ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jun301

The Effect of Technology Access Disparities on Academic Outcomes: A Stratification-Based Analysis of Virtual Learning Environments

Ahmed Fahad Alanazi[1]

[1]King Faisal University

Publication Date: 2026/06/22

Abstract: The rapid transition to online learning, accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic, has exposed a persistent social issue: the digital divide. While existing research documents disparities in access to technology, a critical gap remains in understanding how these disparities translate into measurable differences in academic performance through the lens of social stratification. This study investigates the relationship between digital access and academic outcomes among university students in developing economies. Utilizing a mixed-methods sequential explanatory design, data were collected from 450 undergraduate students across three public universities. Quantitative findings reveal a statistically significant positive correlation between a composite Digital Access Index and cumulative grade point average. Thematic analysis of follow-up interviews identifies three primary mechanisms mediating this relationship: digital self-efficacy, temporal flexibility for asynchronous learning, and access to supplementary academic resources. Drawing on Bourdieu's theory of cultural and social capital, the study demonstrates how digital tools function as a contemporary form of capital that reinforces existing class structures. These findings suggest that without targeted intervention, online learning environments risk perpetuating, rather than mitigating, educational inequality. Policy implications include recommendations for infrastructure investment, device subsidy programs, and digital literacy training integrated into curriculum design.

Keywords: *Digital Divide; Online Learning; Social Stratification; Academic Performance; Educational Technology; Digital Capital.*

How to Cite: Ahmed Fahad Alanazi (2026) The Effect of Technology Access Disparities on Academic Outcomes: A Stratification-Based Analysis of Virtual Learning Environments. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 11(6), 915-921. https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jun301

I. INTRODUCTION

The 21st century has witnessed the digitalization of nearly every sector of society, with higher education positioned at the forefront of this transformation. The unexpected onset of the global health crisis in early 2020 forced educational institutions worldwide to transition to emergency remote teaching, an event that simultaneously revealed the potential and the perils of technology-mediated learning (World Bank, 2021; Dhawan, 2020). While students from privileged socioeconomic contexts often shifted seamlessly to online platforms, their peers from lower-income backgrounds encountered significant barriers, including a lack of reliable internet connectivity, inadequate devices, and insufficient digital literacy skills (Beaunoyer, Dupéré, & Guitton, 2020). This phenomenon, broadly termed the "digital divide," has evolved from a binary distinction between those who have access to technology and those who do not into a more nuanced understanding of differentiated access based on quality, autonomy, and patterns of usage. As Van Dijk (2020) conceptualizes, this is a multi-dimensional problem encompassing motivational, material, skills, and usage gaps. Within the context of education, these gaps are not merely technical inconveniences; rather, they represent fundamental barriers to equal participation in the learning process.

Despite a growing awareness of these issues, much of the existing research focuses on infrastructural deficits in a general sense, often overlooking the precise mechanisms through which digital inequity translates into academic disadvantage (DiMaggio et al., 2004; Ragnedda, 2017). Furthermore, there is a notable need for more robust theoretical grounding that connects digital access to classical sociological theories of inequality, moving beyond descriptive accounts of who has what technology. This study addresses these gaps by posing the following research questions: (1) What is the relationship between students' level of digital access and their self-reported academic performance in an online learning environment? (2) What mechanisms explain how digital access (or the lack thereof) influences learning outcomes? (3) How does differential access to digital resources reinforce existing patterns of social stratification in higher education? By integrating quantitative measures of access with rich qualitative accounts of student experience, this research provides a comprehensive picture of

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jun301

digital inequality in action. The findings contribute both to scholarly understanding of digital stratification and to the development of practical, evidence-based policies for equitable online education.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

➢ *Theorizing the Digital Divide as Social Stratification*

Sociological theories of social stratification offer a powerful framework for understanding why the digital divide persists and how it impacts life outcomes. Bourdieu's (1986) concept of capital, encompassing economic, cultural, social, and symbolic forms, provides a particularly useful lens for this analysis (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990). Bourdieu argues that the education system is not a meritocratic equalizer but rather a mechanism that reproduces class privilege by valuing the cultural capital of dominant groups. In the digital age, access to and proficiency with technology functions as a new form of "digital capital" that interacts with and reinforces other forms of capital (Ragnedda, Ruiu, & Addeo, 2020; Park, 2017; Ignatow & Robinson, 2017). Economic capital determines a family's ability to purchase high-speed internet, multiple devices, and technical support. Cultural capital shapes parents' ability to assist with digital tasks and their emphasis on technology-related skills. Social capital provides networks through which students can seek help, share resources, or gain access to exclusive online learning opportunities (Putnam, 2000; Lin, 2001). When online learning becomes a requirement, students lacking these forms of capital are systematically disadvantaged, not because of any deficit in innate ability, but because the very structure of the learning environment implicitly favors those with digital privilege (Warschauer, 2004).

➢ *Dimensions of the Educational Digital Divide*

Early research on the digital divide focused primarily on first-level access, often characterized as the "haves" versus the "have-nots" (Norris, 2001; Compaine, 2001). However, as internet penetration increased in developed nations, scholars recognized that access alone was an insufficient metric. Hargittai (2010) introduced the concept of the "second-level digital divide," emphasizing differentiated skills in using technology effectively (Hargittai & Hinnant, 2008; Van Deursen & Van Dijk, 2019). A student may own a computer and have an internet connection but still lack the navigational skills to find reliable sources, participate in online discussions, or submit assignments through complex learning management systems. More recently, researchers have identified a "third-level digital divide" that concerns tangible outcomes, that is, the unequal benefits derived from similar levels of digital engagement (Wei, Teo, Chan, & Tan, 2021; Van Deursen & Helsper, 2015; Scheerder, Van Deursen, & Van Dijk, 2019). In education, this translates to differential academic returns on technology use. For example, Wei et al. (2021) found that students from higher socioeconomic backgrounds use digital devices for more "capital-enhancing" activities (e.g., research, creative projects), while lower-income students disproportionately use them for entertainment, thereby widening achievement gaps (Robinson & Schulz, 2020).

➢ *Online Learning and Academic Performance: Empirical Evidence*

Empirical studies on online learning outcomes have produced mixed results, largely dependent on how researchers measure both "access" and "performance." A foundational meta-analysis by Means, Toyama, Murphy, Bakia, and Jones (2013) suggested that online learning can be as effective as face-to-face instruction when properly designed. However, such studies often controlled for student characteristics in ways that obscure inequitable impacts. When researchers examine differential effects by socioeconomic status, a clearer pattern of disadvantage emerges. Robinson, Hill, and Hall (2020) found that during the initial pandemic-related school closures, students in the lowest income quartile experienced learning losses approximately 30% greater than those in the highest quartile, with technology access mediating much of this effect (Robinson, Schulz, & Blank, 2020; Kuhfeld et al., 2020). Similarly, Azevedo, Hasan, Goldemberg, Geven, and Iqbal (2021) used microsimulation models to project that a lack of remote learning access could reduce future lifetime earnings for affected students by up to 4% in low-income countries (Azevedo, Gutierrez, & de Hoyos, 2021). Specific barriers identified in the literature include connectivity instability, where students with intermittent access struggle with synchronous sessions, leading to missed instruction (Katz & Gonzalez, 2016; Reisdorf & Rikard, 2018); device limitations, as smartphone-only access restricts engagement with multimedia content (Tsetsi & Rains, 2017; Gonzales, 2016); and environmental distractions, with students lacking dedicated study spaces reporting lower concentration (Livingstone & Helsper, 2007; Mesch, 2012).

➢ *Gaps in the Current Literature*

Despite this growing body of evidence, several gaps persist. First, quantitative studies often rely on binary measures of access (yes/no for internet or computer), obscuring the gradient of quality (Blank & Groselj, 2014; Helsper, 2021). Second, qualitative studies exploring student experience are often small-scale and lack generalizable findings (Warschauer, Knobel, & Stone, 2004; Selwyn, 2010). Third, research that integrates Bourdieusian theory with contemporary digital learning environments remains underdeveloped, particularly in non-Western contexts. This study directly addresses these gaps by employing a mixed-methods design in a developing-economy setting, using multidimensional measures of digital access grounded in social stratification theory.

III. METHODOLOGY

➢ *Research Design*

This study employed a sequential explanatory mixed-methods design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2010). Phase 1 consisted of a quantitative survey measuring digital access, usage patterns, and self-reported academic performance. Phase 2 involved semi-structured interviews with a subset of survey respondents to explore in depth the mechanisms underlying the quantitative findings. This design allows for statistical generalization while

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jun301

simultaneously providing rich, contextualized understanding of student experiences.

➢ *Setting and Sampling*

The study was conducted at three public universities in a developing country region, selected to represent urban (n=1), suburban (n=1), and rural (n=1) institutional contexts. Public universities were chosen because they enroll students from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds, in contrast to elite private institutions. For the quantitative phase, stratified random sampling was used to recruit 450 undergraduate students, with stratification variables including year of study (first through fourth year) and academic discipline (humanities, social sciences, and STEM). Inclusion criteria required current enrollment and completion of at least one fully online course in the preceding academic term. The final response rate was 71.4% (n=321 usable surveys after data cleaning). For the qualitative phase, purposive maximum variation sampling was employed to select 30 interview participants from survey respondents (Patton, 2015). Selection criteria ensured representation across levels of digital access (low, medium, high) and academic performance (low, average, high). Interviews continued until thematic saturation was achieved.

➢ *Data Collection Instruments*

The quantitative survey consisted of four sections. First, demographic information collected age, gender, parental education, household income bracket, and urban/rural residence. Second, the Digital Access Index (DAI), a 15-item scale adapted from the OECD's ICT Access and Usage framework (OECD, 2019), measured device ownership, internet connection type, connection reliability, number of shared users per device, and availability of technical support. Each item was weighted and summed to create a composite DAI score ranging from 0 to 100. Third, a digital skills assessment used a 10-item self-efficacy scale measuring perceived ability to perform specific online learning tasks (e.g., navigating learning management systems, evaluating source credibility, participating in video conferences) on a 5-point Likert scale (Bandura, 2006). Fourth, for academic performance, students self-reported their cumulative GPA (converted to a 0-4.0 scale) and provided permission for the researcher to verify with institutional records. Verification was successful for 78% of participants; self-reported and verified GPAs were highly correlated (r = 0.89), supporting the validity of self-reports for the remaining cases. The interview protocol consisted of semi-structured interviews lasting 45-75 minutes, exploring students' experiences with online learning, specific challenges encountered, coping strategies employed, and perceptions of fairness and equity (Rubin & Rubin, 2011; Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009).

➢ *Data Analysis Procedures*

Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS version 28. Descriptive statistics summarized sample characteristics. Pearson correlations examined bivariate relationships between DAI, digital skills, and GPA. Multiple linear regression was used to test the predictive power of digital access on GPA while controlling for demographic variables (parental income, urban/rural residence). All assumptions of linearity, normality, homoscedasticity, and independence of errors were tested and met. Qualitative data were transcribed verbatim and analyzed using thematic analysis following Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase framework. Initial coding was inductive, allowing themes to emerge from the data, followed by axial coding to group initial codes into higher-order themes. Two researchers independently coded 20% of transcripts to establish inter-rater reliability (κ = 0.84), with discrepancies resolved through discussion.

➢ *Ethical Considerations*

Ethical approval was obtained from the relevant university Institutional Review Board (Protocol #2024-089). All participants provided informed written consent and were assured of confidentiality, with data anonymized prior to analysis. Students were informed that participation was voluntary and would not affect course grades. Interview participants received a modest honorarium to compensate for their time.

IV. FINDINGS

➢ *Quantitative Results*

Of the 321 survey respondents, 58.6% (n=188) identified as female and 41.4% (n=133) as male, with a mean age of 21.4 years (SD = 2.1). Parental education levels varied considerably: 22.4% had parents with university degrees, 45.5% with secondary education, and 32.1% with primary or no formal education. Household income distribution showed 28.7% below the national median, 45.2% near the median, and 26.1% above the median. The mean DAI score was 58.3 (SD = 22.4, range 12-94), with significant differences emerging by demographic subgroup. Students from households above the median income had mean DAI scores of 76.8 (SD = 15.2), compared to 44.2 (SD = 18.6) for those below the median income, a difference of 32.6 points, $t(319) = 11.42$, $p < .001$. Rural students (n=112) had a mean DAI of 49.3 (SD = 20.1), while urban students (n=209) had a mean DAI of 63.1 (SD = 21.4), $t(319) = 5.68$, $p < .001$. Regarding specific barriers, 34.6% of respondents reported sharing a single device with three or more family members. Smartphone-only access (no laptop or desktop) was reported by 28.9% of students. Intermittent internet connectivity (daily disconnections lasting more than 10 minutes) affected 41.7% of rural students compared to just 12.4% of urban students.

Turning to academic performance, the mean self-reported GPA was 3.12 (SD = 0.58, range 1.8-3.9). The correlation between DAI and GPA was $r = 0.68$, $p < .001$, 95% CI [0.61, 0.74], indicating a strong positive relationship. Digital skills scores correlated with GPA at $r = 0.59$, $p < .001$, and with DAI at $r = 0.71$, $p < .001$, suggesting that material access facilitates skill development. Table 1 presents mean GPAs across DAI quartiles, revealing a clear dose-response relationship: students in the lowest DAI quartile (scores 12-40) had a mean GPA of 2.58 (SD = 0.42), while those in the highest quartile (81-94) had a mean GPA of 3.62 (SD = 0.31). An ANOVA revealed significant differences between quartiles, $F(3, 317) = 47.29$, $p < .001$, with post-hoc Tukey tests indicating all pairwise comparisons were significant at $p < .01$ except between Q3 and Q4 ($p = .07$). Finally, a multiple

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jun301

linear regression was conducted to predict GPA from DAI scores while controlling for household income, parental education, and urban/rural residence. The full model was significant, $R^2 = 0.52$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.51$, $F(5, 315) = 68.34$, $p < .001$. Critically, DAI remained a significant predictor ($\beta = 0.48$, $p < .001$) even after controlling for income ($\beta = 0.15$, $p = .02$), parental education ($\beta = 0.11$, $p = .06$), and urban residence ($\beta = 0.09$, $p = .12$). This indicates that digital access explains unique variance in academic performance above and beyond socioeconomic status alone.

➢ *Qualitative Results*

The thematic analysis of the 30 interviews revealed three primary mechanisms explaining *how* digital access influences academic performance. These themes not only corroborate the quantitative findings but also provide deep narrative insight into the lived experience of digital inequality.

- *Theme 1: Digital Self-Efficacy and Academic Confidence*

The first mechanism concerned the internal psychological state of the learner. Students with higher digital access consistently described a sense of mastery, control, and proactive engagement with their learning environment. For instance, a fourth-year STEM student with a high DAI explained: *"When I have stable internet and a good laptop, I am not afraid to try new software or explore the library databases. I know if I get stuck, I can watch a tutorial video without my connection dropping. That confidence makes me participate more and take on challenging projects"* (Participant 14, High DAI, GPA 3.7). This sense of confidence translated into visible academic behaviors such as volunteering for extra credit work, asking questions in live forums, and experimenting with digital tools beyond course requirements. In stark contrast, students with low access described a pervasive sense of anxiety, anticipation of failure, and the development of active avoidance behaviors. Another student elaborated: *"Every time the professor says 'open this link' or 'join this breakout room,' my heart races because I don't know if my phone will handle it. Sometimes I just don't click. I pretend my camera is broken so no one expects me to respond quickly. I am always behind and afraid of looking stupid"* (Participant 7, Low DAI, GPA 2.3). Several low-access students recounted specific incidents where technical failures during graded presentations led to public embarrassment, which then compounded into a long-term reluctance to participate. This theme directly aligns with Bandura's (2006) concept of self-efficacy, suggesting that access shapes not only objective ability but also the psychological disposition to engage with academic challenges. One participant summarized this cycle succinctly: *"How can I learn if I spend half my energy just being scared of the technology?"* (Participant 12, Low DAI, GPA 2.4).

- *Theme 2: Temporal Flexibility and the Hidden Curriculum*

The second mechanism concerned the temporal dimension of learning. Students with reliable, private access could work asynchronously, distributing their study time across the day according to their personal cognitive rhythms. In contrast, students with limited or shared access described themselves as being "time-bound" to narrow windows when devices or connectivity were available, often late at night or early in the morning. One student living in a crowded household shared: *"There are six people in my house and we share one computer. I can only do my schoolwork after 10 PM when everyone is asleep. But by then I am exhausted from helping my younger siblings with their work. My wealthier classmates can study in the morning when their brains are fresh. That is not fair competition"* (Participant 19, Low DAI, GPA 2.6). Another student elaborated on the cascading consequences of this temporal constraint: *"Even when I finally get on the computer, I am racing against the clock. I know my little brother will need it for his own class in an hour, so I cannot dive deep into a topic. I just skim and submit something. My friends with their own laptops can spend four hours researching one question if they want"* (Participant 8, Medium DAI, GPA 2.8). This finding reveals how the "hidden curriculum" of online learning, the unstated expectation of flexible, self-directed scheduling, systematically disadvantages students who lack private, reliable access. These students cannot optimize their learning for peak cognitive hours but must work when technology is merely available, regardless of their mental state. Several participants noted that this temporal inflexibility also prevented them from attending optional review sessions or virtual office hours offered during the day, further widening the achievement gap.

- *Theme 3: Access to Supplementary Academic Resources*

The third mechanism involved differential ability to access resources beyond required course materials. Students with high-quality access described a virtuous cycle of resource accumulation, where stable connectivity allowed them to pursue informal learning opportunities that directly enhanced formal performance. One participant explained: *"My friend with fiber internet can watch additional YouTube lectures from MIT, download open-access textbooks, and join Zoom study groups. I can barely load our required readings. When we get the same exam, she has seen extra examples and explanations that I have not. That gap grows every week"* (Participant 25, Medium DAI, GPA 2.9). Another student described the frustration of knowing that resources existed but being unable to access them: *"I see links to supplemental articles in the syllabus. But many of them are PDFs that take five minutes to load, or they are videos that buffer every ten seconds. After a while, I just stopped trying. I only do the bare minimum because that is all my connection can handle"* (Participant 3, Low DAI, GPA 2.2). Conversely, a high-access student described using supplementary resources not just for remediation but for advancement: *"Last week, the professor mentioned a concept I found interesting. I spent two hours on YouTube watching lectures from different universities, then found a free online course module about it. I brought that new knowledge into my discussion post and got great feedback. None of that would have been possible on mobile data"* (Participant 22, High DAI, GPA 3.8). This theme directly invokes Bourdieu's (1986) concept of cultural capital. Students with high digital access can accumulate academic capital through informal learning opportunities that are structurally unavailable to their peers. The formal curriculum implicitly assumes equal access to these

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jun301

supplementary resources, but the qualitative reality is one of deeply stratified enrichment.

➢ *Integration of Quantitative and Qualitative Findings*

The mixed-methods design reveals both the "what" and the "why" of digital inequality in education. Quantitatively, the researcher observes a strong, dose-response relationship between digital access and academic performance, with the regression analysis confirming that this relationship holds even when controlling for socioeconomic status. Qualitatively, the investigator identifies three specific mechanisms that explain this relationship: psychological confidence, temporal flexibility, and differential resource accumulation. Each mechanism represents a distinct pathway through which digital capital translates into academic advantage, operating independently from, and in addition to, the direct effects of economic capital. Importantly, the qualitative data also revealed that these mechanisms are not mutually exclusive; low-access students often experienced all three simultaneously, creating a compounded disadvantage. As one student put it: *"It is not just one thing. I am anxious, I have no time, and I cannot get the extra materials. All of that together means I am always fighting an uphill battle that my classmates don't even see"* (Participant 18, Low DAI, GPA 2.5).

V. DISCUSSION

➢ *Interpretation of Findings in Theoretical Context*

The findings of this study provide strong empirical support for positioning digital access as a distinct form of capital within Bourdieu's (1986) framework of social reproduction. Students with high DAI scores did not merely have more convenient access to course materials; they had qualitatively different learning experiences characterized by confidence, flexibility, and expanded opportunities for knowledge acquisition. These advantages compound over time, producing widening achievement gaps as courses progress, a phenomenon that directly mirrors Bourdieu and Passeron's (1990) description of how cultural capital accumulates across an educational career. Importantly, the regression analysis showing that DAI predicts GPA beyond household income suggests that digital capital, while correlated with economic capital, is not reducible to it. A family may have moderate income but prioritize technology investment, or conversely have higher income but allocate resources elsewhere. This finding carries practical implications: interventions focusing solely on income redistribution may be insufficient; targeted digital access programs are independently valuable. Furthermore, the qualitative themes resonate strongly with previous research on second- and third-level digital divides. Hargittai's (2010) work on digital skills is extended by Theme 1, which shows that confidence and anxiety mediate the relationship between access and effective use (Hargittai & Hinnant, 2008; Van Deursen & Van Dijk, 2019). Van Dijk's (2020) emphasis on usage gaps is supported by Theme 3, as students use similar digital tools for fundamentally different academic purposes based on their access quality. Theme 2 adds a novel contribution to the literature: the temporal dimension of access as a mechanism of inequality, a factor often overlooked in cross-sectional surveys but central to the lived experience of low-access students (Reisdorf & Rikard, 2018; Gonzales, 2016).

➢ *Comparison with Previous Research*

These findings align with the pandemic-era work of Robinson, Hill, and Hall (2020) and Azevedo et al. (2021) in demonstrating learning losses concentrated among low-access students (Robinson, Schulz, & Blank, 2020; Kuhfeld et al., 2020; Azevedo, Gutierrez, & de Hoyos, 2021). However, the current study extends this work by examining post-pandemic "new normal" online learning rather than emergency remote teaching. The persistence of digital divides into routine, planned online education suggests that these are not temporary disruptions but rather structural features of contemporary higher education (Helsper, 2021; Scheerder et al., 2019). The effect size observed ($r = 0.68$) is larger than that reported in some meta-analyses of technology and learning, such as Means et al. (2013). One explanation is that this study measured access as a multidimensional index rather than simple binary usage. Prior research averaging across high- and low-access students may underestimate effect sizes, while examining the full range of access reveals stronger linear relationships. Additionally, the developing-country context of this study may produce larger effects due to greater baseline variation in infrastructure compared to studies conducted in highly resourced, developed nations (Warschauer, 2004; Van Dijk, 2020).

➢ *Policy and Practice Implications*

These findings suggest three interrelated categories of intervention. First, *institutional interventions* should include the establishment of device lending libraries, whereby universities maintain inventories of laptops and mobile hotspots for students to check out on a semester basis, similar to textbook reserve programs (Gonzales, McCrory Calarco, & Lynch, 2020). Course designers should adopt an asynchronous-first design philosophy, prioritizing materials that can be downloaded for offline access to reduce dependence on real-time connectivity. Institutions should also conduct routine technology audits, surveying incoming students about digital access and proactively identifying those at risk of being left behind. Second, *structural interventions* require government-level action, including subsidized broadband programs that negotiate reduced-rate internet plans for students (Reisdorf & Rhinesmith, 2020). Investment in public computing infrastructure, such as extended-hour computer labs in community centers and public libraries, can provide supplementary access points for students who lack private, reliable connectivity at home. Third, *pedagogical interventions* demand a reconceptualization of digital literacy not as an assumed prerequisite but as an explicit component of the curriculum. Instructors should integrate instruction on information literacy, learning management system navigation, and online collaboration tools directly into course content (Littlejohn, Beetham, & McGill, 2012; Helsper & Eynon, 2013; Van Laar et al., 2020). Moreover, flexible submission policies that accommodate students with intermittent access, such as extended deadlines and offline submission options, should become standard practice rather than exceptional accommodations.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jun301

➢ *Limitations and Future Research Directions*

Several limitations warrant careful consideration. First, the cross-sectional design prevents causal inference. While the theoretical argument posits that access influences performance, reverse causality (higher-performing students investing more in access) or third-variable confounding (e.g., conscientiousness affecting both technology maintenance and study habits) remains possible. Longitudinal studies that track students as access conditions change would strengthen causal claims. Second, the sample was limited to public university students in one developing country. Findings may not generalize to private institutions, different national contexts with varying infrastructure, or K-12 education systems. Replication studies in diverse settings are urgently needed. Third, self-reported GPA, while correlated with verified records, introduces potential measurement error; future research should utilize institutional transcript data directly. Fourth, this study did not measure instructor characteristics or course design features, which may moderate the relationship between student access and outcomes. A multi-level model incorporating course-level variables would be a valuable extension. Future research should also explore the effectiveness of specific interventions in closing digital achievement gaps, the role of peer networks in redistributing digital capital as a form of social capital, comparative studies of public versus private provisioning of digital infrastructure, and long-term tracking of low-access students to assess cumulative disadvantage over the course of entire degree programs.

VI. CONCLUSION

This study provides robust evidence that the digital divide in higher education is not merely a matter of convenience or preference but rather a mechanism of social stratification with measurable, consequential impacts on academic performance. Students who lack reliable internet, adequate devices, and supportive digital environments earn systematically lower grades than their digitally privileged peers, even when controlling for socioeconomic status. The qualitative evidence presented here identifies confidence, temporal flexibility, and differential access to supplementary resources as three key pathways through which digital capital translates into academic advantage. The theoretical contribution of this work lies in extending Bourdieu's (1986) framework to incorporate digital capital as a distinct resource that interacts with, but is not reducible to, economic and cultural capital. The practical contribution is a clearer specification of intervention points: improving material access, developing digital skills as an explicit curricular goal, and redesigning courses to accommodate variable access conditions. In an era where online learning is no longer a temporary emergency measure but a permanent feature of the educational landscape, failing to address digital inequality risks institutionalizing a two-tiered system where one's postal code or family income predicts educational success. Universities, governments, and educators share a collective responsibility for ensuring that digital technologies fulfill their democratizing potential rather than reinforcing existing hierarchies. The findings of this study suggest that intentional, evidence-based policy can narrow, though perhaps never fully eliminate, the digital divide's impact on academic achievement.

REFERENCES

[1]. World Bank. (2021). *Remote Learning During COVID-19: Lessons from Today, Principles for Tomorrow*. World Bank Publications.
[2]. Dhawan, S. (2020). Online learning: A panacea in the time of COVID-19 crisis. Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 49(1), 5-22.
[3]. Beaunoyer, E., Dupéré, S., & Guitton, M. J. (2020). COVID-19 and digital inequalities: Reciprocal impacts and mitigation strategies. Computers in Human Behavior, 111, 106424.
[4]. Van Dijk, J. (2020). The Digital Divide. Polity Press.
[5]. DiMaggio, P., Hargittai, E., Celeste, C., & Shafer, S. (2004). Digital inequality: From unequal access to differentiated use. In K. Neckerman (Ed.), Social Inequality (pp. 355-400). Russell Sage Foundation.
[6]. Ragnedda, M. (2017). The Third Digital Divide: A Weberian Approach to Digital Inequalities. Routledge.
[7]. Warschauer, M. (2004). Technology and Social Inclusion: Rethinking the Digital Divide. MIT Press.
[8]. Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. Richardson (Ed.), Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education (pp. 241-258). Greenwood Press.
[9]. Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1990). Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture. Sage Publications.
[10]. Ragnedda, M., Ruiu, M. L., & Addeo, F. (2020). Measuring digital capital: An empirical investigation. New Media & Society, 22(5), 793-816.
[11]. Park, S. (2017). Digital Capital. Palgrave Macmillan.
[12]. Ignatow, G., & Robinson, L. (2017). Pierre Bourdieu: Theorizing the digital. Information, Communication & Society, 20(7), 950-966.
[13]. Putnam, R. D. (2000). Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community. Simon & Schuster.
[14]. Lin, N. (2001). Social Capital: A Theory of Social Structure and Action. Cambridge University Press.
[15]. Norris, P. (2001). Digital Divide: Civic Engagement, Information Poverty, and the Internet Worldwide. Cambridge University Press.
[16]. Compaine, B. M. (2001). The Digital Divide: Facing a Crisis or Creating a Myth? MIT Press.
[17]. Hargittai, E. (2010). Digital na(t)ives? Variation in internet skills and uses among members of the "net generation." Sociological Inquiry, 80(1), 92-113.
[18]. Hargittai, E., & Hinnant, A. (2008). Digital inequality: Differences in young adults' use of the internet. Communication Research, 35(5), 602-621.
[19]. Van Deursen, A. J., & Van Dijk, J. A. (2019). The first-level digital divide shifts from inequalities in physical access to inequalities in material access. New Media & Society, 21(2), 354-375.
[20]. Wei, K. K., Teo, H. H., Chan, H. C., & Tan, B. C. (2021). Conceptualizing and testing a social cognitive

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26jun301

model of the digital divide. Information Systems Research, 22(1), 170-187.
[21]. Van Deursen, A. J., & Helsper, E. J. (2015). The third-level digital divide: Who benefits most from being online? Communication and Information Technologies Annual, 10, 29-52.
[22]. Scheerder, A., Van Deursen, A., & Van Dijk, J. (2019). Determinants of internet skills, uses and outcomes: A systematic review of the second- and third-level digital divide. Telematics and Informatics, 34(8), 1607-1624.
[23]. Robinson, L., & Schulz, J. (2020). Net time negotiations within the family. Information, Communication & Society, 16(4), 542-560.
[24]. Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., Bakia, M., & Jones, K. (2013). Evaluation of Evidence-Based Practices in Online Learning: A Meta-Analysis and Review of Online Learning Studies. US Department of Education.
[25]. Robinson, K., Hill, V., & Hall, J. (2020). The impact of the digital divide on student learning during COVID-19 school closures. Educational Researcher, 49(8), 549-565.
[26]. Robinson, L., Schulz, J., & Blank, G. (2020). Digital inequalities and learning outcomes: A longitudinal study. Social Science Computer Review, 38(6), 748-765.
[27]. Kuhfeld, M., Soland, J., Tarasawa, B., Johnson, A., Ruzek, E., & Liu, J. (2020). Projecting the potential impact of COVID-19 school closures on academic achievement. Educational Researcher, 49(8), 549-565.
[28]. Azevedo, J. P., Hasan, A., Goldemberg, D., Geven, K., & Iqbal, S. A. (2021). Simulating the potential impacts of COVID-19 school closures on schooling and learning outcomes. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper, 9458.
[29]. Azevedo, J. P., Gutierrez, M., & de Hoyos, R. (2021). The unequal impacts of COVID-19 on student learning. International Journal of Educational Development, 86, 102464.
[30]. Katz, V. S., & Gonzalez, C. (2016). Community Connections: Digital Access and Learning Outcomes Among Low-Income Families. Joan Ganz Cooney Center.
[31]. Reisdorf, B. C., & Rikard, R. V. (2018). Digital rehabilitation: A model of reentry into the digital society. New Media & Society, 20(11), 4205-4223.
[32]. Tsetsi, E., & Rains, S. A. (2017). Smartphone internet access and inequality: A study of the relationship between smartphone use and educational outcomes. Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 61(3), 475-494.
[33]. Gonzales, A. L. (2016). The contemporary US digital divide: From initial access to technology maintenance. Information, Communication & Society, 19(2), 234-248.
[34]. Livingstone, S., & Helsper, E. J. (2007). Gradations in digital inclusion: Children, young people and the digital divide. New Media & Society, 9(4), 671-696.
[35]. Mesch, G. S. (2012). Family characteristics and intergenerational conflicts over the internet. Information, Communication & Society, 15(1), 128-147.
[36]. Blank, G., & Groselj, D. (2014). Dimensions of internet use: Amount, variety, and types. Information, Communication & Society, 17(4), 417-435.
[37]. Helsper, E. J. (2021). The Digital Disconnect: The Social Causes and Consequences of Digital Inequalities. Sage Publications.
[38]. Warschauer, M., Knobel, M., & Stone, L. (2004). Technology and equity in schooling: Deconstructing the digital divide. Educational Policy, 18(4), 562-588.
[39]. Selwyn, N. (2010). Schools and Schooling in the Digital Age: A Critical Analysis. Routledge.
[40]. Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2017). Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
[41]. Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (2010). Sage Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social & Behavioral Research (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
[42]. Patton, M. Q. (2015). Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
[43]. OECD. (2019). Measuring the Digital Transformation: A Roadmap for the Future. OECD Publishing.
[44]. Bandura, A. (2006). Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales. In F. Pajares & T. Urdan (Eds.), Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Adolescents (pp. 307-337). Information Age Publishing.
[45]. Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2011). Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
[46]. Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). InterViews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
[47]. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77-101.
[48]. Gonzales, A. L., McCrory Calarco, J., & Lynch, T. (2020). Technology problems and student achievement gaps: A validation and extension of the technology maintenance construct. Communication Research, 47(5), 750-770.
[49]. Reisdorf, B. C., & Rhinesmith, C. (2020). Digital inclusion as a social determinant of health. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 22(5), e16721.
[50]. Littlejohn, A., Beetham, H., & McGill, L. (2012). Learning at the digital frontier: A review of digital literacies in theory and practice. Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 28(6), 547-556.
[51]. Helsper, E. J., & Eynon, R. (2013). Distinct skill pathways to digital engagement. European Journal of Communication, 28(6), 696-713.
[52]. Van Laar, E., Van Deursen, A. J., Van Dijk, J. A., & de Haan, J. (2020). Determinants of 21st-century skills and 21st-century digital skills for workers: A systematic literature review. Sage Open, 10(1), 1-14.