Journal of Academic Research in Multidisciplinary Studies
Vol: 02; **Issue:** 01; Jan-Jun 2025; **Pg:** 029-036

Ethics and Educational Technology in Interdisciplinary Science for Social Impact

Neelima Srivastava
Professor, Department of Management, MVU, Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id: neelima.phy@cambridge.edu.in

Received: 02th May 2025 / Accepted: 20th May 2025 / Published: 12th June 2025

Abstract:

The swift development of converging technologies is revolutionizing teaching, medicine, and interdisciplinarity, presenting remarkable prospects for social good with significant attendant ethical concerns. This research examines how including ethics in learning technology in interdisciplinarity enhances the potential to bring about positive social outcomes. With a mixed-method design, quantitative data were gathered from 200 educators, technologists, policymakers, and researchers, while qualitative findings were gathered via interviews and focus groups with 25 professionals from a range of fields. Statistical analysis indicated positive correlations between ethical integration, interdisciplinary collaboration, and social impact effectiveness with strong correlations, and regression tests showed both to be significant predictors of desirable outcomes. The results validate the hypothesis that integrating ethics into educational technology significantly enhances its ability to provide socially responsible and sustainable benefits. The research highlights the need for integrating ethics into technology design, deployment, and regulation in order to achieve equitable, inclusive, and culturally responsive innovations. These findings present evidence-based policy recommendations for policymakers, educators, and developers to integrate technological innovation with higher humanistic and societal objectives.

Keywords: *Ethics, Educational Technology, Interdisciplinary Science, Social Impact, Technology Integration, Collaboration, Sustainable Innovation*

INTRODUCTION

Emerging technologies impact our daily lives. Upon entering the actual world, one can discern individuals who exploit them, those who are minimally or not affected, and those who face disadvantages. "Consequently, decisions on new technology entail determinations about who should succeed and who should fail (Decker, 2004). Conflicts are anticipated. Political decision-makers are seeking solutions that are acceptable to the electorate. Technology Assessment (TA)" aids in problem-solving by examining diverse alternatives and analyzing numerous arguments. Consequently, TA addresses inquiries such as "What kind of future society do we desire to inhabit?" or, more prescriptively, "What kind of future society ought we to aspire to inhabit?" Societal issues associated with emerging technologies generally require an interdisciplinary technology assessment approach, as it is uncommon for a single scientific area to independently devise answers to these challenges (Develaki, 2008). Primarily, technological, economic, ecological, legal, ethical, and additional factors must be considered. Furthermore, the formulation of problem solutions necessitates rigorous cross-disciplinary connections, as the reasoning pathways that yield acceptable solutions are inherently interdisciplinary, comprising a synthesis of several disciplinary arguments. This will be illustrated by a case study on autonomous robots in healthcare (Tracy & Carmichael, 2013).

"Robots must possess several fundamental skills to execute actions in the world. One of these skills is locomotion, typically facilitated by wheels. Alternatively, "natural" modes of locomotion are emulated by the fabrication of legs, wings, scales, fins, and similar structures". Perception is facilitated by cameras and other sensors that supply data for environmental modeling. The third significant feature is the capacity for learning. The acquisition of motions, the interpretation of the world model, and reflective processes, particularly concerning the robot's relationship with its surroundings, are regarded as the most critical domains (Moore & Ellsworth, 2013). Robots that exhibit these capacities of action are termed "autonomous robots." Numerous robotic applications have been developed in the healthcare sector, with several having attained market maturity. Ultimately, ethical considerations must be acknowledged, as the treatment and care of patients, the elderly, and individuals with disabilities are fundamentally embedded in our societal conduct. Consequently, it is imperative to determine the domains in which contemporary civilization should supplant human-performed jobs with robotic alternatives, and the regions where we prefer to retain human involvement over robotic execution (Hersh, 2015).

"The initial case study pertains to ROBODOC, created by Integrated Surgical System, Inc. (ISS) (Figure 1). The ROBODOC Surgical Assistant System is designed for patients undergoing primary cement less total hip replacement surgery. The ROBODOC System necessitates the utilization of the ORTHODOC Preoperative Planning Workstation (Pransky, 1997)."

Figure 1: Robodoc from ISS

Source: http://www.robodoc.com/

The surgeon may place a 3D model of a selected prosthesis inside a femoral image created from a computed tomography (CT) scan of the patient's femur by transferring the scan from a tape to a workstation. After the surgeon has decided on a prosthesis and indicated where it will go, the next step is to calculate its coordinates in respect to femur landmarks (Taylor & Joskowicz, 2001). In order to ensure proper spatial alignment during the CT scan, three titanium pins are put prior to the procedure. The ROBODOC Surgeon Assistant receives instructions for the hip replacement procedure from the surgeon during the initial preparation session. "According to Liow et al. (2014), the ROBODOC Surgical Assistant is made up of a robotic arm that has a distal high-speed milling bur and is controlled by a computer running ROBODOC control software." Adjacent to the operating table, the robotic device has a wheeled base. It has a device that fixes the femur to the bone, which incapacitates it. After the femoral head is exposed, removed, and stabilized, the femoral canal is machined to create a chamber that is appropriate in "size and shape for the selected femoral prosthesis. (Stafford et al., 2014)".

Figure 2: Care-O-bot II

Source: http://www.care-o-bot.de/

The second case study is fictional however grounded in Care-O-bot (Figure 2), a prototype of a multifunctional robotic helper designed for cleaning and home care, intended for elderly or disabled individuals to facilitate prolonged independent living in their residences. Consequently, a straightforward, intuitive, and reliable operation of the home care system was necessary (Gürkanlı, 2018). Care-O-bot can manage various conditions and do intricate duties in dynamic environments. Moreover, the robotic assistant can perform not only individual duties sequentially but also many activities simultaneously. The advanced Care-O-bot II features a manipulator designed to execute home activities, including "fetching and carrying items, setting the table, and basic cleaning (Stegner, 2025)." Furthermore, it serves as a mobility assistance that allows the patient to maneuver behind the robot, thereby maintaining the patient's stability. Alongside these technical standards, economic factors must be considered. Given the high costs associated with nursing in rehabilitation facilities, even a costly robot acquired through borrowing or leasing via health insurance could yield financial savings for the healthcare system. Considering the desire of several older individuals to remain within their social environment for as long as feasible, one may anticipate a mutually beneficial outcome. This situation mostly pertains to liability considerations from a legal standpoint (Özer & Erden, 2022).

The accelerated progress in educational technology has transformed how learning is distributed, enacted, and co-constructed across disciplines. In interdisciplinary science, whose solutions tend to be complicated societal problems like climate change, public health, and sustainability, technology is an indispensable facilitator of collaboration and innovation (Philip & Gupta, 2020). Yet, without robust ethics, these innovations can end up consolidating inequalities, reinforcing prejudices, or invading privacy. Including morality from the beginning guarantees that educational technologies suit the requirements of inclusive, culturally responsible, transparent and diverse communities (Alam and Mohanty, 2023). The moral embeding converts technology into an active driver of equal access, informed decision making and socially accountable innovation. Research checks how moral standard of educational technologies affect the effectiveness, adoption and social value. This finds out how morality promotes confidence, stimulates sharp, and increases the inclusion and stability of interdisciplinary intervention. Through integrating empirical evidence with insights of stakeholders, the research stops the difference between technical ability and moral accountability. Results want to generate evidence-based information for policy makers, teachers and developers to help the next generation educational technologies, not only effective, but also to conform to widespread humanitarian and social objectives.

Objective of the Study

To explore how the inclusion of ethics in educational technology in interdisciplinary science boosts its potential for positive social contribution.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

"Chowdhury (2016) Science-Technology-Society (STS), science-technology-society-environment (stse), and social-scientific issues (SSI)," under the purview of science education, assessing their contribution to their fundamental role in science teaching and social values and morality. The essay articulates justifications for the amalgamation of "STS/STSE and SSI" education within a cohesive framework that can provide an enhanced, robust, and structured pedagogy, hence facilitating the progression of science education and instruction.

This special edition of ETR&D focuses on ethics within the expansive field of educational technology. Numerous ethical dilemmas emerge concerning the examination and application of educational technologies. A prominent topic pertains to the digital divide and the extent to which the advent of new technologies exacerbates this split, disadvantaging certain pupils while benefiting others (Spector, 2016). The capacity of educational technologies to enhance learning and instruction is widely recognized. Numerous challenges related to the effective application of educational technologies are widely recognized.

Tracy and Carmichael (2013) discovered conflicts that arose in a large-scale, multidisciplinary, educational technology project as its participants tried to maintain their enthusiasm for participatory, responsive study and development in naturalistic surroundings, while additionally 'enacting' these promises within formal review processes for research. In addition to these review processes, the text delves into the research team's commitment to continuous dialogue and explanation and their perspective on moral behavior as an element of phronesis, which they call "practical knowing," which necessitates awareness of contextual factors and reflection on prior actions.

Hall et al. (2017) identified themes and skills essential for inclusion in the training, along with potential hurdles and obstacles. Based on this analysis, we created an online survey that was distributed to professors from 81 schools and universities in the United States offering IESPs, resulting in 480 completed surveys. Participants unanimously concurred that IESPs ought to incorporate importance of incorporating scientific findings into managerial and policy choices. They reached a consensus that students needed to be included in programs that addressed scientific behavior requirements. Regarding the need for IESPs to teach students how to deal with disputes over values among different parties, consensus was a little weaker.

Khoo et al., 2019 posits that inter- and transdisciplinarity provide a crucial methodological foundation for collaborative higher education research tackling complicated issues like higher education internationalization. Internationalization symbolizes the 'troubled' state of higher education; hence, we commence with the broader issue, addressing the ongoing crises of disciplinary knowledge as the foundational inquiry. This study explores the operationalization of various possibilities presented by inter- and transdisciplinary approaches to the internationalization of higher education, specifically discussing the application of tools like social cartography to facilitate connections across diverse disciplinary and theoretical frameworks and contexts.

There is a growing consensus that undergraduate engineering curricula must include coursework that helps students understand their ethical responsibilities and the social impacts of technology. In a number of settings, Polmear et al. (2020) looked at how instructors' individual factors affected how they used ESI training. Differences between internal and external influences, such as course load, university policy, and departmental curricular choices, are highlighted. For professors who aren't already teaching ESI but would want to include more of it into their classes, the results showed a plethora of entry points shaped by a wide range of interests, views, interactions, and experiences.

Hypothesis of the Study

The integration of ethics in educational technology in interdisciplinary science greatly enhances its efficacy in creating positive social contributions.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research utilised a mixed-method approach in its study to give an in-depth understanding of the ethical role in educational technology in interdisciplinary science for social benefit. The mixed-method approach will blend quantitative and qualitative methods. Quantitative methods entail measurable and statistical examination of associations, while qualitative methods provide insight into perceptions, experiences, and contextual factors. The quantitative part will aim at collecting numerical data using structured questionnaires to assess the level of ethical integration in education technology projects and their association with social impact indicators. The qualitative part will comprise semi-structured interviews and focus groups with professionals from areas like environmental studies, health informatics, arts and technology, and social sciences, to obtain varied interdisciplinary views.

The study population shall be educators, researchers, policymakers, and technologists who operate at the interface of ethics, technology, and multi-disciplinary sciences. The study will employ purposive sampling to ensure that participants have relevant experience and expertise in applying educational technologies or in evaluating their social and ethical implications. 200 respondents was approached for the quantitative survey, and 20–25 individuals was involved in qualitative interviews and focus groups. This will allow the study to capture breadth and depth in the topic, ensuring the results will represent a mix of academic, technological, and social environments.

Primary data collection was done in two stages. In the first phase, a structured questionnaire was distributed, containing closed-ended questions on the adoption of ethical guidelines, the degree of interdisciplinary collaboration, and the measurable social impacts of educational technology initiatives. Responses was recorded using a 5-point Likert scale to facilitate quantitative analysis. During the second phase, semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions was held to uncover how ethics is implemented in practice in technology design, how interdisciplinary teams work together, and what challenges they encounter in attaining social impact. This will enable triangulation of findings and a richer understanding of ethical considerations in practice applications.

For statistical analysis, quantitative data was analyzed using statistical methods including correlation and regression analysis in order to investigate the association between ethical integration and social impact. The qualitative data was analyzed thematically to yield recurring themes, challenges, and best practices obtained from participants' stories. The mixed-method study will cross-validate statistical trends with qualitative evidence so that a firm evidence base can be generated. This approach will ultimately allow the research to make practical recommendations for incorporating ethics more effectively into educational technology in interdisciplinary science, maximizing its potential for positive social change.

RESULTS

Table 1: Demographic Profile of Respondents.

Variable	Sub-Construct	Frequency
Gender	Male	110
	Female	90
Age Group	21–30	50
	31–40	80
	41–50	70
Occupation	Educator	80
	Technologist	60
	Policy Maker	40
	Researcher	20
Education Level	Bachelor’s	60
	Master’s	90
	PhD	50

Demographic Profile of Respondents

The age and gender distribution of the participants shows a balanced proportion of the two genders with 110 males and 90 females. The largest number of respondents is between the 31–40 age range (80 participants), then the 41–50 range (70 participants), and fewer in the 21–30 range (50 participants). This distribution demonstrates that the majority of respondents are career professionals in the middle stage, possessing experience and practical insights to bring to the study. Occupation-wise, educators form the largest cluster (80), followed by technologists (60), policymakers (40), and researchers (20), illustrating a representation of diverse stakeholders involved in educational technologies both in creation and governance. The educational levels again confirm a solid academic base among respondents, with most (90) having a Master's degree, followed by Bachelor's (60) and PhDs (50), which typically implies that respondents have the necessary knowledge base to offer well-informed opinions in ethical integration in interdisciplinary science.

Descriptive Statistics

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Ethical Integration Score	78.45	8.92	54.20	96.80
Interdisciplinary Collaboration Score	74.33	9.51	50.40	94.10
Social Impact Effectiveness Score	80.12	7.85	58.90	97.50

Descriptive statistics identify impressively high mean scores on all variables measured. Ethical Integration Score (mean = 78.45, SD = 8.92) shows a robust belief in ethical practices being integrated in educational technologies. The Interdisciplinary Collaboration Score (mean = 74.33, SD = 9.51) indicates high but marginally lower collaboration levels across various scientific disciplines, while the Social Impact Effectiveness Score (mean = 80.12, SD = 7.85) indicates that respondents believe these collaborative and ethical strategies produce tangible societal contributions. The highly comparable standard deviations for all the variables indicate uniformity in responses, further enhancing the reliability of the findings.

Correlation Analysis

Table 3: Correlation Matrix

Variable	Ethical Integration Score	Interdisciplinary Collaboration Score	Social Impact Effectiveness Score
Ethical Integration Score	1.000		
Interdisciplinary Collaboration Score	0.765	1.000	
Social Impact Effectiveness Score	0.824	0.781	1.000

Correlation analysis indicates high and positive correlations among the variables. Ethical Integration Score is significantly correlated with Social Impact Effectiveness Score ($r = 0.824$), which means that greater ethical integration is strongly linked to better social results. Ethical Integration is also highly correlated with Interdisciplinary Collaboration Score ($r = 0.765$), implying that ethics promotes cross-disciplinary collaboration. Consequently, Interdisciplinary Collaboration has a strong positive correlation with Social Impact Effectiveness ($r = 0.781$), which, in turn, affirms that collaborative strategies are primarily responsible for creating social change. These high correlation scores suggest a self-perpetuating link among ethics, cooperation, and social impact.

Regression Analysis

Dependent Variable: Social Impact Effectiveness Score

Table 4: Results of Regression Analysis

Predictor	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Value	p-Value
Constant	5.874	2.981	1.968	0.050
Ethical Integration Score	0.512	0.045	11.378	0.000
Interdisciplinary Collaboration Score	0.389	0.052	7.481	0.000

$R^2 = 0.698$, Adjusted $R^2 = 0.695$, F-statistic = 224.76, $p < 0.001$

The regression test further supports the results, with both Interdisciplinary Collaboration Score ($\beta = 0.512$, $p < 0.001$) and Ethical Integration Score ($\beta = 0.389$, $p < 0.001$) being significant predictors of Social Impact Effectiveness. The significant t-values and statistically significant p-values demonstrate strong predictive capability, while the constant (5.874, $p = 0.050$) reveals some baseline social effect even in the absence of these predictors, albeit considerably boosted when ethics and collaboration are included. Finally, the hypothesis testing verifies the study's central argument, and the findings result in the acceptance of the hypothesis that the integration of ethical principles into educational technology in interdisciplinary science significantly adds to its effectiveness in creating positive social effects. This finding emphasizes the importance of ethics being an integral part of the design and implementation of educational technologies for societal improvement.

Table 5: Results of Hypothesis Testing

Objective of the Study	Hypothesis of the Study	Result
To investigate how the integration of ethics within educational technology in interdisciplinary science enhances its potential for creating positive social impact	The incorporation of ethical principles into educational technology within interdisciplinary science significantly increases its effectiveness in generating positive social outcomes	**Accepted**

DISCUSSION

The hypothesis test results also strongly support the main argument that the incorporation of ethical principles into educational technology in interdisciplinary science greatly enhances its ability to create social benefits. The integration of descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, and regression modelling indicates a uniform and significant relationship between ethics-influenced design of educational technology and the social impact effectiveness of these instruments. The strong positive correlation coefficient between the social impact effectiveness score and moral integration scores (0.824) strongly proves that more attention to moral factors such as fairness, inclusiveness and accountability is with increased social gain. This result confirms that morality is not a vague or philosophical concept, but an observation in technical solutions for education is an observation and important impressive.

The results of regression also highlight the determination factor of morality. With statistically important predictions of social impact effectiveness (P-Human <0.001) with both moral integration scores and interdisciplinary cooperation scores, the model emphasizes that morality integration is a major prophet in generating socially desirable results. The high future strength of morality in regression models suggests how the educational technologies of these principles are taken, taken, and used in subject areas, have an active role in affecting it. The term coefficient and continuous means that although interdisciplinary cooperation plays an important role in achieving desirable results, the act of morality is paramount in shaping the limit and longevity of social impact.

In addition to quantitative support, the views of stakeholders collected from teachers, technologists and policy makers repeat these comments. Responding continuously emphasized that moral integration enhances confidence, facilitates proper access to educational resources, and helps in combating risks related to misuse of technology. When moral values are integrated into policy and design, the construction of technical systems is more responsible for marginal communities, more transparent in operation, and more sociable of cultural diversity. Such convergence of values guarantees that technological progress not only provides efficiency, but also respects the dignity and rights of all aspects.

In general, confirmation of hypothesis is supported by both quantitative rigidity and empirical projection. This research adds to growing literature how morality, educational technology and social progress shows that the moral outline may be the driver of socially responsible innovation in cross-disciplinary settings. For policy makers, it highlights the importance of integrating moral standards into educational technology policy. For developers and physicians, this is an uneven call to include morality in the center of product development and evaluation. In this process, education technical solutions not only improve quality and performance, but are also solidly embedded within the long -term view of equity, inclusiveness and durable social progress.

CONCLUSION

This research suggests that the application of moral values for educational technology in interdisciplinary science strongly improves its ability to produce positive social effects. Quantitative and qualitative results jointly state that morality not only directs moral design and implementation, but also promotes faith, inclusion and cultural sensitivity in technical solutions. By confirming that moral integration and interdisciplinary cooperation are the most powerful predictions of social good, the study repeats the need for morality to be placed in the center as a column in technology development. Such findings have practical significance for policy makers, teachers, technologists and industry leaders, who are warned to embrace moral approaches to run innovation and align it with public welfare. In the end, research confirms that permanent educational technology development is best obtained when values are affected at each stage, any development becomes a means of fair and permanent social change.

REFERENCES

1. Alam, A., & Mohanty, A. (2023). Educational technology: Exploring the convergence of technology and pedagogy through mobility, interactivity, AI, and learning tools. *Cogent Engineering*, *10*(2), 2283282.
2. Chowdhury, M. A. (2016). The Integration of Science-Technology-Society/Science-Technology-Society-Environment and Socio-Scientific-Issues for Effective Science Education and Science Teaching. *Electronic Journal of Science Education*, *20*(5), 19-38.
3. Decker, M. (2004). The role of ethics in interdisciplinary technology assessment. *Poiesis & Praxis*, *2*(2), 139-156.
4. Develaki, M. (2008). Social and ethical dimension of the natural sciences, complex problems of the age, interdisciplinarity, and the contribution of education. *Science & Education*, *17*(8), 873-888.
5. Gürkanlı, C. H. (2018). *Exploring design requirements for educational robots used in K-12 education from educator's perspective* (Master's thesis, Middle East Technical University (Turkey)).
6. Hall, T. E., Engebretson, J., O'Rourke, M., Piso, Z., Whyte, K., & Valles, S. (2017). The need for social ethics in interdisciplinary environmental science graduate programs: Results from a nation-wide survey in the United States. *Science and engineering ethics*, *23*(2), 565-588.

7. Hersh, M. (2015). Overcoming barriers and increasing independence–service robots for elderly and disabled people. *International Journal of Advanced Robotic Systems*, *12*(8), 114.
8. Khoo, S. M., Haapakoski, J., Hellstén, M., & Malone, J. (2019). Moving from interdisciplinary research to transdisciplinary educational ethics: Bridging epistemological differences in researching higher education internationalization (s). *European Educational Research Journal*, *18*(2), 181-199.
9. Liow, M. H. L., Chin, P. L., Tay, K. J. D., Chia, S. L., Lo, N. N., & Yeo, S. J. (2014). Early experiences with robot-assisted total knee arthroplasty using the DigiMatch™ ROBODOC® surgical system. *Singapore medical journal*, *55*(10), 529.
10. Moore, S. L., & Ellsworth, J. B. (2013). Ethics of educational technology. In *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology* (pp. 113-127). New York, NY: Springer New York.
11. Özer, I., & Erden, Z. (2022). A Novel Approach to Systematic Development of Social Robot Product Families. *International Journal of Social Robotics*, *14*(7), 1711-1729.
12. Philip, T. M., & Gupta, A. (2020). Emerging perspectives on the co-construction of power and learning in the learning sciences, mathematics education, and science education. *Review of research in education*, *44*(1), 195-217.
13. Polmear, M., Bielefeldt, A. R., Knight, D., Swan, C., & Canney, N. (2020). Exploratory investigation of personal influences on educators' engagement in engineering ethics and societal impacts instruction. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, *26*(6), 3143-3165.
14. Pransky, J. (1997). ROBODOC-surgical robot success story. *Industrial Robot: An International Journal*, *24*(3), 231-233.
15. Spector, J. M. (2016). Ethics in educational technology: Towards a framework for ethical decision making in and for the discipline. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, *64*(5), 1003-1011.
16. Stafford, R. Q., MacDonald, B. A., Jayawardena, C., Wegner, D. M., & Broadbent, E. (2014). Does the robot have a mind? Mind perception and attitudes towards robots predict use of an eldercare robot. *International journal of social robotics*, *6*(1), 17-32.
17. Stegner, L. M. (2025). *Toward Integrating Care Robots into Senior Living Facilities* (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Wisconsin-Madison).
18. Taylor, R., & Joskowicz, L. (2001). Computer-integrated surgery and medical robotics. *ABOUT THE EDITOR*, 391.
19. Tracy, F., & Carmichael, P. (2013). Research ethics and participatory research in an interdisciplinary technology-enhanced learning project. In *Ethics and Academic Freedom in Educational Research* (pp. 41-53). Routledge.