



Digital Education in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: Towards an Emirati Model for Protecting Family Identity and Enhancing Social Cohesion

Dr. Wadeema Aldhaheri

Associate Professor, Department of Islamic Studies and Graduate Studies, Mohamed bin Zayed University for Humanities, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

ARTICLE INFO

KEYWORDS

Digital education; artificial intelligence; new media; family identity; social cohesion; United Arab Emirates; digital ethics.

HOW TO CITE

Aldhaheri, D. W. (2026). Digital Education in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: Towards an Emirati Model for Protecting Family Identity and Enhancing Social Cohesion. Emirati Journal of Education and Literatures, 4(2), 83-93.

<https://doi.org/10.54878/5yz8va6o>

ABSTRACT

Artificial intelligence (AI), algorithmically curated platforms, and generative media are reshaping how people access information, communicate, and learn. These developments create educational opportunities while raising questions about privacy, misinformation, bias, family interaction, cultural identity, and social cohesion. This conceptual paper examines digital education as a framework for developing the knowledge, judgement, and ethical dispositions needed to participate responsibly in AI-mediated environments. It focuses on the United Arab Emirates (UAE), where national efforts to advance AI literacy provide a relevant policy context for considering how technological capability can be aligned with cultural context and human values. The paper uses a qualitative descriptive-analytical approach to examine selected international frameworks and institutional policy documents alongside conceptual literature on networked communication, media literacy, participatory culture, and digital ethics. It does not claim to measure the prevalence or causal effects of digital risks in Emirati families; rather, it synthesises relevant concepts and derives a proposed educational framework. The analysis identifies five mutually reinforcing pillars: digital national and cultural identity; media and algorithmic literacy; digital ethics and safety; partnership among families, schools, media, and public institutions; and a human-centred balance between technology use and face-to-face relationships. The paper argues that these pillars should be translated into age-appropriate learning outcomes, family guidance, teacher development, and coordinated institutional practice. It concludes that the proposed model is a conceptual contribution requiring subsequent expert review and empirical evaluation before its effectiveness can be established



Double-blind peer review by independent reviewers.

Received: 08 Jul 2026, Accepted: 12 Nov 2026, Published: 09 Dec 2026

*Corresponding author: wadeema.aldhaheri@mbzuah.ac.ae

Copyright: © 2026 by the author. Licensee Emirates Scholar Center for Research & Studies, UAE.

Open access under the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

Introduction:

Artificial intelligence has become part of the everyday information environment through recommendation systems, search engines, automated translation, generative applications, and digital learning platforms. Its influence is therefore not confined to technical innovation or economic productivity. AI-mediated systems also shape what information people encounter, how they communicate, and how they make sense of social and cultural questions. In education, these technologies may support personalisation, accessibility, and new forms of inquiry, but they also require careful attention to privacy, reliability, bias, and the role of human judgement (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2021).

Families and educational institutions now operate within an environment in which knowledge and influence circulate across homes, schools, online communities, and commercial platforms. Parents and teachers remain important sources of guidance, yet they are no longer the only actors through which children encounter information, behavioural models, and cultural narratives. The implications should not be reduced to a claim that technology necessarily weakens family relationships. Effects depend on the nature of use, the age and circumstances of the user, the quality of available content, and the presence of supportive relationships and educational guidance.

Algorithmic personalisation can make information access more relevant, but it may also narrow exposure to alternative perspectives or amplify content designed to capture attention. Generative AI adds a further challenge because fabricated text, images, audio, and video can appear credible. UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence calls attention to human rights, transparency, fairness, privacy, and human oversight as essential considerations in the development and use of AI (UNESCO, 2021). These principles have direct educational relevance: learners need not only operational skills but also the ability to question outputs, assess evidence, protect personal information, and recognise when human judgement is required.

The UAE provides a significant context for this discussion because it is pursuing AI-related innovation while developing educational approaches to AI literacy. The UAE National AI Literacy Curriculum Framework (K–12), published by the Ministry of Education, describes a structured approach to AI concepts, ethical responsibility, societal impact, critical thinking, and applied innovation, while explicitly recognising local values and cultural context (Ministry of Education,

United Arab Emirates, n.d.). This official framework offers a concrete policy reference for considering how digital education might connect technical understanding with responsible participation and family identity.

The central argument of this paper is that digital education should be understood as a social and ethical capability, not merely as the ability to operate devices or applications. The paper develops a proposed Emirati model that connects digital literacy with identity, ethical judgement, family–school partnership, and the preservation of meaningful human relationships. Because the study is conceptual and document-based, the model is presented as a structured proposal for further review, not as an empirically validated intervention.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Digital education, literacy, and citizenship

Digital education encompasses more than the delivery of lessons through electronic platforms. It includes the knowledge and dispositions needed to navigate digital information, understand the social consequences of technology, communicate responsibly, and make informed decisions. Digital literacy concerns the ability to locate, interpret, evaluate, and use information through digital systems. Media and information literacy adds a critical dimension: individuals should be able to examine the purpose, provenance, framing, and credibility of media messages rather than treating visibility or popularity as evidence of truth.

Gilster's (1997) influential account of digital literacy emphasised the interpretation and evaluation of information rather than technical operation alone. Contemporary AI environments make this distinction especially important. A learner may be able to use a generative tool effectively yet lack the judgement needed to check its claims, identify missing context, or recognise fabricated references. Accordingly, digital education should combine practical competence with critical inquiry, ethical reasoning, and an understanding of how digital systems influence the circulation of information.

Digital citizenship similarly extends beyond access and technical proficiency. It involves responsible participation, respect for others, attention to privacy and security, and an understanding that online conduct has consequences for individuals and communities. UNESCO's work on AI ethics provides a normative basis for integrating human dignity, fairness, transparency, and accountability into education about technology (UNESCO, 2021). The OECD's review of digital education also stresses that smart technologies may support teaching and learning, but their value depends on how

they are designed, implemented, and governed (OECD, 2021).

2.2 Networked communication and the family

Castells (2010) describes the network society as one in which social organisation and communication are increasingly structured through information networks. This perspective helps explain why digital education cannot be limited to the classroom: online environments influence the broader contexts in which identity, knowledge, and social relationships develop. Jenkins (2009) likewise examines participatory culture, in which users may act as creators and distributors of content as well as audiences. Children and young people therefore need guidance not only as consumers of digital media but also as participants who publish, share, comment, and contribute to online communities.

Turkle (2011) explores the tensions between digital connection and the quality of human relationships. Her work invites consideration of how continuous connectivity may coexist with reduced attention to people physically present. It does not establish that digital technologies invariably cause isolation; rather, it helps frame questions about the circumstances in which mediated interaction complements or displaces face-to-face communication. For family education, the relevant task is to foster intentional use, shared expectations, and opportunities for conversation without assuming that all screen use is harmful.

The family remains a key context for developing habits of trust, dialogue, responsibility, and cultural belonging. Yet family guidance may be challenged by rapid product changes, uneven levels of digital confidence, and the difficulty of assessing content generated or recommended by opaque systems. A constructive response is not simply restrictive monitoring. It combines age-appropriate boundaries with explanation, modelling, collaborative discussion, and opportunities for children to practise evaluating digital information.

2.3 Algorithms, misinformation, and digital ethics

Recommendation systems and personalised feeds organise content according to signals such as prior interactions, inferred interests, and engagement. Pariser (2011) popularised the concept of the “filter bubble” to describe how personalisation may limit exposure to a broader range of information. The concept should not be treated as a universal or inevitable outcome: the degree of personalisation and its effects vary across platforms and users. Nevertheless, it highlights the importance of helping learners understand that a feed is selected and

ranked, rather than a neutral representation of everything available.

The information environment is also affected by misleading content, manipulated media, and the speed with which unverified claims can circulate. Wardle and Derakhshan (2017) provide a framework for analysing information disorder and distinguishing different forms of problematic information. Generative AI increases the need for provenance checking and corroboration because fluent language or realistic imagery can be produced without reliable evidence. Educational responses should therefore teach learners to verify claims through independent and authoritative sources, inspect dates and context, and avoid forwarding material whose authenticity has not been established.

Digital ethics addresses questions that technical training alone cannot resolve. These include how personal data are collected and used, how automated systems may reproduce bias, who is accountable for harmful outputs, and when human review is necessary. UNESCO (2021) identifies privacy, transparency, fairness, human oversight, and accountability as important ethical concerns. These principles can be translated into practical educational questions: What data does an application require? Is the output reliable? Could it unfairly represent a person or group? What information should never be shared? Who should review a consequential decision?

2.4 Cultural identity and the UAE policy context

Digital platforms make cultural content accessible across national boundaries and can create opportunities for language learning, intercultural dialogue, and the preservation of heritage. At the same time, global circulation may expose learners to conflicting claims, stereotypes, or content detached from its original context. Protecting identity should not mean insulating learners from cultural difference. It should mean equipping them to understand their own cultural references, engage respectfully with others, and evaluate content critically.

In the UAE, the Ministry of Education’s National AI Literacy Curriculum Framework (K–12) provides a relevant official reference. It identifies foundational AI knowledge, ethical responsibility, societal impact, critical thinking, and applied innovation as components of AI literacy, and situates these aims within national priorities and cultural context (Ministry of Education, United Arab Emirates, n.d.). The OECD (2021) similarly presents digitalisation as a policy challenge requiring attention to both opportunities and implementation conditions. Together, these sources support a model that integrates technical understanding with ethical and social learning.

The literature reviewed here points to a common conclusion: effective digital education requires connected competencies. Technical understanding without critical evaluation may leave learners vulnerable to unreliable content; critical awareness without ethical habits may not protect privacy or respect; and individual skills without support from families and institutions may be difficult to sustain. The proposed model therefore treats identity, critical literacy, ethics, institutional partnership, and human relationships as mutually reinforcing dimensions.

3. Purpose and Objectives of the Study

The purpose of this study is to develop a conceptual model of digital education suited to the UAE context, with particular attention to protecting family identity and strengthening social cohesion amid the expansion of AI-mediated communication.

The study has four objectives:

- To clarify the educational competencies required for responsible participation in AI-mediated digital environments.
- To analyse key risks and opportunities associated with algorithmic media, generative AI, family communication, and cultural identity.
- To relate international principles of digital education and AI ethics to the UAE's current AI-literacy policy context.
- To propose an integrated model with practical areas for implementation and future evaluation.

The guiding research question is: How can digital education in the UAE be conceptualised to support responsible engagement with artificial intelligence while strengthening family identity and social cohesion? Two subsidiary questions guide the analysis: (1) Which digital, ethical, cultural, and relational competencies are most relevant to this purpose? (2) How can families, educational institutions, media organisations, and public bodies contribute to a coherent educational approach?

4. Methodology / Research Approach

This paper adopts a qualitative, descriptive-analytical, and conceptual approach. It synthesises selected academic works on networked communication, participatory culture, digital literacy, family relationships, and information disorder, and examines relevant institutional documents addressing AI ethics and digital education. The analysis is designed to identify recurring concepts and policy principles that can inform a proposed educational model; it is not a systematic review and does not claim exhaustive coverage of all published research.

The documentary basis includes UNESCO's Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence, the OECD's Digital Education Outlook 2021, the UAE Ministry of Education's National AI Literacy Curriculum Framework (K-12), and selected foundational works relevant to digital literacy, networked society, participatory culture, and algorithmic personalisation. Sources were considered for their relevance to the research question, institutional or scholarly standing, and contribution to one or more of the model's dimensions. The analysis grouped the material into five themes: identity and cultural context; critical and media literacy; ethics and safety; family-school-community partnership; and balance between technology and human relationships.

The themes were then compared to identify areas of convergence and to formulate the proposed model. Each pillar is linked to an educational purpose and a set of possible implementation measures. These measures are recommendations derived from conceptual analysis, not interventions whose effects have been measured in this study. No interviews, surveys, experiments, or family-level observations were conducted. Consequently, the paper cannot estimate the prevalence of digital isolation, establish causal relationships between screen use and family cohesion, or demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed model. These limits are material and are addressed in the discussion and conclusion.

5. Findings / Results

5.1 Digital education must extend beyond technical competence

The analysis indicates that operational proficiency is necessary but insufficient for responsible participation in AI-mediated environments. Learners also require the ability to assess the credibility of outputs, understand that algorithmic systems select and rank content, recognise uncertainty, protect personal information, and consider the social effects of their online actions. This finding follows from the convergence between digital-literacy scholarship and institutional principles that emphasise critical thinking, ethical responsibility, and human oversight (Gilster, 1997; OECD, 2021; UNESCO, 2021).

5.2 Family identity is supported through active cultural literacy

The review suggests that family identity is better supported through informed participation than through an approach based solely on restricting exposure. Digital environments can provide access to language, history, heritage, and cultural expression, while also exposing learners to misleading representations or content without

context. A constructive educational response should help children recognise cultural references, ask informed questions, and engage respectfully with difference. This approach treats cultural identity as a capacity for understanding and participation rather than as a barrier to intercultural contact.

5.3 Ethical and critical literacy should be taught together

The analysis identifies a close relationship between information evaluation and ethical action. Verifying a claim is not only a cognitive task; it can also prevent the spread of harmful misinformation. Protecting privacy requires both knowledge of platform practices and an ethical understanding of consent and dignity. Similarly, recognising bias requires learners to consider how automated outputs may affect people and groups. Digital education should therefore avoid teaching safety, media literacy, and ethics as disconnected topics.

5.4 Shared responsibility is essential

No single institution can address all dimensions of digital education. Families can establish routines and model responsible use; schools can teach structured competencies and provide guided practice; media organisations can support public understanding and responsible content practices; and public authorities can provide standards, resources, and appropriate safeguards. The proposed model consequently depends on coordination rather than transferring responsibility to parents or teachers alone.

5.5 Human relationships should remain an explicit educational outcome

Digital education should evaluate success not only through the ability to use applications, but also through the quality of judgement, respectful communication, and participation in family and community life. The relevant goal is not to eliminate digital communication. It is to help individuals choose when digital tools are useful and when sustained attention, dialogue, or direct interaction is more appropriate. This balance should be framed as a developmental and educational objective, not as a claim that all technology use is socially damaging.

6. Discussion

The findings support an integrated understanding of digital education. Digital literacy, media literacy, ethical reasoning, cultural awareness, and relationship skills are interdependent. A curriculum that teaches how to operate AI tools but does not address verification, privacy, bias, and accountability risks preparing users to be efficient without preparing them to be discerning.

Conversely, a programme focused only on danger may overlook the real educational benefits of AI-enabled accessibility, personalised learning, and creative exploration identified in policy analysis (OECD, 2021).

The UAE policy context offers a basis for aligning these dimensions. The National AI Literacy Curriculum Framework (K–12) links AI concepts with ethical responsibility, societal impact, critical thinking, and applied innovation while recognising national and cultural context (Ministry of Education, United Arab Emirates, n.d.). The model proposed here extends this orientation conceptually by placing family identity and social cohesion explicitly alongside technical and ethical competencies. It should be understood as a complementary framework for discussion and further testing, not as a substitute for the Ministry's official curriculum or as a claim that the five pillars have already been adopted nationally.

The first pillar, digital national and cultural identity, focuses on the ability to access, create, and evaluate digital content that represents the UAE's language, history, heritage, and contemporary society. This pillar does not imply that identity is fixed or that exposure to global cultures should be discouraged. Rather, it proposes that learners should possess enough cultural knowledge to interpret representations critically and participate confidently in intercultural communication. Practical measures may include evaluating online portrayals of local heritage, creating reliable digital resources, and discussing how cultural content changes when removed from its original context.

The second pillar, media and algorithmic literacy, addresses the selection and circulation of digital information. Learners should understand that recommendation systems are shaped by design choices and user data, and that a personalised feed does not represent the full range of available knowledge. They should practise checking claims against independent sources, distinguishing evidence from opinion, identifying manipulated media, and acknowledging uncertainty. These practices are especially important when AI-generated material is plausible in style but unsupported in fact.

The third pillar, digital ethics and safety, translates principles such as privacy, fairness, transparency, and accountability into everyday decisions. Age-appropriate learning should address data minimisation, consent before sharing images or personal details, cyberbullying, respectful communication, and the limits of automated advice. Students should also learn that AI-generated outputs can be inaccurate or biased and that important

decisions require appropriate human judgement. The ethical objective is not merely compliance with rules; it is the development of habits that respect the dignity and rights of others.

The fourth pillar, partnership among families, schools, media, and public institutions, recognises that digital habits are formed across settings. Schools can provide parents with concise, practical guidance and create channels for discussing emerging risks. Family activities can reinforce classroom learning by encouraging joint evaluation of online content and agreed routines for device use. Public institutions can make resources accessible and coordinate consistent messages. Media organisations can contribute through clear information, public education, and responsible reporting on AI and digital risks. Coordination should preserve the distinct responsibilities and professional roles of each actor.

The fifth pillar, balance between technology and human relationships, makes relational well-being an explicit concern. Families and schools can establish routines that protect time for conversation, shared activities, rest, and in-person participation. Such routines should be flexible and sensitive to age, educational needs, disability, and legitimate uses of technology. The point is not to impose a universal screen-time prescription unsupported by this study, but to promote reflective decisions about purpose, context, and opportunity cost.

Taken together, the five pillars offer a conceptual structure for curriculum design and family education. Their value lies in the relationships among them: cultural knowledge gives context to media interpretation; critical literacy supports ethical decisions; institutional partnership reinforces individual learning; and a human-centred orientation keeps technological competence connected to social purpose. The model's practical value, however, remains a proposition to be examined. Its implementation would require clear learning outcomes, age-appropriate resources, teacher preparation, family engagement, and evaluation measures.

7. The Proposed Emirati Model for Digital Education

The proposed model aims to develop a “balanced digital citizen” who can use AI tools competently, evaluate digital information critically, act ethically, maintain cultural awareness, and participate constructively in family and community life. It consists of five connected pillars.

7.1 Pillar One: Digital national and cultural identity

Purpose: strengthen learners' ability to understand and represent Emirati cultural identity in digital settings while engaging respectfully with other cultures. Possible

actions include producing age-appropriate digital heritage content, strengthening Arabic-language content creation, analysing representations of local culture, and teaching learners to distinguish credible historical or cultural sources from decontextualised or fabricated material.

7.2 Pillar Two: Media and algorithmic literacy

Purpose: enable learners to evaluate digital claims and understand how content is selected, recommended, and generated. Possible actions include source triangulation exercises, analysis of recommendation feeds, comparison of AI-generated answers with authoritative materials, and practice identifying manipulated images or misleading headlines. Assessment should focus on reasoning and verification practices rather than memorisation of terminology.

7.3 Pillar Three: Digital ethics and safety

Purpose: establish responsible practices for privacy, consent, fairness, respectful communication, and safe use of AI. Possible actions include case-based discussion of personal data, classroom protocols for AI-assisted work, lessons on cyberbullying and harmful sharing, and guidance on when AI outputs require verification or human review. Rules should be clear, proportionate, and adapted to learners' developmental stages.

7.4 Pillar Four: Family-school-community partnership

Purpose: align guidance across the settings in which children learn and interact. Possible actions include parent workshops, family-school digital agreements, accessible guidance sheets, student-led digital citizenship projects, and coordination with relevant community and public institutions. Partnership should be reciprocal: families contribute contextual knowledge, while schools provide pedagogical support and reliable information.

7.5 Pillar Five: Balance between technology and human relationships

Purpose: encourage intentional use of technology that supports, rather than displaces, meaningful interaction and participation. Possible actions include device-free periods agreed by families, shared reading or heritage activities, reflective discussion of how digital tools affect attention, and opportunities for collaborative activities away from screens. The approach should avoid treating technology as inherently harmful and should instead evaluate how it is used and what it replaces or enables.

7.6 Implementation and evaluation

For implementation, the five pillars should be translated into learning outcomes across age groups and

educational settings. At the primary level, emphasis may fall on privacy, respectful interaction, basic verification, and guided use. At later stages, learners can examine algorithmic selection, data practices, generative AI limitations, bias, and the social consequences of sharing content. Teacher development should include subject-specific examples and methods for assessing reasoning rather than simply checking whether a student has used a tool.

The following indicators are proposed for future evaluation; they have not been tested in this study: (a) learners' demonstrated ability to verify claims and identify uncertainty; (b) understanding of privacy, consent, and AI limitations; (c) quality of digital content created about local culture; (d) participation in family-school learning activities; and (e) self-reported and observed practices relating to respectful communication and balanced use. Evaluation should use multiple sources of evidence and should avoid relying solely on self-report or treating correlation as proof of causation. Any data involving children or families should be collected with appropriate consent, privacy protection, and ethical oversight.

8. Conclusion, Implications, and Recommendations

Artificial intelligence and digital media have become part of the environments in which learning, communication, and cultural participation occur. Their implications for family life and social cohesion cannot be reduced to a simple opposition between technology and tradition. Digital tools may support access, creativity, and learning, while also creating challenges involving privacy, misinformation, algorithmic selection, and the quality of human interaction. The educational task is to equip individuals to navigate these conditions with competence, critical judgement, ethical responsibility, and cultural awareness.

This paper has proposed a conceptual Emirati model comprising five pillars: digital national and cultural identity; media and algorithmic literacy; digital ethics and safety; family-school-community partnership; and balance between technology and human relationships. The model builds on relevant scholarly concepts and institutional principles, and is compatible in broad orientation with the UAE National AI Literacy Curriculum Framework (K-12). Its distinctive contribution is to bring family identity and social cohesion into a single conceptual structure for digital education.

The following recommendations are proposed:

Integrate age-appropriate AI literacy, media verification, privacy, and digital ethics into relevant learning experiences, with clear outcomes and opportunities for practice.

Provide parents and caregivers with practical guidance on discussing AI-generated content, protecting personal information, and establishing constructive family routines.

Strengthen teacher professional development so educators can explain algorithmic selection, generative AI limitations, bias, and responsible use in subject-specific contexts.

Develop reliable Arabic-language and UAE-focused digital resources that support cultural literacy and enable learners to evaluate representations of local history and society.

Encourage coordination among schools, families, relevant public institutions, and media organisations while maintaining clear accountability for each actor.

Pilot the proposed model in varied educational settings and evaluate it through expert review, learner assessments, family feedback, and ethically designed empirical research before making claims about effectiveness.

The principal limitation of the study is its conceptual and documentary design. It does not provide original empirical evidence about Emirati families, nor does it establish that the proposed pillars produce measurable improvements in family cohesion. Future research should validate the model through expert consultation and carefully designed pilot studies, with attention to age, context, digital access, and differences in family practices. Such research would help distinguish broadly applicable principles from measures that require adaptation. Until then, the model should be treated as a structured proposal to inform discussion, curriculum design, and future investigation rather than as a tested national intervention.

8.1 Additional implications for curriculum design and policy

The theoretical contribution of the proposed model is its integration of five dimensions that are often addressed separately: cultural identity, critical media literacy, digital ethics, institutional partnership, and human relationships. The framework does not claim that these dimensions exhaust every aspect of digital education, nor that they are entirely new concepts. Its contribution is organisational: it places them within a common structure oriented towards family identity and social cohesion in

the UAE context. This structure may help policymakers and educators map existing initiatives, identify gaps, and design complementary activities rather than creating disconnected programmes.

The model also recognises that responsibility is distributed but not interchangeable. Families provide continuity, trust, and everyday examples; teachers design learning experiences and assess understanding; platform providers influence the architecture and visibility of content; and public institutions establish policy expectations and provide public resources. Assigning all responsibility to families would overlook the influence of platform design and unequal access to expertise. Conversely, relying exclusively on regulation would not develop the habits of judgement required for everyday choices. A balanced approach combines personal capability, educational support, institutional accountability, and proportionate safeguards.

For schools, the model suggests that learning outcomes should be progressive. Younger learners may first practise asking a trusted adult before sharing personal information, distinguishing a fact from an opinion, and communicating respectfully. Older learners can examine how a recommendation system may influence their information environment, compare multiple sources, test AI-generated claims, and discuss bias or accountability. Adolescents may also explore how digital participation affects reputation, consent, relationships, and public debate. This progression should be adjusted to developmental readiness and should not assume that all learners have the same level of access or prior experience.

For higher education, the model can be extended through academic integrity and discipline-specific AI literacy. Students should be able to disclose when AI assistance has been used where required, verify factual claims and references, protect confidential or sensitive information, and explain the limits of AI-generated analysis. These practices can be taught through research methods, writing, professional ethics, and subject-specific assignments rather than being isolated in a single general lecture. In this way, digital education becomes a transferable academic capability that supports independent judgement instead of replacing it.

The proposed model also has implications for the design of digital learning resources. Materials should be culturally relevant without becoming closed to global perspectives; accessible without oversimplifying difficult ethical questions; and practical without encouraging uncritical dependence on AI tools. Examples can draw on everyday decisions familiar to learners, such as checking a circulating message, deciding whether to upload a

photograph, comparing an AI-generated explanation with a textbook, or assessing a video that purports to document a public event. These examples help learners connect abstract principles to decisions they may actually face.

The five pillars can be operationalised through a simple planning sequence. First, identify the learner group and the digital situation to be addressed. Second, select the relevant pillar or combination of pillars. Third, define an observable learning outcome, such as verifying a claim with two independent sources or explaining why a personal detail should not be entered into a public tool. Fourth, choose a guided activity and a proportionate assessment. Finally, review the activity with learners, teachers, and—where appropriate—families. This sequence makes the model more actionable while keeping the distinction between a proposed design method and demonstrated effectiveness clear.

Implementation should be iterative. Institutions may begin with a limited set of learning outcomes and pilot resources in selected settings, collect feedback from teachers and families, and revise the materials before broader adoption. This approach would allow implementers to identify unintended effects, such as overburdening teachers, creating unrealistic expectations for parents, or treating students' digital behaviour as a matter of individual blame rather than a shared educational responsibility. Iteration also provides an opportunity to distinguish between principles that should be consistent across settings—such as privacy, verification, and respect—and practices that require adaptation to age, subject, school context, and family circumstances.

A final policy implication is that digital education needs to be sustained rather than delivered as a one-off awareness campaign. AI tools, platform designs, and common forms of online deception change over time. Curricula and public guidance should therefore be reviewed periodically, with mechanisms for teachers and families to report emerging questions. This does not require every classroom to follow every technological trend. It requires stable foundational principles—critical inquiry, privacy, fairness, transparency, human judgement, and respect—supported by examples that can be updated as the environment changes.

At the policy level, institutions should avoid treating “digital balance” as a single universal time limit. The meaning of use differs according to purpose, context, age, accessibility requirements, and whether the activity supports learning or social connection. A more defensible educational approach is to help learners and families

reflect on purpose, duration, content, and what other activity is displaced. Such reflection can support locally appropriate routines without presenting an unsupported numerical threshold as a scientific finding of this study.

The model also raises a question of institutional coherence. If schools teach verification but families receive no accessible guidance, learners may encounter inconsistent expectations. If families are advised to restrict use without understanding the educational purposes of a tool, beneficial learning opportunities may be lost. If public messaging focuses only on risks, students may not develop the confidence to explore AI critically; if it focuses only on innovation, ethical limitations may be neglected. Coordination should therefore establish a shared vocabulary and common principles while allowing each institution to adapt examples and methods to its responsibilities.

8.2 Limitations and future research

This conceptual contribution has boundaries. The model has been derived from selected scholarship and policy documents, not from a systematic review with a registered protocol or from primary data collected in Emirati households or schools. It should therefore be assessed for conceptual clarity, cultural relevance, feasibility, and measurability before being treated as an implementation framework. Expert review could examine whether the five pillars are sufficiently distinct, whether proposed activities fit current curricula, and whether the language is accessible to teachers and parents. Subsequent pilot research could then assess usability and learning outcomes across different age groups and contexts.

The proposed indicators should be interpreted carefully. For example, a learner's ability to identify a manipulated image in a classroom exercise does not necessarily mean that the learner will do so under the pressure of a rapidly circulating message. Similarly, reported family agreement about device use may not reveal how consistently that agreement works in daily life. Future evaluation should therefore combine scenario-based tasks, interviews or focus groups where appropriate, observation of learning activities, and feedback from relevant stakeholders. Research involving minors should use appropriate consent procedures, data minimisation, secure handling of records, and independent ethical review where required.

A further implication concerns evaluation. Digital education should not be judged only by the number of devices distributed, the frequency of platform use, or learners' ability to complete technical tasks. Those measures may describe access or activity, but they do not

establish that students can evaluate information, understand the limitations of AI, or act responsibly. Evaluation should therefore include demonstrated reasoning, practical verification tasks, understanding of privacy and consent, and the ability to explain why a digital decision is appropriate. Where family participation is assessed, the process should remain supportive rather than punitive and should respect differences in access, time, language, and caregiving arrangements.

Finally, social cohesion should be approached as a long-term educational aspiration rather than an outcome that can be attributed to one programme alone. Digital education may contribute by strengthening the ability to evaluate claims, engage across difference, avoid harmful sharing, and understand cultural context. However, social cohesion is also shaped by broader social, economic, institutional, and interpersonal conditions. The proposed model should therefore be positioned as one educational contribution within a wider ecosystem of family support, responsible media practice, inclusive education, and sound technology governance.

8.3 Suggested implementation matrix

For practical planning, each pillar can be connected to an intended learning outcome, a learning activity, and an indicator for later evaluation. Under the identity pillar, a learning outcome might be the ability to identify credible sources about UAE heritage and explain why context matters when sharing cultural content. Under media and algorithmic literacy, learners might compare a claim generated by an AI tool with two independent sources and explain discrepancies. Under digital ethics, learners might analyse a scenario involving personal data or an AI-generated image and justify a responsible response. Under partnership, schools might provide a short family activity that encourages joint discussion of source credibility. Under human relationships, learners might reflect on how a device-free shared activity changes the quality of attention and conversation. These examples are proposed learning designs, not evidence of demonstrated impact.

Assessment should match the intended outcome. A quiz may test vocabulary, but a scenario-based task is better suited to evaluating whether learners can apply verification principles. A reflective explanation may reveal whether a student understands privacy and consent, while a portfolio may show the ability to create culturally grounded digital content. Family-school activities can be assessed through participation and feedback, provided that the measures do not penalise families who face time, access, language, or disability-related barriers. The aim is to generate useful evidence

for improvement, not to rank families or infer social cohesion from a single indicator.

A pilot phase should document feasibility as well as learning. Relevant questions include whether teachers have enough preparation time, whether examples are age-appropriate, whether families understand the guidance, and whether the activities can be delivered equitably across different settings. The evaluation should record adaptations and implementation constraints so that later decisions are based on actual experience. Where results are mixed, the appropriate response may be to refine materials or training rather than to conclude that the underlying goal is unimportant.

The framework should also include a periodic review mechanism. Because AI systems and digital platforms evolve quickly, examples of misinformation, privacy risks, and AI-generated media can become outdated. A stable core of principles can be maintained while learning scenarios are refreshed. Review can draw on teachers' classroom observations, feedback from families, official policy updates, and relevant international guidance. Any revisions should be documented transparently so that educators can understand why content has changed and how it relates to the model's central objectives.

8.4 A proposed agenda for empirical validation

Future empirical work should begin by examining the conceptual validity of the five pillars. A panel of specialists in education, media literacy, AI ethics, family studies, and UAE cultural studies could assess whether the pillars are clearly defined, sufficiently distinct, and relevant to the intended users. The consultation should invite suggestions for missing dimensions and examine whether proposed activities are feasible within existing educational structures. A transparent account of how expert feedback is collected and used would help prevent the model from being treated as self-validating simply because it is conceptually coherent.

A subsequent pilot could test a small set of learning activities rather than attempting to implement the entire model at once. For example, one activity could focus on verifying AI-generated claims, another on privacy and consent, and a third on interpreting digital representations of local heritage. Before-and-after tasks could examine whether learners improve in the specific skills taught, while interviews or structured feedback could identify which activities are understandable and useful. Such a design would provide preliminary evidence of usability and learning, but it would not by itself demonstrate lasting changes in family relationships or social cohesion.

Research involving families should account for variation in household circumstances, access to devices, language, parental confidence, and the educational needs of children. The model should not assume that every family has the same capacity to supervise digital activity or that a single routine is appropriate in all circumstances. Studies should therefore report relevant contextual factors and avoid deficit-based interpretations of families who face structural constraints. The purpose of family engagement is to support shared learning and dialogue, not to shift institutional responsibilities onto caregivers.

Longer-term evaluation could examine whether digital education practices are sustained and transferred to new situations. Learners may master a classroom example yet struggle to apply the same reasoning to a novel platform or a persuasive message shared by a trusted contact. Researchers should therefore include unfamiliar scenarios and assess the reasoning used, not only the final answer. If the model is associated with improvements, studies should consider alternative explanations and, where feasible, use comparison groups or other suitable designs. Claims about social cohesion would require particularly careful operational definitions and evidence over time.

The proposed agenda distinguishes three levels of evidence: conceptual validity, implementation feasibility, and effectiveness. Conceptual validation asks whether the model is clear and relevant; feasibility research asks whether it can be implemented fairly and consistently; effectiveness research asks whether participation produces measurable improvements in specified outcomes. These levels should not be conflated. Establishing one does not automatically establish the next, and conclusions should remain proportionate to the research design and data available.

References

- Castells, M. (2010). *The rise of the network society* (2nd ed., with a new preface). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Gilster, P. (1997). *Digital literacy*. Wiley Computer Publishing.
- Jenkins, H. (2009). *Confronting the challenges of participatory culture: Media education for the 21st century*. MIT Press. <https://mitpress.mit.edu/9780262513623/confronting-the-challenges-of-participatory-culture/>
- Ministry of Education, United Arab Emirates. (n.d.). *UAE National AI Literacy Curriculum Framework (K-12)*. Retrieved October 12, 2026, from <https://www.moe.gov.ae/en/pages/ai.aspx>

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2021). OECD digital education outlook 2021: Pushing the frontiers with artificial intelligence, blockchain and robots. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/589b283f-en>

Pariser, E. (2011). The filter bubble: What the Internet is hiding from you. Penguin Press.

Turkle, S. (2011). Alone together: Why we expect more from technology and less from each other. Basic Books.

UNESCO. (2021). Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000381137>

Wardle, C., & Derakhshan, H. (2017). Information disorder: Toward an interdisciplinary framework for research and policy making. Council of Europe. <https://rm.coe.int/information-disorder-toward-an-interdisciplinary-framework-for-research/168076277c>