Jurnal Fisika Terapan dan Inovasi Indonesia
Volume. 1, Issue 1, November 2025
Page No: 1-13

Systemic Barriers and Enablers in Educational and Healthcare Technology Integration

Amar Amrullah[1], Finta Amalinda[2], Nurasyah Dewi Napitupulu[3]
Universitas Garut, Indonesia[1]
Universitas Muhammadiyah Palu, Indonesia[2]
Universitas Tadulako, Indonesia[3]
Correspondent : amaramrullah16@uniga.ac.id [1]

Received : October 04, 2025
Accepted : November 09, 2025
Published : November 30, 2025

Citation: Amrullah, A., Amalinda, F., Napitupulu, N, D. (2025). Systemic Barriers and Enablers in Educational and Healthcare Technology Integration. Jurnal Fisika Terapan dan Inovasi Indonesia, 1(1), 1-13.

ABSTRACT: This narrative review explores the integration of emerging technologies in education and healthcare, focusing on their impact on service accessibility, instructional practices, and systemic challenges. The study aims to examine how tools such as Arduino kits, Python programming, and brain-computer interfaces are shaping educational and health outcomes. Literature was collected from major databases including Scopus, PubMed, and Google Scholar, using Boolean-based keyword strategies and systematic inclusion criteria to identify peer-reviewed studies from the past decade. Findings indicate that while educational technologies show promise in enhancing teaching and learner engagement, and assistive health tools can improve communication and mobility, their implementation is hindered by fragmented policies, infrastructural deficits, and socio-cultural barriers. Community-based approaches emerged as effective pathways to contextualize and sustain interventions, particularly in low-resource environments. However, evidence on policy coordination and long-term effectiveness remains limited. This study calls for adaptive policymaking, inclusive training programs, and expanded infrastructure support as critical measures to overcome current challenges. Future research should address gaps in empirical evidence through cross-country comparisons and longitudinal evaluations. By aligning innovation with systemic reform and community engagement, technology can become a catalyst for inclusive and sustainable transformation in global education and health systems.

Keywords: Educational Technology, Healthcare Innovation, Community-Based Interventions, Policy Reform, Digital Equity, STEM Education, Global Health Access.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the integration of emerging technologies into the fields of education and healthcare has attracted significant scholarly attention, driven by the pressing need to respond to global challenges in learning and health systems. Rapid technological advancement has reshaped traditional pedagogical practices and medical interventions, creating new opportunities to enhance human capabilities and outcomes. In particular, the use of hardware kits such as Arduino, along with programming languages like Python, has emerged as a promising strategy for improving teacher competencies in science and technology education. Kyslitsyn et al. (2024) demonstrate that these tools not only enrich the methodological arsenal of educators but also stimulate students' interest in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) disciplines, particularly in under-resourced settings where engagement in science education has historically been low. Similarly, brain-computer interface (BCI) systems, especially those based on electroencephalography (EEG) models, have opened new frontiers in rehabilitative therapy and human-machine interaction, necessitating in-depth exploration of their educational and clinical applications (Zhang et al., 2021).

Current literature points to a growing urgency for research that bridges the divide between technological innovation and its pedagogical or therapeutic implementation. Zhang et al. (2021) underscore the transformative potential of BCI in supporting individuals with physical disabilities, enabling them to communicate and interact more effectively with their environment. This technological breakthrough offers considerable promise for enhancing the quality of life for vulnerable populations. Furthermore, the application of technologies like magnetorheological dampers in civil engineering, as highlighted by Rossi et al. (2018), demonstrates the versatility of physical systems modeling in addressing structural resilience, particularly in regions prone to natural disasters. These cases collectively reflect a trend toward multidisciplinary technological deployment that intersects with education, public health, and infrastructure. The relevance of such innovations is especially pronounced in developing countries and marginalized communities where systemic challenges often hinder access to quality education and healthcare.

The statistics reinforce this need for innovation. In the realm of education, global disparities in access to technological resources are well-documented. A substantial proportion of students in rural or underserved areas remain excluded from digital learning opportunities, widening the educational divide(Bhagwat et al., 2025; Kulkarni & Joshi, 2025). In healthcare, the World Health Organization (WHO) has emphasized the potential of assistive technologies to bridge care gaps for persons with disabilities, who often face isolation and limited access to rehabilitation (WHO, 2023). Research by Zhang et al. (2021) reiterates this, showing that EEG-based BCIs provide vital tools for communication and environmental control for individuals with severe physical impairments. At the same time, advanced structural engineering solutions such as adaptive dampers are being leveraged to mitigate disaster impact and reinforce community resilience in high-risk regions (Rossi et al., 2018). Taken together, these developments illustrate the expansive role that technology can play in solving real-world problems, provided that integration strategies are contextually appropriate and supported by inclusive policy frameworks.

Despite these positive trends, several significant challenges persist. From a policy standpoint, there is insufficient institutional support for the adoption of innovative educational technologies(Mahasneh et al., 2025; TANG et al., 2025). Kyslitsyn et al. (2024) argue that in many countries, regulatory inertia and limited financial investment inhibit educational institutions from experimenting with or implementing technology-enhanced teaching methods(Dembovskiy & Rodimtsev, 2024). Technical limitations also remain, particularly in embedding tools like Arduino into standardized curricula that are still heavily reliant on traditional lecture-based approaches. Such curricula often fail to accommodate more interactive and exploratory learning formats that emerging technologies require. In parallel, social challenges such as unequal access to digital infrastructure and lack of technical literacy further marginalize disadvantaged populations. Kyslitsyn et al. (2024) emphasize that these structural barriers must be addressed if technology is to fulfill its potential as a democratizing force in education.

In the healthcare domain, similar constraints are observed. Although BCIs hold great promise for enhancing autonomy among individuals with disabilities, their deployment remains limited due to technical, ethical, and cost-related factors. Zhang et al. (2021) note that the majority of BCI studies focus on laboratory settings with limited generalizability, and that more inclusive and scalable models are urgently needed. Moreover, while mathematical modeling in physics and engineering has led to significant advances in simulating complex systems, its social implications often remain underexplored. Liang (2023) highlights that technological integration in education or healthcare is not merely a technical challenge but also a social process that affects interpersonal relationships, learning dynamics, and institutional structures.

These challenges underscore persistent gaps in the literature that hinder a comprehensive understanding of technology's impact. One such gap lies in the long-term assessment of educational technologies like BCIs in real-world school settings. While many studies examine technical feasibility and performance metrics, few analyze how these technologies interact with pedagogical goals, institutional constraints, or sociocultural contexts (Kyslitsyn et al., 2024). Additionally, there is a lack of comparative studies that evaluate how educational technologies perform across diverse geographic and demographic settings(Kurt-Taspinar & Tikiz-Erturk, 2025; Zaremohzzabieh et al., 2025). The absence of such contextualized analyses limits the scalability and transferability of technological solutions. Liang, (2023) further asserts that little attention has been paid to how technological adoption shapes and is shaped by social norms, equity considerations, and policy ecosystems.

To address these issues, this review aims to synthesize current knowledge on the intersection of technology, education, and health, with particular emphasis on how innovative tools like Arduino, Python programming, BCI systems, and adaptive engineering solutions are reshaping practices and outcomes. Specifically, the review seeks to examine how these technologies influence teaching strategies, learner engagement, health interventions, and institutional responses. The objective is not only to map the technological landscape but also to evaluate how policy, technical, and social dimensions intersect to facilitate or hinder successful implementation. In doing so, this study aspires to offer insights that inform future research directions, policymaking, and program development.

The scope of this review spans a wide array of technological applications in both educational and healthcare contexts, with a geographical emphasis on developing regions and vulnerable populations. While much of the existing literature originates from high-income countries with advanced research infrastructures, this review seeks to expand the analytical lens to include underrepresented settings where technological adoption often faces systemic obstacles. It also considers multiple stakeholder perspectives, including educators, learners, healthcare providers, patients, and policymakers. By incorporating a broad and inclusive viewpoint, the study endeavors to generate findings that are both globally relevant and locally applicable.

In conclusion, the integration of emerging technologies in education and healthcare offers significant promise for addressing longstanding challenges related to equity, quality, and access. However, realizing this potential requires more than technological innovation; it demands a nuanced understanding of the socio-technical systems in which these tools are embedded. By interrogating the interplay between technology, policy, and practice across diverse contexts, this review contributes to a more holistic and actionable body of knowledge that can inform inclusive and sustainable development.

METHOD

This study employed a narrative review methodology to investigate the intersection of emerging technologies and their applications in education and health systems. The methodological approach was structured to ensure that the literature analyzed would be of high academic quality, thematically relevant, and representative of the current state of research across interdisciplinary domains. The entire process was designed to guarantee transparency, reproducibility, and academic rigor, beginning with database selection, keyword formulation, and culminating in the systematic filtering and analysis of the included studies.

The literature search was conducted using three main academic databases: Scopus, PubMed, and Google Scholar. Each database was selected based on its unique advantages in terms of coverage and disciplinary focus. Scopus was chosen for its comprehensive scope across disciplines such as engineering, computer science, educational research, and social sciences(Chaer et al., 2025; Ru, 2025). It is recognized as a reliable source for peer-reviewed publications and provides extensive indexing of journals that publish interdisciplinary research in educational technologies and applied physical systems. PubMed, on the other hand, specializes in biomedical literature and was therefore deemed essential for accessing studies that examined health-related applications of technologies such as Brain-Computer Interfaces (BCIs), EEG systems, and rehabilitation tools. The inclusion of PubMed allowed the research team to delve into clinical and neurological aspects of technological interventions, particularly in contexts involving physical disability, cognitive therapy, or neural interface systems. Google Scholar was used as a complementary resource to widen the scope of the search. Although it is not as selective as Scopus or PubMed, Google Scholar offers access to gray literature, conference proceedings, theses, and working papers, providing additional context or insights that may not yet be formally published in high-impact journals.

The search strategy involved a carefully designed set of keyword combinations using Boolean operators to optimize the specificity and relevance of retrieved articles. The primary terms included "technology in education," "health outcomes," "Arduino," "Python," "BCI," "EEG," and "applications." These terms were combined using Boolean connectors such as "AND," "OR," and "NOT" to refine search results and eliminate irrelevant or redundant material. For example, combinations such as "technology in education AND health outcomes," "BCI AND education," and "Arduino OR Python AND teaching" were used to identify literature exploring the role of technology in facilitating both pedagogical practices and clinical improvements. Additionally, search queries like "EEG AND BCI AND applications" enabled the identification of literature specific to the implementation of EEG-based brain-computer systems in both educational and rehabilitative contexts(Chen, 2025). By utilizing these structured keyword queries, the research team ensured a focused search that captured studies directly addressing the intersection of technological innovation, learning environments, and healthcare outcomes.

Once the literature pool was established, a systematic process of screening and selection was employed to determine which studies met the criteria for inclusion in the review. The inclusion criteria were designed to filter for peer-reviewed articles published within the last ten years, from 2014 to 2024, to ensure the timeliness and relevance of findings. Only studies published in English were considered, due to resource limitations for translating non-English literature. Articles were included if they explicitly examined the use of technology in educational or healthcare settings, focused on practical implementations or empirical evaluations, and contributed new insights into how tools such as Arduino, Python programming, BCIs, or adaptive hardware systems were employed. Studies also had to provide a clear methodological framework and report empirical results or theoretical discussions that could inform practice or policy.

Exclusion criteria were applied to remove articles that lacked academic rigor or relevance to the core focus of the study. Commentaries, opinion pieces, and editorial notes without empirical support were excluded. Studies focused exclusively on software development without educational or health applications were also filtered out. Moreover, papers that described the theoretical potential of a technology without any implementation evidence or applied context were not considered suitable for inclusion. This was to ensure that the resulting body of literature reflected not just technological potential, but tangible, actionable insights grounded in real-world applications.

Following the initial identification and de-duplication of search results, all articles were subjected to a title and abstract screening. This phase involved a critical examination of each abstract to determine alignment with the review objectives. If ambiguity remained, the full-text article was retrieved and assessed in-depth by two independent reviewers. Any disagreements regarding inclusion were resolved through consensus or, when necessary, adjudication by a third reviewer. This iterative process ensured that selection bias was minimized and that only studies of high relevance and methodological integrity were retained.

The types of studies considered in this narrative review included a variety of research designs, reflecting the interdisciplinary and applied nature of the topic. These included experimental studies such as randomized controlled trials (RCTs) evaluating the effectiveness of BCI in rehabilitation; cohort and case-control studies that examined longitudinal impacts of educational technology on learning outcomes; and case studies that detailed specific implementations of technologies like Arduino in classroom or clinical settings. Qualitative research, including interviews and ethnographic studies, was also incorporated to provide context on the social and institutional factors influencing the adoption of technology. This inclusive approach enabled the review to synthesize insights from diverse methodologies, thereby enriching the analysis with both depth and breadth.

Finally, each study that met the inclusion criteria was evaluated using a set of standardized appraisal tools appropriate for its research design. Quantitative studies were assessed for methodological quality using criteria such as sample size, statistical validity, and reliability of measures. Qualitative studies were evaluated based on credibility, transferability, and consistency. This quality appraisal ensured that the final synthesis of literature was not only comprehensive but also grounded in sound scientific evidence. Studies that scored poorly in methodological assessment but offered unique conceptual contributions were not discarded outright but were clearly marked in the analysis to differentiate between levels of evidentiary support.

In summary, the methodological framework for this review was carefully designed to capture a holistic and current understanding of how technologies are being integrated into educational and health systems. Through the systematic use of diverse academic databases, carefully curated keyword strategies, clearly defined inclusion and exclusion criteria, and rigorous screening and appraisal procedures, this methodology ensured that the review findings would be both robust and practically relevant. The multi-disciplinary scope of the literature, encompassing quantitative, qualitative, and mixed-methods research, provides a comprehensive foundation for the discussion and implications sections that follow. This methodological rigor positions the review to contribute meaningfully to both academic discourse and policy development in the evolving landscape of technology-enhanced education and healthcare.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Akses terhadap Layanan Kesehatan

The analysis of literature concerning access to healthcare reveals significant disparities across demographic and geographical groups, especially in low- and middle-income countries. While comprehensive, evidence-based references on this theme remain sparse, general trends indicate that economic and infrastructural limitations are among the most prominent barriers to healthcare access. For instance, remote areas in developing countries often suffer from a lack of medical personnel, limited availability of facilities, and insufficient technological infrastructure. Although this observation is widely recognized, no specific studies in the present review adequately quantify or substantiate these constraints with empirical precision.

Kyslitsyn et al. (2024) offer a potentially valuable insight into this gap by arguing that educational technologies, originally designed for pedagogical enhancement, can be adapted to support health education and training in underserved areas. Their findings suggest that tools like Arduino-based instructional kits and Python programming platforms can facilitate the development of locally-tailored health education programs. By empowering teachers and students with technical knowledge and problem-solving skills, such initiatives may help bridge the knowledge and training gap among community healthcare providers and support broader dissemination of healthcare information.

Despite the promising intersection between education and healthcare technology, there is insufficient literature linking technological education tools directly to improvements in healthcare access. Zhang et al. (2021), while focusing on the technical development of EEG-based Brain-Computer Interfaces (BCIs), indirectly highlight the potential for BCI applications in assisting individuals with severe physical disabilities. However, the study primarily addresses signal classification and does not provide empirical evidence regarding healthcare accessibility or outcomes. This underscores a crucial limitation in current research—namely, the lack of studies evaluating the social and structural implications of assistive technologies within health systems.

Hambatan Sistemik dalam Kebijakan Publik

Structural barriers in public policy represent another recurring theme in the reviewed literature. These include fragmented regulatory environments, insufficient funding mechanisms, and misalignment between technological innovations and policy directives. Kyslitsyn et al. (2024) document several cases in which institutional resistance and policy inertia prevented the effective integration of new educational technologies into national curricula. Their study highlights that in many contexts, the adoption of digital learning tools is impeded by outdated policy frameworks and a lack of interagency coordination, resulting in inconsistent implementation across educational institutions.

Although the broader literature often alludes to policy-related obstacles, there is a shortage of comprehensive cross-country analyses. The review uncovered only limited comparative discussions of how different nations approach the policy integration of emerging technologies in education and healthcare. For example, advanced economies such as Germany have demonstrated success in mainstreaming technology-enhanced STEM curricula, largely due to well-funded governmental initiatives and robust digital infrastructure. In contrast, developing countries face persistent constraints stemming from weak institutional capacities and scarce financial resources. These observations are widely recognized in policy discourse, but the studies included in this review do not provide primary data or in-depth comparative evaluations to substantiate such claims. Therefore, while the assertion of policy divergence across countries is plausible, the need for empirical validation through comparative policy analysis remains unmet.

Furthermore, studies such as that of Witkovský & Frollo, (2020) allude to infrastructural and policy limitations in Central and Eastern Europe, but do not engage directly with educational or healthcare applications of technology. Similarly, research that explores how policy coordination affects the integration of technologies into public service delivery is largely absent from the corpus analyzed. The lack of relevant regulatory scholarship in this area highlights a gap that warrants future investigation, particularly with respect to harmonizing technological advancement with existing legal and institutional norms.

Peran Masyarakat Sipil dan Pendekatan Berbasis Komunitas

Civil society engagement and community-based approaches have emerged as critical mechanisms for fostering effective educational and healthcare programs, especially in regions where institutional reach is limited. Community involvement is often associated with improved outcomes due to its participatory nature, which enhances relevance, ownership, and sustainability of interventions. Within the context of this review, Kyslitsyn et al. (2024) provide the most salient example of such engagement. Their research emphasizes that educational programs incorporating Arduino and Python not only improved instructional quality but also enhanced student interest and engagement in STEM disciplines. When scaled through community networks, these initiatives demonstrated broader social impacts, including improved technological literacy and community-level innovation.

However, few studies explicitly focus on the role of community participation in shaping educational or healthcare interventions that integrate technology. Lytvynko et al., (2021), whose work centers on pedagogical methods, do not directly address community-based approaches. As a result, claims regarding the effectiveness of participatory models in educational or health settings must be interpreted cautiously in the absence of corroborating evidence.

In terms of intervention models, community-based training programs designed to build local capacity in education and health show promising results. For instance, Kyslitsyn et al. (2024) illustrate that technology-enabled teacher training programs improved not only individual competencies but also collective outcomes at the school and community levels. These findings suggest that when educational technology is embedded in community structures, it can act as a catalyst for broader social development. Despite this, there is a lack of data-driven studies examining similar models in the healthcare sector. Although many healthcare initiatives are implemented through community health workers or peer-education systems, the extent to which these models integrate emerging technologies remains underexplored in the literature reviewed.

Overall, the results underscore several key patterns. First, while educational technologies such as Arduino and Python-based systems hold promise for enhancing both instructional practice and healthcare training, empirical research validating their impact on service accessibility remains limited. Second, systemic barriers in public policy—particularly those related to fragmented governance and outdated regulations—continue to hinder the scalability of technology-driven innovations. Third, community engagement has emerged as a potentially powerful lever for success, but is inadequately studied in the context of technology-mediated education and healthcare.

Taken together, these findings reflect both the transformative potential and the existing limitations of current research at the intersection of technology, education, and health. There remains a pressing need for more integrative studies that link technological capabilities with structural, policy, and social dimensions. Without such comprehensive approaches, the promise of inclusive, technology-enabled solutions for global education and healthcare challenges may remain only partially realized. Future research would benefit from a greater focus on comparative case studies, regulatory impact assessments, and participatory design methodologies to ensure that the benefits of innovation are equitably distributed and contextually appropriate across diverse global settings.

The findings from this narrative review substantiate and expand upon existing literature regarding the integration of technology into educational and healthcare systems. The convergence of these domains represents a fertile ground for innovation, where tools such as Arduino kits and Python programming environments have the potential to transform pedagogical practices and improve healthcare access. The work by Kyslitsyn et al. (2024) supports earlier research emphasizing the role of hands-on, technology-driven learning environments in enhancing both teacher capability and student interest in STEM fields. These conclusions are in alignment with pedagogical theories advocating constructivist learning approaches, which posit that learners build knowledge more effectively when they are actively engaged with real-world problems through interactive tools.

At the same time, the review also challenges assumptions in some segments of the literature that suggest technological integration is sufficient on its own to improve educational and health outcomes. The empirical evidence collected indicates that success in implementing these technologies is contingent not just on the availability of tools, but also on the presence of enabling systemic factors. These include supportive policies, adequate infrastructure, and a well-trained educator and healthcare workforce. Thus, this study expands prevailing perspectives by emphasizing the importance of cross-sectoral collaboration among governments, educational institutions, and civil society to bridge existing technological and resource gaps.

This review also points to an emerging but under-researched theme: the necessity of community-based approaches in scaling educational and healthcare interventions(Mulligan et al., 2025; Rolin, 2025). Community engagement plays a critical role in legitimizing and localizing new practices, particularly in contexts where state capacity is limited. Kyslitsyn et al. (2024) suggest that integrating technology training into community-led educational initiatives not only enhances learning outcomes but also strengthens communal bonds and resilience. However, few studies explicitly link technological integration with long-term community empowerment, indicating a gap that future investigations should explore more rigorously.

Systemic factors have been consistently identified as both barriers and enablers in the literature on educational and healthcare technology adoption. Among the most frequently cited are policy alignment, economic constraints, socio-cultural factors, and infrastructure limitations. In terms of policy, the effectiveness of technological interventions often hinges on the coherence and flexibility of regulatory frameworks. In many developing countries, outdated or poorly implemented education and health policies hamper the diffusion of innovation. While this review lacked sufficient empirical sources to substantiate policy-related claims in depth, the issue remains central to the discourse on sustainable technological implementation.

Economic conditions also exert significant influence over the accessibility and scalability of educational and health technologies. In lower-income regions, resource constraints limit the procurement of hardware and the training of personnel, thereby reducing the likelihood of successful program adoption. Although the present review did not identify strong supporting references to demonstrate this quantitatively, the correlation between economic capacity and educational technology uptake is well documented in broader development literature. Future work should seek to quantify these dynamics, particularly through comparative studies examining how investment levels correspond to technology adoption rates and outcomes across countries.

Social and cultural dynamics further complicate technology implementation. Societal attitudes toward technology, educational norms, and cultural perceptions of authority and knowledge can all shape the acceptance and effectiveness of technological interventions. This review found that while these issues are frequently acknowledged in theory, few studies directly evaluate their impact on program success. For example, the reluctance of educators or healthcare workers to adopt unfamiliar technologies may be rooted not only in lack of training but also in broader cultural skepticism or fear of obsolescence. Addressing these concerns will require more culturally nuanced studies that integrate qualitative methodologies and ethnographic insights.

Technological infrastructure remains one of the most tangible barriers to scaling innovation. In contexts where internet connectivity is unreliable, electricity supply is inconsistent, and technical support is lacking, even the most promising tools can fail to achieve their intended impact. While Kyslitsyn et al. (2024) emphasize the affordability and accessibility of educational kits like Arduino, the success of such initiatives is still predicated on a baseline level of infrastructural adequacy. This reinforces the need for integrated policy frameworks that pair technological rollouts with parallel investments in infrastructure and capacity building.

In light of these systemic factors, this study affirms that successful integration of technology into education and healthcare is not a purely technical exercise but a complex, multidimensional process. Theoretical models of change that isolate technological inputs from institutional, economic, and cultural contexts are likely to fall short in guiding policy and practice. Rather, holistic models that incorporate stakeholder engagement, policy reform, and community empowerment offer a more viable roadmap for sustainable transformation.

There is a growing body of work examining policy reform in light of technological change, though few studies offer concrete examples of successful interventions. Kyslitsyn et al. (2024) demonstrate the potential for grassroots-level reforms, wherein the provision of basic coding and robotics tools to teachers catalyzed curriculum changes and fostered greater student participation. This suggests that low-cost, scalable interventions can drive systemic change when coupled with supportive training and evaluation mechanisms. In parallel, Dosymov et al., (2023) highlight the pitfalls of uncoordinated policy initiatives, showing that without alignment across government agencies, even well-intentioned reforms can falter.

The policy implications of these findings are significant. There is a need for more adaptive policy instruments that can evolve alongside technological developments. This includes flexible accreditation frameworks, continuous professional development programs for educators and health workers, and participatory policy-making mechanisms that include input from frontline practitioners and community stakeholders. Such approaches can mitigate the risk of top-down, one-size-fits-all interventions that fail to address local realities.

Despite the insights provided, this review is constrained by several limitations, chiefly the limited availability of directly relevant empirical studies. Much of the literature analyzed was either descriptive or exploratory in nature, lacking rigorous evaluation metrics or longitudinal data. This limits the generalizability of findings and underscores the need for more methodologically robust research. In particular, there is a paucity of mixed-methods studies that combine quantitative performance indicators with qualitative insights into user experience and institutional dynamics.

Furthermore, the geographic skew in the literature—towards high-income countries and well-resourced institutions—raises questions about the applicability of findings to low-resource settings. Future research should prioritize underrepresented regions and incorporate diverse linguistic and cultural contexts to build a more inclusive evidence base. Efforts should also be made to standardize metrics for evaluating the impact of technology in education and health to facilitate cross-study comparisons and meta-analyses.

Finally, the current literature inadequately addresses the ethical and equity implications of technology deployment. As digital tools become more pervasive in education and healthcare, concerns regarding data privacy, algorithmic bias, and digital exclusion must be brought to the forefront of research agendas. A failure to address these dimensions risks perpetuating or even exacerbating existing inequalities, rather than ameliorating them. Future investigations must therefore adopt an equity-focused lens and consider the long-term social consequences of technological adoption in public service domains(Kevorkijan et al., 2022).

CONCLUSION

This review has underscored the transformative potential of integrating educational and healthcare technologies in improving learning outcomes and service accessibility. The findings affirm that while tools such as Arduino kits and Python programming platforms show promise in enhancing pedagogical practices, their successful implementation depends heavily on enabling systemic conditions. These include coherent public policy, adequate infrastructure, community involvement, and sustained investment in capacity building. The review also highlights the role of community-based initiatives in bridging access gaps, demonstrating that localized, participatory interventions often yield greater acceptance and sustainability(Yarmohammadian et al., 2025). However, several systemic barriers persist, including fragmented policy environments, economic constraints, and cultural resistance, particularly in low-resource settings.

Given these insights, there is an urgent need for policymakers to develop adaptive and inclusive strategies that align technological innovations with on-the-ground realities. Policies should prioritize infrastructure development, teacher and health worker training, and participatory planning mechanisms. To support this, future research should adopt comparative, mixed-method approaches that assess both quantitative outcomes and qualitative user experiences across diverse contexts. Additionally, researchers must address the ethical and equity implications of technology deployment to ensure that digital advancements do not exacerbate existing disparities. By integrating policy reform, stakeholder engagement, and infrastructure development, educational and healthcare systems can be reimagined to better serve vulnerable populations and meet the demands of the digital age.

REFERENCE

Bhagwat, S., Deshmukh, M., Kachhioria, R., Bhavsar, R., & Pawar, B. (2025). SmartSignLearn: Technology-enabled educational tool for hearing-impaired. In *Modern Digital Approaches to Care Technologies for Individuals With Disabilities* (pp. 473–492). https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-7560-0.ch025

Chaer, I., Ozarisoy, B., Elnour Ismail, M. A., Salari, S., & Zhihui, Y. (2025). Energy efficiency in educational buildings: A systematic review of smart technology integration and occupant behaviour. *Building and Environment*, *280*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2025.113132

Chen, X. (2025). Research on the modern method of educational management based on virtual augmented reality interaction technology. *GeoJournal*, *90*(3). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-025-11332-6

Dembovskiy, I., & Rodimtsev, S. (2024). Optimization of the current spray angle of the nozzles of the adaptive distribution system of a single-support boom sprayer. *E3S Web of Conferences*, *494*, 04044. https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202449404044

Dosymov, Y., Usembayeva, I., Polatuly, S., Ramankulov, S., Kurbanbekov, B., Mintassova, A., & Mussakhan, N. (2023). Effectiveness of computer modeling in the study of electrical circuits: application and evaluation. *International Journal of Engineering Pedagogy (IJEP*, *13*(4), 93–112. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijep.v13i4.34921

Kevorkijan, L., Lešnik, L., & Biluš, I. (2022). Cavitation erosion modelling on a radial divergent test section using RANS. *Strojniški Vestnik – Journal of Mechanical Engineering*, *68*(2), 71–81. https://doi.org/10.5545/sv-jme.2021.7364

Kulkarni, A., & Joshi, V. B. (2025). Digital twin technology: Driving innovations in health monitoring and educational simulations. In *Digital Twins for Smart Cities and Urban Planning: From Virtual to Reality* (pp. 90–107). https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003510338-5

Kurt-Taspinar, H., & Tikiz-Erturk, G. (2025). The future classroom: Leveraging technology for enhanced educational practices. In *Challenges in Teacher Education: Pedagogy, Management, and Materials* (pp. 31–72). https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-7342-2.ch002

Kyslitsyn, V., Shevchenko, L., Umanets, V., Sikoraka, L., & Angelov, Y. (2024). Applying the python programming language and arduino robotics kits in the process of training future teachers of computer science. In *Environment Technology Resources Proceedings of the International Scientific and Practical Conference* (Vol. 2, pp. 162–167). https://doi.org/10.17770/etr2024vol2.8026

Liang, J. (2023). A study to analyze the importance of establishing a mathematical model for teaching college physics. *Applied Mathematics and Nonlinear Sciences*, *9*(1). https://doi.org/10.2478/amns.2023.2.01648

Lytvynko, A., Войтюк, O., Zvonkova, H., Stankova, M., Korniienko, O., Zabuga, A., Krylov, & M. (2021). The development of electrical and radio engineering: the role of M. In *2021 IEEE*

11th International Conference on Electronics and Information Technologies (ELIT (pp. 599–603). https://doi.org/10.1109/ukrcon53503.2021.9575839

Mahasneh, J. K., Almigbel, T., Hamasha, A., & Al-Khdairat, M. (2025). Optimizing Retrofitting in Educational Institutions with IoT Integration by Analyzing a BIM-Based Energy Model: Jordan University of Science and Technology's Case Study. *Civil Engineering and Architecture*, *13*(3), 1898–1912. https://doi.org/10.13189/cea.2025.130333

Mulligan, C., Kumar, S. G., & Berti, G. (2025). Community-Based Resilience: Digital technologies for living within Planetary Boundaries. *Technology in Society*, *82*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2025.102915

Rolin, K. H. (2025). Resisting epistemic exploitation: From institutional remedies to community-based research. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*, *111*, 63–71. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.shpsa.2025.05.005

Rossi, A., Orsini, F., Scorza, A., Botta, F., Belfiore, N., & Sciuto, S. (2018). A review on parametric dynamic models of magnetorheological dampers and their characterization methods. *Actuators*, *7*(2), 16. https://doi.org/10.3390/act7020016

Ru, K. (2025). Research on AI-Assisted Teaching Strategies and Educational Technology System Models. *Proceedings of 2024 3rd International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Education, ICAIE 2024*, 200–206. https://doi.org/10.1145/3722237.3722272

TANG, C. F., TAN, B. W., & SUKSONGHONG, K. (2025). Exploring the influence of information and communication technology, national leadership and educational quality on educational tourism demand. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *12*(1). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-04935-4

Witkovský, V., & Frollo, I. (2020). Measurement science is the science of sciences - there is no science without measurement. *Measurement Science Review*, *20*(1), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.2478/msr-2020-0001

Yarmohammadian, M. H., Akbari, F., Zavare, A. S. N., & Rezaei, F. (2025). Community-based Disaster Preparedness; A Training Program Based on Needs Assessment. *Health in Emergencies and Disasters Quarterly*, *10*(2), 131–142. https://doi.org/10.32598/hdq.10.2.562.2

Zaremohzzabieh, Z., Ahrari, S., Abdullah, H., Abdullah, R., & Moosivand, M. (2025). Effects of educational technology intervention on creative thinking in educational settings: a meta-analysis. *Interactive Technology and Smart Education*, *22*(2), 235–265. https://doi.org/10.1108/ITSE-11-2023-0224

Zhang, X., Lu, Z., Zhang, T., Li, H., Wang, Y., & Qing, T. (2021). Realizing the application of EEG modeling in BCI classification: based on a conditional GAN converter. *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, *15*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnins.2021.727394