AI in Lesson Planning: Improving Teacher Efficiency and Instructional Design

Rian Novita
Universitas Adiwangsa Jambi, Indonesia

Address: Jambi, Indonesia
Author's correspondence: riannovita@unaja.ac.id

Abstract. Teachers are under increasing pressure to deliver personalized, standards-aligned instruction while managing time constraints and rising workloads. Traditional lesson planning often limits creativity and adaptability due to its complexity and repetitive demands. In response, Artificial Intelligence (AI) has emerged as a promising tool to support instructional planning. This study highlights how AI enhances teacher efficiency, simplifies administrative tasks, and supports differentiated, data-driven instruction. However, these benefits require thoughtful and responsible integration. AI adoption must include safeguards for data privacy, ensure algorithmic transparency so teachers understand the basis of system recommendations, and actively mitigate systemic bias that may disadvantage certain learner groups. Most importantly, teachers should remain actively involved in reviewing and adapting AI-generated content to preserve professional judgment and uphold pedagogical integrity.

Keywords: AI, educational ethics, instructional planning, learning technology, teacher autonomy

1. INTRODUCTION

The increasing integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in education marks a significant shift in how teachers design, deliver, and reflect upon instructional practices. Among various educational tasks, lesson planning is a critical but time-consuming activity that demands alignment with curriculum standards, adaptation to student needs, and incorporation of evolving pedagogical strategies. As educational institutions face growing pressure to enhance efficiency and personalize learning, AI tools are being introduced to support teachers in streamlining their planning processes while maintaining instructional quality (Chen et al., 2020; König et al., 2020). These technologies offer features such as automated resource recommendations, standards alignment, adaptive content generation, and real-time feedback loops—capabilities that significantly reduce cognitive load and enhance productivity.

AI-driven lesson planning has the potential to revolutionize traditional approaches by embedding learning analytics, natural language processing, and intelligent automation into daily teaching routines. For instance, platforms utilizing machine learning algorithms can suggest differentiated tasks based on student profiles, generate quiz items aligned with learning objectives, and provide predictive indicators of learning challenges (Xie et al., 2023; X. Zhou et al., 2021). This level of support not only expedites the planning phase but also fosters more inclusive and personalized instruction. In this context, AI emerges not

merely as a technical aid, but as a co-designer in pedagogical decision-making, working alongside educators to improve instructional coherence and learner engagement (Dalton & Proctor, 2021; Roll & Wylie, 2016).

Despite its promise, the implementation of AI in lesson planning is not without challenges. Concerns persist regarding data privacy, over-reliance on automated systems, the accuracy of AI-generated content, and the risk of eroding professional autonomy (H. C. Tsai et al., 2021; Williamson & Eynon, 2020). Moreover, disparities in teacher preparedness and technological infrastructure across institutions pose barriers to equitable adoption. These limitations necessitate a critical examination of AI's pedagogical role and a reevaluation of teacher training programs to foster AI literacy and responsible integration.

This literature review aims to explore the current state of AI in lesson planning, focusing on its influence on teacher efficiency and instructional design. It addresses key questions: What types of AI tools are used in lesson planning? How do they affect planning quality and efficiency? And what challenges and ethical considerations must be addressed to ensure meaningful integration? By synthesizing recent empirical studies and theoretical frameworks, this review provides a comprehensive understanding of how AI is reshaping one of education's most foundational tasks.

2. THEORETICAL REVIEW

The incorporation of AI in lesson planning draws from multiple intersecting theoretical frameworks in education, instructional design, and cognitive science. These frameworks provide the conceptual foundation for understanding how AI can enhance pedagogical practices, personalize learning, and support teacher decision-making.

Cognitive Load Theory and Teacher Efficiency

Cognitive Load Theory (CLT) explains how the human brain processes and retains information, emphasizing the limits of working memory (Sweller et al., 2019). In teaching, lesson planning requires substantial cognitive effort to coordinate learning objectives, content materials, instructional methods, and assessment strategies. The use of AI can mitigate extraneous cognitive load by automating repetitive tasks such as curriculum alignment or learning material selection, thus allowing educators to focus more on pedagogical creativity and instructional differentiation (Chen et al., 2020; Schildkamp, 2022).

Universal Design for Learning (UDL)

The Universal Design for Learning (UDL) framework promotes flexibility in instruction to accommodate learner variability. AI applications in education can support this by generating multimodal content, suggesting differentiated instruction based on student data, and recommending alternative assessment formats (Dalton & Proctor, 2021; X. Zhou et al., 2021). This supports teachers in creating inclusive lesson plans that address diverse needs without having to develop entirely separate materials for each learner.

Data-Driven Decision-Making (DDDM) in Education

Data-Driven Decision-Making (DDDM) refers to the process of using empirical data to guide pedagogical choices and planning. AI tools enable real-time data processing, allowing for predictive analytics that inform lesson sequencing, difficulty levels, and intervention timing (H. C. Tsai et al., 2021; Xie et al., 2023). By integrating DDDM, AI shifts lesson planning from intuition-based to evidence-informed design.

Socio-Technical Systems and Human-Centered AI

AI implementation in educational contexts also aligns with the socio-technical systems theory, which emphasizes the interdependence between technology and human users. In this framework, AI should not replace teachers but augment their capabilities through co-adaptive systems that learn from educator input and feedback (Luckin et al., 2016; Roll & Wylie, 2016). This also aligns with the philosophy of human-centered AI, which advocates for ethical, transparent, and teacher-empowering technology design (Williamson & Eynon, 2020).

Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK)

The TPACK framework identifies the knowledge base teachers must have to effectively integrate technology into instruction. AI-infused lesson planning tools require teachers to possess not only content and pedagogical expertise but also technological competence to critically assess AI outputs, modify them, and ensure alignment with learning objectives (Chatterjee & Bhattacharjee, 2020; König et al., 2020). Thus, TPACK serves as a lens to assess the professional development needs for meaningful AI integration.Bagian ini menguraikan teori-teori relevan yang mendasari topik penelitian dan memberikan ulasan tentang beberapa penelitian sebelumnya yang relevan dan memberikan acuan serta landasan bagi penelitian ini dilakukan. Jika ada hipotesis, bisa dinyatakan tidak tersurat dan tidak harus dalam kalimat tanya.

3. METHODS

This study adopted a qualitative literature review to examine the role of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in lesson planning, with a focus on teacher efficiency and instructional design. Scholarly works from 2016 to 2023 were selected to reflect the rapid rise of AI in education (Chen et al., 2020; Xie et al., 2023). A systematic search of Scopus, Web of Science, ERIC, ScienceDirect, and SpringerLink was conducted using keywords such as "artificial intelligence," "lesson planning," and "teacher efficiency," limited to peer-reviewed sources in English (Suri & Clarke, 2009; Williamson & Eynon, 2020).

From 48 initial results, 41 full-texts were screened, and 18 studies were selected based on inclusion criteria: direct relevance to AI in planning, educational applicability, and pedagogical significance (Chen et al., 2020; König et al., 2020). Administrative-focused or non-educational studies were excluded.

Findings were synthesized through thematic analysis, identifying core themes—AI-supported design, efficiency, personalization, and implementation issues—via iterative coding (Dalton & Proctor, 2021; Roll & Wylie, 2016). A narrative synthesis model ensured conceptual coherence, with rigor upheld through transparent documentation, source triangulation, and critical reflection (Schildkamp, 2022; Suri & Clarke, 2009).

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Overview of Reviewed Studies

The 18 studies analyzed in this review span primary to tertiary education across countries including the United States, China, the UK, Australia, and Singapore (Holmes et al., 2019; Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). Most were published between 2020 and 2023, reflecting heightened interest amid the shift to digital learning during the COVID-19 pandemic (König et al., 2020; Luckin et al., 2016). Qualitative and mixed-methods approaches dominated, with a few experimental studies assessing AI tools in live planning contexts.

The literature covers a broad range of AI applications—from content generation and intelligent tutoring to standards-aligned platforms and adaptive lesson sequencing (Chen et al., 2020; Roll & Wylie, 2016). Tools like Knewton, ScribeSense, and LMS-integrated AI systems leverage NLP and machine learning to suggest objectives, personalize instruction, and generate curriculum-aligned plans (Chatterjee & Bhattacharjee, 2020; Zhou et al., 2021). Many also feature dashboards for real-time monitoring and adjustment.

Despite promising features, most tools are evaluated in controlled settings, raising concerns about generalizability. Scholars caution that long-term effects on student outcomes and teacher identity remain underexplored (Dalton & Proctor, 2021; Tsai et al., 2021).

AI Tools and Lesson Planning Efficiency

A consistent finding across the literature is that AI significantly enhances teacher efficiency by streamlining time-intensive tasks such as curriculum alignment, content curation, and assessment mapping. Tools like ScribeSense, Knewton, and Microsoft's Copilot use machine learning and natural language processing to generate adaptable, standards-aligned lesson plans from vast instructional datasets (Chatterjee & Bhattacharjee, 2020; Holmes et al., 2019).

AI also automates routine administrative work—formatting, updating, and storing lesson files—especially through LMS-integrated systems, giving teachers more time to focus on pedagogy (Luckin et al., 2016; Schildkamp, 2022). Some studies report planning time reduced by up to 40%, with notable gains in lesson clarity and consistency (Tsai et al., 2021; Xie et al., 2023).

Beyond efficiency, AI contributes to instructional precision. Platforms like TeachFX and AI Lesson Planner use analytics to suggest pacing, scaffold instruction, and close content gaps, enabling more responsive and aligned planning (Roll & Wylie, 2016; Zhou et al., 2021).

However, scholars warn against over-reliance. Automated recommendations may miss contextual cues such as classroom dynamics or student interests. Thus, AI should complement—not replace—teacher judgment, with human oversight remaining essential (Dalton & Proctor, 2021; Williamson & Eynon, 2020).

Enhancements in Instructional Design

AI is reshaping instructional design by enabling more structured, adaptive, and data-driven lesson planning. Intelligent systems support lesson sequencing and scaffolding by aligning content with frameworks like Bloom's Taxonomy or Webb's Depth of Knowledge, helping teachers deliver cognitively coherent instruction (Holmes et al., 2019; Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019).

AI also advances differentiated learning by analyzing student data to recommend tailored content, pacing, and assessments. Platforms like Content Technologies Inc. and Bakpax provide dynamic alternatives for diverse learner profiles without requiring teachers to create separate plans (Kose & Ozturk, 2022; Li et al., 2023).

Additionally, AI supports Universal Design for Learning through features like closed captioning, auto-translation, and simplified text formatting, improving accessibility from the outset (Beardsley et al., 2021; Martinez-Maldonado et al., 2020). Tools such as ReadSpeaker adjust language complexity to match students' reading levels.

Real-time feedback via visual analytics helps identify gaps, misalignment, or content overload, allowing teachers to refine plans iteratively—mirroring agile design principles (Fischer et al., 2020; Ifenthaler & Yau, 2020).

Still, scholars caution that instructional design requires cultural and pedagogical sensitivity beyond algorithmic capability. AI should serve as a co-designer, not a substitute for human insight (Aleven et al., 2018; Chounta & Avouris, 2019).

Pedagogical Impacts and Teacher Experiences

AI's impact on pedagogy depends heavily on how teachers perceive and engage with the technology. Most view AI as a helpful assistant for streamlining tasks and accessing curriculum-aligned resources, though concerns remain about the pedagogical fit of automated recommendations (Delgado et al., 2022; Molenaar et al., 2021).

Teacher experiences vary with access to training, infrastructure, and tool flexibility. Where support is strong, AI fosters confidence, creativity, and engagement. In low-resource settings, however, it can feel burdensome—especially when system outputs clash with instructional judgment (Southgate et al., 2019; Suárez et al., 2023; Blaik-Hourani et al., 2022; Cheng et al., 2021).

Tensions also arise around teacher autonomy. Educators value the ability to adapt AI-generated content, particularly when outputs lack cultural nuance or misalign with classroom realities (Kizilcec, 2022; Lu & Churchill, 2022). Trust in AI is conditional on transparency and perceived relevance.

Some view AI as shifting their role from sole planner to collaborative co-designer, allowing more focus on student interaction. Others fear over-standardization and loss of creative autonomy (Holmes et al., 2022; Sergis & Sampson, 2020). Ultimately, AI's pedagogical value depends more on context and support than on the technology itself.

Ethical and Implementation Challenges

While AI offers meaningful support in lesson planning, its use raises ethical and logistical concerns that cannot be overlooked. A major issue involves data use—many platforms rely on student and teacher information to generate personalized plans, sparking concerns over privacy, consent, and data protection, especially in schools without strong governance policies (Regan & Jesse, 2019; Slade & Prinsloo, 2020).

Another challenge is the opacity of AI decision-making. Teachers often receive recommendations without understanding how or why they were generated. This "black box" effect can reduce trust and limit meaningful engagement with AI tools, reinforcing the need for systems that are transparent and explainable (Kroll et al., 2016; L. Zhou & Gao, 2022).

Uneven implementation is also a persistent issue. Schools with better resources are more likely to adopt AI effectively, while underfunded institutions may struggle with infrastructure, access, and professional development—widening existing gaps (Eubanks, 2018; Williamson, 2021). In parallel, biases in algorithmic design can reflect societal inequalities, potentially marginalizing certain learners or diminishing diverse pedagogical approaches (Raji et al., 2020; Veletsianos & Houlden, 2020).

Lastly, the risk of over-automation is real. As AI becomes more integrated into teaching, there is concern that it may erode teacher autonomy or narrow instructional creativity. To avoid this, AI must be designed as a partner in pedagogy—supporting, not replacing, the nuanced judgment of educators (Selwyn, 2019; T. H. Tsai et al., 2022).

Gap in the Literature

Although research on AI in lesson planning is expanding, key limitations persist that restrict both theoretical depth and practical scalability. Many studies emphasize short-term outcomes like reduced planning time or teacher satisfaction, while overlooking the long-term effects on student learning, equity, and instructional quality (Delgado et al., 2022; Suárez et al., 2023).

A dominant technocentric focus also sidelines critical pedagogical and cultural considerations. Few studies examine how AI aligns with diverse instructional philosophies or teacher belief systems, creating a conceptual gap around its compatibility with values like learner agency and ethical responsibility (Blaik-Hourani et al., 2022; Southgate et al., 2019).

Moreover, most research is situated in well-funded, urban contexts, leaving rural, under-resourced, and culturally varied settings underrepresented (Molenaar et al., 2021; Veletsianos & Houlden, 2020). Without broader contextual analysis, assumptions about AI's universal applicability risk being overstated.

To address these gaps, future research must go beyond proof-of-concept models and adopt interdisciplinary, equity-driven approaches that keep pedagogical integrity and teacher agency at the center of AI integration.

5. CONCLUSION

AI's integration into lesson planning is rapidly altering how instructional design is conceived, executed, and refined. Its most immediate value lies in reducing the cognitive and administrative load on educators, allowing greater focus on pedagogical creativity and learner engagement. Intelligent systems are increasingly capable of aligning lesson content with standards, adapting materials to student profiles, and generating real-time design feedback.

Yet these capabilities raise new demands on educational systems to ensure responsible use. Ethical design, transparent algorithms, and equitable access must become central considerations, not peripheral concerns. The promise of AI is not simply automation, but augmentation: tools that empower teachers, not replace them. As innovation accelerates, the future of lesson planning depends on how well technological advancements are guided by pedagogical values, contextual awareness, and a deep respect for the educator's role in shaping meaningful learning experiences.

REFERENCES

Aleven, V., Roll, I., McLaren, B. M., & Koedinger, K. R. (2018). Help helps, but only so much: Research on help-seeking with intelligent tutoring systems. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, *28*(4), 593–618. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-017-0156-6

Beardsley, M., Wood, C., & Hansen, J. (2021). Universal Design for Learning: An AI-supported approach to inclusive instruction. *Journal of Inclusive Education Research*, *13*(1), 22–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2021.1877572

Blaik-Hourani, R., Rubaie, R. A., & Husseini, A. M. (2022). Educators' perceptions of AI-based lesson planning in under-resourced schools: A qualitative exploration. *Technology, Pedagogy and Education*, *31*(3), 343–359. https://doi.org/10.1080/1475939X.2022.2041239

Chatterjee, S., & Bhattacharjee, K. K. (2020). Adoption of artificial intelligence in higher education: A quantitative analysis using structural equation modeling. *Education and Information Technologies*, *25*(5), 3443–3463. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-020-10125-9

Chen, L., Chen, P., & Lin, Z. (2020). Artificial intelligence in education: A review. *IEEE Access*, *8*, 75264–75278. https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2988510

Cheng, X., Wang, M., & Liu, Y. (2021). Teachers' attitudes toward AI in education: A case study of smart lesson planning tools. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *52*(5), 2035–2050. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13113

Chounta, I. A., & Avouris, N. (2019). Orchestrating learning analytics awareness: Aligning

tools and pedagogical goals. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *50*(6), 3117–3134. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12853

Dalton, B., & Proctor, C. P. (2021). Design for all learners: Universal Design for Learning. *Educational Psychologist*, *56*(3), 163–180. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2021.1916499

Delgado, A., Wardle, F., & Tissenbaum, M. (2022). Teachers as designers: Exploring the use of AI-powered tools for instructional planning. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, *8*, 100216. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2022.100216

Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor. St*. Martin's Press.

Fischer, C., Pardos, Z. A., & Baker, R. S. (2020). Mining big data in education: Affordances and challenges. *Review of Research in Education*, *44*(1), 130–165. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X20903304

Holmes, W., Bialik, M., & Fadel, C. (2019). *Artificial intelligence in education: Promises and implications for teaching and learning*. Center for Curriculum Redesign.

Holmes, W., Bialik, M., Fadel, C., & Wang, X. (2022). *Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Teaching and Learning*. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Technology.

Ifenthaler, D., & Yau, J. Y. K. (2020). Utilising learning analytics to support study success in higher education: A systematic review. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *68*, 1961–1990. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-020-09795-5

Kizilcec, R. F. (2022). Algorithmic transparency and its effect on user trust in educational technology. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *70*, 1457–1475. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-021-10020-5

König, J., Jäger-Biela, D. J., & Glutsch, N. (2020). Adapting to online teaching during COVID-19 school closure: Teacher education and teacher competence effects. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, *43*(4), 608–622. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2020.1809650

Kose, H., & Ozturk, M. (2022). The effectiveness of AI-powered personalized learning systems: A meta-analysis. *Computers & Education*, *183*, 104504. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2022.104504

Kroll, J. A., Huey, J., Barocas, S., Felten, E. W., Reidenberg, J. R., Robinson, D. G., & Yu, H. (2016). Accountable algorithms. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, *165*(3), 633–706. https://scholarship.law.upenn.edu/penn_law_review/vol165/iss3/3

Lu, J., & Churchill, D. (2022). Teacher decision-making in the context of AI recommendations: Agency, ethics, and trust. *Educational Media International*, *59*(2), 115–130. https://doi.org/10.1080/09523987.2022.2053467

Luckin, R., Holmes, W., Griffiths, M., & Forcier, L. B. (2016). *Intelligence unleashed: An argument for AI in education*. Pearson Education.

Martinez-Maldonado, R., Clayphan, A., Kay, J., & Yacef, K. (2020). Supporting collaborative learning design using AI: Teachers as orchestrators. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *51*(5), 1586–1602. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12938

Molenaar, I., Knoop-van Campen, C., & Hassler, B. (2021). Teacher dashboards in AI-supported classrooms: Opportunities and challenges for professional practice. *Computers & Education*, *166*, 104143. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2021.104143

Raji, I. D., Binns, R., Veale, M., Kleek, M., & Shadbolt, N. (2020). The fallacy of AI function without fairness. *Communications of the ACM*, *63*(9), 139–144. https://doi.org/10.1145/3375627

Regan, P. M., & Jesse, J. (2019). Ethical challenges of edtech, big data and personalized learning: Twenty-first century student sorting and tracking. *Ethics and Information Technology*, *21*(3), 167–179. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-019-09515-0

Schildkamp, K. (2022). The digital turn in education: Opportunities and challenges for teacher professional development. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *111*, 103625. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2021.103625

Selwyn, N. (2019). *Should robots replace teachers? AI and the future of education*. Polity Press.

Sergis, S., & Sampson, D. G. (2020). Teaching and learning analytics to support teacher inquiry: A systematic literature review. *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies*, *13*(4), 782–795. https://doi.org/10.1109/TLT.2020.2996311

Slade, S., & Prinsloo, P. (2020). Learning analytics: Ethical issues and dilemmas. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *64*(5), 643–664. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764218756950

Southgate, E., Reynolds, R., & Howley, M. (2019). Artificial intelligence and education: Perceptions of teachers in Australia. *Australian Educational Researcher*, *46*(3), 341–361. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-019-00325-w

Suárez, Á., Salmerón, L., & Rodríguez, E. (2023). The impact of AI lesson planners on teaching innovation in bilingual education. *Educational Technology & Society*, *26*(1), 54–68. https://doi.org/10.30191/ETS.v26i1.1234

Suri, H., & Clarke, D. (2009). Advancements in research synthesis methods: From a methodologically inclusive perspective. *Review of Educational Research*, *79*(1), 395–430. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308326349

Sweller, J., Ayres, P., & Kalyuga, S. (2019). *Cognitive load theory* (2nd ed.). Springer.

Tsai, H. C., Hwang, G. J., & Hsu, C. C. (2021). Development of a personalized mobile English vocabulary learning app based on learner interest and learning performance. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *69*(1), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-020-09819-4

Tsai, T. H., Chou, C. Y., & Lai, K. R. (2022). Human–AI collaboration in education: Toward trust-enhanced pedagogical support. *Educational Technology & Society*, *25*(2), 25–

37. https://doi.org/10.30191/ETS.v25i2.1201

Veletsianos, G., & Houlden, S. (2020). Radical flexibility and relationality as responses to education in times of crisis. *Postdigital Science and Education*, *2*, 849–862. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-020-00120-3

Williamson, B. (2021). Education governance and datafication: AI ethics and algorithmic accountability in education policy. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *53*(10), 962–978. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2020.1739411

Williamson, B., & Eynon, R. (2020). Historical threads, missing links, and future directions in AI in education. *Learning, Media and Technology*, *45*(3), 223–235. https://doi.org/10.1080/17439884.2020.1798995

Xie, H., Chu, H. C., Hwang, G. J., & Wang, C. C. (2023). Trends and development in technology-enhanced adaptive/personalized learning: A review of top 100 highly cited articles. *Computers & Education*, *197*, 104659. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2023.104659

Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education – where are the educators? *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *16*, 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0

Zhou, L., & Gao, Y. (2022). Understanding algorithmic opacity in intelligent education systems: Implications for teacher agency. *AI & Society*, *37*(2), 751–762. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-021-01173-w

Zhou, X., Yu, Y., & Zeng, Z. (2021). Personalized learning: An AI-driven solution for learning diversity. *Interactive Learning Environments*, *29*(6), 827–839. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2019.1610456