ISSN–2278-5655

AMIERJ Aarhat Multidisciplinary International Education Research Journal

Volume–XV, Special Issue– I (c) March – April, 2026

OPEN ACCESS Original Research Article

DIGITAL LEADERSHIP IN HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS AND AI-BASED DISRUPTIONS: OPPORTUNITIES, CHALLENGES, AND A ROADMAP TO SUSTAINABILITY AS AN ETHICAL DIGITAL LEADER

** Mrs. Kavitha Kothari, ** Dr. M.R. Jhansi Rani & *** Dr. Anand Shankar Raja M.*

** Research Scholar, Fellow Program in Management (FPM), ** Professor & Director, Research Centre & *** Assistant Professor & Research Manager, ISBR Business School, Bangalore, Karnataka, India.*

Abstract:

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence (AI), big data analytics, automation, and digital platforms is fundamentally transforming higher educational institutions (HEIs) across the globe. Digital leadership has emerged as a strategic imperative to navigate AI-driven disruptions while ensuring resilience, ethical governance, sustainability, and inclusive development. This theoretical paper examines the conceptual foundations of digital leadership in HEIs, synthesizes extant literature on AI-based disruptions, and proposes an integrated ethical-sustainability roadmap for institutional leaders. Drawing upon leadership theories, digital transformation frameworks, technology acceptance models, institutional theory, stakeholder theory, sustainability paradigms, and ethical AI governance frameworks, this paper reviews more than thirty scholarly contributions to position digital leadership as a multidimensional construct encompassing technological competence, ethical foresight, governance agility, and sustainable value creation. The study contributes to interdisciplinary discourse by aligning AI governance with academic values, digital resilience, and policy frameworks, thereby offering a comprehensive roadmap for HEIs to evolve into ethically responsible, digitally resilient institutions.

Keywords: *Digital Leadership, Higher Education, Artificial Intelligence, Ethical AI, Sustainability, Governance, Digital Transformation, Institutional Resilience.*

Introduction:

Higher educational institutions are experiencing an unprecedented phase of digital disruption driven by artificial intelligence, machine learning, predictive analytics, generative technologies, blockchain, and cloud computing (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014; Selwyn, 2016). These technological transformations are reshaping governance models, pedagogical practices, research ecosystems, assessment methodologies, stakeholder engagement, and institutional competitiveness. The integration of AI systems in admission processes, learning analytics, automated grading, curriculum design, and administrative decision-making signals a paradigm shift in institutional operations (Luckin et al., 2016).

Digital leadership in this context refers not merely to technological adoption but to the capacity of leaders to strategically guide digital transformation while ensuring ethical accountability, inclusivity, and long-term sustainability (Kane et al., 2015; Westerman et al., 2014). In higher education, the stakes are particularly high because institutions function as knowledge custodians and moral agents in society. AI-based disruptions raise concerns regarding algorithmic bias, data privacy, academic integrity, surveillance, workforce displacement, and digital inequity (Zuboff, 2019; O'Neil, 2016). Consequently, digital leadership must integrate technological innovation with ethical stewardship and sustainable governance.

ISSN–2278-5655

AMIERJ Aarhat Multidisciplinary International Education Research Journal

Volume–XV, Special Issue– I (c) March – April, 2026

OPEN ACCESS Original Research Article

Review of Literature:

No.	Full reference (published title)	Year	Venue / Journal	Short contribution to your topic (1–2 sentences)
1	Wang, S., et al. "Artificial intelligence in education: A systematic literature review"	2024	*Elsevier / Journal*	Comprehensive bibliometric + content review of AI applications in education; identifies gaps in educator involvement and governance — directly informs governance and leadership dimensions in HEIs.
2	Airaj, M. "Ethical artificial intelligence for teaching-learning in higher education"	2024	*Education & Information Technologies (Springer)*	Proposes a human-centered approach and ethical design principles for AI in HE, useful for ethical digital leadership and policy roadmaps.
3	Wu, C. "AI Governance in Higher Education: Case Studies of Responsible Strategies"	2024	*MDPI / Future Internet*	Case-study analysis of AI governance models across universities; presents multi-unit governance structures leaders can adopt.
4	Bittle, K. "Generative AI and Academic Integrity in Higher Education: A Systematic Review"	2025	*MDPI / Information*	Systematic synthesis of generative AI impacts on academic integrity, informing assessment redesign and integrity policy — core for leadership responses.
5	Banihashem, S. K. "A systematic review of learning analytics and feedback practices in HE"	2022	*Computers & Education / Review*	Maps learning analytics use for feedback; shows leaders how analytics can support learner success and institutional metrics.
6	Pan, Z. "A Systematic Review of Learning Analytics–incorporated Interventions on LMSs"	2024	*Journal of Learning Analytics*	Reviews LA interventions on LMSs and implementation issues — provides evidence for leaders aiming to scale analytics.
7	U.S. Department of Education. "Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Teaching and Learning: Insights and Recommendations" (Report)	2023	U.S. Department of Education	Policy guidance synthesizing implications of AI for teaching, assessment, and governance — practical for HE digital leadership planning.
8	H. Wang. "Generative AI in higher education: Seeing ChatGPT and institutional responses"	2024	*Elsevier / Journal*	Examines university GenAI policies across top institutions; highlights cautious-open approaches leaders are taking.

ISSN–2278-5655

AMIERJ Aarhat Multidisciplinary International Education Research Journal

Volume–XV, Special Issue– I (c) March – April, 2026

OPEN ACCESS Original Research Article

9	Vieriu, A. M. "The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Students' Learning and Performance"	2025	*MDPI / Education Sciences*	Empirical study on students' perceptions and performance effects of AI tools — informs leaders on learner outcomes and adoption tradeoffs.
10	Olabiyi, O. J. "Digital Academic Leadership in Higher Education Institutions" (bibliometric analysis)	2025	*MDPI / Education Sciences*	Bibliometric study mapping digital leadership scholarship and identifying thematic clusters — useful for situating your theoretical framing.
11	Muljani, B. D., et al. "Digital Leadership in Higher Education Institutions: A Conceptual Framework"	2025	Conference Proceedings (ICOPAG)	Proposes competencies linking digital leadership to sustainable institutional performance — directly aligns with your roadmap aim.
12	Obied, A. S. "Digital leadership in the academic environment"	2025	*ScienceDirect / Journal (2025)*	Conceptual discussion on leadership requirements for digital transformation in academia — supports leadership competency arguments.
13	Toofaninejad, E. "Transformative potential of learning analytics in medical education"	2025	*PMC / Systematic Review*	Reviews LA applications in medical HE — demonstrates domain-specific analytics benefits and governance considerations.
14	Chen, F. "Learning analytics in inquiry-based learning: a systematic review"	2025	*Educational Technology Research & Development*	Synthesizes LA support for inquiry-based pedagogies — useful for leaders promoting pedagogical transformation.
15	Mirzaei, S. "Creativity in Learning Analytics: Systematic review"	2025	*Journal / MDPI*	Discusses creative uses of analytics to support learning — informs innovative leadership use-cases for student engagement.
16	Ma, D. "Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education: A Cross-Cultural Study"	2024	*IRRODL*	Cross-cultural evidence on student/faculty attitudes toward AI — helps leaders tailor policies across diverse campuses.
17	Schmidt, D. A. "Integrating artificial intelligence in higher education: perceptions, strategies, & recommendations"	2025	*Elsevier / Journal*	Qualitative study offering practical integration strategies and change management implications for leaders.
18	Taneri, G. U. "Artificial Intelligence & Higher Education"	2020	*SCIRP / Overview article*	Early overview for HE stakeholders explaining AI concepts and adoption hesitancies — valuable baseline for 2020–2026 narrative.

ISSN–2278-5655

AMIERJ Aarhat Multidisciplinary International Education Research Journal

Volume–XV, Special Issue– I (c) March – April, 2026

OPEN ACCESS Original Research Article

19	Trivedi, P., et al. "FATE in AI for Higher Education: Systematic Review"	2025	*ResearchGate / Systematic Review*	Focused on Fairness, Accountability, Transparency, Ethics (FATE) in HE AI — central to ethical digital leadership framing.
20	SemanticsScholar entry: "AI in higher education: PRISMA 2020 review"	2025	*Semantic Scholar / PRISMA review*	PRISMA-style review synthesizing AI opportunities and risks in HE — evidence base for leadership recommendations.
21	Williamson, K. "A Review of Learning Analytics Dashboard Research in Higher Education"	2021/ 2022	*ACM / EDU*	Reviews LA dashboards and their equity/justice implications; useful when discussing leadership decisions about data dashboards and transparency.
22	Gašević, D. "Learning analytics in higher education – Stakeholders, strategy and scalable implementation"	2022	*Elsevier Special Issue*	Addresses stakeholder engagement and scaling LA — directly relevant to institutional leadership and governance models.
23	Olabiyi, O. J. "Digital Academic Leadership in Higher Education Institutions" (additional MDPI piece)	2025	*MDPI*	Maps empirical studies and proposes priorities for leadership capacity building in digital contexts.
24	Obied, A. S. "Digital leadership in the academic environment" (duplicate journal listing — conceptual)	2025	*ScienceDirect*	Emphasizes communication and IT governance roles for academic leaders — supports sections on leadership roles and communication.
25	Kiliç, A. H. "A Systematic Literature Review of Articles on Learning Analytics (2004–2024)"	2024	*ERIC / Review*	Meta-review that charts LA development and future research needs — helps justify LA as a leadership priority.
26	Weuts, R. "AI Governance course design for higher education" (arXiv)	2025	*arXiv / Preprint*	Curriculum design synthesizing AI governance literature — practical for leaders building capacity and curricula on AI ethics/governance.
27	Wiese, L. J. "AI ethics education: A systematic literature review"	2025	*ScienceDirect*	Systematic review on AI ethics education design and pedagogy — essential reading for leaders planning ethical literacy initiatives.
28	Itani, A. "Ethical considerations for teaching with artificial intelligence"	2025	*Frontiers / PMC article*	Discusses practical ethical questions for AI-supported mentoring and instruction — informs ethical guidance for faculty leaders.

ISSN–2278-5655

AMIERJ Aarhat Multidisciplinary International Education Research Journal

Volume–XV, Special Issue– I (c) March – April, 2026

OPEN ACCESS Original Research Article

29	Aguado-García, J. M. "Using Artificial Intelligence for Higher Education"	2025	*SAGE / Article*	Reviews AI use-cases for institutional management and student pathways — leadership implications for strategy and resource allocation.
30	Pan, Z. (alternate LA meta-review). "A Systematic Review of Learning Analytics"	2024	*Journal of Learning Analytics*	Meta-analysis of LA interventions and methodological patterns — supports decisions on evaluation, scaling, and governance.

Inference:

The reviewed literature from 2020–2026 converges on the conclusion that AI-driven technologies and data analytics are reshaping the core functions of higher educational institutions—teaching, learning, assessment, research administration, and strategic governance—creating both unprecedented opportunities for personalization, efficiency, and sustainability, and novel ethical and operational challenges. Empirical studies and systematic reviews show that learning analytics and generative AI can meaningfully improve student support, adaptive learning pathways, and institutional decision-making when deployed with clear pedagogical alignment and governance. Policy and case-study analyses indicate that institutions which combine transformational leadership, distributed decision-making, and targeted capacity building are better able to scale digital innovations while maintaining academic quality. At the same time, a steady strand of scholarship emphasizes the perils of opaque algorithms, data privacy breaches, algorithmic bias, platform dependence, and inequitable access, arguing that technological capability alone is insufficient; leadership that integrates ethical frameworks, stakeholder engagement, and sustainability criteria is essential for positive, long-term institutional outcomes.

Gap: Despite the growing empirical evidence on isolated benefits and risks of AI tools in higher education, there remains a coherent and pressing gap in integrative, longitudinal research that links digital leadership practices directly to measurable ethical and sustainability outcomes. Few studies systematically evaluate how specific leadership behaviors, governance structures, or institutional policies moderate the relationship between AI adoption and outcomes such as equity in learning gains, academic integrity incidents, energy/resource efficiency, and public trust. There is also limited cross-cultural and multi-campus comparative research examining how contextual factors—regulatory environments, funding models, digital infrastructure maturity, and socio-economic disparities—influence the effectiveness of leadership interventions. Methodologically, much of the literature relies on short-term pilot evaluations, case descriptions, or bibliometric mappings; rigorous mixed-methods and longitudinal designs that combine institutional metrics, stakeholder perceptions, and ethical impact assessments are scarce. Finally, while frameworks for "ethical AI" exist in principle, there is a lack of actionable, evidence-tested roadmaps that translate ethical principles into operational policies, accountability mechanisms, and sustainability indicators tailored for HEIs.

Bridging proposition: To address these gaps, future research should adopt multi-site, longitudinal designs that trace how defined digital leadership interventions—such as the introduction of AI governance committees, ethical impact assessments, faculty capacity programs, and sustainability-oriented procurement policies—affect a suite of institutional outcomes over time. Such studies should prioritize mixed methods that integrate quantitative institutional

ISSN–2278-5655

AMIERJ Aarhat Multidisciplinary International Education Research Journal

Volume–XV, Special Issue– I (c) March – April, 2026

OPEN ACCESS Original Research Article

KPIs (learning outcomes, retention rates, energy consumption, incidence of academic misconduct), qualitative stakeholder narratives (students, faculty, IT staff, regulators), and audit trails of algorithmic transparency and compliance. Comparative analyses across national contexts and funding regimes will reveal boundary conditions for leadership effectiveness and inform adaptable roadmaps. Empirically grounded roadmaps that operationalize ethical principles into measurable governance practices and sustainability targets would directly support the conference theme by enabling HEI leaders to navigate AI disruptions ethically while building resilient and sustainable digital ecosystems.

Theoretical Foundations of Digital Leadership:

Digital leadership intersects with transformational leadership theory, which emphasizes vision, change management, and innovation (Bass, 1985). Transformational leaders inspire institutional change by fostering digital cultures and adaptive mindsets (Avolio & Bass, 1995). Complementing this perspective, adaptive leadership theory (Heifetz, 1994) stresses responsiveness to complex, technology-driven environments, while distributed leadership models recognize collective digital capacity-building across institutional hierarchies (Spillane, 2006).

Institutional theory (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983) explains how regulatory pressures and normative expectations compel HEIs to adopt AI technologies for legitimacy. Technology Acceptance Model (Davis, 1989) and Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (Venkatesh et al., 2003) elucidate faculty and student adoption behaviours. Resource-based theory (Barney, 1991) frames AI capability as a strategic asset, while dynamic capabilities theory (Teece, 2007) underscores the need for ongoing reconfiguration of digital competencies.

Stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984) situates digital leadership within broader accountability to students, faculty, regulators, and society. Furthermore, triple bottom line theory (Elkington, 1997) and sustainable development paradigms position digital transformation within environmental, social, and governance (ESG) dimensions. Ethical leadership theory (Brown & Treviño, 2006) and responsible innovation frameworks (Stilgoe, Owen, & Macnaghten, 2013) are particularly salient in navigating AI governance.

AI-Based Disruptions in Higher Education:

AI disrupts HEIs across pedagogical, administrative, and research domains. Learning analytics enhance personalization and predictive intervention (Siemens & Long, 2011), while intelligent tutoring systems improve adaptive learning (Woolf, 2010). Generative AI tools transform content creation and assessment processes, raising concerns about academic integrity (Cotton et al., 2023). Automation streamlines admissions and student support (Luckin et al., 2016), yet introduces ethical challenges related to bias and transparency (O'Neil, 2016).

The diffusion of innovation theory (Rogers, 2003) highlights varied adoption rates across institutions. Digital ecosystems are also shaped by platform and surveillance capitalism (Zuboff, 2019), potentially compromising academic autonomy. Moreover, digital inequality persists, especially in developing economies, accentuating access divides (Van Dijk, 2020).

Opportunities Emerging from AI Integration:

AI integration presents opportunities for institutional efficiency, learner personalization, predictive decision-making, interdisciplinary research collaboration, and global academic competitiveness (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014). Data-driven governance enhances accountability and performance metrics (Kane et al., 2015). AI can further support sustainability goals through optimized resource management and energy monitoring (George et al., 2020).

ISSN–2278-5655

AMIERJ Aarhat Multidisciplinary International Education Research Journal

Volume–XV, Special Issue– I (c) March – April, 2026

OPEN ACCESS Original Research Article

From a policy perspective, digital transformation aligns with national digital education missions and global sustainable development objectives (United Nations, 2015). Innovative digital pedagogies expand access to marginalized communities, reinforcing social inclusion (Selwyn, 2016). AI-enhanced research analytics foster interdisciplinary innovation ecosystems.

Ethical and Governance Challenges:

Despite opportunities, AI introduces profound ethical dilemmas. Algorithmic bias can perpetuate systemic inequities (O'Neil, 2016). Data privacy breaches threaten institutional trust (Zuboff, 2019). The opacity of AI decision-making challenges academic transparency (Floridi et al., 2018). Workforce implications, including academic deskilling and job displacement, necessitate ethical workforce strategies (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014).

Academic integrity concerns emerge with generative AI tools (Cotton et al., 2023). Additionally, overreliance on commercial ed-tech platforms may compromise institutional autonomy and governance sovereignty (Selwyn, 2016). Ethical governance frameworks must therefore integrate principles of fairness, accountability, transparency, and explainability (Floridi et al., 2018).

Roadmap to Sustainability as an Ethical Digital Leader:

An integrated roadmap for digital leadership in HEIs requires multilevel strategic alignment. First, leaders must establish AI governance frameworks grounded in ethical AI principles emphasizing transparency, accountability, and inclusivity (Floridi et al., 2018). Institutional policies must align with data protection norms and sustainable digital infrastructure development.

Second, capacity-building initiatives should cultivate digital literacy among faculty and students, enhancing responsible AI engagement (Siemens & Long, 2011). Transformational and adaptive leadership competencies must be embedded in professional development frameworks (Avolio & Bass, 1995; Heifetz, 1994).

Third, digital transformation should align with sustainability objectives, incorporating energy-efficient data centres and ESG reporting mechanisms (Elkington, 1997; George et al., 2020). Fourth, participatory governance models must ensure stakeholder inclusion, consistent with stakeholder and responsible innovation theories (Freeman, 1984; Stilgoe et al., 2013).

Finally, resilience planning, informed by dynamic capabilities theory (Teece, 2007), should anticipate technological volatility and regulatory shifts. Continuous evaluation mechanisms must ensure ethical accountability and sustainability benchmarking.

Implications for Law, Business Policy, and Communication:

Digital leadership in HEIs intersects with regulatory compliance, intellectual property management, cyber law, and public-private partnerships. AI governance requires alignment with national policy frameworks and global digital ethics standards. Strategic communication practices must foster transparency and trust in algorithmic systems. Policy formulation should ensure equitable digital infrastructure funding and responsible commercialization of academic AI innovations.

Conclusion:

Digital leadership in higher education extends beyond technological integration to encompass ethical stewardship, sustainability alignment, and institutional resilience. AI-based disruptions present transformative opportunities but demand robust governance and inclusive strategies. A sustainable roadmap grounded in transformational leadership, stakeholder engagement, ethical AI governance, and sustainability principles can enable HEIs to evolve into resilient knowledge ecosystems. As digital ecosystems reshape

ISSN–2278-5655

AMIERJ Aarhat Multidisciplinary International Education Research Journal

Volume–XV, Special Issue– I (c) March – April, 2026

OPEN ACCESS Original Research Article

academia, ethical digital leadership will determine whether AI enhances or undermines the foundational values of higher education.

References :

1. *Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1995). Individual consideration viewed at multiple levels of analysis: A multi-level framework for examining the diffusion of transformational leadership. The Leadership Quarterly, 6(2), 199–218. https://doi.org/10.1016/1048-9843(95)90035-7*
2. *Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. Journal of Management, 17(1), 99–120. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108*
3. *Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership and performance beyond expectations. Free Press.*
4. *Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. The Leadership Quarterly, 17(6), 595–616. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.004*
5. *Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies. W. W. Norton & Company.*
6. *Cotton, D., Cotton, P., & Shipway, J. (2023). Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT. Innovations in Education and Teaching International. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148*
7. *Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. MIS Quarterly, 13(3), 319–340. https://doi.org/10.2307/249008*
8. *DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. American Sociological Review, 48(2), 147–160. https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101*
9. *Elkington, J. (1997). Cannibals with forks: The triple bottom line of 21st century business. Capstone.*
10. *Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., et al. (2018). AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations. Minds and Machines, 28, 689–707. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5*
11. *Freeman, R. E. (1984). Strategic management: A stakeholder approach. Pitman.*
12. *George, G., Merrill, R. K., & Schillebeeckx, S. J. D. (2020). Digital sustainability and entrepreneurship: How digital innovations are helping tackle climate change and sustainable development goals. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 45(5), 999–1027. https://doi.org/10.1177/1042258719899425*
13. *Heifetz, R. A. (1994). Leadership without easy answers. Harvard University Press.*
14. *Kane, G. C., Palmer, D., Phillips, A., Kiron, D., & Buckley, N. (2015). Strategy, not technology, drives digital transformation. MIT Sloan Management Review and Deloitte Insights Report.*
15. *Luckin, R., Holmes, W., Griffiths, M., & Forcier, L. (2016). Intelligence unleashed: An argument for AI in education. Pearson Education.*
16. *O'Neil, C. (2016). Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy. Crown Publishing.*
17. *Rogers, E. M. (2003). Diffusion of innovations (5th ed.). Free Press.*
18. *Selwyn, N. (2016). Education and technology: Key issues and debates (2nd ed.). Bloomsbury Academic.*
19. *Siemens, G., & Long, P. (2011). Penetrating the fog: Analytics in learning and education. EDUCAUSE Review, 46(5), 30–40.*
20. *Spillane, J. P. (2006). Distributed leadership.*

ISSN–2278-5655

AMIERJ Aarhat Multidisciplinary International Education Research Journal

Volume–XV, Special Issue– I (c) March – April, 2026

OPEN ACCESS Original Research Article

Jossey-Bass.

21. *Stilgoe, J., Owen, R., & Macnaghten, P. (2013). Developing a framework for responsible innovation. Research Policy, 42(9), 1568–1580. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2013.05.008*
22. *Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. Strategic Management Journal, 28(13), 1319–1350. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.640*
23. *United Nations. (2015). Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development. United Nations.*
24. *Van Dijk, J. (2020). The digital divide. Polity Press.*
25. *Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. MIS Quarterly, 27(3), 425–478.*
26. *Westerman, G., Bonnet, D., & McAfee, A. (2014). Leading digital: Turning technology into business transformation. Harvard Business Review Press.*
27. *Woolf, B. P. (2010). Building intelligent interactive tutors: Student-centered strategies for revolutionizing e-learning. Morgan Kaufmann.*
28. *Zuboff, S. (2019). The age of surveillance capitalism. PublicAffairs.*

Cite This Article:

Mrs. Kothari K., Dr. M.R. Jhansi Rani & Dr. Anand Shankar R. M. (2026). *Digital Leadership in Higher Educational Institutions and AI-Based Disruptions: Opportunities, Challenges, and a Roadmap to Sustainability as an Ethical Digital Leader*. **In Aarhat Multidisciplinary International Education Research Journal**: Vol. XV (Number II, pp. 186–194) Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20458977