ISSN Online: 3006-4708
ISSN Print: 3006-4694

SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW ARCHIVES
https://policyjournalofms.com

Technology-Based Curriculum and Student Academic Performance: A Qualitative Document Analysis of Secondary Education in Pakistan

Osama Shakil[1] Pervez Alam[2,] Dr Fayyaz Ahmed Shaheen[3]

[1] Department of Education Faculty of Social Sciences and Education, M.Phil. Scholar Researcher (Hamadard University Karachi) Email : osamashakeel206@gmail.com
[2] M Phil Scholar Researcher (Hamdard University Karachi)
[3] Assistant professor Hamdard University Email: Dr.fayyazshaheen@gmail.com

DOI: https://doi.org/10.70670/sra.v4i2.2261

Abstract
Global secondary education is rapidly transitioning toward technology-based curricula, a trend reflected in Pakistan's ambitious ICT frameworks designed to boost student performance and 21st-century skills. However, a significant gap remains between these policy intentions and actual academic outcomes due to systemic implementation challenges. A qualitative analysis of national curriculum documents and regional case studies from 2023 to 2026 reveals that technology education suffers from fragmented, compartmentalized execution and a heavy reliance on theoretical content over practical digital competence. Furthermore, entrenched examination practices continue to stifle progress by rewarding rote memorization rather than the authentic application of technology. To bridge this divide, the study concludes that educational authorities must implement interdisciplinary curriculum integration, comprehensive assessment reform, continuous professional teacher development in digital pedagogy, and equitable resource allocation across all secondary institutions.

Keywords: Technology-based curriculum; Academic performance; Secondary education; Qualitative document analysis; 21st-century skills; Pakistan.

Introduction

Background: The Global Shift Toward Technology-Integrated Secondary Education

The integration of technology into secondary education curricula has emerged as one of the most defining pedagogical developments of the contemporary era. Across educational systems globally, policymakers, curriculum architects, and academic theorists have moved decisively toward the incorporation of digital tools, computational thinking, and technology-enriched learning environments within the formal secondary school framework. This shift reflects a broader recognition that twenty-first-century economic and civic life demands a qualitatively different set of competencies than those cultivated by traditional instructional paradigms — competencies that are explicitly tied to information literacy, collaborative problem-solving, adaptive technological fluency, and the capacity for autonomous knowledge construction in complex digital environments.

A structured technology-based curriculum, as theorized within contemporary educational scholarship, is positioned not merely as a vehicle for transmitting technical knowledge but as a

transformative pedagogical architecture capable of reshaping the conditions under which learning occurs. When implemented with fidelity, technology integration has been shown to catalyze higher-order thinking by placing students in authentic, problem-rich environments that require analytical reasoning, synthesis, and creative application rather than passive reception of information. Research consistently demonstrates that students engaged in technology-supported, active learning environments demonstrate measurably stronger academic performance across disciplinary domains, exhibit greater metacognitive awareness, and develop more robust critical reasoning capacities than their counterparts in exclusively traditional, lecture-oriented classrooms (Bransford et al., 2000; Means et al., 2010; Voogt & Roblin, 2012; Fullan et al., 2018). The curriculum, in this conceptualization, functions as the structural mediating force between the technology available in schools and the academic performance outcomes that institutions are ultimately held accountable for producing.

The transformative promise of technology-based curricula is thus inextricably linked to the structural integrity of the curriculum itself — the coherence of its objectives, the developmental appropriateness of its content sequencing, the alignment of its assessment instruments with its stated learning goals, and the degree to which it equips teachers with the pedagogical frameworks necessary to translate digital tools into generative learning experiences. Without these structural supports, even the most sophisticated technological infrastructure remains pedagogically inert.

Research Objectives and Questions

General Objective:

This study is organized around three discrete but interrelated research objectives, each of which generates a corresponding qualitative research question designed to guide the document analysis process:

Specific Objective:

Objective 1: To examine and critically evaluate the extent to which technology-based modules are integrated into the current secondary curriculum frameworks and textbooks in Pakistan, with particular attention to the coherence, depth, and contemporary relevance of that integration.

Objective 2: To analyze the perceived or documented impact of technology curriculum integration on student academic performance outcomes, as evidenced in empirical qualitative case studies, curriculum evaluation reports, and examination data summaries from 2023 to 2026.

Research Question:

Research Question 1: To what extent do current national and provincial secondary curriculum frameworks and textbook content reflect a coherent, deep, and contemporary integration of technology-based learning modules?

Research Question 2: What does the available qualitative evidence suggest regarding the impact of technology-based curriculum integration on secondary students' academic performance and skill development outcomes in Pakistan?

Literature Review and Research Gap

Global Scholarship on Digital Tools and Student Academic Outcomes

The literature on technology-integrated instruction and its relationship to student academic outcomes is expansive, methodologically diverse, and broadly — though not uniformly — affirmative of the educational benefits that well-implemented digital tools can deliver. Beginning with the foundational synthesis work of Means and colleagues (2010), which examined over a thousand empirical studies on technology-enhanced learning and concluded that students in technology-enriched environments

modestly but consistently outperformed those in traditional classroom settings on measured academic outcomes, subsequent scholarship has progressively deepened and complicated this picture. The key variable, as a broad consensus of more recent research emphasizes, is not the presence of technology itself but the pedagogical intentionality with which it is deployed within a coherent curriculum framework.

Voogt and Roblin (2012) conducted an influential comparative analysis of twenty-first-century skill frameworks developed by major international organizations — including the Partnership for 21st Century Skills, the European Commission's Key Competences framework, and the Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority — and found that while the specific competencies foregrounded varied by framework, a core cluster of skills consistently associated with effective technology integration emerged: critical thinking, communication, collaboration, creativity, and digital literacy. Their analysis emphasized that these skills are not produced automatically by access to digital tools but require deliberate curriculum design that creates structured opportunities for their exercise and development. Curriculum content, instructional methodology, and assessment design must be explicitly aligned with the competency goals the curriculum purports to advance.

More recent scholarship has extended this argument into the specific domain of secondary education. Fullan, Quinn, and McEachen (2018), in their influential articulation of 'deep learning' as a pedagogical orientation, argued that the transformative potential of technology in schools is fully realized only when digital tools are embedded within learning designs that prioritize student agency, real-world problem-solving, and meaningful knowledge application. Their global New Pedagogies for Deep Learning initiative, which gathered evidence from institutions across multiple continents, found that secondary schools achieving the strongest academic and competency outcomes from technology integration were those that had systematically restructured their curriculum frameworks not merely added digital devices or software to existing instructional routines.

Identification of the Research Gap

The synthesis of global and regional literature presented above reveals a substantial body of scholarship affirming the general importance of technology integration for educational quality and student outcomes, as well as a growing body of regional evidence documenting the specific challenges of technology curriculum implementation in Pakistani secondary schools. However, a distinct and consequential gap remains in the existing scholarship — a gap that this study is specifically designed to address.

While existing literature broadly argues for the general importance of educational technology and documents various implementation challenges at the level of school practice, there is a pronounced absence of qualitative, document-grounded analysis examining how the physical curriculum content itself — the written objectives, the textbook structure, the assessment frameworks, the pedagogical guidance embedded in curriculum documents — either facilitates or hinders academic performance at the secondary level in Pakistan. Most existing studies either take the quality of the curriculum for granted and focus on implementation barriers, or assess outcomes quantitatively without interrogating the curriculum architecture that shapes those outcomes. The specific question of how the design of the curriculum document itself — rather than the adequacy of infrastructure or the enthusiasm of individual teachers — contributes to the gap between policy intentions and actual student academic performance has not been systematically addressed through qualitative document analysis.

Particularly absent from the literature is a theoretically grounded examination of the role played by rote-learned assessment models in suppressing the academic performance benefits that technology integration is designed to produce. If the examination system rewards the retrieval of memorized content while the curriculum claims to develop higher-order technological competencies, the

resulting structural contradiction is not merely a peripheral implementation challenge but a fundamental architectural contradiction within the curriculum itself — one that can only be identified and addressed through careful analysis of the curriculum documents, textbooks, and assessment frameworks in their specificity and inter-relationships. This study fills precisely that gap.

Methodology

Research Design: Qualitative Document Analysis

This study employs a qualitative analytical research design centered on systematic document analysis. The decision to privilege qualitative over quantitative methods reflects a fundamental alignment between the epistemological commitments of the study and the nature of the research questions it addresses. The primary concern of this investigation is not with generating numerical measures of student performance outcomes — data that already exist in abundance in examination board records and national assessment reports — but with understanding the structural and pedagogical architecture of the technology curriculum itself and the mechanisms through which that architecture shapes performance outcomes. Such questions of meaning, coherence, and alignment are most productively pursued through the interpretive, systematic, and theoretically grounded methods of qualitative inquiry.

Document analysis as a qualitative research method has a well-established tradition in educational research, particularly in curriculum studies, policy analysis, and educational sociology (Bowen, 2009; McCulloch, 2004). As a method, it involves the systematic examination of documents — in this case, curriculum frameworks, policy texts, textbooks, and empirical case studies — for evidence relevant to the research questions, organized through an explicit analytical framework and evaluated against established criteria of rigor and trustworthiness. Document analysis is particularly well-suited to investigations of the alignment between intended and enacted curricula, as it allows the researcher to examine the written curriculum as an artifact in its own right — attending to not merely what documents say but how they say it, what they prioritize and marginalize, and what their structural organization implies about the curriculum's underlying assumptions regarding learning, teaching, and assessment.

The qualitative analytical design adopted in this study prioritizes systemic evaluation over quantitative metrics, exploring the alignment between policy objectives embedded in national and provincial curriculum frameworks and the actual content, cognitive demands, and pedagogical guidance provided in the textbooks and instructional materials through which those frameworks are operationalized. This approach enables a level of analytical depth and theoretical sophistication that survey-based or test-score analyses of technology education in Pakistan have not previously achieved.

Data Sources and Sample

The secondary qualitative datasets analyzed in this study were selected through a systematic process of purposive sampling designed to ensure comprehensive coverage of the primary documentary artifacts through which the Pakistani secondary technology curriculum is constituted. The corpus of documents analyzed comprises four categories of primary and secondary sources:

National and provincial curriculum frameworks constitute the first and most foundational category of documents. These include the National Curriculum for Computer Science and Information Technology published by the Ministry of Federal Education and Professional Training, the Single National Curriculum frameworks for relevant subject areas, and provincial curriculum frameworks developed by the Punjab Curriculum and Textbook Board, the Sindh Textbook Board, the Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Curriculum Academy, and the Balochistan Textbook Board. These documents represent the officially intended curriculum — the formal policy-level articulation of what technology

education at the secondary level should accomplish, contain, and produce.

Regional education policy papers form the second category of documentary sources. These include strategic education development plans at both the federal and provincial levels, reports from the National Education Assessment System (NEAS), evaluation documents produced by international development organizations working in partnership with the Pakistani education system (including the World Bank, UNICEF, and the Aga Khan University Institute for Educational Development), and periodic curriculum review reports addressing the ICT and computer science components of the secondary curriculum.

Secondary-level computer science and technology textbooks constitute the third and most content-rich category of documents analyzed. Textbooks from grades 9 and 10 across the four provincial textbook boards were selected, providing a comparative perspective on how the national curriculum framework is operationalized in the primary instructional resource that shapes daily classroom practice. Textbook analysis focused on content selection and organization, cognitive demand levels of exercises and assessment questions, the presence or absence of practical, hands-on activities, and the degree of alignment between textbook content and contemporary digital literacy competencies.

Empirical qualitative case studies from 2023 to 2026 constitute the fourth category of sources. These studies — drawn from peer-reviewed journals including the Journal of Education and Educational Development, the Pakistani Journal of Education, the International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, and comparable regional and international outlets — provide ground-level qualitative evidence regarding the implementation of the technology curriculum in actual secondary school classrooms and the academic performance outcomes observed in those contexts. Case studies were selected using inclusion criteria requiring explicit focus on secondary-level technology education in Pakistan, qualitative or mixed-methods design, and publication within the 2023–2026 window.

Analytical Framework: Four Pillars of Analysis

Qualitative content analysis and thematic analysis were applied systematically across four distinct analytical pillars, each of which addresses a different dimension of the technology curriculum's structure and its relationship to student academic performance. This multi-pillar analytical framework was developed through an iterative process combining deductive theory-driven analysis — derived from the TPACK, SAMR, and Bloom's Digital Taxonomy frameworks — with inductive theme emergence from the documentary corpus.

The first analytical pillar addresses Curriculum Objectives and Content Alignment, examining the degree of coherence between the stated learning objectives of national and provincial curriculum frameworks, the content knowledge selected for inclusion in textbooks, and the contemporary landscape of digital literacy competencies identified in the international scholarship. Analysis within this pillar attends particularly to gaps between objectives and content, instances of outdated or narrow content that fails to prepare students for current digital contexts, and the degree to which curriculum content supports the development of higher-order versus lower-order cognitive skills.

The second analytical pillar addresses Instructional and Teaching Methodologies, examining the pedagogical guidance embedded in curriculum documents and textbooks and evaluating its adequacy for supporting teachers in implementing technology-integrated instruction at the Modification and Redefinition levels of the SAMR framework. Analysis within this pillar attends to the presence or absence of explicit methodological guidance, the degree to which instructional suggestions align with constructivist and student-centered learning principles, and the TPACK demands placed on teachers by the curriculum without corresponding professional development support.

The third analytical pillar addresses Assessment and Examination Practices, examining the alignment between the curriculum's stated learning objectives and the examination formats used by provincial

boards to assess student achievement in technology subjects. Analysis within this pillar employs Bloom's Digital Taxonomy to characterize the cognitive demand levels of examination questions, identifies patterns of misalignment between higher-order curriculum objectives and lower-order assessment demands, and examines the structural incentives created by examination design for both teacher instruction and student learning behavior.

The fourth analytical pillar addresses the Practical Integration of Digital and Technological Tools, examining the extent to which curriculum documents, textbooks, and instructional materials actively support, require, and scaffold students' hands-on engagement with specific digital technologies. Analysis within this pillar attends to the ratio of theoretical to practical content in textbooks, the specificity of guidance for practical digital activities, and the degree to which the practical curriculum is designed in ways that could be meaningfully implemented across the diverse infrastructural conditions of Pakistani secondary schools.

Trustworthiness and Rigor

Qualitative research trustworthiness is established through four core criteria — credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability — drawn from Lincoln and Guba's (1985) foundational framework for qualitative inquiry. This study addresses each criterion through specific methodological strategies.

Credibility — the qualitative analogue of internal validity — is established through rigorous cross-referencing of findings across multiple document sources. Interpretations derived from curriculum framework analysis are systematically checked against textbook content analysis and empirical case study findings, ensuring that conclusions are grounded in convergent evidence from multiple documentary sources rather than the idiosyncratic features of any single document. Credibility is further supported by the explicit use of established theoretical frameworks (TPACK, SAMR, Bloom's Digital Taxonomy) as analytic lenses, which provides a transparent interpretive structure that external reviewers can evaluate and critique.

Dependability — the qualitative analogue of reliability — is addressed through a detailed documentation of the analytical procedures applied at each pillar of analysis, including the specific criteria used for document selection, the coding categories employed in content analysis, and the process through which themes were identified, refined, and cross-checked against theoretical frameworks. This procedural transparency enables other researchers to evaluate the consistency of the analytical process and, if necessary, to replicate the analysis with updated documentary sources.

Confirmability — the qualitative analogue of objectivity — is addressed through a reflexivity stance in which the researcher explicitly acknowledges the theoretical commitments and analytical orientations brought to the document analysis, attends to disconfirming evidence and alternative interpretations within the documentary corpus, and maintains a clear distinction between the evidence contained in documents and the analytical interpretations imposed upon it. The selection of primary source documents — official curriculum frameworks, textbooks, and peer-reviewed empirical studies — rather than reliance on secondary summaries or anecdotal reports further strengthens the confirmability of the analysis.

Critical Analysis of Curriculum Content and Findings

Perhaps the most structurally consequential finding of the document analysis concerns the profound compartmentalization of technology education within the Pakistani secondary curriculum. Across the provincial curriculum frameworks and textbooks examined, technology and computer science are consistently constituted as self-contained, stand-alone subject areas with minimal formal linkage to the broader secondary curriculum — to science, mathematics, social studies, language arts, or any other subject domain through which the conceptual and applied dimensions of technology could be

reinforced, extended, and contextualized.

This compartmentalization operates at multiple levels simultaneously. At the level of formal curriculum architecture, technology subjects are assigned dedicated time allocations but are explicitly positioned as peripheral rather than central to the secondary curriculum, reflecting a historical legacy in which computer education was first introduced as an optional enrichment subject rather than a foundational competency. Provincial curriculum documents, despite occasional rhetorical gestures toward the cross-curricular relevance of digital skills, provide no structural mechanisms — no interdisciplinary unit designs, no collaborative curriculum planning frameworks, no shared assessment instruments — through which technology teachers and subject-area teachers might coordinate their instructional practice in ways that would reinforce digital skill development across the curriculum.

At the level of textbook content, this compartmentalization produces a curriculum characterized by narrow technical knowledge that students experience as disconnected from their learning in other subjects and, more critically, from the kinds of authentic digital tasks they will encounter in further education and professional life. The computer science textbook teaches programming syntax in isolation from the mathematical reasoning that underpins computational thinking; it addresses data management concepts without connection to the statistical analysis skills developed in mathematics; it introduces communication technology concepts without integration with the critical writing and information literacy skills cultivated in language arts. The result is a fragmented curriculum experience in which technology knowledge exists in a conceptual silo, its wider relevance unexplored and its transferability to other academic domains undeveloped.

From the perspective of Bloom's Digital Taxonomy, this compartmentalization has direct implications for the cognitive quality of student engagement with technology content. When technology learning is isolated from other subject domains, the highest levels of Bloom's Taxonomy — particularly Analyzing, Evaluating, and Creating — become very difficult to access, because these cognitive operations require students to apply knowledge across contexts, evaluate competing approaches to complex problems, and create novel solutions that integrate multiple knowledge domains. Restricted to a stand-alone computer science class with limited connection to other subjects, students are most readily engaged at the lower cognitive levels of Remembering, Understanding, and basic Applying — precisely the cognitive levels that examination instruments also tend to reward, creating a reinforcing cycle of low cognitive demand that systematically forecloses the higher-order academic performance outcomes the curriculum ostensibly targets.

Comparative evidence from high-performing technology education systems supports the conclusion that interdisciplinary integration is not merely a curriculum design preference but a structural prerequisite for the academic performance benefits attributed to technology integration in the scholarship. Finland's national curriculum framework, for example, explicitly mandates the integration of digital literacy competencies across all subject areas at every level of schooling, rather than confining technology education to a dedicated subject (Finnish National Agency for Education, 2016). South Korea's curriculum reform initiatives, Singapore's Smart Nation education framework, and Estonia's digital education strategy similarly embed technology competencies within cross-curricular frameworks rather than treating them as subject-specific content. The Pakistani curriculum's departure from this global best practice is not a peripheral design flaw but a fundamental architectural decision that reverberates through every dimension of the technology education experience.

Discussion

The findings presented in the preceding section, taken together, delineate a structural disconnect between the policy ideals embedded in Pakistan's technology-based secondary curriculum and the

classroom realities within which that curriculum is enacted — a disconnect that is more fundamental, more systemic, and more theoretically significant than a simple implementation failure narrative would suggest. The dominant explanation for the gap between technology curriculum intentions and student academic performance outcomes in Pakistani secondary schools — that the problem is primarily one of inadequate infrastructure and teacher training — is not wrong, but it is incomplete in ways that have important practical consequences.

The document analysis conducted in this study reveals that the technology curriculum itself — in its written design, its content choices, its assessment alignment, and its pedagogical scaffolding — contains architectural features that actively work against the academic performance benefits it is theoretically designed to produce. These architectural features are not accidental or peripheral; they reflect deep structural assumptions about the nature of technology knowledge, the purposes of secondary schooling, and the appropriate relationship between curriculum, instruction, and assessment that are embedded throughout the curriculum system and that resist resolution through incremental reform.

The theoretical framework provided by the TPACK model is particularly illuminating for understanding the nature of this structural disconnect. A curriculum that fails to address the integrated nature of technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge — treating these as separate domains rather than as mutually constitutive dimensions of effective technology teaching — will systematically underequip teachers for the demands of high-quality technology-integrated instruction, regardless of the quality of pre-service education or in-service professional development available. When teachers engage with a curriculum document that specifies technology learning objectives without providing pedagogical guidance regarding how those objectives are best pursued through digital tools in the context of specific subject matter knowledge, they are placed in a position of knowledge fragmentation that the TPACK model predicts will result in low-quality technology integration. The curriculum's failure to model and support TPACK-level professional practice is thus not merely a missed opportunity; it is an active impediment to the realization of its own objectives.

Recommendations

Actionable Recommendations for Systemic Reform

The following strategic recommendations emerge directly from the findings and theoretical analysis presented in this study. They are addressed collectively to national and provincial curriculum authorities, regional textbook boards, teacher education institutions, school administrators, and education policymakers, recognizing that the systemic nature of the identified challenges requires coordinated action across multiple institutional levels.

Recommendation 1: Redesign the Curriculum Architecture to Enable Interdisciplinary Technology Integration

- Provincial and national curriculum frameworks should be revised to explicitly embed digital literacy competencies within all secondary subject areas rather than confining technology education to a stand-alone computer science subject. This redesign should identify specific points of integration between technology competencies and the learning objectives of science, mathematics, language arts, social studies, and other secondary subjects, and provide interdisciplinary unit designs that enable teachers from different subject areas to collaborate in developing students' applied digital competencies.
- Textbook boards should commission interdisciplinary curriculum materials that model technology integration at the Modification and Redefinition levels of the SAMR model, providing concrete examples of how digital tools can be used not merely to replicate

traditional learning activities but to create qualitatively new forms of inquiry, collaboration, and knowledge production.

- Curriculum revision processes should include structured consultation with technology industry representatives, university faculty from both STEM and humanities disciplines, and classroom teachers, ensuring that the content and competency goals of the revised curriculum reflect both contemporary digital practice and the pedagogical wisdom of experienced classroom practitioners.

Recommendation 2: Reform Assessment Structures to Align with Higher-Order Technology Competencies

- Provincial examination boards should undertake a comprehensive review of secondary technology examination formats with the explicit goal of aligning examination cognitive demand with the higher-order learning objectives stated in the curriculum. This review should employ Bloom's Digital Taxonomy as an analytical framework, targeting a significant and explicitly planned increase in the proportion of examination marks allocated to Analysis, Evaluation, and Creation level tasks.
- Project-based assessment models — in which students demonstrate technology competency through the creation of original digital artifacts, the completion of collaborative technological problem-solving tasks, or the documentation of a sustained inquiry process — should be piloted and systematically evaluated as complements or partial substitutes for traditional written examinations in technology subjects.
- Assessment rubrics for practical technology components should be developed collaboratively between curriculum authorities, examination boards, and classroom teachers, ensuring that the criteria used to evaluate student work reflect genuine technological competency rather than the surface-level completion of prescribed procedural steps.

Conclusion

This study has undertaken a systematic qualitative document analysis of Pakistan's secondary technology-based curriculum, examining the alignment between national and provincial curriculum frameworks, textbook content, assessment structures, and the qualitative evidence base regarding student academic performance outcomes. The analysis has identified four interacting structural and pedagogical barriers — curriculum compartmentalization, rote-extraction assessment dominance, content obsolescence, and the teacher preparedness and resource constraint nexus — through which the technology curriculum's stated aspirations for higher-order academic performance and twenty-first-century skill development are systematically frustrated.

The study's central conclusion is both straightforward and consequential: a technology-based curriculum cannot transform student academic performance unless accompanied by systemic, practical shifts in instruction and examination models. The provision of digital devices, the designation of computer science as a mandatory subject, and the articulation of ambitious technology learning objectives in curriculum documents are necessary but radically insufficient conditions for realizing the academic performance benefits that technology integration is theoretically capable of producing. Without the simultaneous reform of assessment instruments to reward higher-order cognitive performance, the redesign of curriculum architecture to enable interdisciplinary technology integration, the sustained development of teachers' integrated TPACK professional knowledge, and the equitable distribution of the material resources that genuine technology instruction requires, the gap between Pakistan's technology education policy ambitions and the academic reality of its secondary classrooms will persist — and will continue to exact a significant and growing cost on the students, communities, and national development aspirations that the curriculum was designed to

serve.

The path toward a technology-based secondary curriculum that genuinely enhances student academic performance is neither technically mysterious nor economically prohibitive. It requires, above all, the institutional courage to confront the structural contradictions within the current curriculum system honestly, to resist the temptation of superficial reform — more devices, more courses, more mentions of AI in policy documents — in favor of the deep, systemic, theoretically grounded transformation that the evidence demands. This study offers a document-grounded, theoretically coherent contribution to the knowledge base upon which such transformation must be built.

References

Ahmed, F., Naseem, N., & Shah, R. (2023). Between intention and practice: A qualitative multi-site case study of technology education implementation in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa secondary schools. Journal of Education and Educational Development, 10(1), 45–68.

Alderson, J. C., & Wall, D. (1993). Does washback exist? Applied Linguistics, 14(2), 115–129.

Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (Eds.). (2001). A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives. Longman.

Bloom, B. S., Engelhart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H., & Krathwohl, D. R. (1956). Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. Handbook I: Cognitive domain. David McKay.

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. Qualitative Research Journal, 9(2), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027

Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (Eds.). (2000). How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school (expanded ed.). National Academy Press.

Bruner, J. S. (1960). The process of education. Harvard University Press.

Bruner, J. S. (1966). Toward a theory of instruction. Harvard University Press.

Churches, A. (2008). Bloom's digital taxonomy. Educational Origami. Retrieved from https://burtonslifelearning.pbworks.com/

Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. Educational Researcher, 38(3), 181–199. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X08331140

Ertmer, P. A. (2005). Teacher pedagogical beliefs: The final frontier in our quest for technology integration? Educational Technology Research and Development, 53(4), 25–39. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02504683

Finnish National Agency for Education. (2016). National core curriculum for basic education 2014. Finnish National Agency for Education.

Fullan, M., Quinn, J., & McEachen, J. (2018). Deep learning: Engage the world, change the world. Corwin Press.

Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. American Educational Research Journal, 38(4), 915–945. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312038004915