Beyond the Techno-Solutionist Narrative: Human, Ethical, And Structural Limits of Technology in Education, Health, And Food Security

Davendra Sharma [ORCID]

Lecturer and PhD Scholar University of Fiji, Fiji Islands

ABSTRACT

In recent decades, technology has been increasingly promoted as a universal solution to complex human challenges across education, health, food security, and environmental sustainability. While digital innovations, ranging from artificial intelligence and learning platforms to precision agriculture and health informatics, have expanded possibilities for service delivery and efficiency, they have also reinforced a growing techno-solutionist narrative that overlooks deeper human, ethical, and structural dimensions of development. This paper critically examines the assumption that technological advancement alone can resolve systemic human problems. Drawing on interdisciplinary literature across education, public health, development studies, and sustainability research, the study argues that technological interventions are inherently shaped by social contexts, power relations, institutional capacities, and cultural values. The review highlights how issues such as inequality, governance failures, digital divides, ethical accountability, and human agency often limit the transformative potential of technology, particularly in Global South and resource-constrained contexts. By synthesizing evidence across sectors, the paper demonstrates that technology functions most effectively not as a panacea, but as a complementary tool embedded within broader human-centred systems, policy frameworks, and community-driven practices. The study contributes to contemporary debates by reframing technology as an enabler rather than a determinant of human progress, and calls for development approaches that prioritise ethical governance, contextual responsiveness, and human capability alongside technological innovation.

Keywords: Techno-solutionism; Technology and development; Human-centred approaches; Digital inequality; Ethics of technology; Education and health systems; Food security; Sustainable development; Global South.

INTRODUCTION

Technological innovation has become one of the most dominant narratives shaping contemporary responses to global human challenges. Across education, health, food security, and environmental sustainability, digital technologies are increasingly framed as efficient, scalable, and neutral solutions to deeply complex social problems (Selwyn, 2016; Morozov, 2013). Governments, international development agencies, and private-sector actors have invested heavily in artificial intelligence, data analytics, digital platforms, and automation, often presenting these innovations as transformative tools capable of accelerating human progress and closing longstanding development gaps (World Bank, 2021; United Nations, 2023). This growing confidence in technological solutions reflects what scholars describe as techno-solutionism, the belief that complex human and societal problems can be primarily, if not entirely, solved through technological means (Morozov, 2013).

While technology has undoubtedly expanded access to information, improved service delivery, and enabled new forms of learning, care, and production, its rapid adoption has also exposed significant limitations. Persistent educational inequities, uneven health outcomes, food insecurity, and environmental degradation continue to challenge societies despite unprecedented technological advancement (OECD, 2020; Sen, 1999). These contradictions raise a critical question: *Can technology, on its own, solve fundamentally human problems that are rooted in social structures, power relations, ethics, culture, and governance?*

In the field of education, digital technologies have been widely promoted as solutions to issues such as access, quality, teacher shortages, and skills mismatches in the 21st century (Fullan, Quinn, Drummy, & Gardner, 2018).

Online learning platforms, learning analytics, and artificial intelligence–driven tools are often presented as mechanisms to personalise learning and democratise education. However, research consistently demonstrates that technology-mediated education outcomes are strongly influenced by teacher capacity, pedagogical practices, institutional leadership, socio-economic conditions, and cultural relevance (Selwyn, 2016; Biesta, 2015). Without attention to these human and contextual dimensions, educational technologies risk reproducing existing inequalities rather than transforming them.

Similarly, in health systems, digital health technologies such as telemedicine, electronic health records, and AI-assisted diagnostics have shown promise in improving efficiency and extending care to remote populations (Topol, 2019). Yet, health outcomes remain shaped by broader determinants including governance, trust, infrastructure, ethics, and social inequality (Marmot, 2005). Technological interventions that overlook these determinants may exacerbate exclusion, undermine patient autonomy, or introduce new ethical risks related to data privacy, surveillance, and algorithmic bias (Floridi et al., 2018).

In the domain of food security and environmental sustainability, technological innovations such as precision agriculture, genetically modified crops, and climate-smart technologies are frequently positioned as solutions to hunger, climate change, and resource scarcity (FAO, 2022). While these tools can increase productivity and efficiency, scholars caution that food insecurity is less a problem of technological capacity and more a consequence of poverty, land access, governance, market structures, and political decision-making (Sen, 1981; Shiva, 2016). Technological fixes that fail to address these structural factors risk reinforcing corporate control over food systems while marginalising smallholder farmers and Indigenous knowledge systems.

Across these sectors, a growing body of critical scholarship challenges the assumption that technology is neutral or universally beneficial. Technology is socially constructed, embedded within existing power relations, and shaped by the values and interests of those who design, implement, and govern it (Winner, 1980; Feenberg, 2017). As such, technological systems can privilege certain groups while disadvantaging others, particularly in contexts marked by inequality, colonial legacies, and uneven access to resources

(Noble, 2018; Eubanks, 2018). This is especially evident in Global South contexts, where digital divides, infrastructural constraints, and cultural misalignment often limit the effectiveness of technology-driven development initiatives (Heeks, 2017).

Ethical considerations further complicate the techno-solutionist narrative. The rapid deployment of digital technologies has outpaced regulatory frameworks and ethical oversight, raising concerns about data ownership, consent, accountability, and human agency (Floridi et al., 2018). In education and health, algorithmic decision-making can shape life opportunities, access to services, and resource allocation, yet these systems often operate with limited transparency and minimal public scrutiny (O'Neil, 2016). Without ethical governance, technology risks shifting responsibility away from institutions and policymakers while placing the burden of adaptation on individuals and communities.

This paper argues that the limitations of technology are not due to technological inadequacy per se, but to the mis-framing of technology as a determinant rather than an enabler of human development. Drawing on interdisciplinary literature across education, health, food security, and development studies, the paper critically examines how techno-solutionist approaches overlook the central role of human systems, including policy coherence, institutional capacity, cultural knowledge, ethical norms, and social relationships. Building on human-centred and capability-based perspectives (Sen, 1999; Nussbaum, 2011), the study positions technology as one component within broader socio-technical systems that must prioritise human well-being, equity, and sustainability.

By synthesising insights across sectors, this paper contributes to contemporary debates on digital transformation and sustainable development by offering a nuanced critique of technological determinism. It calls for a shift from technology-led solutions to human-centred, ethically grounded, and context-responsive approaches, particularly in education and development policy. In doing so, the paper seeks to inform scholars, policymakers, and practitioners who are grappling with the promises and pitfalls of technology in addressing complex human challenges in an increasingly digital world.

Table 1: Techno-Solutionist Assumptions versus Human-Centred Perspectives Across Sectors

Dimension	Techno-Solutionist Perspective	Human-Centred Perspective	Key Sources
View of problems	Problems framed as technical deficits	Problems understood as social, ethical, and structural	Morozov (2013); Sen (1999)

Role of technology	Primary driver of change	Enabler within socio-technical systems	Feenberg (2017); Winner (1980)
Human agency	Users as passive adopters	Humans as active agents and co-creators	Nussbaum (2011); Selwyn (2016)
Equity considerations	Often implicit or secondary	Central to design and evaluation	Eubanks (2018); Noble (2018)
Policy focus	Innovation, efficiency, scalability	Ethics, governance, inclusion, sustainability	Floridi et al. (2018); Heeks (2017)

LITERATURE REVIEW

Techno-Solutionism and Technological Determinism

The concept of techno-solutionism has gained prominence as scholars increasingly critique the assumption that technological innovation can provide definitive solutions to complex social and human problems. Morozov (2013) defines techno-solutionism as a mindset that reframes deeply political, cultural, and ethical challenges as technical problems amenable to digital fixes. Closely related is the idea of technological determinism, which positions technology as the primary driver of social change, often downplaying human agency, institutional structures, and contextual factors (Winner, 1980; Feenberg, 2017).

Critical theorists argue that such perspectives oversimplify the relationship between technology and society. Rather than being neutral or autonomous, technologies are socially constructed and embedded within power relations, economic interests, and ideological assumptions (Feenberg, 2017). This critique is particularly relevant in development and policy contexts, where digital interventions are frequently introduced without sufficient attention to local realities, governance capacity, or long-term sustainability (Heeks, 2017). As a result, technological initiatives may fail to address root causes of inequality while creating new forms of exclusion.

Technology and Education: Promise and Limitations

In education, digital technologies have been widely promoted as transformative tools capable of expanding access, improving quality, and preparing learners for the demands of the 21st century (OECD, 2020; World Bank, 2021). Learning management systems, artificial intelligence–driven personalised learning platforms, and open educational resources are often framed as solutions to teacher shortages, skills mismatches, and educational inequity (Fullan et al., 2018).

However, a substantial body of research challenges the assumption that technology alone improves educational outcomes. Selwyn (2016) argues that educational technology often reinforces existing inequalities by privileging students and institutions with greater resources, digital skills, and infrastructural support. Biesta (2015) further cautions that an excessive focus on technological efficiency risks narrowing the purpose of education to measurable outcomes, marginalising broader goals such as citizenship, ethics, and human development. Empirical studies consistently show that the effectiveness of educational technologies depends heavily on teacher capacity, pedagogical alignment, institutional leadership, and cultural relevance (Darling-Hammond et al., 2020). Without meaningful integration into teaching and learning practices, technology risks becoming an add-on rather than a transformative force. In Global South contexts, challenges such as unreliable infrastructure, limited professional development, and socio-economic disparities further constrain the impact of digital education initiatives (Trucano, 2016; Heeks, 2017).

Technology and Health Systems

In the health sector, digital technologies, including telemedicine, electronic health records, mobile health applications, and AI-assisted diagnostics, have been widely adopted to improve efficiency, access, and decision-making (Topol, 2019). Proponents argue that these innovations can address workforce shortages, enhance disease surveillance, and extend healthcare services to underserved populations.

Yet, health outcomes remain strongly shaped by social determinants of health, such as income, education, housing, and governance (Marmot, 2005). Technological interventions that fail to address these determinants often produce limited or uneven benefits. Moreover, the rapid digitisation of health systems has raised ethical concerns related to data privacy, consent, algorithmic bias, and accountability (Floridi et al., 2018). Eubanks (2018) and Noble (2018) demonstrate how automated decision-making systems can reproduce structural inequalities by embedding historical biases into digital tools. In health contexts, such biases may affect

diagnosis, access to care, and resource allocation, disproportionately impacting marginalised communities. These findings challenge the notion that technological innovation is inherently objective or equitable.

Technology, Food Security, and Environmental Sustainability

Technological innovation plays a central role in contemporary approaches to food security and environmental sustainability. Precision agriculture, biotechnology, climate-smart agriculture, and digital supply-chain management are frequently promoted as solutions to hunger, climate change, and resource scarcity (FAO, 2022).

However, scholars argue that food insecurity is not primarily a technological problem but a socio-political one. Sen's (1981) entitlement theory demonstrates that hunger often results from poverty, inequality, and lack of access to resources rather than insufficient food production. Shiva (2016) further critiques techno-centric agricultural models for undermining smallholder farmers, biodiversity, and Indigenous knowledge systems.

Environmental scholars similarly caution that technological fixes may divert attention from systemic issues such as overconsumption, governance failures, and economic inequality (Scoones et al., 2020). While technology can support sustainability efforts, its effectiveness depends on policy coherence, community participation, and ethical stewardship.

Ethics, Power, and Human Agency in Technology Use

A growing interdisciplinary literature highlights the ethical and political dimensions of technology. Winner (1980) famously argued that technologies have politics, shaping social relations and distributions of power. More recently, Floridi et al. (2018) have emphasised the need for ethical governance frameworks to guide the development and deployment of digital technologies.

O'Neil (2016) warns that opaque algorithmic systems can function as "weapons of math destruction," reinforcing inequality while evading accountability. These concerns are particularly salient in education, health, and development contexts, where technological decisions can have long-term consequences for human capabilities and life opportunities.

Human-centred and capability-based frameworks offer an alternative to techno-solutionism by prioritising human well-being, agency, and freedom (Sen, 1999; Nussbaum, 2011). From this perspective, technology should be evaluated not by its novelty or efficiency, but by its contribution to expanding people's real opportunities to live meaningful lives.

Table 2: Sectoral Evidence on the Limits of Technology-Driven Solutions

Sector	Common Technological Interventions	Documented Benefits	Key Limitations Identified in Literature
Education	LMS, AI tutoring, online learning	Expanded access, flexibility	Digital divide, weak pedagogy, teacher capacity constraints (Biesta, 2015; Selwyn, 2016)
Health	Telemedicine, AI diagnostics, EHRs	Improved efficiency, reach	Bias, privacy risks, neglect of social determinants (Marmot, 2005; Noble, 2018)
Food Security	Precision agriculture, GM crops	Increased productivity	Power asymmetries, exclusion of smallholders, governance failures (Sen, 1981; Shiva, 2016)
Environment	Climate modelling, monitoring tech	Better data, forecasting	Technological fixes without behavioural or policy change (Scoones et al., 2020)

Literature Gaps

Despite a rapidly expanding body of research on technology in education, health, food security, and environmental sustainability, several critical gaps remain evident.

First, much of the existing literature remains sector-specific, with limited cross-sectoral synthesis. Studies on educational technology, digital health, and agricultural innovation are often analysed in isolation, resulting in fragmented insights. There is a lack of integrative reviews

that examine common assumptions, limitations, and ethical challenges of techno-solutionism across multiple human development domains.

Second, while critiques of techno-solutionism and technological determinism exist, they are frequently conceptual or philosophical, with insufficient application to concrete policy and practice contexts. There is a need for literature that systematically connects critical theory with real-world implications for education, health, and food security systems, particularly in development settings.

Third, Global South perspectives remain underrepresented in dominant technology and development discourses. Much of the literature is grounded in high-income contexts, overlooking how digital divides, infrastructural constraints, cultural diversity, and colonial legacies shape the outcomes of technological interventions (Heeks, 2017). Comparative and context-sensitive analyses are therefore needed.

Fourth, ethical considerations are often treated as secondary or add-on concerns rather than as central analytical lenses. Existing studies tend to focus on efficiency, scalability, and innovation, with limited attention to ethics, power, accountability, and human agency—especially in relation to algorithmic governance and data-driven decision-making.

Finally, there is a lack of human-centred conceptual frameworks that reposition technology as an enabler within broader socio-technical systems. While capability-based and human development approaches offer valuable insights, they are not consistently integrated into analyses of digital transformation across sectors.

Table 3: Summary of Identified Literature Gaps

Gap Area	Description	Implications for Research and Policy
Cross-sector synthesis	Siloed sectoral analyses dominate	Missed systemic insights
Global South perspectives	Underrepresentation in dominant literature	Context-blind policy design
Ethics integration	Ethics treated as secondary	Risk of harm and inequality
Human-centred frameworks	Limited use of capability-based models	Technology over human well-being
Empirical grounding	Over-reliance on conceptual critique	Weak policy translation

Contribution of This Study

In response to these gaps, this paper offers a critical, interdisciplinary review that examines the human, ethical, and structural limits of technology across education, health, and food security. By synthesising insights from multiple domains and foregrounding human-centred perspectives, the study contributes to a more nuanced understanding of technology's role in addressing complex human problems.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

Reframing Technology: From Determinism to Socio-Technical Systems

The findings from the reviewed literature collectively challenge the assumption that technology functions as an autonomous driver of human progress. Instead, they reinforce the view that technology operates within socio-technical systems shaped by human agency, institutional arrangements, cultural norms, and power relations (Feenberg, 2017; Winner, 1980). Across education, health, and food security, technological interventions produce uneven outcomes when introduced without adequate consideration of these broader systems.

Morozov's (2013) critique of techno-solutionism is particularly salient in this context, as it highlights how technological fixes often reframe political and ethical problems as technical challenges. This reframing can obscure structural causes such as inequality, governance failures, and historical marginalisation. As Heeks (2017) argues, many digital development initiatives fail not because of technological shortcomings, but because they overlook the complex realities of implementation environments. The analysis thus underscores the need to move beyond binary debates of "technology versus no technology" toward a more nuanced understanding of how, why, and for whom technology is deployed.

Education: Technology, Pedagogy, and Human Capability

In education, the discussion reveals a persistent gap between technological adoption and meaningful learning outcomes. While digital platforms and AI-driven tools promise personalised and scalable education, empirical

evidence suggests that learning gains depend more on pedagogy, teacher expertise, and institutional support than on technology itself (Darling-Hammond et al., 2020; Selwyn, 2016). Technology-enhanced learning environments that lack pedagogical coherence risk prioritising efficiency over depth, measurement over meaning, and access over quality.

Biesta's (2015) critique of the "learnification" of education provides an important lens for analysing these trends. When education is reduced to data-driven performance metrics, broader aims such as critical thinking, ethical reasoning, and civic engagement are marginalised. From a capability perspective, Sen (1999) emphasises that education should expand learners' freedoms and agency rather than merely transmit skills aligned with labour market demands. Technology can support this goal only when embedded within human-centred pedagogical frameworks that respect cultural context and learner diversity.

The analysis also highlights how digital divides, both within and between countries, continue to shape educational outcomes. In resource-constrained contexts, limited infrastructure, insufficient teacher training, and socio-economic inequality restrict the transformative potential of educational technologies (Trucano, 2016; Heeks, 2017). These findings challenge narratives that position technology as an equaliser, suggesting instead that it often amplifies existing disparities unless accompanied by systemic investment and inclusive policy design.

Health Systems: Efficiency Versus Equity

In health systems, technological innovation has undoubtedly enhanced diagnostic capacity, data management, and service delivery (Topol, 2019). However, the analysis reveals that efficiency gains do not automatically translate into equitable health outcomes. Marmot's (2005) work on social determinants of health demonstrates that health inequalities are deeply rooted in social and economic structures that technology alone cannot address.

The rapid expansion of digital health technologies has also introduced ethical and governance challenges. Floridi et al. (2018) argue that the lack of robust ethical frameworks risks undermining patient autonomy, trust, and accountability. Algorithmic decision-making systems, while potentially improving accuracy, may embed biases that disproportionately affect marginalised populations (Noble, 2018; Eubanks, 2018). These concerns highlight the tension between innovation and responsibility, underscoring the need for transparent, participatory governance mechanisms.

From a human-centred perspective, health technologies should be evaluated not solely on efficiency metrics but on their capacity to enhance human dignity, access, and well-being. This requires integrating technological solutions with investments in health workforce development, community engagement, and public trust, factors that remain underemphasised in techno-centric health reforms.

Food Security and Environmental Sustainability: Technology and Power

The discussion of food security and environmental sustainability further illustrates the limitations of techno-solutionism. While technological innovations in agriculture and environmental management offer tools for improving productivity and monitoring ecosystems, they do not address the political and economic structures that drive hunger and environmental degradation (FAO, 2022; Scoones et al., 2020).

Sen's (1981) entitlement approach provides a critical framework for understanding why food insecurity persists despite technological advances in food production. Hunger is fundamentally a problem of access, inequality, and governance rather than scarcity. Shiva (2016) extends this critique by highlighting how technology-driven agricultural models can marginalise smallholder farmers, erode biodiversity, and undermine Indigenous knowledge systems.

The analysis suggests that technology, when driven by corporate or technocratic agendas, may reinforce power imbalances rather than promote sustainability. Conversely, when aligned with community knowledge, ethical governance, and inclusive policies, technological tools can support more resilient and equitable food systems. This reinforces the argument that technology's impact depends on the values and structures within which it is embedded.

Ethics, Governance, and Human Agency

A central theme emerging from the analysis is the ethical dimension of technological intervention. Winner's (1980) assertion that technologies have politics remains highly relevant in the digital age, as algorithmic systems increasingly shape access to education, healthcare, and resources. O'Neil (2016) warns that opaque and unaccountable technologies can entrench inequality while shifting responsibility away from institutions.

Human-centred and capability-based approaches offer a normative framework for addressing these challenges. Sen (1999) and Nussbaum (2011) emphasise that development should be evaluated in terms of people's real opportunities to lead lives they value. From this perspective, technology should enhance human agency rather than constrain it. This requires ethical design, inclusive governance, and participatory decision-making processes that involve affected communities.

The analysis thus calls for a shift from technology-led

governance to ethically grounded, human-centred digital governance. Such an approach recognises technology as a means rather than an end, and prioritises transparency, accountability, and social justice in technological decision-making.

Toward a Human-Centred Model of Technological Engagement

Synthesising insights across sectors, this discussion proposes a reframing of technology's role in human development. Rather than viewing technology as a universal solution, it should be understood as a context-dependent enabler whose effectiveness is mediated by human systems. This aligns with socio-technical and constructivist perspectives that emphasise interaction between technology, people, and institutions (Feenberg, 2017).

The analysis supports a model in which successful technological interventions are characterised by:

- Alignment with human values and ethical principles
- Integration with institutional capacity and governance structures
- Responsiveness to cultural and contextual realities
- Commitment to equity and inclusion

Such a model, challenges dominant narratives of innovation and progress, advocating instead for responsible, reflective, and human-centred technological engagement in education, health, and food security.

Table 4: Structural and Ethical Barriers Limiting Technological Impact

Barrier Type	Description	Cross-Sector Implications
Structural inequality	Unequal access to infrastructure and resources	Reinforces education, health, and food disparities
Governance gaps	Weak regulation and oversight	Accountability and trust deficits
Ethical risks	Bias, surveillance, data misuse	Marginalisation of vulnerable groups
Cultural misalignment	Technologies misfit local contexts	Low adoption and sustainability
Capacity constraints	Limited skills and institutional readiness	Technology underutilisation

Note. These barriers are particularly pronounced in Global South and resource-constrained settings (Heeks, 2017).

Summary of Key Insights

Overall, the discussion demonstrates that technology cannot solve human problems in isolation. Its potential lies not in replacing human systems, but in complementing and strengthening them. By foregrounding ethics, agency, and context, this paper contributes to a more balanced and sustainable understanding of technology's role in addressing complex global challenges.

CONCLUSION

This paper set out to critically examine the prevailing techno-solutionist narrative that positions technology as a primary remedy for complex human challenges across education, health, and food security. Drawing on interdisciplinary literature, the analysis demonstrates that while technological innovations have expanded possibilities for efficiency, access, and data-driven decision-making, they remain fundamentally constrained by human, ethical, and structural factors. Technology does not operate in a vacuum; rather, its outcomes are shaped by social contexts, institutional capacities, governance arrangements, cultural values, and power relations (Feenberg, 2017; Winner, 1980).

Across all sectors examined, the evidence reveals a recurring pattern: technological interventions are most effective when embedded within robust human systems and least effective when treated as standalone solutions. In education, digital tools cannot substitute for pedagogical quality, teacher agency, and culturally responsive learning environments (Biesta, 2015; Selwyn, 2016). In health, technological efficiency gains are insufficient to overcome inequalities rooted in social determinants, governance failures, and ethical oversight gaps (Marmot, 2005; Floridi et al., 2018). In food security and environmental sustainability, technological advances fail to address hunger and ecological degradation when underlying issues of access, power, and political economy remain unchallenged (Sen, 1981; Shiva, 2016).

The analysis further underscores that technology is not neutral. Algorithmic systems, data infrastructures, and digital platforms reflect the values and interests of their

designers and institutions, often reproducing existing inequalities unless deliberately governed otherwise (Eubanks, 2018; Noble, 2018). Ethical considerations, such as accountability, transparency, data rights, and human agency, are therefore not peripheral concerns but central determinants of whether technology contributes to human well-being or exacerbates harm.

Overall, this paper concludes that technology should be understood not as a panacea, but as an enabler within broader socio-technical systems. Sustainable and equitable solutions to human problems require a shift away from technological determinism toward human-centred, ethically grounded, and context-responsive approaches. Reframing technology in this way allows for more realistic, just, and effective responses to contemporary global challenges.

WAY FORWARD

Moving beyond techno-solutionism requires both conceptual and practical reorientation in how technology is designed, implemented, and governed across sectors. Based on the synthesis of literature and analysis presented in this paper, several key directions for future policy, practice, and research are proposed.

Re-centring Human-Centred and Capability-Based Approaches

Future technological initiatives should be explicitly grounded in human-centred and capability-based frameworks, which prioritise human agency, dignity, and well-being over efficiency and scalability alone (Sen, 1999; Nussbaum, 2011). In education, this means designing technologies that support critical thinking, ethical reasoning, and lifelong learning rather than narrow skills acquisition. In health and food systems, it requires evaluating technological success based on improved equity, access, and resilience, not just technical performance.

Strengthening Ethical and Governance Frameworks

The rapid pace of technological innovation has outstripped existing governance and regulatory mechanisms. A critical way forward lies in developing robust ethical frameworks and participatory governance structures that ensure transparency, accountability, and public trust (Floridi et al., 2018). Policymakers must treat ethical oversight as integral to technological development, particularly in areas involving algorithmic decision-making, data surveillance, and AI-driven systems.

Addressing Structural Inequality and Digital Divides

Technological interventions must be accompanied by deliberate efforts to address structural inequalities and digital divides, especially in Global South and resource-constrained contexts (Heeks, 2017). Investments in infrastructure, human capacity, and institutional leadership are essential to prevent technology from reinforcing existing disparities. Context-sensitive design, local ownership, and community engagement should be central principles rather than afterthoughts.

Integrating Indigenous and Local Knowledge Systems

A sustainable and inclusive technological future requires recognising the value of Indigenous and local knowledge systems, particularly in education, health, and food security. Technological solutions should complement, not replace, community-based practices and cultural knowledge. This integration can enhance relevance, legitimacy, and long-term impact, while challenging technocratic models of development (Shiva, 2016).

Advancing Interdisciplinary and Cross-Sectoral Research

Finally, future research should move beyond siloed analyses and adopt interdisciplinary, cross-sectoral perspectives that examine common patterns, assumptions, and outcomes of technological interventions. Comparative studies across education, health, and sustainability can generate more holistic insights into when and how technology contributes to human development. There is also a need for more empirical research from the Global South to balance dominant narratives shaped by high-income contexts.

Table 5: Human-Centred Pathways for Responsible Technological Engagement (Way Forward)

Strategic Area	Recommended Action	Expected Outcome
Policy design	Embed ethics and equity in digital policy	Inclusive and accountable systems
Education reform	Align technology with pedagogy and teacher development	Meaningful learning outcomes
Health governance	Strengthen data ethics and public trust	Safer, equitable care
Food systems	Integrate technology with local knowledge	Sustainable and resilient systems

Research agenda	Promote interdisciplinary and Global South research	Context-responsive innovation

Closing Reflection

In an era marked by rapid digital transformation and growing global uncertainty, the question is no longer whether technology can contribute to solving human problems, but under what conditions it does so ethically, equitably, and sustainably. By repositioning technology as a tool embedded within human systems, rather than a solution in itself, this paper offers a pathway toward more responsible and inclusive approaches to innovation and development.

REFERENCES

1. Biesta, G. (2015). Good education in an age of measurement: Ethics, politics, democracy. Routledge.
2. Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. Applied Developmental Science, 24(2), 97–140. https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791
3. Eubanks, V. (2018). Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor. St. Martin's Press.
4. FAO. (2022). The state of food security and nutrition in the world 2022. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
5. Feenberg, A. (2017). Technosystem: The social life of reason. Harvard University Press.
6. Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., … Vayena, E. (2018). AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations. Minds and Machines, 28(4), 689–707. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5
7. Fullan, M., Quinn, J., Drummy, M., & Gardner, M. (2018). Deep learning: Engage the world change the world. Corwin.
8. Heeks, R. (2017). Information and communication technology for development (ICT4D). Routledge.
9. Marmot, M. (2005). Social determinants of health inequalities. The Lancet, 365(9464), 1099–1104. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(05)71146-6
10. Morozov, E. (2013). To save everything, click here: The folly of technological solutionism. PublicAffairs.
11. Noble, S. U. (2018). Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism. New York University Press.
12. Nussbaum, M. C. (2011). Creating capabilities: The human development approach. Harvard University Press.
13. O'Neil, C. (2016). Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy. Crown.
14. OECD. (2020). Education at a glance 2020: OECD indicators. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/69096873-en
15. Scoones, I., Stirling, A., Abrol, D., Atela, J., Charli-Joseph, L., Ely, A., … Yang, L. (2020). Transformations to sustainability: Combining structural, systemic and enabling approaches. Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 42, 65–75. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2019.12.004
16. Selwyn, N. (2016). Education and technology: Key issues and debates (2nd ed.). Bloomsbury Academic.
17. Sen, A. (1981). Poverty and famines: An essay on entitlement and deprivation. Oxford University Press.
18. Sen, A. (1999). Development as freedom. Oxford University Press.
19. Shiva, V. (2016). Who really feeds the world? The failures of agribusiness and the promise of agroecology. North Atlantic Books.
20. Topol, E. (2019). Deep medicine: How artificial intelligence can make healthcare human again. Basic Books.
21. Trucano, M. (2016). Knowledge maps: ICT in education. World Bank Group.
22. United Nations. (2023). The sustainable development goals report 2023. United Nations.
23. Winner, L. (1980). Do artifacts have politics? Daedalus, 109(1), 121–136.
24. World Bank. (2021). World development report 2021: Data for better lives. World Bank Publications. https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-1600-0