

Comparative analysis reveals significant variation in how countries conceptualise and operationalise digital citizenship. In high-income countries such as Canada and New Zealand, digital citizenship is framed as part of a broader citizenship education agenda, encompassing digital ethics, critical media literacy, and civic participation (Barrett & Barnes, 2022). Curriculum documents in these contexts often include specific learning outcomes related to evaluating online sources, managing digital identity, and engaging respectfully in online dialogue. In contrast, middle-income countries such as Brazil and South Africa tend to focus on digital access and literacy, with less emphasis on civic and ethical dimensions. While efforts are underway to expand this scope, the lack of institutional capacity and teacher training poses significant constraints (Subramanian, 2023).

In contrast, research from Indonesia and Malaysia shows that while digital citizenship is recognised as important, implementation is often hampered by resource constraints, fragmented curricula, and limited teacher expertise (Saputra & Siddiq, 2020; Prasetyo et al., 2023). These case studies underscore the importance of context-sensitive strategies that account for local needs, capacities, and cultural values. The comparative data affirm that digital citizenship must be grounded in context. A one-size-fits-all approach often fails to address unique national priorities, historical inequalities, and cultural diversity. Tailoring frameworks and pedagogical practices to local contexts is crucial for equitable implementation.

• **Aligning Digital Citizenship Competencies with SDG 4 Targets**

Digital citizenship aligns with multiple SDG 4 targets, especially those related to quality education (4.1), relevant skills for employment (4.4), and education for sustainable development and global citizenship (4.7). However, policy alignment does not always translate into coherence in practice. The findings suggest that while countries increasingly reference digital skills in their SDG implementation strategies, few explicitly link them to broader competencies such as civic responsibility, ethical behaviour, or digital rights (Shah & Lister, 2022). Scholars such as Manca et al. (2022) advocate for the inclusion of qualitative indicators—such as learner agency, digital participation, and ethical reasoning—to better reflect the transformative goals of SDG 4.

Conclusion and Recommendations

While many national education policies have recognised the importance of digital skills and responsible online behaviour, the operationalisation of digital citizenship remains uneven and often fragmented. Frameworks developed by UNESCO and the OECD have provided valuable guidance, but country-level adaptations vary significantly across contexts, infrastructure, and political will.

Second, digital tools—when supported by adequate infrastructure—have demonstrated their capacity to broaden access and promote inclusive education. However, disparities in connectivity, digital competence, and socio-cultural factors continue to limit the equitable implementation of these tools, particularly in rural and marginalised communities.

Third, while some countries have made strides in integrating digital citizenship into curricula, most focus narrowly on technical skills rather than a holistic understanding that includes civic engagement, ethics, and critical digital literacy. The findings suggest that aligning digital citizenship with SDG 4 targets requires systemic efforts across policy, curriculum, teacher training, and community engagement.

References

1. Ahtiainen, R., & Thuneberg, H. (2022). Digital learning in Finnish schools: The post-pandemic innovation. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 66(2), 212–229.

2. Ahn, J., Bivona, L. K., & DiGiacomo, D. K. (2021). Youth perspectives on digital citizenship: A phenomenological exploration. *Learning, Media and Technology*, 46(2), 188–201. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2020.1809452>
3. Aikman, S., Halai, A., & Rubagiza, J. (2011). Conceptualising gender equality in research on education quality. *Comparative Education*, 47(1), 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2011.541674>
4. Al-Abdullatif, A. M., & Gameil, A. A. (2020). Exploring students' knowledge and practice of digital citizenship in higher education. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning*, 15(19), 122–142. <https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v15i19.15611>
5. Alvi, S., & Gillani, U. (2022). Digital literacy and gender divide: A study of female students in marginalized communities. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 60(6), 1451–1470. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07356331221096124>
6. Atif, Y., & Chou, C. (2018). Guest editorial: Digital citizenship: Innovations in education, practice, and pedagogy. *Educational Technology & Society*, 21(1), 152–154.
7. Barrett, B., & Barnes, M. (2022). Civic digital literacies: Teaching the politics of platforms. *Journal of Media Literacy Education*, 14(1), 42–56. <https://doi.org/10.23860/JMLE-2022-14-1-4>
8. Bond, M., Bedenlier, S., Marín, V. I., & Händel, M. (2021). Emergency remote teaching in higher education: Mapping the first global online semester. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 18, Article 50. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00282-x>
9. Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
10. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). *Thematic analysis: A practical guide*. SAGE Publications.
11. Camacho, D., & Legare, C. H. (2021). Moral reasoning in digital citizenship: A developmental perspective. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 24(3), 101–113.
12. Carretero, S., Vuorikari, R., & Punie, Y. (2017). *DigComp 2.1: The Digital Competence Framework for Citizens with eight proficiency levels and examples of use*. Publications Office of the European Union.
13. Carretero, S., Vuorikari, R., & Punie, Y. (2022). *DigComp 2.2: The Digital Competence Framework for Citizens – With new examples of knowledge, skills and attitudes*. Publications Office of the European Union. <https://doi.org/10.2760/115376>
14. Chaudhary, R., & Bhattacharya, D. (2023). Evaluating access and equity in digital education post-COVID. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Education*, 43(1), 56–74.
15. Choi, M. (2016). A concept analysis of digital citizenship for democratic citizenship education in the Internet age. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 44(4), 565–607. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00933104.2016.1210549>
16. Choi, M., Glassman, M., & Cristol, D. (2022). Digital citizenship as critical pedagogy: Theory and practice in an age of surveillance capitalism. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 54(5), 560–573. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2021.1898664>
17. Chopra, R., & Singh, M. (2022). Policy shifts in Indian education: NEP 2020 and digital inclusion. *Contemporary Education Dialogue*, 19(2), 213–232.
18. CoSN. (2025). *Digital Citizenship, Digital Literacy, and Education*. <https://www.cosn.org/digital-citizenship>
19. Council of Europe. (2025). *Citizenship in the digital age: Council of Europe launches European Year of Digital Citizenship Education 2025*. <https://www.coe.int/en/web/education/digital-citizenship>
20. Council of Europe. (2025). *Directorate General of Democracy and Human Dignity/Directorate for Democracy/Education Department*.
21. Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
22. Daniella, S., Hossain, M. A., & Mohiuddin, M. (2023). Digital fatigue and learner anxiety during COVID-19: A cross-sectional study. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, 9, 100157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2022.100157>

23. Digital Skills and Jobs Platform. (2025). European Year of Digital Citizenship Education 2025's launch conference. https://digital-skills-jobs-platform.ec.europa.eu/en/news/european-year-digital-citizenship-education-2025-launch-conference_en
24. Dorn, E., Hancock, B., Sarakatsannis, J., & Viruleg, E. (2020). COVID-19 and student learning in the United States: The hurt could last a lifetime. McKinsey & Company. <https://www.mckinsey.com>
25. Gee, K. A., Asmundson, V., & Vang, T. (2020). Educational Inequities Related to Race and Socioeconomic Status Deepened by the COVID-19 Pandemic. Centre for Poverty and Inequality Research.
26. Haderlein, S., et al. (2021). Disparities in Educational Access in the Time of COVID: Evidence From a Nationally Representative Panel of American Families. *Educational Researcher*, 7(1), 1–21.
27. Heath, M. K. (2018). Critical digital citizenship: Promoting ethical, responsible, and empowered technology use. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 62(3), 343–349. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.911>
28. Hodges, C., Moore, S., Lockee, B., Trust, T., & Bond, A. (2020). The difference between emergency remote teaching and online learning. *Educause Review*. <https://er.educause.edu/articles/2020/3/the-difference-between-emergency-remote-teaching-and-online-learning>
29. Hohlfeld, T. N., Ritzhaupt, A. D., & Wilson, M. L. (2021). A decade of digital divide research in K–12 education: Reflections and future directions. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, 53(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2020.1846147>
30. Jandrić, P., Knox, J., & Besley, T. A. C. (2021). Postdigital science and education: Reimagining digital literacy in global contexts. *Postdigital Science and Education*, 3, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-020-00193-4>
31. Kamyli, P., & Punie, Y. (2020). Developing digital competence in Europe: A review of policy implementation and stakeholder perspectives. *European Journal of Education*, 55(1), 24–39. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ejed.12324>
32. Kara, N. (2018). Understanding university students' thoughts and practices about digital citizenship: A mixed-methods study. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 66, 1179–1199. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-018-9581-3>
33. König, J., Jäger-Biela, D. J., & Glutsch, N. (2020). Adapting to online teaching during COVID-19 school closure: Teacher education and teacher competence effects. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(4), 608–622. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2020.1809650>
34. Laufer, A., & Barak, M. (2021). Teachers' digital literacy and beliefs about digital learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, 30(1), 15–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1475939X.2020.1855596>
35. Lee, J., Blanchard, M., & Williams, K. (2021). Rethinking digital citizenship: A review and future research agenda. *Computers & Education*, 164, 104129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2021.104129>
36. Lee, S., Kim, H., & Park, Y. (2021). National digital citizenship education policies in East Asia: Comparative insights. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 22(2), 287–302. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-021-09680-2>
37. Livingstone, S., & Third, A. (2020). Children and young people's rights in the digital age: An emerging agenda. *New Media & Society*, 23(6), 1282–1303. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444820901343>
38. Manca, S., Guarino, G., & Bocconi, S. (2022). Developing digital citizenship: A systematic literature review on educational policies and practices (2015–2021). *Education and Information Technologies*, 27, 4697–4720. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10702-4>
39. McGrath, S., & Powell, L. (2016). Skills for sustainable development: Transforming vocational education and training beyond 2015. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 50, 12–19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2016.05.006>

40. Media & Learning. (2024). European Year of Digital Citizenship Education 2025. <https://media-and-learning.eu/news/european-year-of-digital-citizenship-education-2025/>
41. Öztürk, G. (2021). Digital citizenship and its teaching: A literature review. *Journal of Educational Technology and Online Learning*, 4(1), 31–45.
42. Pangrazio, L., & Selwyn, N. (2021). Towards a school-based 'critical data education'. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 29(3), 431–446. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2020.1747527>
43. Pettersson, F. (2022). Digital competence in teacher education: A review of policy and practice. *Education and Information Technologies*, 27(1), 409–425. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10730-0>
44. Pokhrel, S., & Chhetri, R. (2021). A literature review on impact of COVID-19 pandemic on teaching and learning. *Higher Education for the Future*, 8(1), 133–141. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2347631120983481>
45. Prasetyo, D., Kurniawan, D. A., & Sumarni, S. (2023). The impact of training on digital citizenship skills in developing sustainable development attitudes among university students. *Advanced Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(1), 1–12.
46. Reimers, F. M., & Schleicher, A. (2020). A framework to guide an education response to the COVID-19 Pandemic of 2020. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.31132.85120>
47. Schleicher, A. (2020). The impact of COVID-19 on education: Insights from education at a glance 2020. *OECD Journal: Economic Studies*, 2020(1). <https://doi.org/10.1787/69096873-en>
48. Saputra, A., & Siddiq, F. (2020). The insertion of digital citizenship in online learning. In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Education and Social Science Research (ICESRE 2019)* (pp. 210–218).
49. Shah, R., & Lister, R. (2022). UNESCO's humanistic approach to digital education: Critical insights for global education policy. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 52(6), 873–889. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057925.2021.1873694>
50. Subramanian, S. (2023). Bridging the digital divide in India's education system: Post-NEP challenges. *Journal of Educational Policy and Practice*, 10(1), 22–34.
51. Tikly, L. (2017). *Education for sustainable development in the postcolonial world: Towards a transformative agenda for Africa*. Routledge.
52. Trust, T., & Whalen, J. (2020). Should teachers be trained in emergency remote teaching? Lessons learned from the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 28(2), 189–199.
53. UN. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. United Nations. <https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda>
54. United Nations. (2022). *Sustainable Development Goal 4 and interlinkages with other SDGs*. <https://sdgs.un.org/goals/goal4>
55. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2023). *Achieving SDGs in the wake of COVID-19: Scenarios for policymakers*. https://sdgs.un.org/sites/default/files/2023-03/SDG_Report_2023.pdf
56. UNESCO. (2021). *Reimagining our futures together: A new social contract for education*. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000379707>
57. Warschauer, M., Zheng, B., & Yu, F. (2021). The digital learning gap: A decade of research. *Computers & Education*, 165, 104114. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2021.104114>
58. Zhang, Y., & Zhu, X. (2021). Rethinking digital citizenship with OECD's Learning Compass: Global competencies in a digital world. *Educational Review*, 73(4), 497–513. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2020.1840615>
59. Zhao, Y., Watterston, J., & Leahy, M. (2022). Redesigning education in a post-pandemic world: Lessons from the COVID-19 crisis. *Prospects*, 51(1), 143–160. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11125-021-09550-6>.

