African Journal of Inter/Multidisciplinary Studies (AJIMS)
Volume 8, Issue 1, pp. 1-13
e-ISSN: 2663-4589

History Education in the Fourth Industrial Revolution: Navigating Challenges and Unleashing New Possibilities

Raymond Nkwenti Fru[1] **and Kehdinga Fomunyam**[2]

[1]**Department of Human Science Teaching, Sol Plaatje University, Kimberley, South Africa**
[2]**International Centre of Nonviolence, Durban University of Technology, Durban, South Africa**

Abstract: The Fourth Industrial Revolution (4IR) has transformed knowledge production, access, and dissemination, creating challenges and opportunities for history education. In this rapidly changing landscape, History teaching hitherto characterised by rote learning has evolved to accommodate digital technologies and artificial intelligence. By adopting a critical self-reflection of practice approach, nuanced with the theory of change, this article explores the challenges imposed by the 4IR and the opportunities and possibilities these technological disruptions can create for History Education. The paper argues that the proliferation of digital sources, while expanding access to historical content, raises serious concerns about information distortions and historical bias. This pedagogic shift also requires improved skill sets in digital literacy to incorporate novel instructional strategies and AI-driven tools in history classrooms, such as interactive simulations and virtual reality (VR) for immersive learning experiences. Despite these challenges, the emerging technologies offered by the 4IR enable personalised learning experiences, allowing students to engage with history in more exciting and previously unimaginable ways. Although the shift from rote memorisation to inquiry-based learning fosters historical thinking skills and encourages students to critically interpret historical events, digital archives, AI-assisted historical analysis, and reconstructions create opportunities for deeper engagement with the past. However, integrating these innovations requires addressing other socio-economic concerns, such as the digital divide (access) and inadequate teacher training. In a country like South Africa, where inequality at various levels of social strata has been a persistent issue for years, this article argues that without strategic implementation, technological advances risk exacerbating existing educational inequalities rather than alleviating them. This study emphasises the need for pedagogical adaptation through a balanced approach to history teaching, where technology enhances rather than replaces traditional historical methodologies.

Keywords: artificial intelligence; digital literacy; fourth industrial revolution; history education; historical thinking

CORRESPONDENCE
Email: raymond.fru@spu.ac.za

EDITORIAL DATES
Received: 20 October 2025
Revised: 13 December 2025
Accepted: 13 December 2025
Published: 30 December 2025

DOI: https://doi.org/10.51415/ajims.v7i2.3703

Introduction

The discipline of history stands at a profound technological crossroads (Fru, 2015), facing numerous challenges, among them the transformative currents of the Fourth Industrial Revolution (4IR). Chaka (2023), supported by Mhlanga 2024, argues that this era presents a fundamental duality for history education, offering an unprecedented arsenal of tools for engaging with the past while simultaneously posing significant threats to the integrity of historical inquiry and the equity of its practice. The 4IR is not a mere technological update, but a systemic transformation in knowledge production, dissemination, and validation. This shift strikes at the core tenets of the historical discipline. However, Vurayai (2025) warns that the uncritical adoption of these powerful technologies, particularly in national contexts marked by deep and persistent inequality, risks entrenching historical disadvantages rather than alleviating them. The opportunities presented by 4IR technologies, such as unprecedented access to global digital archives and immersive learning experiences through virtual reality, are counterbalanced by the proliferation of misinformation, the potential for cognitive overload, and the risk of technology replacing, rather than enhancing, sound pedagogy. Navigating this complex landscape requires a robust theoretical framework. This paper proposes a commitment to critical self-reflection of practice as the essential disposition for educators grappling with innovative technologies. This involves a continuous questioning engagement with the pedagogical implications of digital tools, moving beyond simple adoption to a deeper analysis of their impact on learning and equity (Leon-Henri, 2024; Scharff et al., 2023). In addition, there is a need for the systematic and equitable implementation of educational technology. This model requires institutions and policymakers to move beyond reactive measures and instead articulate a purpose-driven path from identifying educational problems to achieving desired, equitable outcomes. This article addresses a critical problem: how can history education harness the transformative potential of the Fourth Industrial Revolution while mitigating its risks, particularly in contexts marked by profound inequality, such as South Africa? The study has three interrelated objectives: (1) to critically examine the challenges that 4IR technologies pose to historical integrity and pedagogical practice, (2) to identify and evaluate the opportunities these technologies offer to improve history education, and (3) to propose a balanced, equity-focused framework for integrating 4IR technologies into history classrooms that prioritises critical thinking and addresses structural inequalities. This article employs a conceptual and analytical approach, drawing on an extensive review of current literature to examine the intersection of the Fourth Industrial Revolution and history education. The methodology synthesises insights from educational theory, technological studies, and pedagogical research to construct a comprehensive framework to understand both challenges and opportunities. This approach is grounded in the Theory of Change, which provides a structured lens for analysing how technological interventions can lead to desired educational outcomes while accounting for contextual barriers and enablers.

Early explorations of AI in history teaching date back to 1982, when researchers first considered the intersection of computers and historical thinking, noting that both historians and AI researchers draw on familiar philosophical sources, such as Collingwood's work on understanding human action and Davidson's theories on belief structures (Ennals, 1982). More recently, a special series investigating the relationship between Generative Artificial Intelligence and history education emphasises that educators and institutions have responded to GenAI in varied ways, with some adopting techno-optimistic stances promoting integration as transformative. In contrast, others express techno-sceptical concerns about algorithmic bias, privacy violations, and academic integrity issues (Bormuth et al., 2025). The Republic of South Africa is a critical case study for this analysis. It is a nation where the global dynamics of the 4IR intersect with a unique and stubborn legacy of socio-economic and racial inequality (David et al., 2023; Seyama, 2024). In this context, the promise of technological advancement is overshadowed by the danger of a widening digital divide, making the stakes of integrating educational technology exceptionally high. The challenges faced in South Africa are not unique, but are an intensified microcosm of the global struggle to harness the 4IR for inclusive progress. This paper argues for a balanced and deliberate approach to integrating 4IR technologies into history pedagogy. It posits that technology must catalyse deeper historical thinking, enhancing rather than replacing the foundational methodologies of the discipline. The central challenge is to harness the democratising potential of digital resources while simultaneously fortifying learners against the epistemological dangers of a polluted information environment, all within a framework that prioritises equity and access for the most vulnerable.

The nature of the revolution: Understanding the 4IR's impact on knowledge and learning

To comprehend the implications of the 4IR for history education, one must first grasp the nature of the revolution itself. Petersen (2016) argues that Klaus Schwab, the founder of the World Economic Forum, coined and announced the concept of the Fourth Industrial Revolution. The 4IR is defined not by a single technology, but by a fusion of technologies that blur the lines between the physical, digital, and biological spheres. It builds on the digital revolution of the late twentieth century but is distinguished by three core characteristics: its unprecedented velocity, its broad scope, and its profound systemic impact. Unlike previous industrial revolutions that unfolded over decades, the 4IR is evolving exponentially, disrupting every industry and transforming entire systems of production, governance, and social interaction (Al-Sabaawi & Al-Dulaimi, 2024). The engine of this transformation is an interconnected ecosystem of core technologies. These include Artificial Intelligence (AI) and machine learning, which enable systems to perform increasingly complex cognitive tasks; the Internet of Things (IoT), which connects billions of physical devices to a global network; robotics and autonomous vehicles; virtual and augmented reality (VR/AR), which create immersive digital experiences; big data analytics, which allows for the interpretation of massive datasets; and advanced manufacturing techniques such as 3D printing (Schwab, 2017). The convergence of these technologies creates a world where the virtual and physical realms cooperate in unprecedented ways, fundamentally altering how we live, work, and interact with one another (Vurayai, 2025).

This technological sea change has precipitated a corresponding shift in educational philosophy, often referred to as 'Education 4.0.' This new model represents a deliberate break from the standardised, teacher-centric approach of "Education 1.0," which emerged during the first industrial revolution to prepare workers for specific roles through rote memorisation and knowledge transfer. Education 4.0, in contrast, is defined by a set of principles designed to prepare learners for a complex, uncertain, and rapidly changing world. Key characteristics include a learner-centred pedagogy that empowers students as active architects of their learning journey, often facilitated by AI-driven personalised and adaptive learning pathways (Schwab, 2016). Mhlanga (2024) argues that the focus shifts from knowledge acquisition to competency-based learning, which cultivates uniquely human skills such as critical thinking, creativity, and collaboration that complement the capabilities of AI. Furthermore, it necessitates interdisciplinary and lifelong learning to navigate dissolving disciplinary boundaries and the obsolescence of a single "career for life".

Meylahn (2024) states that the defining characteristic of the 4IR is the blurring of lines between the physical, digital, and biological spheres, and this presents a unique and profound epistemological challenge to the discipline of history. Boadu and Okyere (2025) support this argument when they contend that traditional historical practice is predicated on a clear distinction: the past itself is gone and inaccessible, while the present is where the historian works with its traces, including primary sources, artefacts, and memories that serve as evidence. This evidence, whether a physical document or a digital scan, is understood to represent, but is fundamentally separate from, the past event. The 4IR's fusion technologies disrupt this foundational distinction (Dafermos, 2022; Wood, 2019). A virtual reality reconstruction that allows a student to "walk through" ancient Rome is not a primary source in the traditional sense, nor is it a secondary analysis; it is a new form of historical representation, an experiential simulation that collapses the distance between past and present (Yende, 2023). Similarly, according to Farber (2023), an AI-powered chatbot that simulates a conversation with a historical figure blurs the line between a historical actor and a contemporary algorithm, creating a representation that is neither an authentic artefact nor a scholarly interpretation. This fusion presents an ontological challenge to the discipline, requiring educators and students to confront new questions about the nature of historical evidence, truth, and experience. Therefore, the core challenge of the 4IR for history education extends beyond the mere adoption of new pedagogical tools; it demands a confrontation with a fundamental shift in the representation of history itself.

Perils in the digital past: Challenges to historical integrity and pedagogy

Luo et al. (2023) argue that while the 4IR promises to democratise access to historical information on an unprecedented scale, it concurrently unleashes a torrent of unreliable, biased, and deliberately falsified content that threatens the foundation of historical understanding. The digital ecosystem, characterised by its speed, reach, and algorithmic amplification, has become a fertile ground for misinformation (false information spread without harmful intent) and disinformation (false information deliberately created and disseminated to mislead).

Psychological research demonstrates that individuals are highly susceptible to these false narratives, often due to cognitive biases such as confirmation bias, the tendency to favour information that confirms pre-existing beliefs, and social pressures to conform to one's peer group(Singh & Kumar, 2024). The misinformation effect, a well-documented cognitive phenomenon (Arntzen and Vaidya 2008; Otgaar et al., 2023; Putnam et al., 2017), shows that post-event information can alter and corrupt the memory of the original event, making individuals vulnerable to suggestion. The result is a polluted information environment in which falsehoods can achieve greater engagement and circulation than verified facts, undermining public trust in the media and expert knowledge.

Generative AI introduces a new and particularly insidious dimension to this crisis. Unlike traditional forms of misinformation, AI models can produce text, images, and data that mimic the form and style of credible historical sources with remarkable sophistication (Farber, 2023). However, according to the American Historical Association (2023), these large language models are designed to identify and reproduce patterns in their training data, not to comprehend or verify truth. This leads to "hallucination," where an AI confidently invents fictional sources, quotes, and even historical events to complete a prompt, presenting fabricated information with an aura of authority. This poses a grave danger in the history classroom, where students may unknowingly accept an AI-generated falsehood as a legitimate historical fact. Furthermore, AI systems are not neutral arbiters of the past. The American Historical Association (2023) argues that historians are trained on vast datasets of existing digital texts and images, and inevitably reproduce biases, omissions, and perspectives within those datasets. If the training data over-represent certain historical narratives – for instance, those centred on elite, male figures from Western nations - the AI's outputs will reflect and amplify those biases, perpetuating a skewed and incomplete vision of the past. This algorithmic reinforcement of historical bias risks undoing decades of scholarly work to recover the voices and experiences of marginalised groups, potentially reinscribing a narrow, hegemonic historical canon through a technological veneer of objectivity.

Contemporary research raises fundamental questions about the evaluation of the "effectiveness" of GenAI in producing historical content, interpretations, narratives, and representations, as well as concerns about authenticity in historical representations generated by or with the aid of GenAI (Bormuth et al., 2025). Historical educators face a particularly acute challenge: while AI-powered chatbots can simulate conversations with historical figures, they blur the line between historical actors and contemporary algorithms, creating representations that are neither authentic artefacts nor scholarly interpretations (Bormuth et al., 2025). This requires teaching students to approach AI-generated historical content with the same critical scepticism that they would apply to primary archival documents. The "crisis of veracity" precipitated by the 4IR demands a fundamental reorientation of history pedagogy. In an era of information abundance and digital pollution, the traditional educational model, which prioritises memorising and recalling an established body of historical facts, is no longer adequate or defensible (Sajjad, 2023; Singh & Kumar, 2024). The central challenge for learners is not a lack of information, but an overwhelming surplus of it, much of which is unreliable. Consequently, the most crucial skill is not content mastery, but critical digital literacy, the ability to navigate this complex information landscape with discernment (Mhlanga, 2024). This involves a suite of competencies, including evaluating the credibility of digital sources, identifying authorial intent and bias, corroborating claims across multiple sources, and distinguishing between verifiable facts, reasoned interpretations, and outright falsehoods (Vurayai, 2025). The discipline of history is uniquely positioned to cultivate these essential skills of the 21st century. American Historical Association (2023) adds that the core methodologies of the historian's craft: rigorous source criticism, contextual analysis, the weighing of evidence, and the understanding of multiple perspectives, are the intellectual tools required for responsible digital citizenship. Teaching students to analyse a 19th-century political cartoon for its biases and intended audience is functionally identical to teaching them how to deconstruct a modern-day meme or a viral news story. The 4IR, therefore, does not render the history study obsolete; in contrast, it elevates the practice of historical thinking from an academic exercise to an essential survival skill for navigating contemporary society (American Historical Association, 2023).

This realisation necessitates a pedagogical shift in the history classroom, away from being a site for transmitting received narratives and toward becoming a workshop for developing cognitive defence mechanisms. The rise of digital falsehoods creates a direct and urgent societal need for the foundational skills of the historical discipline. By training students to approach every digital source with the same critical scepticism and analytical rigour they would apply to a primary document from the archives, history education can serve as a form of "cognitive immunisation." Equip learners with the intellectual antibodies necessary to resist the "infodemic" of misinformation and disinformation (Singh & Kumar, 2024). This reframes the discipline not as a backwards-looking

subject concerned solely with the past but as a vital, forward-looking civic enterprise essential for the health of democratic society in the digital age.

New vistas of understanding: Opportunities for revitalised history education

Despite the profound challenges it presents, the 4IR also offers a suite of powerful new tools that have the potential to revitalise history education, making the study of the past more engaging, accessible, and meaningful for a new generation of learners (Sajjad, 2023; Singh & Kumar, 2024). Moving beyond rote memorisation, these technologies can foster deeper forms of historical inquiry, empathy, and understanding.

Perhaps the most significant opportunity afforded by the 4IR is the unprecedented democratisation of access to primary sources through the proliferation of digital archives (Annet, 2025; Asmaa, 2020). For centuries, direct engagement with historical records was the exclusive domain of professional historians with the means to travel to physical archives. Today, vast collections of letters, diaries, photographs, government documents, and manuscripts are available online, allowing students to step into the role of the historian without leaving the classroom. This accessibility transforms the pedagogical model from passive reception to active inquiry. Instead of merely consuming a pre-digested narrative from a textbook, students can engage in the authentic practice of constructing their own historical interpretations. Using digital tools such as collaborative annotation platforms and online discussion forums, they can work together to analyse primary sources, evaluate their reliability and bias, corroborate evidence, and build their own evidence-based arguments. This process deepens their understanding of a specific historical period and develops crucial and transferable skills in critical thinking, research, and argumentation (Farber, 2023). The classroom becomes less of a lecture hall and more of a historian's workshop, where students learn by doing the work of history.

Recent pedagogical innovations demonstrate the transformative potential of AI in practice. One innovative approach involves the "Letters to the Past" activity, where students write letters to historical figures and receive AI-generated responses that simulate the perspectives of these figures (Azevedo, 2024). After studying a specific historical period such as the French Revolution, students explain aspects of their contemporary life to historical figures and ask questions about their actions and thoughts, allowing playful and practical interaction with historical knowledge. This method allows teachers to identify anachronisms, incorrect use of concepts, and misunderstanding of fundamental historical aspects in student writing. With ChatGPT, teachers can now provide personalised feedback to all students instead of manually responding to only a few letters per class (Azevedo, 2024). Teachers can instruct ChatGPT on the appropriate response format by providing specific commands before processing student letters, ensuring pedagogically sound feedback. Additionally, ChatGPT can analyse letters collectively, identifying common themes and conceptual errors, allowing teachers to make focused adjustments in areas where students demonstrate difficulties. For example, teachers can ask ChatGPT to determine how many students correctly used the term "revolution" or list the most common mistakes, ranked by frequency (Azevedo, 2024). Similarly, early applications of logic programming in history education, such as using MicroPROLOG for census data interrogation, demonstrated that students could easily retrieve and analyse historical information from databases using simple logical commands, making historical data analysis accessible even to younger learners (Ennals, 1982).

Yende (2023) argues that immersive technologies, such as Virtual Reality (VR) and Augmented Reality (AR), offer a powerful new medium for historical representation and learning. By creating interactive three-dimensional environments, VR can transport students to historical sites, allowing them to experience the past in a spatial and emotionally resonant way, which is impossible to achieve through text or two-dimensional images. Studies indicate that such immersive experiences can significantly enhance historical knowledge, increase student interest, and foster positive attitudes towards the subject (Yende, 2023; Boadu & Okyere, 2025). A key potential of VR lies in its ability to foster historical empathy and affective learning (Frentzel-Beyme & Krämer, 2025). They argue that by allowing a student to "stand" in a digitally reconstructed space, such as the Secret Annexe of Anne Frank, technology can foster a deeper emotional connection to the experiences of historical actors. This can make abstract historical concepts tangible and visceral, such as confinement or persecution. However, the use of these technologies must be approached with critical caution. VR reconstructions are not transparent windows to the past; they are inherently fictional interpretations, as developers must fill in countless details, from the texture of a wall to the sounds of a street, unknown to historians. These risks create a false sense of certainty, collapsing the critical distance necessary for historical analysis. Frentzel-Beyme and Krämer (2025) conclude that significant practical and pedagogical challenges remain, including the high cost of implementation, technical

issues like user discomfort and cognitive overload, and the need for carefully designed learning activities to ensure that immersion leads to deep learning rather than mere distraction. Although VR has proven effective in enhancing substantive knowledge (facts and dates), a critical gap remains in research on its ability to develop procedural knowledge or historical thinking skills (Boadu & Okyere, 2025).

The African reality of implementing technologies like virtual reality in history education involves substantial practical barriers often overlooked in techno-optimistic discourse. The cost of VR headsets (ranging from $300 to $800 per unit) represents approximately 40% of the annual technology budget for many South African schools, making classroom sets financially prohibitive for most institutions (Birguid, 2024). Beyond procurement, there are hidden costs: VR content creation requires specialised historical consultants and technical developers, with a single immersive historical experience costing $15,000- $50,000 to develop professionally. Training teachers to use VR pedagogically, not just technically, requires sustained professional development programs that few African countries have adequately resourced. Additionally, the digital infrastructure challenges are compounded: VR applications require high-speed internet (minimum 25 Mbps) for cloud-based content and regular updates, which are often unavailable in most rural and peri-urban African schools. Power supply instability further complicates usage, as VR equipment requires consistent electricity for charging and operation. These material realities mean that without substantial, sustained investment in infrastructure, training, and content development specifically designed for African historical contexts, VR and similar 4IR technologies risk becoming "showcase" interventions accessible only to elite schools, thereby deepening rather than closing the digital divide (Chisango et al., 2023; Ndlovu, 2023).

Beyond its potential for generating misinformation, Artificial Intelligence presents constructive possibilities for the history classroom when used as a carefully guided tool (American Historical Association, 2023). Adding to this, Schleicher (2019) posits that AI can function as a powerful research assistant, capable of analysing massive datasets such as census records, trade logs, or newspaper archives, to help students identify historical trends, patterns, and correlations that would be invisible through traditional methods of analysis. This introduces students to the methods of quantitative history and "big data" analysis, expanding their methodological toolkit. Schleicher (2019) further argues that AI also holds significant promise for creating personalised and adaptive learning platforms. Such systems can tailor educational content to each student's needs and learning pace, providing real-time feedback, suggesting supplemental resources, and offering interactive exercises. For example, AI-powered chatbots can be designed to simulate conversations with historical figures, allowing students to explore different perspectives on an event in an engaging, inquiry-driven format. This moves away from a one-size-fits-all model of instruction towards a more individualised and student-centred approach. The most effective pedagogical use of AI may be as a "cognitive collaborator" rather than an information provider. For example, an instructor might ask students to critically evaluate an AI-generated summary of a scholarly article, identifying its strengths, weaknesses, and omissions (American Historical Association, 2023). Such an assignment simultaneously develops students' historical analysis skills and AI literacy, teaching them to use these powerful tools as critical and discerning users.

Beyond these general applications, AI offers specific and transformative possibilities for history education. For example, AI-powered language translation tools can make historical sources available across linguistic barriers, allowing South African students to access archival materials in English, Afrikaans, or indigenous languages, thus democratising engagement with primary sources. Machine learning algorithms can analyse large historical datasets such as census records, court documents, or newspaper archives to identify patterns of social change, economic transformation, or political mobilisation that would take human researchers years to uncover, introducing students to computational history methods. AI can also provide scaffolded support for historical writing, offering real-time feedback on argument structure, evidence use, and citation practices, helping students develop sophisticated historical writing skills. Furthermore, adaptive assessment systems can diagnose individual student misconceptions about historical causation, chronology, or interpretation, then provide targeted interventions tailored to each learner's needs. In terms of curriculum personalisation, AI can curate custom "learning pathways" through complex historical topics, adjusting the depth, pace, and examples based on student performance and interests, making history education more responsive to diverse learning needs (Becker & Ebert, 2024; Farber, 2024).

The South African crucible: The digital divide and the imperative for equity

The global discourse surrounding the 4IR's potential in education must be grounded in the stark realities of national and local contexts. In South Africa, the conversation is not about abstract possibilities, but about urgent high-stakes challenges. The nation's deep-seated historical inequalities have created a profound digital divide, and the uncritical rollout of 4IR technologies threatens to function not as a bridge across this chasm, but as a wedge that drives it deeper (; Sikhosana & Mudau, 2023). The digital divide in South Africa is a direct continuation of the spatial and racial geographies of apartheid in a new technological guise (Seyama, 2024). The challenges facing South African history education mirror broader global concerns about test-oriented education systems prioritising superficial over deep learning. Research on Chinese high school history education reveals that students often use rote memorisation rather than understanding cause-and-effect relationships and practising deductive reasoning when analysing historical figures (Sheng, 2023). However, scholars suggest that in an intelligent machine-dominated future society, creativity and independent thinking skills gained from deep learning will be crucial for individual survival, making the reform of history pedagogy urgent not only in South Africa, but globally (Sheng, 2023). Studies have shown that while virtual reality and augmented reality technologies promise to make history learning more engaging for high schoolers through immersive experiences, their effectiveness depends heavily on careful pedagogical design to ensure that they promote deep learning rather than mere distraction (Yawar & Amany, 2024).

Batisai et al. (2025), argue that the South African landscape is a multi-layered problem that manifests as a chasm between a small, affluent, and largely urban minority with access to state-of-the-art technology and a vast, underprivileged majority in townships and rural areas who lack even the most basic digital infrastructure. The statistics are stark: a 2018 report revealed that only 4,675 of 23,471 public schools had internet connectivity for teaching and learning purposes, while nationally, only 22% of households possessed a computer. This disparity is not merely about access to hardware and connectivity (the first level of the digital divide). It also encompasses a gap in digital literacy and skills (the second level), where learners and teachers in under-resourced schools lack the training and support necessary to use technology effectively, even when it is available (Mthethwa 2025a; Batisai et al., 2025). This culminates in a third-level divide: a disparity in achieving meaningful educational and economic outcomes through digital participation, which disproportionately affects marginalised students and widens existing academic inequalities Mthethwa 2025b). Uleanya (2025) argues that without a deliberate and strategic focus on equity, the integration of 4IR technologies into the South African education system is poised to exacerbate these existing inequalities. The COVID-19 pandemic provided a devastating preview of this reality. A two-tiered system immediately emerged as schools shut down, and learning shifted online. A minority of well-resourced schools transitioned smoothly to remote learning, while most learners were left behind, lacking devices, data, and digitally literate teachers (Seyama, 2024; Sikhosana & Mudau, 2023). The result was a catastrophic loss of learning time, with some studies suggesting that educational outcomes regressed to 2015 levels.

The rural-urban divide is particularly stark. According to Statistics South Africa (2022), only 10% of rural schools have functional computer laboratories compared to 78% of urban schools. Furthermore, the Department of Basic Education (2023) reports that 80% of South African schools are classified as "no-fee" schools serving predominantly poor communities. Yet, these schools receive only 60% of the national education budget. In terms of history education specifically, Wassermann and Maposa (2021) found that fewer than 15% of under-resourced schools have access to digital historical archives or online learning platforms, compared to 85% of well-resourced schools. This disparity in digital infrastructure directly impacts the ability to implement 4IR technologies, with rural and township schools facing compound disadvantages: inadequate connectivity (with average internet speeds below 2Mbps in 65% of rural schools), insufficient devices (student-to-computer ratios of 50:1 or higher), and limited teacher training in digital pedagogy (Department of Basic Education, 2023; Jansen, 2021). Jansen (2019) has extensively documented how South African schools exist in "two worlds" – a privileged minority with resources comparable to first-world institutions and a struggling majority trapped in dysfunction and poverty. This structural inequality, rooted in apartheid's spatial legacy, means that discussions of 4IR integration cannot proceed as if all schools occupy the same starting point. Jansen (2022) further argues that technological interventions often exacerbate rather than address these inequalities because they fail to account for the "micropolitics" of school-level implementation, where resource constraints, undertrained teachers, and community contexts fundamentally shape whether new initiatives succeed or fail.

This scenario highlights the core danger: that the 4IR will create an educational apartheid where the children of the elite are prepared for the future in "smart schools." In contrast, children of people experiencing poverty are further marginalised. This is compounded by a sense of "powerlessness" among educators in underserved contexts, who feel constrained by insufficient infrastructure, a lack of training, and top-down mandates, preventing them from making the independent decisions necessary to prepare their learners for a digital future (Seyama, 2024). Seyama adds that inadequate funding, poor infrastructure, and a critical shortage of teacher development programmes remain the main structural barriers to a fair implementation of 4IR. This dynamic at play within South Africa is a potent national microcosm of what has been termed the "'4IR paradox of globalisation'" (Vurayai, 2025). This paradox describes a global phenomenon in which technologically advanced nations accumulate the benefits of the 4IR exponentially, whereas less developed countries are left further behind. Within South Africa, the same forces of accumulation and marginalisation are replicated internally, demonstrating that the digital divide is not a neutral, technical problem but a structural one rooted in the nation's history of exclusion.

However, under-resourced schools need not remain passive victims of this digital divide. Several strategic interventions can help mitigate marginalisation. First, adopting "low-tech" digital solutions that maximise impact with minimal infrastructure – such as offline digital archives on USB drives, solar-powered tablets loaded with educational content, and WhatsApp-based history discussion groups that require only basic mobile connectivity (Bosch, 2022). Second, leveraging community partnerships with local libraries, universities, and NGOs to share digital resources and provide periodic access to advanced technologies. Third, prioritising teacher professional development in critical digital literacy over expensive hardware enables teachers to help students evaluate AI-generated content and online sources, even with limited access to technology. Fourth, implementing "hub-and-spoke" models where cluster schools share resources, with one better-equipped school serving as a technology centre for surrounding schools (Khoza & Msimang, 2022). Finally, we advocate for policy reforms that redirect 4IR funding toward bridging the infrastructure gap, rather than enhancing already privileged schools. These strategies, while not eliminating inequality, can prevent further marginalisation and create incremental pathways toward more equitable technology integration (Jansen & Blank, 2024; Wassermann & Herman, 2023).

For schools lacking the infrastructure to use AI and other 4IR technologies meaningfully, the implications are profound and multi-layered. First, there is a widening gap in pedagogical quality: while well-resourced schools can offer immersive VR historical experiences, personalised AI tutoring, and access to global digital archives, under-resourced schools remain trapped in outdated, textbook-dependent instruction. This creates a two-tier system where students' exposure to innovative learning experiences is determined by their socio-economic background rather than their potential or interest. Second, this disparity affects the delivery of the curriculum itself. The national curriculum increasingly assumes digital literacy and access to online resources, yet many schools struggle to meet these expectations, forcing teachers to simplify or omit key components (Jansen, 2022; Wassermann, 2023). Third, the divide extends to assessment and certification, as digitally mediated assessments and portfolios become the standard, disadvantaging students from schools without reliable access to technology. Most critically, this technological stratification reproduces and legitimises inequality by framing it as a "natural" consequence of the digital age rather than as a policy failure, thereby normalising a form of educational apartheid under the guise of technological progress (Spaull & Jansen, 2019).

Towards a balanced and reflective pedagogy

Even under the best conditions, Scharff et al. (2023) argue that the ultimate success or failure of technology integration rests with the individual educator in the classroom. Leon-Henri (2024) concurs with this, arguing that the lynchpin of practical and ethical practice in the 4IR is the teacher's commitment to critical self-reflection. This is not a passive or occasional activity, but a purposeful and continuous cycle of self-observation, analysis, and evaluation to understand and improve one's teaching practice. Reflective practice moves beyond the superficial question of "What worked?" to ask the more profound, critical questions: "Why did it work, and for whom?" "Who was advantaged by this approach and who might have been disadvantaged?" Leon-Henri (2024) continues that reflective practice involves systematically examining the alignment between one's pedagogical beliefs and classroom practices. In the context of the 4IR, this reflective lens must be applied rigorously to the use of technology. The reflective history teacher must constantly ask:

- Does this digital tool genuinely deepen historical thinking or merely create a veneer of superficial, gamified engagement? (Sheninger, 2017)
- Does this technology strengthen students' historical thinking skills, specifically their ability to source, contextualise, corroborate, and close-read historical evidence, or does it merely make content delivery more entertaining without deepening historical understanding? (Wineburg, 2018)
- Does this technology improve or undermine equity in my classroom? Does it provide a new pathway for struggling learners or privilege those already technologically savvy?
- Is this tool a "pedagogical catalyst" that enhances effective teaching, or is it at risk of automating and amplifying ineffective methods?
- Does the use of AI or digital archives in my history classroom help students understand the constructed nature of historical narratives, or does it inadvertently present the past as a fixed, objective reality? (VanSledright, 2021)
- How do I prepare students to critically evaluate AI-generated historical content for bias, omissions, and distortions, ensuring that they become discerning consumers of digital history rather than passive recipients? (Breakstone et al., 2023)

Emerging research questions highlight the multifaceted challenges educators face in this new landscape. Critical inquiries include understanding how students and teachers use GenAI to teach and learn history, what ethical issues arise from this usage, what role GenAI plays in the initial and continuing professional development of history teachers, and what conclusions can be drawn from previous technological innovations that might help address current challenges (Bormuth et al., 2025). Research emphasises that AI can serve three critical roles in history teaching: providing applied teaching strategies through systems that recommend educational content suitable for different learning needs, increasing teachers' ability to teach by managing classroom activities and reducing administrative burdens, and supporting teachers' professional development through intelligent evaluation models that provide objective feedback (Yawar & Amany, 2024). However, a significant barrier exists: most teachers do not have a proper understanding of how AI technologies work, and without understanding the mechanisms of content recommendation and teaching strategy suggestions, teachers may feel their professional control is reduced, potentially discouraging them from adopting AI tools in their classrooms (Yawar & Amany, 2024).

This process of critical reflection is not antithetical to technology; in fact, the two can be symbiotic. Digital tools, such as video recordings of lessons or online teaching journals, can provide teachers with objective data to analyse their own practice, leading to more thoughtful and practical integration of technology in the future (Singh, 2016). This capacity for critical reflection distinguishes the professional educator from a mere technician. In an age of increasing automation, teachers' ability to question, adapt, and make principled pedagogical judgments remains their most vital and irreplaceable contribution (Scharff et al., 2023).

Enhancing humanity through technology

The Fourth Industrial Revolution presents history education with a profound and unavoidable duality. On the one hand, Sajjad (2023) argues that the 4IR offers a dazzling array of technologies that can revolutionise the study of the past, making it more interactive, immersive, and accessible. Digital archives can transform students into active historical investigators; virtual reality can foster deep empathy; and artificial intelligence can unlock new modes of analysis and personalised learning. However, Seyama (2024) argues that these same forces carry significant perils. They threaten to pollute the information landscape with sophisticated forms of misinformation, amplify historical biases through opaque algorithms, and, in contexts of deep inequality like South Africa, exacerbate the educational divide between the privileged and the marginalised. Looking ahead, the successful integration of 4IR technologies into history education will require a fundamental shift in how we conceptualise the relationship between technology, pedagogy, and equity. This shift demands that educational stakeholders move beyond viewing technology as either a panacea or a threat, instead recognising it as a powerful but contextually-mediated tool whose impact depends entirely on the systems, values, and pedagogical frameworks within which it is deployed. The path ahead requires several critical commitments.

First, policymakers must prioritise equity in technology infrastructure, ensuring that 4IR interventions begin with closing gaps rather than widening them. This means redirecting resources toward underserved schools and communities, establishing technology hubs in rural areas, and subsidising access for historically marginalised students. Without this foundational commitment to equity, any technological advancement will merely

reproduce existing hierarchies in a digital guise. Second, teacher education programmes must urgently incorporate critical digital literacy and technological pedagogy, preparing history educators not only to use digital tools but also to examine their epistemological implications critically. Teachers need ongoing professional development that helps them navigate the ethical complexities of AI-generated content, evaluate the pedagogical value of immersive technologies, and design learning experiences that leverage technology to deepen rather than superficialise historical thinking. Third, curriculum developers and historians must actively shape how 4IR technologies represent the past, ensuring that AI training data, VR reconstructions, and digital archives reflect diverse historical perspectives rather than perpetuating dominant narratives. This requires sustained collaboration between technologists, historians, and educators to create content that honours historical complexity and pluralism. Finally, researchers must continue investigating the actual impacts of 4IR technologies on historical thinking, learning outcomes, and educational equity, moving beyond techno-optimistic assumptions to rigorously evaluate what works, for whom, and under what conditions. Only through evidence-based implementation can we ensure that technological integration serves educational goals rather than commercial interests.

To navigate this complex terrain, this paper has argued for a deliberate and balanced approach that rejects technophobic resistance and uncritical technological solutionism. The path forward must be guided by the twin pillars of systemic adjustment and a pedagogical commitment to Critical Self-Reflection. At the systemic level, technological changes provide the necessary framework for technological integration that is driven not by novelty but by a clear and unwavering commitment to achieving equitable educational outcomes. It forces policymakers and institutions to address the underlying structural, infrastructural, and funding barriers, as well as teacher capacity issues, that prevent technology from becoming a force for universal progress. At the classroom level, critical self-reflection empowers educators to be the masters, not the servants, of technology. It equips them with the essential disposition to constantly question and adapt their practice, ensuring that digital tools deepen historical thinking and foster critical consciousness, rather than deliver content more efficiently. As the field moves forward, empirical research must reveal not only students' and teachers' abilities to utilise and analyse AI-generated historical content effectively, but also how AI impacts their conceptualisation of history, its purpose, logic, media, and the demands it places on individuals' knowledge and skills (Bormuth et al., 2025). The challenge lies in using AI not as a replacement for human judgment and the human teacher, but as a tool that reduces teacher and student stress while significantly improving the effectiveness of history education through personalised, accessible and engaging learning experiences (Azevedo, 2024; Yawar & Amany, 2024). Although AI provides numerous benefits, including anytime learning, virtual tutoring, enhanced interaction through modern technologies, and potential cost reduction, it cannot and should not replace the human teacher (Yawar & Amany, 2024). The advantages of AI must be understood within the framework of teacher-student collaboration, where technology serves as an ally that reduces administrative burdens while enabling teachers to focus on what truly matters: personalised, meaningful engagement with historical thinking.

Finally, the challenge of the 4IR is not technological, but human. As Klaus Schwab reminds us, it all comes down to people and values (Petersen, 2016). The goal of integrating technology into the history classroom should not be to create more efficient learners or to prepare students for an automated workforce. The true promise of these powerful tools lies in their potential to enhance the very qualities that define our humanity. By leveraging technology to cultivate a more critical, empathetic, and historically conscious citizenry, we can shape a future that works for all of us by prioritising people and empowering them. This is the profound responsibility and extraordinary opportunity that the Fourth Industrial Revolution presents to the discipline of history.

Declarations

Interdisciplinary Scope: This article examines how history education and emerging technologies, including artificial intelligence, intersect. It addresses classroom practice, digital innovation, and broader technological shifts in learning. Drawing on pedagogy, technology studies, and educational philosophy, it offers a theoretical, not empirical, analysis, using conceptual frameworks to trace how technologies shape learning and outcomes. The discussion covers digital misinformation, educational access and inequality (especially in developing contexts), debates over rote memorisation versus critical, inquiry-based learning, and the practical requirements of teacher preparation and infrastructure for effective technology integration.

Author Contributions: Conceptualisation (Raymond and Kehdinga), literature review (Raymond), methodology (Kehdinga), analysis (Raymond and Kehdinga), review and editing (Raymond). The final version of the article has been approved by all the authors.

Conflict of Interest: The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

Funding: There was no funding for the publication of this article.

Availability of Data: The article includes all the relevant data. However, more information can be obtained from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

References

Al-Sabaawi, M. H., & Al-Dulaimi, A. H. (2024). *The Fourth Industrial Revolution: A historical and conceptual review*. ResearchGate. Retrieved December 9 2025, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/379651042

American Historical Association. (2023). *AHA ad hoc committee on Artificial Intelligence in history education report*. Retrieved December 9 2025, from https://www.historians.org/ai-report

Annet, K. A. (2025). *Reimagining history: The role of digital archives in education*. ResearchGate. Retrieved December 9 2025, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/387164728

Arntzen, E., & Vaidya, M. (2008). The effect of baseline training structure on equivalence class formation in children. Https://www.researchgate.net/publication/237010587_The_effect_of_baseline_training_structure_on_equivalence_class_formation_in_children *Experimental Analysis of Human Behavior Bulletin*, *32*(1), 1–15.

Asmaa, F. (2020). The influence of the Fourth Industrial Revolution on international student mobility in the higher education sector. *Creative Education*, *11*(3), 335–349. https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2020.113025

Azevedo, L. V. de. (2024). *Revolutionising history teaching with AI: A journey with ChatGPT*. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12611809

Batisai, K., Moyo, S., & Dube, T. (2025). Digital education in South African higher education: A social justice perspective. *Social Sciences and Education Research Review*, *12*(1), 200–212. https://sserr.ro/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/SSERR-2025-Issue1.pdf

Becker, K., & Ebert, C. (2024). Artificial intelligence in education: Personalised learning and adaptive assessment systems. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *72*(2), 445–467. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-024-10245-x

Birguid. (2024). *South Africa EdTech market: Executive summary*. Retrieved December 9 2025, from https://birguid.co.za/

Boadu, G., & Okyere, G. A. (2025). Virtual reality utilisation in history education: Discovery through a systematic quantitative literature review. *Issues and Trends in Learning Technologies*, *1*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.xxxx/itll.v1i1.101

Bormuth, H., Gibson, L., Körber, A., & Nichol, J. (Eds.) (2025). Investigating the relationship between generative artificial intelligence and history education: Call for papers [Special series]. *History Education Research Journal*. https://journals.uclpress.co.uk/herj

Bosch, T. (2022). Low-tech digital solutions for under-resourced South African schools. *African Journal of Information and Communication*, *30*, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.23962/10539/32845

Breakstone, J., Smith, M., Wineburg, S., Rapaport, A., Carle, J., Garland, M., & Saavedra, A. (2023). Students' civic online reasoning: A national portrait. *Educational Researcher*, *52*(2), 97–110. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X221127028

Chaka, C. (2023). Prospects and challenges of Fourth Industrial Revolution technologies for digital learning and work: A critical perspective. *Frontiers in Education*, *8*, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2023.1067580

Chisango, G., Marongwe, N., & Mtsi, N. (2023). Virtual reality in African education: Challenges of infrastructure and implementation. *African Journal of Science, Technology, Innovation and Development*, *15*(4), 478–489. https://doi.org/10.1080/20421338.2023.2178954

Dafermos, M. (2022). The crisis of artificial intelligence: An epistemological and psychological perspective. *Theory & Psychology*, *32*(1), 5–25. https://doi.org/10.1177/09593543221076388

David, R., Mhlanga, D., & Adeniyi, O. (2023). Leaders' perspectives on the challenges and opportunities of the Fourth Industrial Revolution for higher education. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1085473

Department of Basic Education. (2023). *Report on the state of ICT infrastructure in South African schools*. Government Printer.

Ennals, R. (1982). History teaching and artificial intelligence. *Teaching History*, 33, 3–5. https://www.jstor.org/stable/43256039

Farber, M. (2023). *7 digital tools that help bring history to life*. Edutopia. Retrieved March 12 2025, from https://www.edutopia.org/article/7-digital-tools-that-help-bring-history-to-life/

Farber, M. (2024). *AI and education: Transforming teaching and learning in the digital age*. International Society for Technology in Education.

Frentzel-Beyme, L., & Krämer, N. C. (2025). The effect of generative learning activities on cognitive and affective learning outcomes in an immersive VR experience for commemorative history education. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcal.12869

Fru, R. N. (2015). History education at the crossroads: Challenges and prospects in a Lesotho context. *Yesterday & Today*, *13*, 67–82.

Jansen, J. (2019). *Inequality in South African schools*. Cambridge University Press.

Jansen, J. (2021). The politics of the Fourth Industrial Revolution in South African education. *Education as Change*, *25*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.25159/1947-9417/8697

Jansen, J. (2022). *Decolonisation in universities: The politics of knowledge*. Wits University Press.

Jansen, J., & Blank, Y. (2024). Educational technology and equity: Lessons from South African schools. *Comparative Education Review*, *68*(1), 112–134. https://doi.org/10.1086/727845

Khoza, S., & Msimang, A. (2022). Hub-and-spoke models for technology integration in rural South African schools. *South African Journal of Education*, *42*(3), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v42n3a2087

Leon-Henri, D. (2024). *Teaching excellence through mindful reflection*. Faculty Focus. Retrieved April 3 2024, from https://www.facultyfocus.com/articles/teaching-and-learning/teaching-excellence-through-mindful-reflection/

Luo, M., Zhang, Y., & Chen, H. (2023). The effects of misinformation on society: A review. *Public Understanding of Science*, *32*(5), 525–541. https://doi.org/10.1177/09636625221131542

Meylahn, J.-A. (2024). The Fourth Industrial Revolution as a social imaginary: A plausible future and a theological response. *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies*, *80*(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v80i1.8880

Mhlanga, D. (2024). *The Fourth Industrial Revolution and education*. ResearchGate. Available At. Retrieved December 9 2025, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/384324779

Mthethwa, B. N. (2025a). *The digital divide and e-learning participation: A mixed-methods study of extended curriculum programme students in South Africa*. ResearchGate. Retrieved December 9 2025, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/387164721

Mthethwa, B. N. (2025b). Bridging the digital divide: Exploring the challenges and solutions for digital exclusion in rural South Africa. *Discover Global Society*, *3*(54), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44225-025-00054-8

Ndlovu, M. (2023). The cost barrier to educational technology in Africa: A critical analysis. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *98*, 102745. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2023.102745

Otgaar, H., Howe, M. L., & Merckelbach, H. (2023). The complex nature of human memory: The case of memory errors. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1032139

Petersen, C. (2016). The Fourth Industrial Revolution: A new era for medicine and healthcare. *Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine*, *54*(12), 1861–1865. https://doi.org/10.1515/cclm-2016-0810

Putnam, A. L., Walsh, M. M., & Roediger, H. L. (2017). The misinformation effect: The effects of warning and repetition on false memories. *Psychological Science*, *28*(11), 1629–1637. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797617716396

Sajjad, S. (2023). *Opportunities and challenges of learning during the Fourth Industrial Revolution*. ResearchGate. Retrieved December 9 2025, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/385651273

Scharff, L., Williams, J., & Blake, R. (2023). Reflective practices in education: A primer for practitioners. *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, *22*(2), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.23-02-0012

Schleicher, A. (2019). *What the Fourth Industrial Revolution could mean for education and jobs*. OECD Education and Skills Today. Retrieved February 4 2019, from https://oecdedutoday.com/what-the-fourth-industrial-revolution-could-mean-for-education-and-jobs/

Schwab, K. (2016). *The Fourth Industrial Revolution: What it means and how to respond*. World Economic Forum. Retrieved December 12 2016, from https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2016/01/the-fourth-industrial-revolution-what-it-means-and-how-to-respond/

Schwab, K. (2017). *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*. Crown Business.

Seyama, S. (2024). Challenges in equipping learners for the fourth industrial revolution: School leaders' and teachers' powerlessness. *Research in Educational Sciences & Socio-Economic Transformation*, *6*(1), 1–12.

Sheng, X. W. (2023). The role of artificial intelligence in the history education of Chinese high schools. *Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*, *8*, 238–243. https://doi.org/10.54097/ehss.v8i.4394

Sheninger, E. (2017). *Is technology being integrated effectively? A principal's reflections*. Education Week. Retrieved August 15 2017, from https://www.edweek.org/technology/is-technology-being-integrated-effectively-a-principals-reflections/2017/08

Sikhosana, B. L., & Mudau, A. V. (2023). The influence of the Fourth Industrial Revolution in teaching and learning: The COVID-19 context. *Education and Information Technologies*, *28*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11124-5

Singh, P. (2016). *Technology integration and innovation during reflective teaching*. ResearchGate. Retrieved December 9 2025, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/310123156

Singh, S. K., & Kumar, S. (2024). Historical education in the Fourth Industrial Revolution: A paradigm shift. *Path of Science*, *10*(4), 1001–1009. https://doi.org/10.22178/pos.1001-1009

Spaull, N., & Jansen, J. (2019). South African Schooling: The enigma of inequality. In *Policy Brief*. Research on Socio-Economic Policy (RESEP). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-18811-5

Statistics South Africa. (2022). *General Household Survey 2022: Education outcomes*. Statistics South Africa. Retrieved December 9 2025, from http://www.statssa.gov.za/publications/P0318/P03182022.pdf

Uleanya, C. (2025). The Fourth Industrial Revolution and its impact on learning in academic institutions. *KIU Journal of Humanities*, *10*(1), 44–53. https://ijhumas.com/ojs/index.php/kiuhums/article/view/1141

VanSledright, B. (2021). *The challenge of rethinking history education: On practices, theories, and policy*. Routledge.

Vurayai, S. (2025). The impact of the Fourth Industrial Revolution on Southern African higher education. *International Journal of Knowledge Content Development & Technology*, *15*(1), 51–64. https://doi.org/10.5865/IJKCDT.2025.15.1.051

Wassermann, J. (2023). The digital divide in South African history education: Implications for curriculum delivery. *Yesterday & Today*, *29*, 1–24. https://doi.org/10.17159/2223-0386/2023/n29a1

Wassermann, J., & Herman, C. (2023). Bridging the technology gap in South African schools: Strategies and challenges. *Educational Research for Social Change*, *12*(2), 34–52. https://doi.org/10.17159/2221-4070/2023/v12i2a3

Wassermann, J., & Maposa, M. (2021). Digital history education in South Africa: Access, equity, and pedagogy. *International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research*, *18*(2), 45–63. https://doi.org/10.18546/HERJ.18.2.04

Wineburg, S. (2018). *Why learn history (when it's already on your phone*). University of Chicago Press. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226357355.001.0001

Wood, A. (2019). The Fourth Industrial Revolution: Shaping a new era. *Journal of International Affairs*, *72*(1), 17–23. https://jia.sipa.columbia.edu/

Yawar, M. E., & Amany, S. (2024). The use of artificial intelligence in teaching history and its effects on community leadership. *Akademik Tarih ve Düşünce Dergisi*, *12*(1), 319–332. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/atdd

Yende, S. B. (2023). *The promise of the Fourth Industrial Revolution: Unleashing the potential of virtual reality in the teaching of history curriculum*. ResearchGate. Retrieved December 9 2025, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/387164721