EPRA International Journal of Environmental Economics, Commerce and Educational Management
Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra0414 |ISI I.F Value: 0.815|SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.57 ISSN: 2348 – 814X
Volume: 12 | Issue:6 |June 2025

TECHNOLOGY-ASSISTED LEARNING AND EDUCATIONAL EQUITY: INVESTIGATING THE ROLE OF ADAPTIVE TOOLS IN CLOSING ACHIEVEMENT GAPS

Theresa Arhimah[a], Yvonne Makafui Cudjoe-Mensah[b]
a Department of Mathematical Sciences, Ball State University, Indiana, USA
b Department of Sociology, University of Ghana, Ghana

**Corresponding Author: Yvonne Makafui Cudjoe-Mensah*

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.36713/epra22276
DOI No: 10.36713/epra22276

ABSTRACT
This study explores the potential of adaptive learning technologies to promote educational equity and reduce achievement gaps across diverse student populations. Using a qualitative, literature-based methodology, the research synthesizes findings from peer-reviewed studies, theoretical frameworks, and implementation case studies. The analysis focuses on the effectiveness of adaptive tools in K–12 settings, stakeholder perceptions, and systemic barriers to equitable use. Findings indicate that while platforms like DreamBox, ALEKS, and Khan Academy can individualize learning and support academic gains, their impact is uneven due to digital access disparities, inadequate teacher training, and cultural mismatches in content. The study applies Constructivist Learning Theory, Universal Design for Learning (UDL), and the Digital Divide Framework to interpret outcomes and highlight contextual challenges. It concludes that adaptive technologies alone are insufficient to close equity gaps and recommends comprehensive strategies, such as infrastructure investment, inclusive design, and stakeholder collaboration, to ensure meaningful and equitable implementation

KEYWORDS: *Adaptive Learning Technologies, Educational Equity, Achievement Gap, Digital Divide, Universal Design for Learning (UDL)*

INTRODUCTION
Efforts to achieve educational equity have gained momentum in recent years, as disparities in academic achievement persist across socioeconomic, racial, disability, and geographic lines. Educational equity involves creating a system in which all students have access to the resources they need to succeed, regardless of their background (OECD, 2018). In the United States, long-standing achievement gaps continue to disadvantage students from low-income families, students of color, students with disabilities, and those in rural areas (Reardon, 2012; Bradley, 2022). These inequities are often perpetuated by structural challenges, such as unequal school funding, limited access to highly qualified teachers, and learning environments that do not accommodate diverse needs (Darling-Hammond, 2010).

Digital inequities further compound these issues. As Arhimah et al., (2025a) highlight, disparities in access to educational technology, driven by socioeconomic and racial factors, contribute to lower academic performance, engagement, and college readiness among disadvantaged student groups. These findings emphasize the need for systemic reforms to ensure that all students, regardless of background, have equal access to the tools and digital infrastructure necessary for academic success.

In response to these challenges, personalized learning has emerged as a potential solution, with adaptive learning technologies playing a central role. These tools use algorithms to adjust instructional content and pacing based on students' real-time performance, offering a customized learning experience (Walkington & Bernacki, 2018). Widely adopted platforms such as ALEKS, DreamBox, and Khan Academy exemplify how adaptive systems aim to promote individualized learning and improve outcomes for students who might otherwise be left behind.

EPRA International Journal of Environmental Economics, Commerce and Educational Management
Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra0414 |ISI I.F Value: 0.815|SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.57 ISSN: 2348 – 814X
Volume: 12 | Issue:6 |June 2025

While adaptive technologies are increasingly used in K–12 and higher education settings, their ability to promote educational equity remains debated. Research indicates that while such tools may improve learning outcomes in certain contexts (Pane et al., 2015), challenges related to implementation—including unequal access to devices and high-speed internet, insufficient teacher training, and algorithmic biases—may limit their effectiveness for marginalized student populations (Bulger, 2016; Holmes et al., 2019; Kizilcec & Lee, 2022). For instance, in the context of students with special needs, Arhimah, (2025b) found that digital math tools—when supported by adequate teacher training and inclusive instructional design—can significantly enhance problem-solving skills and engagement. These insights underscore the promise and limitations of technology-assisted learning and the need for deeper investigation into how adaptive tools affect students from diverse backgrounds.

This study explores the role of adaptive learning technologies in supporting academic achievement and promoting educational equity. It focuses on three core research questions: (1) To what extent do adaptive learning tools improve academic performance across student demographics such as race, socioeconomic status, and disability? (2) How do students and educators perceive the effectiveness of these tools in addressing individual learning needs? (3) What barriers exist to implementing adaptive technologies in under-resourced educational settings?

Through a literature-based analysis, this study aims to provide evidence-based insights to guide policymakers, school administrators, and educational technology developers in designing and deploying tools that not only enhance academic performance but also promote equitable learning opportunities for all students.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Educational Equity and Achievement Gaps

Educational equity is widely defined as the principle of fairness in education, which ensures that a learner's background, such as gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, or disability, does not limit their educational opportunities (OECD, 2018). Equity emphasizes the provision of support based on individual needs rather than equality in treatment. Common indicators used to evaluate equity in education include differences in standardized test scores, high school completion rates, access to college-preparatory coursework, and enrollment in higher education (NCES, 2022; Reardon, 2013).

Achievement gaps persist along the lines of race, class, and geography. Reardon (2013) found that the test score gap between students from high- and low-income families is now larger than the Black-White achievement gap. Minority students, particularly Black, Latino, and Indigenous learners, as well as students from low-income households, continue to underperform compared to their White and affluent peers (Garcia & Weiss, 2017). Contributing factors include funding inequities, unequal access to experienced teachers, curriculum tracking, and the underrepresentation of culturally responsive pedagogy (Hersi, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 2006).

2.2 Technology-Assisted Learning: Definitions and Classifications

Technology-assisted learning encompasses a wide range of digital tools used to enhance teaching and learning. These tools are broadly classified into **static tools**, such as pre-recorded videos or digital textbooks, and **adaptive technologies** that personalize instruction based on real-time learner data. Adaptive learning tools analyze student inputs and performance metrics to adjust the content's difficulty, pacing, and presentation (Pane et al., 2017).

Popular adaptive platforms include **DreamBox Learning**, which adapts math content in real time; **Khan Academy**, which uses mastery-based progression with learning dashboards; and **ALEKS**, an AI-driven platform that uses knowledge space theory to assess and guide student learning paths (Falmagne et al., 2013; VanLehn, 2011). These platforms are often integrated with teacher dashboards that provide analytics to support data-driven instruction.

2.3 Theoretical Frameworks

The use of adaptive learning technologies is grounded in several educational theories. **Constructivist learning theory**, championed by Piaget and Bruner, posits that learners construct new knowledge by building upon existing cognitive frameworks through active engagement (Bruner, 1961; Piaget, 1970). Adaptive tools align with this theory by enabling personalized exploration and feedback.

EPRA International Journal of Environmental Economics, Commerce and Educational Management
Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra0414 |ISI I.F Value: 0.815|SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.57 ISSN: 2348 – 814X
Volume: 12 | Issue:6 |June 2025

The **Universal Design for Learning (UDL)** framework promotes instructional practices that accommodate learner variability by providing multiple means of engagement, representation, and expression (Meyer et al., 2014). Adaptive platforms that include visual support, scaffolded content, or audio/text options exemplify the UDL approach.

The **Digital Divide Framework**, articulated by Warschauer (2004), helps explain inequities in educational technology use. It identifies three levels of divide: access (e.g., devices and internet), usage (digital skills), and outcomes (benefits gained from technology). Adaptive tools may help bridge or exacerbate these divides depending on how they are implemented.

2.4 Empirical Studies Review

Studies on adaptive learning technologies show mixed but generally promising results. Pane et al. (2015), in a study conducted by RAND, found that students in personalized learning environments made modest but statistically significant gains in mathematics, particularly when tools were implemented with fidelity. However, the study also noted substantial variability in outcomes across schools, influenced by teacher support, curriculum alignment, and school readiness.

Other studies underscore disparities in usage and effectiveness. For example, Wang and Woodworth (2011), evaluating DreamBox Learning in Rocketship schools, found positive effects in early elementary math scores. However, these effects were more prominent in schools with strong implementation support and where students engaged regularly with the tool.

Concerns about adaptive technologies have also emerged. Bulger (2016) highlights how algorithmic design can unintentionally reinforce bias by privileging certain learning styles or cultural norms. Holmes, (2019) argues that without equitable infrastructure and teacher mediation, adaptive technologies may widen digital and instructional gaps. Additionally, few long-term studies disaggregate outcomes by race, disability, or English language learner (ELL) status, making it difficult to draw definitive conclusions about their equity impact.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Approach

This study employs a **qualitative, literature-based methodology** to explore how adaptive learning technologies influence educational equity and help close achievement gaps. Rather than gathering original empirical data, it relies on the systematic analysis and synthesis of existing scholarly literature, policy reports, and theoretical perspectives to build insights.

3.2 Research Design

The research follows a **thematic literature review design**, guided by principles of **narrative synthesis and interpretive analysis**. The review focuses on identifying key themes, contradictions, and trends related to the integration of adaptive technologies in K–12 educational contexts. Central analytical components include:

- Defining core concepts such as educational equity and adaptive learning technologies.
- Examining literature through theoretical lenses, including **Constructivist Learning Theory**, **Universal Design for Learning (UDL)**, and the **Digital Divide Framework**.
- Synthesizing empirical findings and case studies to evaluate the effectiveness and challenges of adaptive tools.

3.3 Source Selection and Inclusion Criteria

To ensure scholarly rigor, sources were selected based on the following criteria:

- Peer-reviewed articles, academic books, government or institutional policy documents, and reports from established research organizations.
- Relevance to adaptive learning, digital equity, and learning outcomes in K–12 education.
- Focus on socioeconomically or demographically diverse educational environments.
- English-language publications dated between **2010 and 2024**, to ensure contemporary relevance.

Databases used include **ERIC**, **JSTOR**, **Scopus**, and **Google Scholar**. Search terms included: *adaptive learning tools*, *educational equity*, *achievement gap*, *digital divide in education*, *inclusive pedagogy*, and *K–12 technology integration*.

EPRA International Journal of Environmental Economics, Commerce and Educational Management
Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra0414 |ISI I.F Value: 0.815|SJIF Impact Factor (2025): 8.57 ISSN: 2348 – 814X
Volume: 12 | Issue:6 |June 2025

3.4 Analytical Framework

The literature was analyzed using **thematic synthesis**, where findings were grouped into major themes corresponding to the research questions. Key themes include:

- Effectiveness of adaptive learning tools across diverse student groups.
- Teacher and student perceptions of adaptive technologies.
- Systemic barriers to equitable implementation (e.g., access, infrastructure, and training).

These themes were interpreted through the integrated use of **Constructivist Learning Theory**, **UDL**, and the **Digital Divide Framework** to provide deeper contextual insights.

3.5 Limitations

This study does not involve original empirical research and thus does not produce statistically generalizable results. Conclusions are **interpretive** and based on the **scope, depth, and quality of the existing literature**. While this approach provides valuable conceptual insights, future empirical studies are recommended to test and validate the findings presented here.

4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Adaptive Tools and Academic Outcomes Across Diverse Student Populations

Numerous studies affirm that adaptive learning technologies can support personalized instruction, especially in mathematics and reading. Tools such as **DreamBox Learning**, **ALEKS**, and **Khan Academy** adapt to individual learners' performance in real time, facilitating differentiated pathways that align with **constructivist learning principles** (Pane et al., 2017). Pane et al.'s multi-year quasi-experimental research at RAND Corporation found statistically significant, albeit modest, academic gains among low-income students who used adaptive platforms with fidelity.

However, these benefits are unevenly distributed. Students from rural, low-income, or otherwise marginalized communities often lack consistent access to high-speed internet, modern devices, or tech support at home—factors that hinder full engagement with adaptive technologies (Reich et al., 2020). These disparities are explained through the **digital divide framework**, which emphasizes inequities in access, usage, and outcomes (van Dijk, 2006; Warschauer & Matuchniak, 2010).

Discussion: While adaptive learning tools hold promise for closing achievement gaps, their benefits are heavily context-dependent. Without addressing foundational digital inequities, these tools risk reinforcing existing disparities rather than reducing them.

4.2. Perceptions of Adaptive Tools Among Teachers and Students

Teacher attitudes toward adaptive learning tools vary based on training, school support, and perceived value. Studies have shown that while many educators view these tools as beneficial for formative assessment and intervention, others are wary of reduced student-teacher interaction and fear over-reliance may de-skill instruction (Zawacki-Richter & Latchem, 2018; Trust et al., 2017). Additionally, teachers in underserved schools often report a lack of professional development and administrative support, which undermines effective integration (Darling-Hammond et al., 2020).

Students' perceptions also differ. Self-directed learners or those who enjoy visual, gamified content often respond positively to adaptive platforms (Bakia et al., 2012). However, students with disabilities or English language learners may encounter accessibility challenges, especially when adaptive tools are not designed according to **Universal Design for Learning (UDL)** principles (CAST, 2018; Rao, 2021).

Discussion: Perceptions of adaptive technologies are shaped not just by the technology itself, but by its usability, accessibility, and alignment with learners' needs. Teacher training and inclusive tool design are essential for equitable outcomes.

4.3. Challenges and Limitations in Under-Resourced Schools

Implementing adaptive learning technologies in under-resourced schools presents several systemic barriers:

- **Insufficient infrastructure**, including outdated devices and unstable internet connections.
- **Inadequate professional development**, leaving educators ill-equipped to integrate digital tools effectively.

- **Funding limitations**, restricting access to licenses for high-quality platforms.
- **Cultural and linguistic mismatches** in content that fails to reflect diverse learners.

Research indicates that even when these tools are technically available, students in marginalized communities often engage with them less effectively, thereby exacerbating educational disparities. Warschauer and Matuchniak (2010) emphasize that access alone is insufficient; meaningful use of technology requires addressing broader socio-economic and cultural factors that influence digital engagement.

Discussion: Effective implementation in underserved contexts necessitates more than just deploying technology. Equity-driven strategies should encompass investments in infrastructure, development of culturally relevant content, and comprehensive educator capacity-building to ensure that adaptive learning tools serve all students effectively.

4.4. The Role of Theoretical Frameworks in Understanding Equity and Technology

The findings are informed by several key educational theories:

- **Constructivist Learning Theory** supports the notion that learners construct knowledge best through individualized, active learning experiences—principles that align with adaptive platforms (Piaget, 2013; Vygotsky, 1978).
- **Universal Design for Learning (UDL)** offers a framework for creating flexible, inclusive learning environments that accommodate diverse learners through multiple means of engagement, representation, and expression (CAST, 2018).
- **The Digital Divide Framework** contextualizes disparities in educational technology access and outcomes within broader socio-economic structures (van Dijk, 2006).

Discussion: These frameworks underscore that adaptive learning tools are not inherently equitable. Their effectiveness depends on how they are designed, implemented, and supported within educational systems.

Adaptive learning technologies can serve as powerful tools for advancing educational equity and addressing achievement gaps. However, their impact is highly conditional mediated by infrastructure, teacher readiness, design inclusivity, and socio-economic factors. For adaptive tools to be truly transformative, they must be implemented as part of a broader systemic reform that addresses the root causes of educational inequity.

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Adaptive learning technologies offer significant potential to advance educational equity by personalizing instruction and supporting diverse learning needs. However, their success depends on addressing systemic barriers in under-resourced schools, including inadequate infrastructure, insufficient teacher training, and lack of culturally responsive content. To ensure equitable impact, education leaders must prioritize digital inclusion through investments in internet access, updated devices, and ongoing professional development for educators. Adaptive platforms should incorporate Universal Design for Learning principles to accommodate all learners. Additionally, monitoring systems should track outcomes across demographic groups to guide data-informed improvements. Collaborative efforts involving educators, students, families, and developers are essential for tailoring tools to local contexts. Ultimately, bridging the digital divide requires more than deploying technology—it demands a sustained, equity-focused commitment to transforming how education is delivered and experienced in marginalized communities.

REFERENCES

1. *Arhimah, T., Cudjoe-Mensah, Y. M., & Thompson, M. (2025b). Evaluating the effectiveness of digital math tools in enhancing problem-solving skills for students with special needs in U.S. Public Schools. https://doi.org/10.30574/msarr.2025.13.1.0034*
2. *Arhimah, T., Thompson, M., & Cudjoe-Mensah, Y. M. (2025a). Disparities in access to educational technology and its impact on performance across socio-economic and racial groups in US public schools.*
3. *Bradley, K. (2022). The socioeconomic achievement gap in the US public schools. Ballard Brief, 2022(3), 10.*
4. *Nikolopoulou, K. (2024). Children in the Digital Space: Issues Researched and Suggestions for Future Research. Creative Education, 15(5), 815-827.*
5. *Bruner, J. S. (1961). The act of discovery. Harvard Educational Review.*
6. *Bulger, M. (2016). Personalized learning: The conversations we're not having. Data & Society, 22(1), 1–29. https://datasociety.net/pubs/ecl/PersonalizedLearning_primer_2016.pdf*
7. *CAST. (2018). Universal Design for Learning Guidelines version 2.2. https://udlguidelines.cast.org or https://udlguidelines.cast.org/more/downloads/#v2-2*

8. *Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). The flat world and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future. Teachers College Press.*
9. *Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. Applied developmental science, 24(2), 97-140.*
10. *Falmagne, J. C., Albert, D., Doble, C., Eppstein, D., & Hu, X. (Eds.). (2013). Knowledge spaces: Applications in education. Springer Science & Business Media.*
11. *García, E., & Weiss, E. (2017). Education inequalities at the school starting gate: Gaps, trends, and strategies to address them. Economic Policy Institute.*
12. *Hersi, A. A. (2010). Darling-Hammond: The flat world and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future. Teachers College Press, New York, 2010.*
13. *Bakia, M., Shear, L., Toyama, Y., & Lasseter, A. (2012). Understanding the Implications of Online Learning for Educational Productivity. Office of Educational Technology, US Department of Education.*
14. *Rao, K. (2021). Inclusive instructional design: Applying UDL to online learning. The Journal of Applied Instructional Design, 10(1), 1-10.*
15. *Holmes, W. (2019). Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning. Center for Curriculum Redesign.*
16. *Kizilcec, R. F., & Lee, H. (2022). Algorithmic fairness in education. In The ethics of artificial intelligence in education (pp. 174–202). Routledge.*
17. *Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the achievement gap to the education debt: Understanding achievement in US schools. Educational Researcher, 35(7), 3–12.*
18. *Meyer, A., Rose, D. H., & Gordon, D. (2014). Universal design for learning: Theory and practice.*
19. *Piaget, J. (2013). The construction of reality in the child. Routledge.*
20. *OECD. (2018). Equity in education: Breaking down barriers to social mobility. OECD Publishing. https://www.educationandemployers.org/research/equity-in-education-breaking-down-barriers-to-social-mobility/*
21. *Pane, J. F., Steiner, E. D., Baird, M. D., & Hamilton, L. S. (2015). Continued progress: Promising evidence on personalized learning. Rand Corporation.*
22. *Pane, J. F., Steiner, E. D., Baird, M. D., Hamilton, L. S., & Pane, J. D. (2017). Informing Progress: Insights on Personalized Learning Implementation and Effects. Research Report. RR-2042-BMGF. Rand Corporation.*
23. *Piaget, J. (1970). Science of education and the psychology of the child (D. Coltman, Trans.).*
24. *Reardon, S. (2012). The widening academic achievement gap between the rich and the poor. Community Investments, 24(Sum), 19–2438.*
25. *Reardon, S. F. (2013). The widening income achievement gap. In Structure of schooling: Readings in the sociology of education.*
26. *Van Dijk, J. A. (2006). Digital divide research, achievements and shortcomings. Poetics, 34(4-5), 221-235.*
27. *Reich, J., Buttimer, C. J., Fang, A., Hillaire, G., Hirsch, K., Larke, L. R., … Slama, R. (2020, April 2). Remote Learning Guidance From State Education Agencies During the COVID-19 Pandemic: A First Look. https://doi.org/10.35542/osf.io/437e2*
28. *Trust, T., Carpenter, J. P., & Krutka, D. G. (2017). Moving beyond silos: Professional learning networks in higher education. The Internet and Higher Education, 35, 1-11.*
29. *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.*
30. *VanLehn, K. (2011). The relative effectiveness of human tutoring, intelligent tutoring systems, and other tutoring systems. Educational Psychologist, 46(4), 197–221.*
31. *Walkington, C., & Bernacki, M. L. (2018). Personalization of instruction: Design dimensions and implications for cognition. The Journal of Experimental Education, 86(1), 50–68.*
32. *Wang, H., & Woodworth, K. (2011). Evaluation of Rocketship Education's use of DreamBox Learning's online mathematics program. Center for Education Policy.*
33. *Warschauer, M. (2004). Technology and social inclusion: Rethinking the digital divide. MIT Press.*
34. *Zawacki-Richter, O., & Latchem, C. (2018). Exploring four decades of research in Computers & Education. Computers & Education, 122, 136-152.*
    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.
35. *Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes (Vol. 86). Harvard university press.*