



Enhancing Rural Biology Instruction through Technology Integration: The Roles of TPACK, Situated Learning, Funds of Knowledge, Digital Literacy, Professional Development, and Institutional Support

KAYCO B. BULLECER¹, ABEGAIL A. BALBUENA²,
FLOMENA C. BENITEZ³, LOUIELYN L. BESONIA⁴,
PATRICK C. BISAYA⁵

¹Ambago Integrated School, ^{2,4}Saint Joseph Institute of Technology Graduate School, Butuan City 8600, ³Durian National High School, Buenavista, ⁵Tungao National High School, Butuan City, ^{1,2,3,4,5}Agusan del Norte, Philippines

Corresponding author: kaycobullecer03@gmail.com

Originality: 100% • Grammarly: 95% • Plagiarism: 0%

ABSTRACT

Article History

Received: 20 Dec 2025
Revised: 01 Aug 2026
Accepted: 18 Sept 2026
Published: 31 Oct 2026

Keywords— Biology Education Technology Integration, TPACK, Situated Learning Theory, Funds of Knowledge, Digital Literacy, Professional Development, Institutional Support

The integration of technology into science education has become increasingly vital in addressing the challenges of teaching abstract concepts in Grade 10 Biology, particularly within rural contexts where resources and cultural assets shape learning experiences. The main objective of this study is to synthesize literature on six interrelated hypotheses: the role of teachers' Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK), the influence of Situated Learning Theory on student engagement, the moderating



© Bullecer, K. B., Balbuena, A. A., Benitez, F. C., Besonia, L. L., & Bisaya, P. C. (2026). Open Access. This article published by JPAIR Multidisciplinary Research is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0). You are free to share (copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format) and adapt (remix, transform, and build upon the material). Under the following terms, you must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made. You may do so in any reasonable manner, but not in any way that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use. You may not use the material for commercial purposes. To view a copy of this license, visit: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

effect of Funds of Knowledge (FoK), the strengthening impact of Collaborative Professional Development (CPD), the mediating role of student digital literacy, and the reinforcing function of institutional support and policy frameworks in sustaining technology integration. Employing a narrative literature review methodology, peer-reviewed articles, books, and indexed conference proceedings from 1991 to 2025 were analyzed thematically to identify convergences, divergences, and gaps. Significant results reveal that higher levels of TPACK enable effective integration of digital tools, contextualized practices framed by Situated Learning Theory enhance engagement, FoK ensures cultural relevance, CPD builds teacher capacity, digital literacy mediates achievement gains, and institutional support sustains long-term integration. In conclusion, the study demonstrates that effective and sustainable technology integration in rural biology classrooms requires a holistic approach that combines teacher expertise, student capacities, community assets, and systemic supports.

INTRODUCTION

Technology integration in education has become a cornerstone of modern pedagogy, especially in science subjects where abstract concepts require visualization and contextualization. Grade 10 Biology instruction in rural contexts presents unique challenges due to limited resources, infrastructural constraints, and cultural differences. To address these issues, scholars have emphasized the importance of frameworks such as TPACK, Situated Learning Theory, and Funds of Knowledge, alongside systemic supports like Collaborative Professional Development, student digital literacy, and institutional policy frameworks. This paper reviews literature across these six dimensions to provide a comprehensive understanding of how teacher expertise, contextual practices, community assets, student capacities, and institutional supports interact to shape effective technology integration in rural biology classrooms.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The study aimed to (1) examine how teachers' Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) and collaborative professional development influence the effective integration of digital tools in Grade 10 Biology instruction, (2) analyze how contextualized technology integration, explained by Situated Learning Theory and moderated by Funds of Knowledge, enhances student engagement and learning outcomes in rural Biology classrooms. (3) explore the mediating and reinforcing roles of student digital literacy and institutional

support in sustaining technology integration for improved academic achievement in rural Biology education.

SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS

The study focuses on Grade 10 Biology instruction in rural contexts. (2) Synthesizes literature across six theoretical and practical dimensions: TPACK, Situated Learning Theory, Funds of Knowledge, CPD, digital literacy, and institutional support. (3) Emphasizes the interplay between teacher knowledge, student capacities, community assets, and systemic supports. (4) Restricted to secondary-level biology instruction; findings may not generalize to other subjects or grade levels. (5) Literature reviewed is primarily in English and indexed in Google Scholar, Scopus, Web of Science, and ERIC. (6) The study is based on secondary data and theoretical synthesis; no empirical fieldwork was conducted.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employs a narrative literature review design, appropriate for synthesizing theoretical and empirical research across multiple frameworks. Unlike systematic reviews, narrative reviews allow for interpretive synthesis, making them suitable for exploring the multifaceted dimensions of technology integration in rural biology classrooms.

Sources of Data

Data were drawn from peer-reviewed journal articles, books, and conference proceedings indexed in Google Scholar, Scopus, Web of Science, and ERIC. Sources published between 1991 and 2025 were prioritized, covering foundational theories and recent empirical studies.

Search Strategy

Keywords and Boolean operators were used to identify relevant literature for each hypothesis: (1) "TPACK biology education," "technology integration science classrooms." (2) "Situated Learning Theory technology integration," "student engagement rural classrooms." (3) "Funds of Knowledge rural education," "community assets biology instruction." (4) "Collaborative professional development rural teachers," "communities of practice technology integration." (5) "student digital literacy biology learning," "digital skills rural classrooms." (6) "policy frameworks rural education technology," "institutional support science

classrooms.”

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Peer-reviewed sources, studies addressing rural contexts, biology/science instruction, and the six frameworks; English-language publications between 1991–2025. **Exclusion:** Non-scholarly sources, studies outside secondary biology, and references not verifiable in Google Scholar.

Data Extraction and Synthesis

Information extracted included author(s), year, framework applied, context, and key findings. A thematic synthesis organized findings under the six hypotheses, highlighting convergences, divergences, and gaps.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Technology Integration in Rural Biology Classrooms

The integration of technology into science education has become a central focus of educational research and practice. In particular, Grade 10 Biology instruction presents unique opportunities and challenges for technology use, especially in rural contexts where resources and cultural assets shape learning experiences. Three theoretical frameworks—Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK), Situated Learning Theory, and Funds of Knowledge (FoK)—offer complementary insights into how teacher expertise, contextual practices, and community assets interact to influence student engagement and learning outcomes.

This review synthesizes research across these frameworks to support three hypotheses: (1) Higher levels of teachers’ TPACK enable effective technology integration in Grade 10 Biology instruction. (2) Technology integration, explained by Situated Learning Theory, positively influences student engagement in rural Biology classrooms. (3) Funds of Knowledge moderates the relationship between technology integration and Biology learning outcomes by leveraging rural assets.

1. TPACK and Effective Technology Integration in Biology Instruction

The TPACK framework (Mishra & Koehler, 2006) emphasizes the intersection of technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge. Teachers who possess high levels of TPACK are better equipped to design lessons that integrate digital tools meaningfully with subject matter and instructional strategies. In biology education, this is particularly relevant given the abstract nature of concepts such as cell division, genetics, and ecological systems.

Empirical Evidence

Aumann et al. (2024) conducted a mixed-methods study on pre-service biology teachers, finding that those with higher TPACK levels were able to design digital-enhanced lessons that improved student understanding of complex biological processes. Mercado et al. (2019) demonstrated that pre-service science teachers with strong TPACK competencies integrated simulations and interactive media effectively, leading to higher student engagement and achievement. Lee and Kim (2017) showed that implementing a TPACK-Instructional Design model significantly improved teachers' ability to integrate technology in biology lessons. Teachers demonstrated stronger lesson planning, classroom delivery, and reflective practice when their TPACK was enhanced.

Critical Synthesis

The literature consistently supports the hypothesis that higher levels of TPACK positively enable effective technology integration. Teachers with strong TPACK can align digital tools with pedagogy and biology content, making lessons more interactive and effective. However, challenges remain in professional development, particularly in rural contexts where access to technology is limited. This suggests that building TPACK should be a priority in teacher training programs, especially for science educators working in resource-constrained environments.

2. Technology Integration, Situated Learning Theory, and Student Engagement

Situated Learning Theory (Lave & Wenger, 1991) posits that learning occurs through participation in authentic, contextual practices. Technology integration in rural biology classrooms can situate learning within meaningful contexts, connecting abstract scientific concepts to real-world applications.

Empirical Evidence

Mustafa et al. (2024) conducted a systematic review of technology integration in rural schools, finding that contextualized practices enhanced student engagement and motivation. Ferrell and Tharpe (2024) highlighted how partnerships between universities and rural schools facilitated authentic science learning experiences, with technology serving as a bridge between classroom instruction and community practices. Chavez et al. (2023) found that technology integration in science classrooms increased student engagement when lessons were designed around contextual practices, aligning with situated learning principles.

Critical Synthesis

Situated Learning Theory provides a powerful lens for understanding how technology integration influences engagement. In rural biology classrooms, contextualized practices—such as using digital tools to analyze local ecosystems—make learning more relevant and engaging. This supports the hypothesis that technology integration, framed by situated learning, positively influences student engagement. Importantly, engagement is not merely about attention but involves deeper participation in authentic tasks that connect classroom learning to students' lived realities.

3. Funds of Knowledge (FoK) and Moderating Effects on Learning Outcomes **Conceptual Background**

The Funds of Knowledge (FoK) framework (Moll et al., 2006) emphasizes leveraging community and household knowledge to enrich instruction. In rural contexts, FoK includes agricultural practices, ecological knowledge, and cultural traditions that can be integrated into biology instruction through technology.

Empirical Evidence

Moll et al. (2006) demonstrated that connecting classroom instruction to household knowledge improved student learning outcomes. Ferrell and Tharpe (2024) showed that rural science education partnerships leveraged local assets, enhancing the relevance of technology integration. Bhat (2023) found that technology integration improved learning outcomes when contextualized with students' lived experiences, suggesting a moderating role of FoK.

Critical Synthesis

FoK moderates the relationship between technology integration and learning outcomes by grounding digital tools in local rural assets. For example, using mobile applications to study local agricultural biodiversity connects biology concepts to students' lived experiences, enhancing relevance and retention. This supports the hypothesis that FoK positively moderates the relationship between technology integration and biology learning outcomes.

Integrated Framework

Synthesizing these perspectives, an integrated framework emerges: (1) TPACK provides the teacher knowledge base for effective integration. (2) Situated Learning Theory explains how contextual practices enhance engagement. (3) Funds of Knowledge moderates the impact of technology integration on learning outcomes by leveraging local assets.

This framework highlights the interplay between teacher knowledge, contextual practices, and community assets in shaping effective biology instruction in rural classrooms. It suggests that professional development should focus not only on building TPACK but also on designing contextualized practices and leveraging community knowledge.

The literature strongly supports the three hypotheses: (1) Higher levels of TPACK enable effective technology integration in Grade 10 Biology instruction. (2) Technology integration, explained by Situated Learning Theory, positively influences student engagement in rural classrooms. (3) Funds of Knowledge moderates the relationship between technology integration and learning outcomes. Together, these frameworks provide a comprehensive understanding of how technology can be integrated into rural biology classrooms to enhance engagement and outcomes. Future research should explore professional development models that build TPACK, design contextualized practices aligned with situated learning, and leverage FoK to ensure culturally relevant instruction.

Technology Integration, Situated Learning Theory, and Student Engagement in Rural Biology Classrooms

Technology integration in education has become a cornerstone of modern pedagogy, but its effectiveness depends on how it is contextualized within authentic learning environments. In rural settings, where resources and cultural practices shape classroom dynamics, the Situated Learning Theory (Lave & Wenger, 1991) provides a powerful lens for understanding how technology can enhance student engagement. This review synthesizes research on the intersection of technology integration, situated learning, and rural biology education, supporting the hypothesis that technology integration, framed as a contextual practice, positively influences student engagement in rural biology classrooms.

1. Situated Learning Theory: Conceptual Foundations

Situated Learning Theory emphasizes that learning occurs through legitimate peripheral participation in authentic, socially situated practices (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Rather than viewing knowledge as abstract and decontextualized, situated learning frames it as embedded in real-world contexts.

In rural biology classrooms, this means that technology integration should not be treated as an isolated instructional tool but as a means of connecting students to authentic practices—such as analyzing local ecosystems, agricultural processes, or community health issues. Technology becomes a bridge between abstract biological concepts and students' lived experiences, thereby fostering deeper engagement.

2. Technology Integration and Student Engagement Engagement Defined

Student engagement encompasses behavioral, emotional, and cognitive dimensions (Fredricks et al., 2004). Technology integration can enhance all three dimensions when aligned with situated learning principles: (1) Behavioral engagement: Active participation in tasks, such as using digital simulations or mobile apps to collect field data. (2) Emotional engagement: Increased motivation and interest when lessons connect to students' rural contexts. (3) Cognitive engagement: Deeper understanding when students apply biology concepts to authentic problems.

Empirical Evidence

Mustafa et al. (2024) conducted a systematic review of technology integration in rural schools, finding that contextualized practices enhanced student engagement and motivation. They noted that engagement was strongest when technology was used to connect classroom learning to community practices. Ferrell and Tharpe (2024) highlighted how partnerships between universities and rural schools facilitated authentic science learning experiences. Technology served as a bridge between classroom instruction and community practices, increasing student participation and interest. Chavez et al. (2023) found that technology integration in science classrooms increased student engagement when lessons were designed around contextual practices, aligning with situated learning principles. These studies collectively demonstrate that technology integration enhances engagement when contextualized within authentic rural practices.

3. Rural Contexts and Challenges

While technology integration offers significant benefits, rural classrooms face unique challenges: (1) Infrastructure limitations: Limited access to high-speed internet and digital devices. (2) Teacher preparedness: Teachers may lack training in contextualized technology use. (3) Cultural relevance: Standardized digital tools may not align with rural students' lived experiences.

Despite these challenges, research shows that situated learning practices mitigate barriers by grounding technology use in local contexts. For example, using mobile devices to document local biodiversity requires minimal infrastructure but provides authentic engagement opportunities.

4. Case Studies in Rural Biology Classrooms

Example 1: Local Ecosystem Studies. Students in rural areas often live near forests, rivers, or agricultural lands. Integrating technology—such as mobile apps

for species identification or GIS mapping—situates biology learning in authentic contexts. This enhances engagement by connecting classroom instruction to students' immediate environment.

Example 2: Agricultural Practices. Rural students often have direct experience with farming. Using digital tools to analyze soil quality or crop growth situates biology concepts within familiar practices, increasing relevance and motivation.

Example 3: Community Health. Technology can be used to study local health issues, such as water quality or nutrition. Situated learning frames these studies as authentic practices, enhancing both engagement and learning outcomes.

5. Critical Synthesis

The literature consistently supports the hypothesis that technology integration, explained by Situated Learning Theory, positively influences student engagement in rural biology classrooms. Key insights include: (1) Engagement is strongest when technology connects classroom learning to authentic rural practices. (2) Situated learning provides a framework for overcoming rural challenges by contextualizing technology use. (3) Partnerships between schools and communities enhance the authenticity of technology-integrated practices. However, gaps remain in teacher training and infrastructure support. Future research should explore professional development models that equip rural teachers to design contextualized, technology-enhanced lessons.

Situated Learning Theory provides a robust framework for understanding how technology integration influences student engagement in rural biology classrooms. By situating learning within authentic practices—such as ecosystem studies, agricultural analysis, and community health projects—technology becomes a tool for connecting abstract biology concepts to students' lived experiences. The literature strongly supports the hypothesis that technology integration, framed as a contextual practice, positively influences student engagement in rural biology classrooms.

Funds of Knowledge, Technology Integration, and Biology Learning Outcomes in Rural Classrooms

The integration of technology in education has been widely recognized as a transformative force in teaching and learning. However, its effectiveness is not uniform across contexts. In rural classrooms, where cultural practices, community assets, and lived experiences shape learning environments, technology integration must be contextualized to achieve meaningful outcomes. The Funds of Knowledge (FoK) framework (Moll et al., 2006) provides a powerful lens for understanding how local assets can moderate the relationship between technology integration

and student learning outcomes.

This review synthesizes literature on FoK, rural education, and technology integration in biology classrooms, supporting the hypothesis that FoK, by leveraging local rural assets, positively moderates the relationship between technology integration and biology learning outcomes.

1. Funds of Knowledge: Conceptual Foundations

The Funds of Knowledge framework emerged from ethnographic research by Moll et al. (2006), who argued that households and communities possess valuable cultural and intellectual resources that can enrich classroom instruction. FoK emphasizes: (1) Community assets: Skills, practices, and knowledge embedded in everyday life. (2) Cultural relevance: Instruction that connects academic content to students' lived experiences. (3) Equity in learning: Recognizing and valuing diverse knowledge systems. In rural contexts, FoK includes agricultural practices, ecological knowledge, and traditional health practices. Integrating these into biology instruction through technology situates learning in authentic contexts, enhancing relevance and outcomes.

2. Technology Integration in Rural Biology Classrooms

Technology integration in biology classrooms often involves digital simulations, mobile applications, and interactive media. However, in rural settings, challenges such as limited infrastructure and teacher preparedness can hinder effectiveness (Mustafa et al., 2024).

FoK provides a moderating mechanism by ensuring that technology use is contextualized. For example: (1) Using mobile apps to document local biodiversity connects biology concepts to students' environment. (2) Digital tools for analyzing soil quality or crop growth situate biology learning within familiar agricultural practices. (3) Community health studies using technology link biology content to local issues, enhancing relevance. Thus, FoK ensures that technology integration is not abstract but grounded in rural realities, improving learning outcomes.

3. Empirical Evidence Supporting FoK as a Moderator

Household and Community Knowledge. Moll et al. (2006) demonstrated that connecting classroom instruction to household knowledge improved student learning outcomes. Their qualitative approach showed that students engaged more deeply when lessons reflected their lived experiences.

Rural Science Education Partnerships. Ferrell and Tharpe (2024) highlighted how rural school–university partnerships leveraged local assets to enhance science

education. Technology was used to connect classroom instruction to community practices, improving both engagement and outcomes.

Contextualized Technology Integration. Bhat (2023) found that technology integration improved learning outcomes when contextualized with students' lived experiences. This suggests that FoK moderates the relationship between technology integration and outcomes by grounding digital tools in local contexts.

Systematic Reviews. Mustafa et al. (2024) noted that rural schools face challenges in technology integration but emphasized that contextualized practices—aligned with FoK—enhance effectiveness.

4. Case Studies in Rural Biology Instruction

Example 1: Agricultural Biodiversity. In rural areas, students often have direct experience with farming. Using mobile applications to study crop diversity situates biology concepts within familiar practices. FoK moderates technology integration by ensuring relevance, leading to improved outcomes.

Example 2: Local Ecosystem Studies. Students can use digital tools to analyze local ecosystems, such as rivers or forests. FoK ensures that these studies connect to community knowledge, enhancing both engagement and understanding.

Example 3: Community Health Projects. Technology can be used to study local health issues, such as water quality or nutrition. FoK moderates the impact by connecting biology concepts to community practices, improving outcomes.

5. Critical Synthesis

The literature consistently supports the hypothesis that FoK moderates the relationship between technology integration and biology learning outcomes. Key insights include: (1) FoK ensures that technology integration is contextualized, enhancing relevance and effectiveness. (2) Rural assets such as agriculture, ecology, and health practices provide authentic contexts for biology instruction. (3) Partnerships between schools and communities enhance the moderating role of FoK. However, challenges remain in teacher training and infrastructure. Future research should explore professional development models that equip teachers to leverage FoK in technology integration.

Funds of Knowledge provides a robust framework for understanding how technology integration influences biology learning outcomes in rural classrooms. By leveraging local assets—such as agricultural practices, ecological knowledge, and community health—FoK ensures that technology use is contextualized and relevant. The literature strongly supports the hypothesis that FoK positively moderates the relationship between technology integration and biology learning outcomes.

Collaborative Professional Development and Teacher Capacity for Technology Integration in Rural Biology Classrooms

Technology integration in education requires not only individual teacher expertise but also systemic support through professional development. In rural contexts, where resources and isolation can hinder innovation, Collaborative Professional Development (CPD) grounded in communities of practice (CoP) offers a promising approach. This literature review synthesizes research on CPD, teacher collaboration, and technology integration in science education, supporting the hypothesis that collaborative professional development strengthens teachers' capacity for technology integration in rural biology classrooms.

1. Communities of Practice: Conceptual Foundations

The concept of communities of practice (CoP), introduced by Lave and Wenger (1991), emphasizes learning as participation in social groups where members share knowledge, practices, and identities. In education, CoP provides a framework for collaborative professional development, where teachers collectively build capacity for technology integration.

Key features of CoP include: (1) Shared domain: Teachers focus on integrating technology in biology instruction. (2) Community: Teachers collaborate, share experiences, and support one another. (3) Practice: Teachers develop shared resources, strategies, and innovations.

In rural contexts, CoP mitigates isolation by connecting teachers across schools and communities, fostering collective growth.

2. Collaborative Professional Development and Teacher Capacity Importance of CPD

Professional development is critical for building teachers' capacity to integrate technology effectively. Research shows that collaborative models are more effective than individual training because they foster sustained engagement, peer support, and contextualized learning (Desimone, 2009).

Empirical Evidence

McKenney et al. (2016) found that teachers who participated in collaborative professional development programs demonstrated higher levels of technology integration in science classrooms. Kafyulilo et al. (2016) showed that collaborative design of technology-enhanced lessons improved teachers' TPACK and confidence in integrating digital tools. Ferrell and Tharpe (2024) highlighted how rural school–university partnerships provided collaborative professional development opportunities, enhancing teachers' capacity for contextualized

technology integration. These studies confirm that CPD strengthens teacher capacity, particularly when grounded in collaborative practices.

3. Rural Contexts and Challenges

Rural teachers face unique challenges in professional development: (1) Geographic isolation limits access to training opportunities. (2) Resource constraints hinder participation in traditional workshops. (2) Contextual differences mean that generic training may not address rural realities.

Collaborative professional development grounded in CoP addresses these challenges by: (1) Providing peer support networks across rural schools. (2) Leveraging local assets and community knowledge. (3) Ensuring contextual relevance by situating training in rural practices.

4. Case Studies in Rural Biology Instruction

Example 1: Collaborative Lesson Design. Teachers in rural schools collaboratively design biology lessons using digital tools to study local ecosystems. CPD fosters shared strategies and resources, strengthening teacher capacity.

Example 2: School–University Partnerships. Partnerships between rural schools and universities provide collaborative professional development opportunities. Teachers gain access to expertise, resources, and peer networks, enhancing their ability to integrate technology.

Example 3: Online Communities of Practice. Digital platforms enable rural teachers to participate in online CoP, sharing experiences and strategies for technology integration. This mitigates geographic isolation and fosters collective growth.

5. Critical Synthesis

The literature consistently supports the hypothesis that collaborative professional development strengthens teachers' capacity for technology integration in rural biology classrooms. Key insights include: (1) CPD is more effective than individual training because it fosters sustained engagement and peer support. (2) Communities of practice provide a framework for collaborative learning, mitigating rural challenges. (3) Partnerships and online platforms enhance access to CPD for rural teachers.

However, challenges remain in sustaining CPD initiatives and ensuring equitable access. Future research should explore scalable models of CPD that leverage both local and digital communities.

Collaborative Professional Development, grounded in communities of practice, provides a robust framework for strengthening teachers' capacity for

technology integration in rural biology classrooms. By fostering peer support, contextual relevance, and collective growth, CPD addresses the unique challenges of rural education. The literature strongly supports the hypothesis that collaborative professional development positively strengthens teacher capacity for technology integration in rural biology classrooms.

Student Digital Literacy as a Mediator in Technology Integration and Academic Achievement in Rural Biology Classrooms

Technology integration in education has been widely recognized as a transformative force, but its effectiveness depends not only on teacher expertise and contextual practices but also on students' ability to use digital tools effectively. In rural biology classrooms, where students may have limited prior exposure to technology, digital literacy becomes a crucial mediator. This literature review synthesizes research on digital literacy, technology integration, and academic achievement, supporting the hypothesis that student digital literacy positively mediates the relationship between technology integration and academic achievement in rural biology classrooms.

1. Digital Literacy: Conceptual Foundations

Digital literacy refers to the ability to use digital tools effectively, critically, and responsibly (Ng, 2012). It encompasses: (1) Technical skills: Operating devices, software, and applications. (2) Information literacy: Searching, evaluating, and using digital information. (3) Critical literacy: Understanding digital content and its implications. (4) Ethical literacy: Using technology responsibly and safely.

In biology classrooms, digital literacy enables students to engage with simulations, online resources, and data analysis tools. Without digital literacy, technology integration risks becoming superficial, failing to improve academic achievement.

2. Technology Integration and Academic Achievement

Research consistently shows that technology integration can enhance academic achievement when students are able to use digital tools effectively. Aumann et al. (2024) found that pre-service biology teachers with strong TPACK designed digital-enhanced lessons that improved student understanding. However, student outcomes depended on their ability to engage with the digital tools. Bhat (2023) demonstrated that technology integration improved learning outcomes when students had sufficient digital literacy to contextualize digital experiences. Mustafa et al. (2024) noted that rural schools face challenges in technology integration, particularly when students lack digital literacy, limiting

the impact on achievement. These studies suggest that digital literacy mediates the relationship between technology integration and academic achievement.

3. Digital Literacy in Rural Contexts

Rural students often face unique challenges in developing digital literacy: (1) Limited access to devices and internet connectivity. (2) Lower exposure to digital tools outside school. (3) Cultural differences in technology use compared to urban peers.

Despite these challenges, rural contexts also provide opportunities: (1) Community assets (FoK) can be leveraged to contextualize digital literacy. (2) School–university partnerships (Ferrell & Tharpe, 2024) can provide training and resources. (3) Collaborative projects can foster peer learning and digital skill development. Thus, digital literacy development must be contextualized within rural realities to mediate technology integration effectively.

4. Empirical Evidence Supporting Digital Literacy as a Mediator

Ng (2012) emphasized that digital literacy is multidimensional and directly influences students' ability to benefit from technology integration. Fredricks, Blumenfeld, & Paris (2004) highlighted that engagement is linked to achievement, but engagement through technology requires digital literacy. Chavez et al. (2023) found that student engagement increased with technology integration, but achievement gains were strongest when students demonstrated digital literacy. Ferrell and Tharpe (2024) showed that rural partnerships enhanced both teacher capacity and student digital literacy, leading to improved outcomes.

Together, these studies confirm that digital literacy mediates the relationship between technology integration and academic achievement.

5. Case Studies in Rural Biology Instruction

Example 1: Ecosystem Studies. Students use mobile apps to document local biodiversity. Academic achievement improves when students have digital literacy to operate apps, analyze data, and interpret results.

Example 2: Agricultural Analysis. Digital tools for soil testing or crop monitoring enhance biology learning. Outcomes depend on students' ability to use tools effectively, highlighting digital literacy as a mediator.

Example 3: Online Research Projects. Students conduct online research on genetics or ecology. Achievement gains are strongest when students have information literacy to evaluate sources critically.

6. Critical Synthesis

The literature consistently supports the hypothesis that student digital literacy mediates the relationship between technology integration and academic achievement in rural biology classrooms. Key insights include: (1) Digital literacy is essential for students to benefit from technology integration. (2) Rural contexts pose challenges but also opportunities for digital literacy development. (3) Partnerships and contextualized practices enhance digital literacy, strengthening the impact of technology integration on achievement.

Future research should explore scalable models for digital literacy development in rural schools, integrating FoK and collaborative practices.

Digital literacy provides a robust framework for understanding how technology integration influences academic achievement in rural biology classrooms. By equipping students with the skills to use digital tools effectively, critically, and responsibly, digital literacy ensures that technology integration translates into improved outcomes. The literature strongly supports the hypothesis that student digital literacy positively mediates the relationship between technology integration and academic achievement in rural biology classrooms.

Institutional Support and Policy Frameworks in Sustainable Technology Integration for Rural Biology Classrooms

Technology integration in education is not solely dependent on teacher expertise or student digital literacy. Sustainable integration requires institutional support and enabling policy frameworks that provide resources, infrastructure, and long-term vision. In rural biology classrooms, where challenges such as limited connectivity, resource scarcity, and teacher isolation are prevalent, institutional support becomes critical. This literature review synthesizes research on educational policy, institutional support, and rural technology integration, supporting the hypothesis that institutional support and policy frameworks positively reinforce sustainable technology integration in rural biology classrooms.

1. Institutional Support: Conceptual Foundations

Institutional support refers to the structures, resources, and leadership provided by schools, districts, and governments to enable technology integration. Key dimensions include: (1) Infrastructure: Access to devices, internet connectivity, and digital platforms. (2) Training: Professional development opportunities for teachers. (3) Leadership: Administrative vision and support for innovation. (4) Funding: Sustainable financial investment in technology. Without institutional support, technology integration risks being fragmented and unsustainable, particularly in rural contexts.

2. Policy Frameworks and Sustainable Integration

Policy frameworks provide the strategic direction for technology integration. They establish goals, standards, and accountability mechanisms. Effective policies emphasize: (1) Equity: Ensuring rural schools have access to resources comparable to urban schools. (2) Sustainability: Long-term investment in infrastructure and training. (3) Contextualization: Policies tailored to rural realities, leveraging local assets. Policies thus reinforce institutional support, ensuring that technology integration is not a short-term initiative but a sustained practice.

3. Empirical Evidence Supporting Institutional Support and Policy Frameworks

Mustafa et al. (2024) conducted a systematic review of rural schools, highlighting that institutional support and policy frameworks are critical for overcoming challenges in technology integration. Ferrell and Tharpe (2024) showed that rural school–university partnerships, supported by institutional policies, enhanced both teacher capacity and student outcomes. McKenney et al. (2016) emphasized that institutional support for collaborative professional development strengthened teachers' ability to integrate technology sustainably. Kafyulilo et al. (2016) found that institutional policies encouraging continued technology use were essential for sustaining integration beyond initial training. Desimone (2009) argued that policy frameworks must align with professional development to ensure long-term impact.

These studies collectively confirm that institutional support and policy frameworks reinforce sustainable technology integration.

4. Rural Contexts and Challenges

Rural schools face unique challenges in institutional support and policy implementation: (1) Limited funding for infrastructure and devices. (2) Geographic isolation hindering access to training and resources. (3) Policy gaps where national frameworks fail to address rural realities.

Despite these challenges, institutional support can mitigate barriers by: (1) Providing targeted funding for rural schools. (2) Establishing partnerships with universities and NGOs. (3) Designing policies that leverage local assets and community knowledge.

5. Case Studies in Rural Biology Instruction

Example 1: Infrastructure Investment. Policies that provide devices and connectivity to rural schools enable sustainable technology integration in biology classrooms.

Example 2: Professional Development Policies

Institutional support for ongoing training ensures that teachers continue to build capacity for technology integration.

Example 3: Community Partnerships

Policies encouraging partnerships between schools and communities leverage local assets, reinforcing sustainability.

6. Critical Synthesis

The literature consistently supports the hypothesis that institutional support and policy frameworks positively reinforce sustainable technology integration in rural biology classrooms. Key insights include: (1) Institutional support provides the resources and leadership necessary for integration. (2) Policy frameworks ensure sustainability, equity, and contextualization. (3) Rural challenges can be mitigated through targeted policies and partnerships. Future research should explore how national and local policies can be better aligned to support rural schools, ensuring that technology integration is both equitable and sustainable.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this review demonstrate that effective technology integration in rural Grade 10 Biology classrooms is a multidimensional process shaped by teacher expertise, student capacities, community assets, and systemic supports. Teachers' Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) provides the foundation for meaningful lesson design, while Situated Learning Theory ensures that technology use is contextualized within authentic practices that enhance student engagement. The Funds of Knowledge (FoK) framework further moderates outcomes by grounding instruction in local cultural and ecological assets, making learning more relevant and equitable. At the systemic level, Collaborative Professional Development (CPD) strengthens teacher capacity, student digital literacy mediates the relationship between technology use and achievement, and institutional support and policy frameworks reinforce sustainability and equity in rural education. Collectively, these six dimensions highlight that technology integration is not a singular intervention but a holistic approach requiring alignment between pedagogy, context, and policy.

LITERATURE CITED

- Aumann, A., Schnebel, S., & Weitzel, H. (2024). Teaching biology lessons using digital technology: A contextualized mixed-methods study on pre-service biology teachers' enacted TPACK. *Education Sciences*, 14(5), 538. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14050538>
- Bhat, R. A. (2023). The impact of technology integration on student learning outcomes: A comparative study. *International Journal of Social Science, Educational, Economics, Agriculture Research and Technology (IJSET)*, 2(9), 592-596. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/4036/43b81f84ba462e64f61be9227495eb2d352b.pdf>
- Chavez, J. L., Doncoy, G. A. C., Doncoy, A. B., & Tabia, J. C. J. D. (2023). Technology integration in content and pedagogy in classrooms as effecting student engagement. *Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 1(3), 27-40.
- Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. *Educational researcher*, 38(3), 181-199. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X0833114>
- Ferrell, V. A., & Tharpe, A. S. (2024). Enhancing rural science education through school district–university partnership. *Education Sciences*, 14(7), 712. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14070712>
- Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. *Review of educational research*, 74(1), 59-109. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059>
- Kafyulilo, A., Fisser, P., & Voogt, J. (2016). Factors affecting teachers' continuation of technology use in teaching. *Education and Information Technologies*, 21(6), 1535-1554. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-015-9398-0>
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge university press.

- Lee, C. J., & Kim, C. (2017). A technological pedagogical content knowledge based instructional design model: a third version implementation study in a technology integration course. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 65(6), 1627-1654. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-017-9544-z>
- McKenney, S., Boschman, F., Pieters, J., & Voogt, J. (2016). Collaborative design of technology-enhanced learning: What can we learn from teacher talk?. *TechTrends*, 60(4), 385-391. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-016-0078-8>
- Mercado, J. N. L., Panganiban, V. J. M., & Ramos, T. M. I. (2019). Technology integration in teaching science using TPACK among pre-service science teachers. *IOER International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3379278>
- Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. *Teachers college record*, 108(6), 1017-1054. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2006.00684.x>
- Moll, L., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (2006). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. In *Funds of knowledge* (pp. 71-87). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405849209543534>
- Mustafa, F., Nguyen, H. T. M., & Gao, X. A. (2024). The challenges and solutions of technology integration in rural schools: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 126, 102380. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2024.102380>