Open Access Journal
TRICKS
JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND LEARNING PRACTICES

Rethinking Instructional Leadership in the Era of Digital Transformation A Conceptual Framework

Michael Anderson[1]
[1]*University of Melbourne, Australia*

Corresponding Author: ***manderson@unimelb.edu.au***

ARTICLE INFO

Received March 21, 2023
Revised June 11, 2023
Accepted July 20, 2023
Published July 28, 2023

Keywords:
instructional leadership, digital transformation, educational technology, leadership framework

ABSTRACT

Digital transformation has fundamentally altered educational landscapes, necessitating reconceptualization of instructional leadership to address contemporary challenges and opportunities. This conceptual paper proposes an integrated framework for digital-age instructional leadership that extends traditional models to encompass technological, pedagogical, and organizational dimensions essential for leading learning in digitally mediated environments. Drawing on distributed leadership theory, technological pedagogical content knowledge, and organizational change literature, the framework identifies four core dimensions: digital vision and strategic direction, technology-enhanced pedagogical leadership, digital capacity building and professional learning, and data-informed decision-making and accountability. Each dimension encompasses specific competencies, practices, and organizational conditions that instructional leaders must develop and enact. The framework emphasizes distributed leadership approaches recognizing that digital transformation requires collaborative expertise beyond individual leaders' capacities. It also foregrounds equity considerations, acknowledging that technology can either reduce or exacerbate educational inequalities depending on leadership approaches. This conceptual framework provides theoretical foundation and practical guidance for educational leaders, policymakers, and leadership preparation programs navigating digital transformation's complexities while maintaining focus on improved teaching and learning outcomes.

INTRODUCTION

Instructional leadership, defined as leadership practices focused on improving teaching and learning quality, has been extensively researched and widely implemented as a model for effective school leadership over the past four decades. Traditional instructional leadership frameworks emphasize leaders' roles in defining school mission, managing curriculum and instruction, and promoting positive school learning climates through direct involvement in pedagogical processes (Hallinger & Murphy, 1985). However, these foundational models emerged in pre-digital contexts where instruction occurred primarily through face-to-face interaction, textbooks served as primary information sources, and teachers worked largely independently within physical classroom spaces. The accelerating digital transformation of education—characterized by ubiquitous technology access, digital learning resources, online and hybrid instruction, learning analytics, and networked professional collaboration—has fundamentally altered teaching and learning contexts in ways that challenge traditional instructional leadership conceptions. This digital shift necessitates rethinking instructional leadership to address new realities, opportunities, and challenges that digital technologies introduce to educational practice and school leadership (Muhsyanur et al., 2021).

Digital transformation in education extends beyond simply adding technology to existing practices; it represents fundamental restructuring of how teaching and learning occur, how knowledge is accessed and created, how students and teachers interact, and how schools function as organizations. Digital technologies enable personalized learning pathways, expand access to diverse resources and expertise beyond local contexts, facilitate data-driven instructional decisions, and create new modalities for collaboration and communication (Muhsyanur, 2024). However, technology also introduces challenges including digital equity gaps, information quality concerns, privacy and safety issues, and the need for new pedagogical approaches and professional competencies (Fullan & Langworthy, 2014). Instructional leaders must navigate these complexities while maintaining focus on core educational purposes of supporting all students' learning and development. Yet most instructional leadership frameworks, leadership preparation programs, and leadership development initiatives have not adequately addressed digital transformation's implications, leaving leaders underprepared for contemporary technological realities.

The COVID-19 pandemic dramatically accelerated educational digitalization, forcing rapid transitions to remote and hybrid learning that revealed both technology's potential and existing digital leadership gaps. Many school leaders struggled to support teachers in effective online instruction, ensure equitable technology access, maintain instructional quality amid disruption, and leverage digital tools for school operations and communication. These challenges highlighted the inadequacy of traditional leadership models for digital contexts and created urgent demand for reconceptualized instructional leadership frameworks

addressing technological dimensions (Harris & Jones, 2020). While some leaders successfully navigated digital transitions through adaptive leadership, innovation, and collaboration, others found themselves overwhelmed by technological complexities they felt unprepared to address. The pandemic's legacy includes heightened recognition that digital competence is no longer optional for instructional leaders but essential for effective educational leadership in contemporary and future contexts.

Existing research on educational technology leadership provides important foundations but remains fragmented across multiple theoretical traditions and lacks comprehensive frameworks integrating technology with core instructional leadership functions. Technology leadership literature often emphasizes infrastructure, systems management, and administrative applications rather than pedagogical dimensions central to instructional improvement (Anderson & Dexter, 2005). Conversely, instructional leadership research has insufficiently addressed how digital contexts transform teaching supervision, curriculum leadership, and professional learning facilitation. Recent work on digital leadership, technology integration leadership, and blended learning leadership has begun bridging these gaps, but comprehensive frameworks connecting digital dimensions to established instructional leadership theory and practice remain underdeveloped. This conceptual gap limits both leadership preparation and practice, as leaders lack clear models for enacting instructional leadership in digital contexts.

The concept of distributed leadership offers valuable perspective for rethinking instructional leadership amid digital transformation. Distributed leadership theory recognizes that leadership is not solely individual principals' responsibility but emerges through interactions among multiple organizational members, tools, and structures (Spillane, 2006). This perspective proves particularly relevant for digital transformation, where effective technology integration requires expertise distributed across technology coordinators, teacher leaders, instructional coaches, and classroom teachers, each contributing specialized knowledge that individual leaders rarely possess comprehensively. Digital transformation's technical complexity, rapid change pace, and pedagogical implications necessitate collaborative leadership approaches that leverage distributed expertise while maintaining strategic coherence. Instructional leaders' roles shift from direct instruction supervision toward creating conditions enabling effective distributed leadership around technology-enhanced teaching and learning.

Equity considerations must be central to any reconceptualization of instructional leadership for digital contexts. Research consistently demonstrates that technology access and effective use vary significantly by students' socioeconomic status, race, geographic location, and other demographic factors, creating digital divides that reproduce or amplify existing educational inequalities (Warschauer & Matuchniak, 2010). During pandemic-related school closures, these disparities became starkly visible as some students thrived with online learning while others struggled with inadequate devices, unreliable internet access, insufficient home

learning support, or learning designs poorly suited to their needs. Instructional leaders committed to equity must proactively address these disparities through leadership practices ensuring all students benefit from technology-enhanced learning. This requires moving beyond simple device provision toward comprehensive approaches addressing infrastructure, digital literacies, culturally responsive digital pedagogies, and inclusive technology integration that serves diverse learners' needs.

International perspectives reveal varied approaches to educational technology integration and leadership that can inform framework development. Countries like Singapore, Estonia, and Finland have implemented systemic digital transformation initiatives with substantial infrastructure investment, curriculum redesign, teacher professional development, and leadership preparation emphasizing technology integration. Examination of these contexts reveals that successful digital transformation requires coherent policy frameworks, sustained resource commitment, emphasis on pedagogical rather than merely technical dimensions, and leadership at all system levels—school, district, and national. However, these examples also demonstrate that effective approaches must be contextualized to local conditions, resources, and cultural contexts rather than universally replicated. Any instructional leadership framework for digital contexts must therefore balance evidence-based principles with adaptability to diverse implementation settings.

This conceptual paper addresses the critical need for comprehensive frameworks guiding instructional leadership practice, preparation, and research in digitally transformed educational contexts. By synthesizing insights from instructional leadership, technology integration, distributed leadership, and organizational change literature, the paper proposes an integrated framework identifying key dimensions, competencies, and practices for effective instructional leadership amid digital transformation. The framework aims to extend rather than replace traditional instructional leadership models, acknowledging enduring importance of defining educational direction, improving instructional quality, and creating supportive learning climates while recognizing how digital contexts transform enactment of these core functions. The framework also emphasizes distributed, collaborative leadership approaches appropriate to digital transformation's complexity. Ultimately, this work seeks to provide theoretical foundation and practical guidance supporting instructional leaders in leveraging digital transformation to enhance teaching quality, expand learning opportunities, and promote educational equity.

METHODE

This conceptual paper employs systematic literature synthesis methodology to develop an integrated framework for instructional leadership in digital transformation contexts. Conceptual framework development, as described by Jabareen (2009), involves identifying relevant concepts from existing literature, analyzing their relationships, and integrating them into coherent theoretical

structures that advance understanding beyond existing models. The analysis drew upon four primary literature domains: traditional instructional leadership frameworks including seminal works by Hallinger and Murphy (1985) and more recent elaborations; educational technology leadership and integration literature examining how leaders support effective technology use; distributed leadership theory as articulated by Spillane (2006) and applied to educational contexts; and digital transformation and organizational change scholarship addressing how organizations successfully navigate technological disruption. Literature was systematically searched through multiple databases including ERIC, Google Scholar, and Education Source using search terms combining instructional leadership, digital transformation, educational technology, technology integration, and related concepts, with focus on peer-reviewed publications from the past two decades supplemented by foundational earlier works.

The analytical process followed iterative stages of concept identification, deconstruction, categorization, and integration as outlined by Jabareen (2009). Initial analysis identified recurring themes and concepts across literature domains, including specific leadership practices, competencies, organizational conditions, and outcomes associated with effective technology integration and instructional improvement. These concepts were then deconstructed to understand their essential characteristics, assumptions, and relationships to other concepts. Categorization grouped related concepts into broader dimensions, revealing four primary categories corresponding to the framework's core dimensions. Finally, integration synthesized these dimensions into a cohesive framework mapping relationships among dimensions, identifying underlying principles, and articulating implications for leadership practice and development. Throughout this process, particular attention was paid to equity dimensions, examining how leadership practices might address or inadvertently exacerbate digital inequalities. The resulting framework was refined through consultation with educational leadership scholars and practitioners, incorporating feedback to enhance theoretical rigor and practical utility. While this conceptual work does not involve empirical data collection, it provides theoretical foundation for future empirical research examining the framework's validity and effectiveness across diverse educational contexts.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Dimension 1: Digital Vision and Strategic Direction

The first dimension of the framework addresses instructional leaders' responsibilities for articulating compelling visions for technology-enhanced learning and developing strategic directions that guide digital transformation efforts toward improved educational outcomes. Effective digital-age instructional leaders must move beyond vague commitments to "integrating technology" toward clearly articulated visions of how technology will enhance teaching, support diverse learners, expand learning opportunities, and advance educational equity. This vision-setting function extends traditional instructional leadership's emphasis on

defining school mission by specifically addressing digital transformation's purposes, possibilities, and priorities. As Fullan and Langworthy (2014) argue, technology's educational value depends entirely on how it is used; without clear pedagogical vision guiding implementation, schools risk adopting technology for its own sake rather than as means to educational improvement.

Developing digital vision requires leaders to engage stakeholders—teachers, students, families, community members—in collaborative processes examining current practices, identifying improvement priorities, and imagining how technology might address educational challenges and create new possibilities. Effective visions balance ambitious goals with realistic assessment of current capacities and resource constraints. They emphasize learning outcomes rather than technology itself, framing technology as tool serving educational purposes rather than as end goal. Research on successful technology integration consistently identifies clear, shared vision as foundational, providing direction for implementation decisions, motivating stakeholder engagement, and creating coherence across potentially fragmented technology initiatives (Dexter, 2008). However, vision alone proves insufficient without strategic planning translating vision into actionable steps, resource allocation decisions, implementation timelines, and accountability mechanisms ensuring that technology initiatives align with and advance instructional improvement goals.

Strategic direction-setting for digital transformation involves several key leadership practices. Leaders must conduct needs assessments examining current technology infrastructure, teacher competencies, student learning needs, and existing digital practices to identify gaps between current reality and desired vision. They develop strategic technology plans specifying priorities, implementation phases, professional learning needs, infrastructure requirements, and assessment strategies. Importantly, these plans must integrate with broader school improvement planning rather than existing as separate technology initiatives disconnected from instructional priorities. Leaders allocate resources—time, funding, personnel—to support strategic priorities, making difficult decisions about competing demands while maintaining focus on instructional improvement. They also establish timelines with appropriate pacing that allows for thoughtful implementation, learning from experience, and adjustment based on evidence rather than rushing toward premature large-scale deployment.

A critical aspect of digital vision and strategic direction involves addressing equity explicitly. Leaders must examine how technology initiatives affect different student groups, anticipating and preventing potential inequities in access, use quality, and outcomes. This includes ensuring infrastructure serves all students regardless of location or socioeconomic status, selecting technologies and pedagogical approaches that support diverse learners including students with disabilities and English language learners, and monitoring implementation for differential impacts across student populations. Equity-oriented digital vision rejects deficit framings viewing technology as compensating for student limitations, instead

emphasizing technology's potential to provide culturally relevant learning experiences, amplify student voice, and create personalized pathways honoring diverse strengths and needs. Without explicit equity focus, well-intentioned technology initiatives can inadvertently privilege already-advantaged students while leaving marginalized students further behind (Warschauer & Matuchniak, 2010).

Dimension 2: Technology-Enhanced Pedagogical Leadership

The second dimension addresses how instructional leaders support, supervise, and improve teaching quality in technology-rich environments. Traditional instructional leadership emphasizes observing instruction, providing feedback, coordinating curriculum, and monitoring student progress—functions that remain essential but require substantial reconceptualization for digital contexts. Technology fundamentally changes what effective teaching looks like, expanding pedagogical repertoires beyond traditional lecture and discussion toward blended learning, personalized instruction, project-based learning with digital tools, online collaboration, and multimedia creation. Instructional leaders must understand these pedagogical possibilities and challenges to provide meaningful guidance supporting teachers in leveraging technology effectively while maintaining focus on rigorous learning goals (Sheninger & Murray, 2017).

Supporting technology-enhanced pedagogy requires leaders to develop what Koehler and Mishra (2009) term technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK)—understanding how technology, pedagogy, and content knowledge intersect to enable effective teaching. While leaders need not be technology experts in every domain, they must understand how different technologies afford particular pedagogical approaches, how subject-specific content can be enhanced through digital tools, and how to evaluate whether technology use genuinely advances learning versus serving as engaging distraction. This knowledge enables leaders to ask probing questions during classroom observations, recognize effective versus superficial technology integration, and provide useful feedback helping teachers refine technology-enhanced instruction. Leaders model technology use in their own practices, demonstrating tools during faculty meetings, using digital platforms for communication and collaboration, and sharing how they leverage technology for leadership work.

The supervision and evaluation dimension of instructional leadership requires adaptation for digital contexts. Traditional classroom observation protocols may inadequately capture technology-enhanced instruction occurring across physical and digital spaces, extending beyond class periods, and involving asynchronous student work that teachers monitor and respond to outside scheduled class times. Leaders must develop evaluation approaches that assess both in-class technology use and digital learning environments including learning management systems, online discussions, and digital assignments. They examine whether technology use aligns with learning objectives, supports diverse learners, promotes higher-order thinking,

and engages students meaningfully. Importantly, evaluation must move beyond checking whether teachers use technology toward assessing the quality and effectiveness of that use. Some highly effective teaching may involve minimal technology while some technology-rich instruction may be pedagogically weak—leaders must distinguish between technology presence and pedagogical quality.

Curriculum leadership also transforms in digital contexts. Traditional curriculum coordination often focused on textbook selection, pacing guide development, and ensuring alignment with standards—functions that remain relevant but insufficient for technology-rich learning. Digital resources expand curriculum possibilities dramatically, providing access to current information, diverse perspectives, multimedia content, simulations, and authentic learning experiences impossible with traditional materials alone. Leaders must guide teachers in evaluating, selecting, and integrating high-quality digital resources while maintaining curricular coherence and rigor. This includes addressing copyright and digital citizenship issues, ensuring resource accessibility for diverse learners, and balancing commercial resources with open educational resources. Leaders also support teachers in developing digital literacy as curriculum priority, recognizing that students need not only content knowledge but also competencies for navigating digital information environments, evaluating source credibility, creating digital content, and participating responsibly in online communities (Sheninger & Murray, 2017).

Dimension 3: Digital Capacity Building and Professional Learning

The third dimension focuses on instructional leaders' roles in building organizational capacity for effective technology integration through strategic professional learning, distributed leadership development, and creation of collaborative learning cultures. Digital transformation requires substantial changes in teacher knowledge, skills, and pedagogical approaches that cannot be achieved through one-time technology training workshops. Instead, leaders must design and facilitate ongoing professional learning systems that develop teachers' technological and pedagogical competencies while fostering collaborative cultures where educators learn together about effective technology integration. This capacity-building function extends traditional instructional leadership's emphasis on professional development by addressing both individual teacher learning and organizational capacity for continuous improvement in technology-rich contexts.

Effective professional learning for technology integration differs substantially from conventional professional development models. Rather than decontextualized training sessions teaching technology tools in isolation, effective approaches embed learning in authentic teaching contexts, focus on pedagogical applications rather than technical features, provide ongoing support beyond initial introduction, and create opportunities for collaboration and peer learning (Trust et al., 2016). Instructional leaders facilitate these approaches through multiple strategies: organizing professional learning communities focused on technology-enhanced

teaching where teachers collaboratively examine student work, share effective practices, and problem-solve challenges; providing time for teachers to observe colleagues using technology effectively and discuss those observations; arranging coaching support from technology integrators or teacher leaders who work directly with teachers in their classrooms; and creating opportunities for teachers to design and pilot technology-enhanced lessons with structured reflection on effectiveness.

Distributed leadership proves particularly important for capacity building in digital transformation contexts. Given technology's complexity and rapid evolution, expecting individual principals to possess comprehensive technology expertise proves unrealistic and unnecessary. Instead, effective instructional leaders develop and leverage distributed expertise by identifying and supporting teacher leaders, instructional coaches, and technology specialists who possess strong technology integration skills. These distributed leaders work collaboratively with principals to provide professional learning, classroom support, and strategic guidance for technology initiatives. Distributed leadership approaches also empower teachers, creating ownership and sustainability for technology integration beyond dependence on external experts or administrator mandates. Spillane's (2006) distributed leadership perspective emphasizes that leadership emerges through interactions among leaders, followers, and situations—a framework well-suited to digital transformation's collaborative nature where effective technology use depends on collective expertise and shared leadership.

However, distributed leadership requires careful orchestration to remain coherent and connected to instructional improvement goals. Instructional leaders must coordinate distributed leadership activities, ensuring they align with school vision and strategic priorities rather than fragmenting into disconnected technology projects. Leaders establish clear roles and responsibilities for distributed leaders, provide resources supporting their work, and create structures for communication and collaboration among various leadership roles. They also attend to equity in distributed leadership, ensuring that leadership opportunities and associated professional learning benefits extend beyond already-privileged teachers to include educators serving diverse student populations. Building capacity for equitable technology integration requires particular attention to developing expertise among teachers working with marginalized students, recognizing that effective technology use for diverse learners requires specialized knowledge combining cultural responsiveness, differentiation, and technological facility (Warschauer & Matuchniak, 2010).

Dimension 4: Data-Informed Decision-Making and Accountability

The fourth dimension addresses how instructional leaders leverage data and analytics afforded by digital technologies to inform decisions, monitor progress, and ensure accountability for equitable outcomes. Digital technologies generate unprecedented amounts of data about student learning, engagement patterns, resource utilization, and instructional effectiveness that can inform improvement

efforts when used appropriately. Learning management systems track student participation and progress, digital assessments provide immediate performance data, and various analytics tools reveal patterns across classrooms and grade levels. Instructional leaders must develop capacity to interpret and use these data sources for decision-making while avoiding potential pitfalls including data overload, misinterpretation, narrow focus on easily measured outcomes, and privacy violations. When used thoughtfully, data-informed leadership can enhance instructional responsiveness, identify students needing additional support, evaluate initiative effectiveness, and promote equity by revealing disparities requiring intervention (Mandinach & Gummer, 2016).

Developing data literacy among instructional leaders and teachers represents a crucial capacity-building need for digital-age leadership. Data literacy encompasses abilities to access relevant data, interpret patterns and trends, connect data to instructional decisions, and communicate findings to stakeholders. Leaders must understand various data types including formative and summative assessments, engagement metrics, demographic information, and learning analytics, recognizing each type's appropriate uses and limitations. They facilitate professional learning developing teachers' data literacy, creating structures for collaborative data analysis where educators examine student work and performance data together to identify patterns, hypothesize causes, and develop targeted instructional responses. However, leaders must also cultivate critical perspectives on data, questioning what data reveal and conceal, whose interests particular metrics serve, and how data collection and interpretation might reflect biases requiring interrogation.

Accountability systems in digital contexts must balance multiple considerations including learning outcomes, equity, innovation, and ethical technology use. Traditional accountability often emphasizes standardized test scores, but comprehensive accountability for digital transformation requires broader indicators including technology access and use quality, digital literacy development, student engagement in technology-enhanced learning, and closing of digital achievement gaps. Leaders establish accountability mechanisms tracking these indicators, disaggregating data to reveal disparities across student groups, and taking corrective action when evidence indicates inequitable outcomes or ineffective practices. They also communicate accountability data transparently to stakeholders including teachers, families, and communities, explaining both successes and challenges in technology integration efforts while soliciting input for improvement.

However, data-informed leadership requires careful attention to ethical issues including privacy, algorithmic bias, and narrow instrumentalism. Digital data collection raises privacy concerns, particularly when commercial platforms access student information or when surveillance technologies monitor student behavior. Leaders must understand privacy regulations, evaluate technologies' data practices, and protect students' digital privacy rights while leveraging data for educational improvement. They also recognize that algorithms and analytics tools can embed biases, potentially disadvantaging particular student groups through biased

assumptions, limited data perspectives, or inappropriate indicator selection. Critical data literacy involves questioning whose knowledge and values shape analytics systems and whose interests they serve. Finally, leaders must resist narrow instrumentalism where easily measured outcomes displace broader educational values, ensuring that accountability systems honor diverse forms of learning, creativity, and development rather than reducing education to quantifiable metrics alone (Mandinach & Gummer, 2016).

CONCLUSION

This conceptual framework proposes that effective instructional leadership in the digital transformation era requires fundamental reconceptualization extending traditional models to address technological dimensions now central to teaching and learning. The four dimensions—digital vision and strategic direction, technology-enhanced pedagogical leadership, digital capacity building and professional learning, and data-informed decision-making and accountability—provide comprehensive structure for understanding and enacting instructional leadership appropriate to contemporary educational contexts. The framework emphasizes that digital transformation is fundamentally about pedagogy and equity rather than technology itself, positioning instructional leaders as stewards ensuring that technological innovation serves educational improvement and opportunity expansion for all students. It acknowledges digital transformation's complexity by foregrounding distributed leadership approaches that leverage collaborative expertise while maintaining strategic coherence. The framework also centers equity throughout, recognizing that leadership practices must proactively address digital divides and ensure technology enhances rather than undermines educational justice. Future research should empirically examine this framework's validity and effectiveness across diverse contexts, investigate how leaders develop digital-age competencies, and explore organizational conditions supporting comprehensive digital transformation. As education continues evolving in increasingly digital directions, frameworks guiding instructional leadership practice, preparation, and policy become essential for realizing technology's promise while avoiding its pitfalls, ultimately serving the enduring educational purpose of supporting all students' learning, development, and flourishing in digitally mediated worlds.

REFERENCES

Anderson, R. E., & Dexter, S. (2005). School technology leadership: An empirical investigation of prevalence and effect. Educational Administration Quarterly, 41(1), 49-82. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X04269517

Dexter, S. (2008). Leadership for IT in schools. In J. Voogt & G. Knezek (Eds.), International handbook of information technology in primary and secondary education (pp. 543-554). Springer.

Fullan, M., & Langworthy, M. (2014). A rich seam: How new pedagogies find deep learning. Pearson.

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional management behavior of principals. Elementary School Journal, 86(2), 217-247. https://doi.org/10.1086/461445

Harris, A., & Jones, M. (2020). COVID-19—School leadership in disruptive times. School Leadership & Management, 40(4), 243-247. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2020.1811479

Jabareen, Y. (2009). Building a conceptual framework: Philosophy, definitions, and procedure. International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 8(4), 49-62. https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690900800406

Koehler, M. J., & Mishra, P. (2009). What is technological pedagogical content knowledge? Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education, 9(1), 60-70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2010.07.009

Mandinach, E. B., & Gummer, E. S. (2016). What does it mean for teachers to be data literate: Laying out the skills, knowledge, and dispositions. Teaching and Teacher Education, 60, 366-376. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.07.011

Muhsyanur, M. (2024). *Love-Based Curriculum as a New Paradigm in Language Education : Between Cognition , Affection , and Spirituality*. *2*(5), 12–19.

Muhsyanur, Rahmatullah, A. S., Misnawati, Dumiyati, & Ghufron, S. (2021). The Effectiveness of "Facebook" As Indonesian Language Learning Media for Elementary School Student: Distance Learning Solutions in the Era of the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Multicultural Education*, *7*(04), 38–47. https://www.mccaddogap.com/ojs/index.php/me/article/view/8%0Ahttps://www.mccaddogap.com/ojs/index.php/me/article/download/8/10

Sheninger, E. C., & Murray, T. C. (2017). Learning transformed: 8 keys to designing tomorrow's schools, today. ASCD.

Spillane, J. P. (2006). Distributed leadership. Jossey-Bass.

Trust, T., Krutka, D. G., & Carpenter, J. P. (2016). "Together we are better": Professional learning networks for teachers. Computers & Education, 102, 15-34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2016.06.007

Warschauer, M., & Matuchniak, T. (2010). New technology and digital worlds: Analyzing evidence of equity in access, use, and outcomes. Review of Research in Education, 34(1), 179-225. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X09349791